Durham E-Theses

The Akedah Servant Complex: Tracing the Linkage of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Texts

DE-ANDRADO, PABA,NIDHANI

The Akedah Servant Complex:

Tracing the Linkage of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 in Ancient Jewish and

Early Christian Texts

By

Paba Nidhani De Andrado

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirement of

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)

Department of Theology and Religion

Durham University

2011

The Akedah Servant Complex: Tracing the Linkage of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 in Ancient

Jewish and Early Christian Texts

By

Paba Nidhani de Andrado

ABSTRACT

This thesis project involves tracing the convergence of two biblical texts, Akedah (Genesis 22) and the Fourth Servant Song (Isaiah 53) in ancient Jewish and early Christian textual traditions. The passages share conceptual and verbal resonances, including the suffering of a righteous individual, God's direct complicity in willing or commanding an unjust death, unresisting compliance with God's will, notions of cultic sacrifice, exaltation and reward, among other mutual features. Given their intertextual connections, the two passages have been associated together in some ancient Jewish and Early Christian texts, within a context of suffering righteousness and sacrifice (i.e. martyrdom, persecution, Christ's death). My thesis labels this apparent convergence of the primary texts as the Akedah Servant complex, and develops a dialogic method of intertextuality to determine the presence of the complex in selected passages. The texts are grouped into two periods: 1) Stage I or pre-Christian Jewish writings (pre-70CE); 2) Stage II or New Testament, in order to facilitate a comparative study of patterns and influences within and between each group. This thesis confirms the presence of the Akedah Servant complex in a range of texts in each stage, with an increasing tendency to be allied with soteriological motifs. This study indicates that the linking of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 is a long-standing tradition which resulted in shaping an early Christian model of atonement.

Table of Contents

Statement of Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published in any format, including electronic and the Internet, without the author's prior written consent. All information derived from this thesis must be acknowledged appropriately.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CHAPTER ONE

OVERVIEW

1.1   <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

The mosaic representation of Genesis 22 in a vaulted apse at Calvary in the Holy Sepulchre Church, Jerusalem, depicts the conventional figures of Abraham with upraised hand, his bound son Isaac, the intervening angel and a ram caught in a bush. Although a modern work, this mosaic reflects an ancient tradition since the 4th century CE which has "localized the sacrifice of Isaac on Golgotha."[1] By its juxtaposition to the site of the crucifixion of Jesus, the mosaic epitomises the meaning that this narrative acquired within the early Christian tradition.[2] As the church father Ephrem encapsulates, "Isaac carried the wood and was taken up into the mountains to be sacrificed as a blameless lamb. And the saviour took up the cross, to be sacrificed in Calvary as a lamb on behalf of us."[3] John Chrysostom declares,"[Isaac] was even bound and lifted up and laid upon it, and endured all in silence, like a lamb, yea, rather like the common Lord of all. For of Him he both imitated the gentleness, and kept to the type. For 'He was led like a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep dumb before his shearer.'"[4] Such patristic writings claimed an association of the atoning sacrifice of Christ with Akedah,[5] and another

---

[1]   A. Mertens, "Who was a Christian in the Holy Land?" [Isaac, Patriarch], www.christusrex.org/www1/ofm/sbf/escurs/wwc/i.html (13 August 2011); B. McMorrow, "Mosaic of Abraham's Sacrifice of Isaac, Chapel of Calvary, Church of the Holy Sepulchre," www.pbase.com/bmcmorrow/image/124292805 (13 August 2011).

[2] For artwork on Gen 22, see Eddy van den Brink, "Abraham's Sacrifice: Early Jewish and Christian Art," in *The Sacrifice of Isaac* (ed. Ed Noort and Eibert Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 140-151. He writes on the mosaic at San Vitale in Ravenna (547 CE): "Isaac kneels on a clearly Christian altar, exactly over the real altar in the church. The iconography of the altar as well as its localisation demonstrates its meaning and its function: to draw attention to the Eucharistic renewal of Christ's death and resurrection in every Mass on the church's altar" (149).

[3] Ephrem the Greek, "Sermon on Abraham" as cited in Edward Kessler, *Bound By the Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2004), 112.

[4] John Chrysostom, *Homily 3* in *Homilies on Second Corinthians* (*NPNF* 12; First Series) *on CD ROM*.

[5] The term Akedah derives from the Hebrew root עקד for binding and is a *hapax legomenon* in the MT. This thesis employs "Akedah" to refer to the narrative in Genesis 22, as well as to the hermeneutical developments of the original narrative, although at times the phrase 'Akedah tradition' may be used to distinguish the latter. Scholars have debated on definitions of the term. Joseph Fitzmyer,"The Sacrifice of Isaac in Qumran literature," *Bib* 83 (2002): 211-229, remarks: "The name Akedah, however, is used with different connotations today, and so it is necessary to be clear from the outset about the sense in which it is being used. Sometimes it is used to denote only the vicarious expiation of the sacrifice of Isaac, i.e. the offering of Isaac on behalf of others (people of Israel); sometimes it means the story of the sacrifice of

well-known biblical text, Isaiah's Fourth Servant Song.[6] Is this intertextual linkage of Genesis

22 and Isaiah 53 an arbitrary choice of the church fathers, or do they witness to an ancient

pattern of associating these texts together? Given the evidence in a range of biblical exegeses

and ancient writings, this thesis proposes the existence of an atonement tradition which connects

Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song in a context of suffering righteousness and sacrifice, with

antecedents dating back to pre-Christian Jewish literature. My study labels this convergence of

the primary texts as the Akedah Servant complex, and attempts to trace this tradition by

investigating a selected range of ancient Jewish and early Christian texts, including pre-70 CE

Jewish works and New Testament writings.

The Fourth Servant Song and Akedah may well be described as texts that reveal "the

common root of Judaism and Christianity and also the decisive difference which separates

them."[7] These seminal biblical texts have long and complicated exegetical histories which

demonstrate how they have each been interpreted to advocate or refute various polemical and

theological positions in Judaism and Christianity.[8] While extensive studies have been done on

each passage separately, their intertextual ties, as well as the formation of an Akedah Servant

complex which relates to the nexus of the wider Jewish and Christian textual traditions, have

---

Isaac as it developed in the Jewish tradition in contrast to the bare account in Gen 22; and sometimes it connotes the totality of events depicted in art and literature that builds on Gen 22,1- 19. The noun עקדה does not appear in the biblical account of Genesis or in the Qumran text [4Q225 to be discussed]. It first appears in the rabbinic tradition of the third-fourth century of the Christian era" (211). P. R. Davies and B.D. Chilton, "The Aqedah: A Revised Tradition History,"*CBQ* 40 (1978): 514-546, restrict the term to an expiatory meaning: "a haggadic presentation of the vicariously atoning sacrifice of Isaac" (515). James Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac: A Study of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Light of Aqedah* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1981),18,75 prefers "the totality of the events as they are presented in Gen 22:1-19."

[6] For the sake of convenience, this thesis will interchangably employ the terms the Fourth Servant Song or Isaiah 53 (although the exact citation is Isaiah 52:13-53:12).

[7] Otto aBetz, "Jesus and Isaiah 53," in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant* (ed. William H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer; Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1998), 73. Although Betz refers only to Isaiah 53, his quote is just as applicable to Genesis 22.

[8] As well-known, Isaiah 53 has been the focus of centuries-long Jewish Christian debate on the identity of the Messiah. On early Christian engagement with the text, see Christoph Markschies, "Jesus Christ as a Man Before God: Two Interpretive Models for Isaiah 53 in the Patristic Literature and Their Development," in *The Suffering Servant* (ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher; trans. Daniel Bailey; Mich.: Eerdmans, 1996), 225-323. For a survey of Jewish interpretations, see S. R. Driver and A. Neubauer, eds., *The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah According to the Jewish Interpreters* (Oxford: James Parker &Co.,1877; repr., New York: Ktav,1969) which still remains useful. Genesis 22 has generated its share of interpretive discourse. Refer Kessler, *Bound by the Bible* on the exegetical encounters on Akedah between rabbis and church fathers during the first six centuries CE.

largely been overlooked. My thesis aims to address this lacuna in scholarship by investigating the following research question: To what extent have the Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song been linked in early Jewish tradition, and in what manner may such links have shaped an early Christian understanding of atonement?

The connection between Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 may not be obvious at first glance, but the conceptual and verbal resonances between them are apparent on a closer reading.[9] The protagonists in each (the Servant and Abraham respectively) are depicted as righteous persons who accede in obedient silence, without protesting, when placed in situations of suffering.[10] In both passages an innocent person is ordained to die unjustly, since neither Isaac nor the Servant have done any misdeed meriting death. Further, the texts maintain divine complicity in the suffering of the protagonists (Isa 53:10, Gen 22:2). Sacrifice is another mutual link, as Vermes observes: "the Servant is compared to a lamb brought to the slaughter (53:7); Isaac was also a holocaustal lamb. Isaac's sacrifice was ordained by God; so also was the servant's (53:10)."[11] Moreover, close relationships exist between the protagonists, including father and son, Lord and servant. The concept of vicarious atonement is a common element in these texts, with the ram taking the place of Isaac in the Genesis narrative (22:13) while the Servant atones for "many" in the Isaiah text (53:11-12). The two passages also share a feature of the sufferer finally receiving recompense and exaltation (Isa 53:12; Gen 22:17). Both texts also highlight that the reward bears universal consequences, with explicit reference to the nations (Isa 52:15; Gen 22:18).

---

[9] The better known intertextual connections are between Akedah and Job. See R.W. Moberly, *The Bible, Theology and Faith: A Study of Abraham and Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000), 84-86. The Servant has been linked to the suffering virtuous in Wisdom of Solomon. See Jack Suggs, "Wisdom of Solomon 2:10-5: A Homily Based on the Fourth Servant Song" *JBL* 76 (1957): 26-33.

[10] It is fitting to consider Abraham as a suffering figure like the servant, since he has to offer the son he loves.

[11] G. Vermes, "Redemption and Genesis 22" in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies.* (2nd ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 202. Israel Lévi, "Le sacrifice d'Isaac et la Mort de Jésus," *REJ* 64 (1912): 161-84, and Robert Daly, "The Soteriological Significance of the Sacrifice of Isaac," *CBQ* 39 (1977): 45-75, also comments on such a link, although the thrust of these arguments (to establish the influence of Akedah theology on Pauline soteriology) diverges from the thesis pursued here (see ch. 2.2 for critical discussion).

Apart from the above thematic parallels, these primary texts display linguistic resonances which link them together. In the MT versions the following verbal similarities may be found (see ch. 4 for detailed study): גוי (Isa 52:15; Gen 22:18); נשׂא (Isa 52:13,53:4,12; Gen 22:4,13); זרע (Isa 53:10; Gen 22:17,18), לקח (Isa 53:8; Gen 22:2,3), and שׂה (Isa 53:7, Gen 22:7). Likewise, in the LXX versions, the linguistic ties include ἀποστρέφω (Isa 53:3; Gen 22:19), σπέρμα (Isa 53:10; Gen 22:17), κληρονομέω (Isa 53:12; Gen 22:17), ἔθνη (Isa 52:15; Gen 22:18), πρόβατον (Isa 53:6,7; Gen 22:7,8), ἀνάφέρω (Isa 53:12, Gen 22:2), and different forms of παῖς (Isa 52:13; Gen 22:3, 22:5). While these verbal resonances consolidate the strong conceptual links between the two passages, one needs to engage in a careful textual analysis and develop an appropriate methodology to establish the interrelationships between Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53, and to track the trajectory of an Akedah Servant tradition.

1.2 BACKGROUND TO PRIMARY TEXTS

1.2.1 GENESIS 22

The book of Genesis may be divided into two parts: the primeval cycle (1-11) which consists of myths or "sacred narratives" universal in sweep, concerns creation and the created order, including human creation and the unfolding of human civilization; chapters (12-50) concentrate on a particular locale/region, presenting the family narratives of the ancestors of Israel, including Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph.[12] The Abrahamic section (chs.11:27-25:11) consists of several interrelated stories,[13] beginning with the genealogy and call of Abraham, and interspersed throughout with God's promises to Abraham of land, descendants and blessings. Hendel observes that "the stories of Abraham form a loosely connected cycle organized around two central themes: Abraham's need for a child and his relationship with Yahweh. These

---

[12]Background reference: Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis* (Georgia: Mercia UP, 1997; [English translation of 3rd ed.1910]); Ronald S. Hendel, "Book of Genesis," n.p., *ABD on CD-ROM*. Version 2.1. 1997. Gordon Wenham, "Genesis 16-50" *Word Biblical Commentary on CD ROM*. Version 2.1. 1998; Raymond Brown et al.,"Genesis," *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1990),8-43; Tarja Philip's course "Reading the Story of Abraham," Hebrew University, Spring 2008.
[13]These include the divine covenant (15), birth of Ishmael (16), covenant and circumcision (17), birth of Isaac (21), expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael (21), the sacrifice of Isaac (22) burial of Sarah (23), after which attention shifts to Isaac and his marriage (24), with a fleeting announcement of Abraham's marriage to Keturah and his death and burial by his two sons in 25 (1-11).

themes concern Abraham's identity as the ancestor of Israel and the founder of Israelite religion."[14] Within the Abrahamic narratives, Genesis 22 has been viewed as a climactic text,[15] evoking a range of responses.[16] From a literary perspective, the Akedah is well integrated within the Abrahamic cycle, displaying familiarity with preceding stories and bearing some parallels.[17]

Scholarly discussion on Genesis inevitably involves source criticism, with "the long-established identification of J (the Yahwist), E (the Elohist) and P (the Priestly source) still provid[ing] the most plausible model for the composition of Genesis."[18] Concerning Genesis 22, "source critics have usually assigned at least vv 1-14, 19 to E, on the grounds of its use of אלוהים for the deity, the parallels with 21:8-21 (also E), and the nocturnal revelation in vv1-2 [while] vv 15-18, which speak of the Lord (vv 15-16), are generally assigned to J or to a later redactor."[19] Modern scholarship on Genesis 22 has adapted a range of approaches, including theological and historical readings,[20] feminist interpretations,[21] literary and narrative criticism,[22]

---

[14] Hendel,"Genesis," n.p. E. Nicholson, foreword to *Genesis* by Gunkel, (Georgia: Mercia UP, 1997),4-9: "already at the oral stage individual stories concerning the same cycle or dwelling upon a similar theme were attracted to each other and were thus combined to form 'cycles of legends'(8)."

[15] A rabbinic tradition [*m. Avot* 5:3] mentions Abraham's life as a series of ten trials and seven blessings. The Akedah embodies the tenth and greatest trial as well as the climactic blessing. Refer Brown et al. *New Jerome,* 19, for a summary list.

[16] Louis Berman, "The Akedah in Music and Literature in *The Akedah:The Binding of Isaac* (NJ: Jason Aaronson Inc.,1997), 195-213 ; E. Kessler, "Response to Marc Bregman," *Journal of Textual Reasoning* www.etext.virginia.edu/journals/tr/archive/volume10 (3 October 2011); Joseph Guttmann, *Studies in Jewish Art from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (Northampton: Variorum Reprints, 1989) ch xiii; S. Kierkegaard's famous philosophical work *Fear and Trembling* (1843).

[17] Tarja Philip (notes) n.p.: shared features with the Ishmael and Hagar story include divine intervention at the critical moment, promises of blessings, and the reference to Isaac as the the only son (MT) which indicates the narrative's awareness of Ishmael's expulsion. Also Wenham,"Genesis," n.p. remarks "that the reaffirmation of the promises (vv. 17–18) of blessing, numerous descendants, inheritance, and blessing to the nations combines the refrains of the earlier chapters (12:2, 3; 17:16, 20; 18:18; 16:10; 17:2, 20; 15:4–5)." Desmond Alexander, "Genesis 22 and the Covenant of Circumcision," *JSOT* 8 (1983): 17-22, notes a link between Gen 22 and Gen 17 in relation to the "establishment of the covenant of circumcision" (17).

[18] Hendel "Genesis," n.p.

[19] Wenham, "Genesis," n.p., argues that "vv 15–18 should be regarded as integral and indeed central to this narrative in particular and to the Abraham cycle in general."

[20] As Hendel "Genesis," n.p., notes, "Hermann Gunkel [*Genesis*] began the modern study of the Genesis narratives with his attention to matters of genre, literary art, and prehistory in Israelite and ancient Near Eastern traditions." Other commentators include: Claus Westermann *Genesis 12-36* (Minneapolis: Augsburg,1985); Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis* (London: SCM, 1972); W. Brueggemann, *Genesis* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1982); Walter Moberly, *The Bible, Theology and Faith: A Study of Abraham and Jesus* (Cambridge UP, 2000), and also "Genesis 22: Abraham – Model or Monster?" in *The Theology of the Book of Genesis* (Cambridge UP: 2009),179-199; Brevard Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments* (London: SCM, 1992).

and Jewish perspectives.[23] While extensive critical materials exist, particularly relevant for this thesis are debates by Jewish and Christian scholars on the Akedah theology of sacrifice and its soteriological implications for the NT.[24]

One also recalls the extensiveness of ancient exegetical writings on Akedah, a few of which will be examined in this thesis. Among early Jewish Akedah traditions, one may briefly mention *Jubilees*, Josephus, Philo, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, Targums (*Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonathan, Fragmentary, Neofiti*), midrash from *Genesis Rabbah*, and the Mekhiltas. The patristic tradition also contains several references to the Akedah, including the writings of Melito, Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria, among others.

1.2.2   ISAIAH 53

The book of Isaiah holds a pre-eminent place among prophetic texts, covering a range of theological, historical and thematic materials, such as exile and restoration, new creation, salvation, eschatological views, political situations, prophecy, the messiah king and the servant songs.[25] Given its vast scope, scholarly attention has focused on questions of unity and authorship. Traditionally, the entire book (chs. 1-66) was considered to be a single unified work by an 8th century BCE Judean prophet. Bernhard Duhm's influential *Das Buch Jesaja* (1892) challenged this notion, gaining critical acceptance with his assertion that the text contains three major divisions (1-39; 40-55; 56-66) which had "mostly developed independently of each other" and were joined at a late date.[26] According to popular view, "three prophetic personalities

---

[21]Phyllis Trible,"Genesis 22: the Sacrifice of Sarah," in *Women in the Hebrew Bible* (NY: Routledge,1999) 271-290, has an excellent bibliography; Athalya Brenner, *Feminist Companion to Genesis* (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1993).

[22] Famously, Erich Auerbach, "Odysseus' Scar," in *Mimesis:The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (trans. W. Trask, Princeton: Princeton UP,1953).

[23] Nahum Sarna, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Genesis* (JPS: 1989); Jon Levenson, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1993); Shalom Spiegel, *The Last Trial* (trans. J. Goldin; NY: Pantheon books, 1967; repr., NY : Behrman, 1979).

[24]As Childs, *Biblical Theology,* 329 notes, "ever since Israel Lévi (*Le Sacrifice*) argued that Paul's doctrine of Christ's expiatory sacrifice was derived from the Jewish tradition of the 'binding of Isaac' the debate over the influence of Genesis 22 and its Jewish midrashic interpretations has continued." See ch. 2.2 for details.

[25] See outline in John Watts, *"Isaiah 1-33," WBC on CD-ROM*. Version 2.1. 1998.

[26] Brevard Childs, *Isaiah* (Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 2.

emerge: Isaiah, Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah," with the first being an 8th century BCE author, and the others belonging to the 6th century BCE.[27]

Duhm's tri-partite division still retains some influence, even as critical scholarship has evolved in new directions, including a new emphasis on the "unity of Isaiah."[28] Recognizing the unity of the book does not require reverting to the earlier notion of single authorship, but rather the "new perspective seeks to understand the final form of the complex text as an integral statement offered by the shapers of the book for theological reasons."[29] Recent Isaiah scholarship has been extensive,[30] including form and redaction criticism,[31] theological perspectives,[32] text criticism, intertextuality, the use of Isaiah in the NT and in patristic exegesis, and Jewish responses.[33] Qumran Isaiah scrolls also continue to impact on Isaiah studies, including on text forms and transmission, as well as exegesis, though scope for further research remains.[34]

The four servant songs were designated by Duhm, who "had separated from the material of Second Isaiah a group of passages": Isa 42:1-4[5-9], Isa 49:1-6, Isa 50:4-9; Isa

---

[27]Christopher Seitz, "Second Isaiah," *ABD on CD-ROM*. Version 2.1. 1997; Also H.G.M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), Walter Brueggemann, *Isaiah 40-66* (Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 1998), and Childs, *Isaiah,* 8, 289-290. Duhm's tri-partite division came to be over-simplified by the popular claim that each division corresponded respectively to a pre-exilic, exilic and post-exilic author/period, but "this is a major misunderstanding of Duhm" who allowed for late material even within the first division (Childs 7).

[28] See Williamson, *Isaiah*, 3-18, who categorises six groups of studies "from Duhm to the present day" tracing scholarly responses to the idea of multiple authorship. He identifies the "modern period of the study of the unity of Isaiah" starting from the third group onward.

[29] Brueggemann, *Isaiah*, 4.

[30]For some recent studies, see Claire McGinnis and Patricia Tull, eds., "*As Those Who are Taught": The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006).

[31]See Childs, *Isaiah,* 1-5. Redactional studies stress the multilayered quality of the text, and that a process of redaction took place at various points in the text's composition and editorial history. While recognising its usefulness in revealing that earlier Isaiah material has often been reinterpreted by later, Child cautions against the risk of fragmentation (4).

[32] Eugene Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (Leuven: Peeers, 1999). Childs, *Isaiah.*

[33]Claire McGinnis and Patricia Tull, "Remembering the Former Things: The History of Interpretation and Critical Scholarship," in "*As Those Who are Taught,*" 1-27 provide a helpful overview of critical trends.

[34] See George Brooke, "On Isaiah at Qumran," in *As Those Who are Taught* (Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 69-85. Intriguing is his observation (79) that several Isaiah MSS suggest a division between Isa 1-33, and 34-66, which may have implications for the traditional Duhm divisions.

52:13-53:12.[35] Recent scholars have questioned the basis of Duhm's "redactional isolation of four 'Servant Songs' in Isa 40-55."[36] Story suggests viewing the songs in context: "each song left where it is in the final placement, as it has come down to us, occupies a strategic position, lying between an announcement of the 'second exodus' or 'return migrations' (from Babylon to Jerusalem) and a hymn that celebrates both the exodus and God's provision of a servant to lead the exodus or return."[37] Admittedly, the songs share some theological and literary connections, like the calling or appointment of the Servant, his being entrusted with a special task of universal scope, being equipped to carry out his mission, facing challenges, and being vindicated and victorious.[38]

The Fourth Servant Song displays a unique perspective.[39] As Story states, "there is no other place in the [OT] that can compare with this passage in a description of suffering, whether of a nation or of an individual—that is to say, suffering that is vicarious. It is expressed pointedly in 53.5."[40] The text has received extensive attention from ancient and modern commentators, with frequent emphasis given to the question of identity and the idea of a messiah.[41] Spieckermann's view seems best: "the servant is to a certain extent a 'utopian' figure

---

[35] Childs, *Isaiah,* 291. Duhm considered them to "constitute a secondary collection of oracles, that were secondarily inserted into chapters 40-55" (323).

[36] McGinnis and Tull, *As Those,* 2, consider Duhm's ideas as "rooted, at least in part, in traditional Christian presuppositions that are no longer widely accepted . . . Christian scholars' fascination with Duhm's theory was much bolstered by correspondences between the NT Gospel narratives and the story that could be derived from Duhm's four 'servant' passages when isolated from their context in Isaiah."

[37] Cullen Story, "Another Look at the Fourth Servant Song of Second Isaiah," *HBT* 31 (2009): 100-110, p.103.

[38] The songs also become progressively complex in their portrayal of the Servant's role. In the first, the Servant is shown as establishing justice, while showing special concern for the "crushed" and vulnerable, but he faces no personal threat. However, increasingly in the second and third songs, his mission results in challenges, (i.e. failure, hostility and even physical danger). Nonetheless, the Servant expresses confidence in God, that he will be supported and vindicated. In the fourth song, however, the violence escalates, leading to the Servant's death. Paradoxically, it is God who seems to instigate the Servant's suffering. Rather than being vindicated by God (MT version) the Servant justifies many by atoning for their sins.

[39] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,* 168, observes, "The MT consists of two oracles (52:13-15; 53:11-12) which frame a middle confession of first plural speaker speakers" (53:1-11). However, even the main body of verses (1-11) contains shifting perspectives and multiple speakers as aptly reflected by the title of David Cline's *I, He, We & They* (England: JSOT, 1976).

[40] Story, "Another Look," 107.

[41] As well-known, the Christian tradition identified the Suffering Servant with Jesus. Shalom Paul, "Servant of the Lord" in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (ed. Michael Berenbaum and Fred Skolnik; 2nd ed. Vol. 18. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 2007), 316, lists those suggested in Jewish tradition: "Deutero-Isaiah, Trito-Isaiah, and Cyrus to Hezekiah, Jehoiachin, Josiah, Uzziah, Meshullam, Ezekiel, Sheshbazzar,

who must remain nameless because no identification can do justice to the claims about vicarious suffering."[42] Studies pertaining to Isaiah 53, specifically with reference to soteriological concepts (see ch.2.4) are especially pertinent to this thesis.[43]

1.3   METHODOLOGY

In its investigation of the linkage of Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song in selected writings, this thesis employs intertextuality as a hermeneutical approach. This method enables an examination of the conceptual resonances between Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22, as well as the ways in which these passages have been connected in ancient Jewish and Christian writings.

Intertextuality has gained currency among biblical scholars, deriving from the hermeneutical practices of literary criticism which has long recognised the poetic effects of the use of allusions, verbal resonances and thematic parallels. Seminal works like Milton's *Paradise Lost,* with its complex array of biblical and classical allusions, and later Modernist writings, such as James Joyce's *Ulysses* and T. S Eliot's *Waste Land,* have lent themselves well to intertextual explorations. The linguistic theories of Roland Barthes and Julia Kristeva have been foundational in defining this approach. In "*Revolution in Poetic Language"* Kristeva states, "the term *intertextuality* denotes this transposition of one or several sign systems into another; but since this term has been often been understood in the banal sense of 'study of sources,' we prefer the term *transposition* because it specifies that the passage from one signifying system to another demands a new articulation of thetic – of enunciative and denotative positionality."[44] Barthes comments that "any text is an intertext; other texts are present in it, at varying levels, in more or less recognisable forms: the texts of the previous and

---

Eleazar, Moses, Job, or an anonymous contemporary of Deutero-Isaiah. Other theories have suggested that the personality is corporate, messianic, or mythological. For Jewish exegetes, refer Driver and Neubauer *Fifty Third Chapter.* For recent Christian interpretations, see *Jesus and the Suffering Servant* (ed. William Bellinger and William Farmer, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International 1998). For patristic views, see Marckschies, "Jesus," 225-323.

[42] Hermann Spieckermann, "The Conception and Prehistory of the Idea of Vicarious Suffering in the Old Testament," in *The Suffering Servant* (eds. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher; trans. Daniel Bailey; Michigan: Eerdmans, 2004),1-15, p.14.

[43] For example, Bernd Janowski,"He Bore Our Sins," in *The Suffering Servant* (Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher; trans. by Daniel Bailey, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2004).

[44] Julia Kristeva, *The Kristeva Reader* (ed. Toril Moi; New York: Columbia UP, 1986),111.

surrounding culture."[45] He also adds, "intertextuality, the condition of any text whatsoever, cannot be reduced to a problem of sources or influences; the intertext is a general field of anonymous formulae whose origin can scarcely ever be located."[46]

Biblical scholars like Richard Hays and Francis Watson have been effective in adapting and applying intertextuality as a hermeneutical method in their analyses of scriptural texts.[47] Some intertextual notions merit attention prior to developing a model best suited for the needs of this study. Hays describes intertextuality as the "imbedding of fragments of an earlier text within a later one" and states that the voice of Scripture "continues to speak in and through later texts that both depend on and transform the earlier."[48] Regarding Pauline writings, Hays observes that Paul's citations of scripture "generate new meaning by linking the earlier texts to the later in such a way as to produce unexpected correspondences that suggest more than they assert."[49] In his terminology, Hays differentiates between quotation, echo and allusion, explaining them as "points along a spectrum of intertextual reference, moving from the explicit to the subliminal" and that "allusion is used of obvious intertextual references, echo of subtler ones," though he also acknowledges the difficulty of "deciding how to classify" and the need to use the terminology flexibly.[50] Relatedly, Watson observes that "a scriptural text can serve as a lexical and semantic resource or reservoir from which terms, phrases or concepts can be freely drawn and adapted to new uses. Fully embedded in their new contexts they do not draw attention to their scriptural origin; and yet the scriptural impact on the new context may be at least as profound here as in the case of citations and allusions."[51]

---

[45] Roland Barthes, "Theory of the Text," in *Untying the Text: A Post Structuralist Reader* (ed. Robert Young; Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981), 31-47, p.39.
[46] ibid.,39.
[47] Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University,1989). Francis Watson,"Mistranslation and the Death of Christ: Isaiah 53 LXX and its Pauline Reception," in *Translating the New Testament: Text, Translation, Theology* (ed. Stanley Porter and Mark Boda; Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009).
[48] Hays, *Echoes,* 14.
[49] ibid., 24.
[50] ibid., 23,29.
[51] Francis Watson,"Mistranslation and the Death of Christ: Isaiah 53 LXX and its Pauline Reception," in *Translating the New Testament: Text, Translation, Theology* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Mark J. Boda; Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009), 215-250, p.234.

Some scholars have attempted to provide criteria for determining intertextual relationships. Hays sets out the following seven points:[52] 1) Availability (was source of the echo available to author/original readers?); 2) Volume (degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns, and how distinctive or prominent is the precursor text within Scripture?); 3) Recurrence (how often does the author elsewhere cite or allude to the same scriptural passage?); 4) Thematic Coherence (how well does the alleged echo fit into the line of argument that the author is developing?) 5) Historical Plausibility (could the writer have intended the alleged meaning effect and could his readers have understood it?) 6) History of Interpretation (have other readers - both critical and pre-critical - heard the same echoes?); 7) Satisfaction (without clear confirmation from the other criteria listed here, does the proposed reading make sense?).

Likewise, Thomas Brodie notes,[53] "there are three kinds of main indications that one text depends on another" which he descibes as: A) External Plausibility (context): external factors must make literary dependence plausible; B) Significant similarities: (i) theme (ii) pivotal leads or clues (iii) action/plot (iv) completeness (v) order (vi) linguistic details (vii) complex coherence; C) Intelligibility of the differences: the differences as well as the similarities between a text and its retelling must make sense within the larger context of the retelling. Stanley Porter too makes recommendations:[54] 1) know the goal of investigation 2) define categories and apply them rigorously 3) adopt an author-oriented rather than an audience-oriented approach.

While intertextual guidelines are useful, one recognises that "several scholars have decried the lack of methodological rigor in scholarly arguments concerning intertextual relationships, noting the confusing use of such terms as 'quotation,' 'allusion' and 'echo' and 'intertextuality,' and observing that 'the criteria . . . are far from being resolved and even further

---

[52] Hays, *Echoes*, 29-32.
[53] Thomas Brodie, *The Birthing of the New Testament:The Intertextual Development of the NT Writings* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2004,43-49).
[54] Stanley Porter, "The Use of the OT in the NT," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (ed. Craig Evans and James Sanders; JSNT Sup 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 79-96, highlights the problematic use of terminology, and the need for clear criteria and definitions.

from providing objective tests."[55] Some subjectivity and vagueness may be an unavoidable consequence of the subtlety of the enterprise, in attempting to draw inferences from echoes and allusions that may initially be perceptible only to acute readers. This thesis will employ the following terms: direct or explicit reference where the original text has been cited or quoted; indirect reference or allusion where the original text is obviously evoked (as evident by the presence of mutual elements) though not explicitly mentioned, and resonance to indicate lexical or conceptual similarities which suggest some intertextual connection.

In evaluating the suitability of the above intertextual frameworks for the purposes of this thesis, one observes some underlying assumptions: they consider that close correspondences between texts (verbal, thematic and other congruences) may indicate a relationship of direct dependence between the original and later work. However, as Brodie observes, there remains "the problem of judging dependence."[56] It is assumed that the later author came into contact with or had access to the source text, a point which in some instances is difficult, if not impossible, to know with certainty. It does not necessarily imply that the author deliberately or consciously derives from the original text (the author could have made a subliminal association which only a later interpreter discerns). As Watson comments, "intertextuality may be operative even where neither author nor readers are necessarily conscious of it."[57] Nonetheless, this concept of intertexuality seems to take for granted that common features between two texts imply that the latter was derived from or shaped by the earlier, usually in a one to one dynamic, even though the original may be "transformed" by being adapted to a new context and acquire new meanings. Such an understanding of intertextuality does not exclude the possibility of a composite allusion. A text may refer to more than one source. However, the key emphasis remains on defining relations between texts in terms of direct dependence. Consequently, much weight tends to be given to verbal resonances (repetition of identical/ synonymous words, linguisic details) and/or parallel elements

---

[55] Mary Ann Beavis, "The Resurrection of Jephthah's Daughter: CBQ 72 (2010): 46-62, p.49, partially quoting Porter, "Use of OT," 88.
[56] Brodie, *Birthing,* 44.
[57] Watson, personal communication, 4 February 2011.

(syntactical stuctures, word order, etc.) between texts, to establish their connection. Such intertextual frameworks have applicability; one limitation, however, is that multiple and complex networks of textual relationships cannot be explained only in terms of a dynamic of direct dependence. In determining the linkage of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 in a range of selected texts, one does not necessarily expect clear-cut lexical and semantic parallels connecting the primary and secondary texts, and even when such correspondences exist, one cannot assume direct dependence. The conversation of multiple texts with Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 may be more complex and indirect in some cases, bearing circuitous links to the primary texts, which would require a different paradigm of intertextuality.

In this regard, one finds helpful George Brooke's investigation of the shared combinations between the NT and the DSS.[58] In considering relations between texts with common literary elements, Brooke observes that "the starting point requires a literary sensitivity which is not immediately drawn towards making assertions about the possibility of dependence of one author upon another."[59] Even when there is considerable overlap, "it is also obvious that there are many differences which should not be forgotten."[60] Besides, correspondences between two texts could arise from "intertextual exegetical tradition rather than literal dependence."[61] Further, he notes that "scriptural passages may be meaningful not just in themselves in isolation, but because of interpretive traditions associated with them over generations."[62] According to Brooke's understanding of intertextuality, "all texts present their own meanings only in as much as they are in dialogue, primarily with other texts . . . intertextuality is not primarily about identifying what has influenced any writer, but about observing the transformation of influences."[63] The dialogue may "sometimes be on a one-to-one basis, but more commonly a text reflects the outcome of a dialogue with several partners who in turn are the products of their

---

[58] George Brooke, "Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 2005), 70-94.
[59] Brooke,"Shared Intertextual," 71.
[60] ibid., 93.
[61] ibid., 77. For example, Brooke maintains that the authors of Heb 1 and 4Q174 were "both . . . acquainted with a tradition whereby 2 Sam 7 and Psalm 2 belong together. The two texts are mutually suggestive of one another."
[62] ibid., 72.
[63] ibid., 73.

own dialogues."[64] Brooke observes, "texts which assume some kind of authority often produce or are the products of echoes of other texts." It is useful to quote Brooke more fully:

> As is well known, the Hebrew Bible is its own witness to developing literary traditions and the scrolls found at Qumran attest how scribes in copying its books often behaved intertextually themselves, introducing phraseology that was reminiscent of other passages of Scripture. This may happen both deliberately as two scriptural texts with related subject matter are associated with one another; or it may happen unconsciously as the idiomatic phraseology of one passage comes to influence the scribe as he works on another. This attests to the phenomenon that some scriptural texts . . . readily suggest their own spheres of influence. Those that reappear most intricately in subsequent traditions are primarily attesting the suggestiveness of the exegetical base text.[65]

Brooke's concept of intertextuality proves helpful in developing an appropriate hermeneutical model for my thesis, by adapting or expanding on some of his ideas. Firstly, his defining of intertextuality as a continuous dialogue with multiple conversation partners, enables one to consider a web of textual connections, and not just a one-to-one dynamic. Such intertextuality accommodates the multivalency [i.e. multiple combining ability] of texts, and enables one to recognise the variety of (diachronic and synchronic) interactions and influences between them. Secondly, Brooke's veering away from immediate assumptions of direct dependence between two texts (although keeping open this possibility if evidence warrants) enables the recognition that correspondences between texts may arise from shared exegetical traditions and indirect influences. Thirdly, by shifting focus from direct dependence, one is no longer confined by questions of authorial intention, or whether the author had access to or was in contact with the original text. It also reduces the need to "prove" an allusion or echo by establishing verbal links between an earlier and later text through "explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns,"[66] or "nonformal invocation by an author of a text that the author could reasonably have been expected to know."[67] Fourthly, it enables one to place more emphasis on semantic and conceptual patterns [motifs, images, symbols, themes, etc.] which may recur in texts that emerge from a shared exegetical tradition, while also keeping in view verbal

---

[64] Brooke,"Shared Intertextual," 73.
[65] ibid., 93.
[66] Hays, *Echoes*, 30.
[67] Porter, "Use of OT," 95.

connections.[68] Fifthly, Brooke's concept of intertextuality proves relevant for tradition formation. It serves to explain how two prominent biblical texts like Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 could have been associated together to form an Akedah Servant complex, which became incorporated into Jewish and Christian exegetical traditions, as will be expanded on below.

1.4   THE AKEDAH SERVANT COMPLEX

Significant conceptual and verbal resonances exist between Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 (see ch. 4). Such an assertion does not imply that one biblical text influenced another or is dependent on the other. Deriving from Brooke's concept of intertextuality, the two passages can be described as richly connotative "base texts" which evoke their own spheres of influence,[69] and have generated considerable hermeneutical   interest.[70] Ancient writers and exegetes demonstrate a tendency to associate Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 together (see below). While one cannot determine whether this linkage is deliberate or unintentional, this pattern fits in well with Brooke's notion that some scriptural texts which "reappear most intricately in subsequent traditions" attest to the suggestiveness of base texts.[71] Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 are not only "suggestive" texts, but given their mutual lexical and semantic resonances, they suggest one another, resulting in their being brought together in the early reception of this tradition. The process by which they converge may be described as an intertextual dialogue (between the primary, as well as secondary texts) leading to the formation of a complex with associated motifs, which is taken up by further dialoguing texts, in a continuing tradition. Specifically, this thesis proposes that the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53, within a context of suffering righteousness and sacrifice, led to the formation of an Akedah Servant complex. In being incoporated into tradition, the complex became increasingly allied with soteriological elements

---

[68] Although most intertextual frameworks mention both verbal and conceptual evidence, in practice, however, one sees an understandable bias towards linguistic evidence in determining questions of literary dependence.

[69] Brooke, "Shared Intertextual," 72, 93.

[70] As already noted, Isa 53 has been closely associated with the notion of a Messiah. Akedah has been linked to the tradition of temple animal sacrifice (see Spiegel, *Last Trial*, ch. 8). Both texts have been linked to the martyrdom tradition. See Daly "Soteriological Significance," 63.

[71] ibid., 93.

(though it does not necessarily exclude other associations) and may best be described as an atonement tradition.

The Akedah Servant complex refers to a composite set of ideas and motifs, which result from a convergence of the primary texts of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. The defining elements of this Akedah Servant complex may be listed as follows:

1) The portrayal of a righteous figure who suffers unjustly.

2) The suffering is instigated, or permitted (but not caused) by a supernatural being (either God, or the situation is provoked by Mastema and allowed by God).

3) The sufferer does not protest, but co-operates.

4) A free and voluntary response is given on the part of the sufferer.

5) Suffering is framed as a test or demonstration of obedience or faithfulness.

6) The sufferer receives reward and exaltation at the end of the ordeal.

7) The recompense has universal consequence, and involves the nations as well.

8) The relationship between the sufferer and the permitter/instigator is defined in familial terms: father and son; mother and sons; Lord and servant; God and Son; God and children; Son and siblings.

9) Associations are made with ideas of sacrifice and atonement (i.e. temple sacrifice, sacrificial animal).

These nine elements which denote the Akedah Servant complex are derived from a mutual and distinct set of features shared by both Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 (see ch.4). This thesis maintains that no other Hebrew Bible text besides the Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song combine all nine of these elements within one pericope.[72] While the nine motifs derive from and overlap considerably with shared thematic connections between Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 (see p.10) nonetheless, the Akedah Servant complex is not simply the equivalent of corresponding ideas between the two biblical passages. The convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 accentuates or gives nuanced meanings to motifs which may otherwise have remained

---

[72] Such a claim of distinctive features may seem surprising given that the theme of righteous suffering and reward occurs in other biblical texts like *Job o*r some prophetic writings (see ch. 4.2)

latent in the individual texts. For example, the idea of suffering righteousness is implicit rather than explicit in the Akedah unlike in the Fourth Servant Song, and the voluntariness of the protagonist's response is subtler in Isaiah 53 than in Genesis 22. Further, the Akedah Servant complex's motifs encompass a wider dimension than in the original texts. For instance, in the eighth motif, while the relationship between sufferer and permitter is one of Lord and servant in Isaiah 53, and father and son in Genesis 22, the Akedah Servant complex allows for both possibilities, as well as for the notion of God/Son or God/ adopted children, or Son/siblings (as will be discussed in relation to NT texts) and mother/sons (2 Macc). In brief, the distinguishing features of the Akedah Servant complex derive from, and have nine elements in common with the biblical passages, but the composite is not necessarily identical with or limited to the components of each of the base texts.

Having discussed the formation and characteristics of the Akedah Servant complex, one needs to clarify its application in this thesis. The selected texts will be analysed for the presence of the Akedah Servant complex, in order to confirm whether and how the texts have been shaped by and contribute to the atonement tradition being traced in this thesis. The advantage of the complex is that it provides a means to determine the underlying influence of the intertextual linkage of both Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 even in writings which contain no overt references to the primary texts (i.e. 2 Macc) or in texts which ostensibly refer only to one primary text (*Jubilees*). In examining selected texts for the Akedah Servant complex, three approaches may be employed:

A) To analyse each text individually for the presence of all nine motifs comprising the complex.

B) To consider evidence of dialogue with primary texts, including verbal or conceptual resonances with Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53.

C) To consider evidence of dialogue with other secondary texts which manifest the Akedah Servant complex.

The first approach is the most comprehensive and will be employed in analysing the majority of texts. In some cases, the second and third methods will be applied supplementarily

to further corroborate the evidence. In employing the first method, the wording of the sub-headings for the nine motifs may be slightly modified, as required to convey the nuances or adaptions of a specific text. For instance, regarding the fifth motif, some texts may present suffering as a test of obedience while others as a demonstration of faithfulness, and the sub-headings will reflect the appropriate concept. Admittedly, one expects some variation in each text's expression of the complex, though fundamentally consistent with the set of nine motifs.

1.5   TEXTS AND STRUCTURE

In order credibly to establish the existence of a long-standing exegetical tradition incorporating the Akedah Servant complex and to trace its trajectory, this thesis will examine a range of textual witnesses dating from 2nd century BCE to 1st century CE. Given the time span, the selected texts will be studied within two chronological periods or stages. Such categorisation will enable the identification of links and variations among writings within the same group, and also facilitate the tracking of different trends and changing patterns between the periods. The texts may be divided into two major chronological periods:

Stage I -- Pre-Christian (Pre-70 CE) Jewish texts

Stage II -- New Testament

This research project gives special emphasis to Stage I texts as witnessing to the earliest and crucial phase of the reception of this Akedah Servant tradition, and to Stage II texts as revealing the earliest Christian incorporation of this complex. This investigation of two different stages allows for a more definitive assessment of the origins, transmission, tendencies, and influence of the Akedah Servant complex.

One of the challenges facing researchers examining ancient Jewish sources is the difficulty of dating texts. Modern scholarship has been marked by debates about the dating of specific Jewish works like the targums, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*L.A.B.*) and 4

Maccabees, an issue which has implications for this thesis.[73] In choosing Stage I texts (on which the burden of the earliest proof for an Akedah Servant complex rests) only those materials which by critical consensus can be unambiguously dated as pre-Christian are included. In choosing suitable texts to investigate the Akedah Servant complex, the following general points were considered:

- Apparent presence of the Akedah Servant complex

- Diversity of materials (i.e. different authors, various genres and time periods)

- Representativeness of texts (i.e. priority was given to passages which seemed best to encapsulate the tradition)

- (For some cases) clear evidence of dialogue with other selected texts (*Jubilees* and 4Q225).

The two stages with their corresponding texts are presented below. At the preliminary research level, certain assumptions have been made of each stage (as mentioned within brackets). These working assumptions function as reasonable and useful starting points in trying to unravel the possible dynamics of influence and interrelations of texts. The validity of these assumptions will be discussed in the pertinent chapters devoted to each stage.

---

[73]This thesis chose to omit the following Jewish texts from the Stage I (pre-70CE) category despite their containing Akedah tradition, given uncertainity of dating: the Pentateuchal Targums (*Targum Onkelos, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, *Palestinian Targums:Neofiti* and *Fragmentary* (P and V), *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum (L.A.B./ Pseudo-Philo)* and 4 Maccabees. P. Flesher and B. Chilton*, The Targums: A Critical Introduction* (Texas: Baylor University, 2011[with appreciation for pre-publication access, courtesy of Prof. Flesher]) propose a late 2nd or early 3rd century date for the Palestinian targums, and a late 4th century date for *Tg. Ps.-J*, a position close to R. Hayward, "Dating Pseudo-Jonathan," in *Textual and Contextual Studies in the Pentateuchal Targums* (ed. P. Flesher; vol. 1 of *Targum Studies*; Georgia: Scholars, 1992), 31. However, P. Alexander, "Targums and Targumin," n.p.,(*ABD on CD-ROM*. Version 2.1. 1997), states that *Ps.-J.,* "in the form in which it now stands, cannot have been redacted before the 7th/8th century CE." J. Fitzmyer "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament," *NTS* 20 (1974): 382-407, comments that the dates of the classic targums and midrash are "far from certain and the language [of it] is suggestive of several centuries later than the New Testament writings themselves" (384). Regarding 4 Maccabees, see J. van Henten, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees* (Leiden: Brill,1997),73-78, for scholarly debates on dates. Davies and Chilton,"Aqedah," 517, suggest between 70-135 CE for 4 Macc. Kessler, *Bound,* 23, observes that some scholars recommend a 2nd century CE date for 4 Macc. Pseudo-Philo/*L.A.B.* too remains debated. Hayward,"The Sacrifice of Isaac and Jewish Polemic Against Christianity," *CBQ* 52 (1990): 292-306, maintains "it is widely acknowledged that the bulk of its traditional material belongs to the period before 70AD," (301). Kessler, *Bound*, 23, mentions 150CE, but the critical consensus for *L.A.B.* lies between 70CE to 135CE (Davies and Chilton, "Aqedah," 522; Fitzmyer, "Sacrifice,"12 suggests 70-100AD). Josephus' Akedah (*JA* i. 222-236) is also omitted from Stage I since it is a post-70CE text. L. Feldman, "Josephus as a Biblical Interpreter," *JQR* 75 (1985):212-252, p.252, notes: "Josephus spent at least a dozen years (79/81-93/94) writing the *Antiquities*."

1) <u>Stage I: Unambiguously pre-70CE Jewish Texts</u>

   (Assumption: no Christian Influence)

   ❖ *Jubilees* (ca.150 BCE): Akedah section (ch. 18)

   ❖ 2 Maccabees (ca. 142 BCE): martyr narrative (ch.7)

   ❖ 4Q225 (Pseudo-Jubilees): (30BCE -20CE)

   ❖ *Wisdom of Solomon* (late 1ˢᵗ century BCE or early 1ˢᵗ century CE): chs. 1-5

   ❖ Philo's *De Abrahamo* (20BCE – 50 CE): Akedah (ch: 32-36)

2) <u>Stage II: New Testament</u>

   (Assumption: open to the influence of Stage I texts, and possibly concurrent with notions in some later Jewish texts, rather than being derivative or antecedent).[74]

   ❖ John 3:16

   ❖ Hebrews 9:28

   ❖ Romans 8:32

In terms of structure, this thesis consists of seven chapters. The first chapter provides an overview of this research project. Chapter Two highlights recent scholarship, with emphasis on key critical debates which bear relevance for this thesis. The third chapter focuses on text critical issues pertaining to Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. In the fourth chapter, a detailed analysis of the primary texts is conducted, with reference to the Akedah Servant complex. Chapter Five analyses Stage I texts in relation to the nine motifs of the Akedah Servant complex. The sixth chapter examines Stage II or NT texts also with regard to the nine elements of the complex. The final chapter draws conclusions and makes inferences on the Akedah Servant complex based on the research findings. It will evaluate the soteriological significance of this Akedah Servant tradition, and its possible relevance in furthering current understanding of atonement.

------

[74]Leroy Huizenga, "The Battle for Isaac," *JSP* 13.1 (2002): 33-59, observes that "documents that display significant redevelopment of Genesis 22, such as *[L.A.B.]*, 4 Maccabees, and Josephus' *Antiquities*, are roughly contemporaneous with the composition of the New Testament documents. Rabbinic traditions were of course compiled later than the New Testament period, although material contained therein may be relatively early. Targumic material is notoriously difficult to date with even relative precision" (40).

1.6 JUSTIFICATION FOR THIS THESIS

It is hoped that this inquiry on the Akedah Servant complex will serve to clarify the intertextual connection between the primary texts. As stated, while exceptional studies have been done on Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 separately, few have mentioned the linkage between them, and no previous scholarship (as far as is known) has involved a detailed investigation on the convergence of the texts. Tracing the Akedah Servant complex, which seems to occur within contexts of righteous suffering and sacrifice, may provide some insights into the development of an atonement tradition, which would be timely, given the renewed interest in soteriological studies.[75]

Another desired objective of this thesis is to investigate the dynamics of ancient Jewish and Christian textual traditions, and the shaping influences and exegetical interactions between them. While excellent studies of this nature already exist (i.e. Edward Kessler's *Bound By the Bible* and Daniel Boyarin's *Dying for God*) this thesis may further serve to demonstrate the value of such inter-religious explorations in deepening self-understanding, as well as in revealing close relations with the other.[76] This thesis also wishes to make a contribution to some of the ongoing scholarly debates pertaining to the primary texts (see ch.2). While one may list many desired outcomes, one remains aware that a critical investigation can at best highlight rather than resolve the multidimensionality of passages like Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song.

---

[75] See Eamonn Mulcahy, *The Cause of Our Salvation* (Roma: Editrice Pontificia Universita Gregoriana, 2007),15, for a list of soteriological works published in Britain in the late 80s and 90s.
[76] Daniel Boyarin, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* (California: Stanford UP, 1999).

CHAPTER TWO

CRITICAL BACKGROUND

This chapter discusses some recent scholarship and critical background as relevant for contextualising this research project. Given the extensiveness of Jewish and Christian exegetical and scholarly materials on Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53, this chapter will focus on four critical debates which have bearings for this thesis. The potential contribution of the Akedah Servant complex to these discourses has also been briefly considered.

2.1   THE NEW TESTAMENT CONUNDRUM

One issue that has puzzled biblical exegetes has been the paucity of explicit references to the Akedah in the NT. Only Jas 2:21 and Heb 11:17-19 explicitly refer to Abraham's offering of Isaac, but surprisingly not in a soteriological context.[77] The image of a righteous father offering his beloved "only" son would seem to be an evocative metaphorical vehicle to convey the salvific and sacrificial act of the divine father and son, within early Christian understanding, as scholars have commented. Daly observes, "we would expect [Akedah] to play a particularly prominent part . . . especially in the development of New Testament soteriology. However, almost the opposite seems to be the case . . . this reticence is particularly notable in Paul."[78] Similarly, Kessler remarks on "the lack of references to the sacrifice of Isaac in the New Testament," suggesting that Genesis 22 is not central to NT writings, and that "there is no hint in the New Testament that the Akedah has any value in terms of an atoning sacrifice."[79] Seeley too observes that "there is no basis for the claim that Paul has used [the Gen 22] story about Akedah to structure his own soteriology."[80]

---

[77] Kessler, *Bound,* 61, notes that both passages "repeat earlier interpretations found in Philo, Josephus and the apocryphal literature," and that "they provide the context for later patristic interpretations . . . [but] we should note what is *not* mentioned: a typological interpretation of Gen 22, a reference to fulfilment of Scripture, an association between Gen 22 and salvation through Christ."

[78] Daly,"Soteriological Significance," 66.

[79] Kessler, *Bound*, 60-61.

[80] David Seeley, *The Noble Death* (Sheffield: JSOT,1990), 66.

One explanation is that Genesis 22 may have been associated with "an internal Christian debate about the significance of Abraham's action with reference to faith and works."[81] For instance, Jas 2:21-24 refers to the Akedah to demonstrate that faith and works are inseparable, which leads Kessler to infer that "James clearly has Paul's writings in mind," given the latter's advocacy of justification by faith, and Paul's referring to Abraham as an exemplar of faith to validate his point (Rom 4.3,9 and 22).[82] Noticeably, "Paul shows little inclination to develop a detailed exegesis of Genesis 22 and does not make any Christological comparison."[83] Kessler suggests that "Paul deliberately avoided making reference to the Sacrifice of Isaac."[84] An alternative reason for the lack of explicit Pauline citations could be that "the Akedah illustrates for Paul not the faithfulness of Abraham or Isaac, but rather the faithfulness of God."[85] Daly wonders whether the NT silence reflects "early Christian reserve towards a theme which may have been considered too Jewish," just as R. Le Déaut asks whether Paul is reticent in using vocabulary which evokes Akedah perhaps because he is aware of "certaines utilisations de l'épisode que Paul jugeait excessives."[86] Another probability is that "the Akedah was so familiar to Christians of Jewish background that the slightest allusion would have sufficed to recall its significance to them."[87] It may also be that NT writers may have been hesitant to refer to Akedah for fear of detracting from the efficacy of Jesus' own sacrifice. A few centuries later, the church father Athanasius states, "[Abraham] was restrained from laying his hand on the lad, lest the Jews, taking occasion from the sacrifice of Isaac, should reject the prophetic declarations concerning our Saviour."[88] Could a similar motivation have led NT writers not to

---

[81] See Kessler, *Bound,* 62.
[82] ibid., 60-2
[83] ibid.,123
[84] ibid.,122
[85] ibid., 121,123.
[86] Daly,"Soteriological Significance," 66. R. Le Déaut, "La presentation targumique du sacrifice d'Isaac et la soteriologie paulinienne" in *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus*, vol. 2, *AnBib* 17-18 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963): 563-574, p.571.
[87] Daly,"Soteriological Significance," 66.
[88] Athanasius of Alexandria, *Festal Letter 6, NPNF* 4 *on CD-ROM*. Kessler, *Bound,* 133, claims "Athanasius provides us with evidence of patristic awareness of the importance of Isaac in rabbinic interpretations."

"lay their hands" on the Akedah by explicitly appropriating the text, in order to intensify the reader's gaze on the meaning of Jesus' own atoning and redemptive death?

NT reticence applies to Isaiah 53 as well, since it is "rarely quoted in the NT and still more rarely is any use made of it to show vicarious atonement."[89] Although Hengel comments, "Isaiah 53 was the best biblical prophecy for the proclamation of the 'Word of the Cross,' and for defending . . . the ignominious death of the Messiah and Son of God," [90] paradoxically, as Hooker observes, "in none of the seven [NT] passages where a quotation from Isaiah 52-53 is introduced by a formula indicating that a citation from scripture follows is that quotation interpreted *of the meaning* of Jesus' death."[91] While Hooker's assertions regarding the lack of a significant role for Isaiah 53 in the NT have been controversial, [92] nonetheless, even those who uphold the soteriological relevance of Isaiah 53 for the NT, admit some challenges: "But why, if Isaiah 53 describes an individual redeemer, does the New Testament quote extensively from Isaiah 53, but never from the two key verses that sound most like atonement language, verses 10-11?"[93]

Given the predilection for typological/hermeneutical readings of the OT in early Christianity (cf. Gal 4) this dearth of explicit references to two key passages which could have buttressed NT notions on Jesus' atoning sacrifice, poses a conundrum. Some scholars have observed that while citations may be scarce, several allusions may be found in NT texts like

---

[89] Alan Segal, "He Who Did Not Spare His Own Son," in *From Jesus to Paul* (Canada: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 1984 109-39), 173.

[90] Hengel, "Some Considerations about Isaiah 53 and Earliest Christianity," cited in Betz, "Jesus," 73.

[91]"Jesus," 73; Morna Hooker, "Did the Use of Isaiah 53 to Interpret His Mission Begin with Jesus?" in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant* (ed. William Bellinger and William Farmer; Penn: Trinity Press International, 1998), 92.

[92] Hooker's 1959 work *Jesus and the Servant* stirred much controversy. W. Bellinger and W. Farmer, eds., Introduction to *Jesus and the Suffering Servant* (Penn: Trinity Press International, 1998), note two opposing perspectives on Isaiah 53: one represented by Bultmann and Morna Hooker (among others) who question the view that Jesus identified himself with the suffering Servant, and that the early church and Paul interpreted the death of Christ in the light of Isaiah 53 (until later writings like 1 Peter), and the other view of H. W. Wolff, Otto Betz and Peter Stuhlmacher who uphold the "decisive importance of Isaiah 53 for understanding Jesus" (5).

[93] David Sapp, "The LXX, IQIsa and MT versions of Isaiah 53 and the Christian Doctrine of Atonement," in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant* (ed. William Bellinger and William Farmer; Penn: Trinity Press International, 1998), 170-192, 170.

Rom 4:25 and 8:32, 1 Cor 15:3-5, Mark 10:45, Heb 9:28; Gal 1:4, 1 Pet 3:18, 1 Thess 5:10.[94] Watson remarks, "[Isa 53]'s importance is evident already in Paul not just in his explicit citations but also in his use of language drawn from his text."[95] Noteworthy is Nils Dahl's [1969] investigation of Rom 8:32, which was the "first-time a study in depth of a New Testament text was made to explore the possibility of a link with the Akedah."[96] Dahl who observes a correspondence between Rom 8:32 and Gen 22:16 in the context of atonement, argues that it is one of act and reward: "God rewarded Abraham by corresponding action, not sparing his own Son, but giving him up for us."[97] While one may not concur with his conclusions, nonetheless, Dahl's query "to what extent and in which ways the Akedah served as a model of early Christian understanding of the atonement?" may be just as applicable for the Akedah Servant complex.[98]

On the basis of semantic and lexical links, this thesis will investigate the possible presence of the Akedah Servant complex in three NT texts (ch. 6). The question in view is whether, despite the lack of explicit citations of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 in relation to atonement, these primary texts may have played a soteriological role in early Christian writings. Is there an atonement tradition within the NT which is evoked by words, images and ideas of the Akedah Servant complex? By analysing selected verses, one aims to discover if, and to what extent, the convergence of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 may have shaped a concept of atonement in the NT.[99] Could the Akedah Servant complex have been internalized, forming the background

---

[94] For allusions to Isaiah 53 refer to Otfried Hofius,"The Fourth Servant Song in the New Testament Letters," in *The Suffering Servant* (ed. B. Janowski and P. Stuhlmacher; trans. Daniel Bailey; Mich.: Eerdmans , 2004) 163-188, and Peter Stuhlmacher, "Isaiah 53 in the Gospels and Acts," in *The Suffering Servant* (ed. B. Janowski and P. Stuhlmacher; trans. Daniel Bailey; Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004), 147-162. For Gen 22 allusions, see Robert Daly, *Sacrifice Unveiled* (London: T&T Clark International, 2009), 48-49, and Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac,* 80-85.
[95] Watson,"Mistranslation," 215.
[96] Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac*, 14. Nils Dahl, "The Atonement: An Adequate Reward for the Akedah?" in *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991),137-152.
[97] Dahl, "Atonement," 140: "the allusion to Genesis 22 in Rom 8:32 is best explained on the assumption that it is derived from an exposition in which the atonement was understood as an 'adequate reward' for the Akedah." It is "an independent parallel, rather than [being] derived from Jewish Akedah tradition."
[98] ibid., 138.
[99] Admittedly, a variety of atonement concepts exist in the NT, and the tradition proposed here, of atonement shaped by the Akedah Servant complex, would be just one in a wider matrix.

of the NT writers' thinking on soteriology, with or without any critical consciousness?[100] This inquiry may add yet another perspective to this critical issue.

2.2   INFLUENCE OF THE AKEDAH TRADITION ON EARLY CHRISTIANITY

A related scholarly debate has been whether and to what extent the Jewish midrashic-targumic presentation of Akedah influenced the NT.[101] In his (1912) essay Lévi asserts that by the first century Judaism had a doctrine of expiation in relation to the sacrifice of Isaac, as evident in Jewish sources (i.e. the Akedah's link to Passover in *Jubilees*, Josephus' connecting of the sacrifice and the site of the temple, etc).[102] This Akedah doctrine influenced the soteriology of Paul, who was the first to represent the death of Christ as a voluntary act of expiation on behalf of human sins: "C'est l'apôtre Paul qui a fait pénétrer cette conception dans le christianisme, dont elle est devenue le centre."[103] Lévi notes, "Une fois admis par Paul, le principe de la filiation divine de Jésus, la transposition allait de soi, Dieu prenait la place d'Abraham, et Jésus celle d'Isaac; en même temps, la vertu rédemptrice du sacrifice d'Isaac passait à la mort du crucifié."[104] However, Lévi states that Paul is inconsistent in his soteriological thought,[105] which he attributes to Paul's belief on the expiation of sins being derived from a combination of sources: Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22, with Rom 8:32 serving as evidence of the influence of both texts. Lévi's recognition of a composite allusion in the NT which links the Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song in relation to atonement lends support to this thesis, though his objectives differ.

Indebted to Lévi is the work of Schoeps who went further, asserting that the Akedah "served as Paul's model when he undertook to develop out of the doctrine of the Messianic

---

[100] This idea is adapted from Betz, "Jesus,"72, that "we must reckon with the probability that the whole [of Isa 53] with its theme of the vicarious suffering of the Servant is in the mind of Jesus and the early Christians."

[101] See Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac,* 4-22 for critical background, to which my account is partly indebted.

[102] Lévi, "Le sacrifice d'Isaac et la Mort de Jésus,"161-184.

[103] ibid,179.

[104] ibid,182.

[105] As Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac*, 6, remarks on Lévi's stance, "this ambivalence is explained by Paul's sources: "the sacrifice of Isaac in Genesis (where Abraham has the principle role) and the servant of God in Isaiah (where this mysterious figure suffers for the people.)"

atoning death of a divinely sent envoy, his doctrine of salvation through Christ's death on the cross."[106] In addition, Shalom Spiegel's influential book *Me-Aggadot ha Akedah* considers Jewish sources on Akedah, while drawing attention to its pagan background, like archaic elements of sacrifice of the first born, harvest festival and paschal sacrifice.[107] The biblical account of Akedah laid the foundation for the entire temple complex amalgamating "the legend of the name of the place . . . with the legend on the institution of substitutes in sacrifice."[108] Nonetheless, Spiegel considers that traces of the pagan inheritance survive in the haggadah.[109] In Christianity too "Paul wove together an entire system of forgiveness of sins without works of the Law, from a hybrid mixture of Jewish messianic hopes and pagan notions of gods."[110] While Spiegel does not entirely discount the possibility of mutual influence between Christianity and Judaism, he considers that "both differentiae and parallels in the traditions on the one bound and the one crucified seem to point rather to a common source in the ancient pagan world."[111] Pertinent for this thesis is Spiegel's claim that Paul's soteriology is a "fusion and confusion of the story of Akedah and the vision of the Servant of the Lord, smitten of God and afflicted, crushed by his sins not his own and by whose stripes we are healed. From these two channels the Christian idea of atonement drew its nourishment."[112] It affirms the idea of an atonement doctrine arising from the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53.

Drawing on the work of Lévi, Spiegel and Schoeps, scholars like Vermes and Daly have posited that Akedah theology significantly shaped NT soteriology. Vermes[113] holds that the oldest targumic tradition on Akedah (in the *Fragmentary* and *Neofiti* targums) contains the following features: Abraham told Isaac that he was to be the sacrificial victim; Isaac gave his consent; Isaac asked to be bound so that his sacrifice might be perfect; Isaac was favoured with a heavenly vision; Abraham prayed that his own obedience and Isaac's willingness might be

---

[106] H.J. Schoeps,"The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's Theology," *JBL* 65 (1946): 385-92, p. 386.
[107] Shalom Spiegel, *The Last Trial* (trans J. Goldin; New York: Behrman House, Inc, 1967), 57.
[108] ibid, 69,72.
[109] ibid., 56-7.
[110] Spiegel, *Last Trial*, 81-82.
[111] ibid.,116
[112] ibid., 83-84.
[113] Vermes, "Redemption and Genesis 22," 193-227.

remembered by God on behalf of Isaac's children; his prayer was answered. Vermes maintains

that this targumic tradition is implicit in three 1st century CE works: Josephus, 4 Maccabees,

and [*L.A.B*].[114] Based on further midrashic and other texts, Vermes makes extensive claims for

the importance of Akedah theology: 1) the sacrificial character of the Akedah which was "the

sacrifice *par excellence* whose lasting benefits would be felt for all time";[115] 2) Akedah's

salvific effects with "a unique role in the whole economy of the salvation of Israel," and "a

permanent redemptive effect;"[116] 3) Akedah's relation to temple sacrifice, where "the atoning

efficacy of the Tamid offering, of all the sacrifices in which a lamb was immolated, and

perhaps, basically, of all expiatory sacrifice depended on the virtue of Akedah;[117] 4) Akedah's

impact on Jewish Liturgy, commemorated at Rosh ha-Shana and the Passover, and also linked

with messianic and eschatological salvation;[118] 5) Akedah's influence on the NT, especially on

the Pauline doctrine of Redemption which is "basically a Christian version of the Akedah"

since by the first century CE "the Akedah was considered a sacrifice of Redemption, the source

of pardon, salvation, and eternal life, through the merits of Abraham who loved God so greatly

as to offer his only son, but principally through the merits of Isaac."[119] Vermes' attribution of a

crucial soteriological weight to Akedah in ancient Judaism and early Christianity has elicited

caution.[120] Nonetheless, this thesis finds useful his linking of the primary texts (in forming

Akedah haggadah): "it is almost certain that this association [of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53] was

---

[114] Vermes, "Redemption and Genesis 22," 197.
[115] ibid., 206.
[116] ibid., 208.
[117] ibid., 211.
[118] ibid., 213,218.
[119] ibid., 219.
[120] Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac,*11,"this is an imposing array of evidence, even if not unmixed with speculation. But one cannot avoid the suspicion that it has been unconsciously weighted to bring Isaac to a point of prominence in Judaism parallel to that enjoyed by Jesus in Christianity." Hayward, *Sacrifice*, 298-99*,* who agrees with Vermes on an early dating of texts, nevertheless, expresses caution about the redemptive notions of Isaac's sacrifice. Referring to the phrase "the blood of Isaac" he states, "its importance should not be overestimated since Isaac's blood stands alongside other equally weighty considerations." E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (London: SCM,1977), 28-9 objects that [Vermes] "takes such midrashic interpretations of what blood was seen [ie. from the Mekhilta] as establishing a Jewish *doctrine*. . . thus he can state that 'the Binding of Isaac' was thought to have played a unique role in the whole economy of the salvation of Israel, and to have a permanent redemptive effect on behalf of its people.' This gives the scant reference to binding of Isaac in the Tannaitic midrash a significance far out of proportion to what they actually hold in Rabbinic literature."

due to reflections on the significance of martyrdom. If the blood of martyrs is viewed by God as an expiatory sacrifice, *a fortiori,* the self-offering of Isaac atoned for the sins of his descendants."[121]

Robert Daly closely aligns with Vermes' views: "just as the Akedah is a key for understanding the late Jewish idea of sacrifice so is it also a key for understanding the Early Christian idea of sacrifice."[122] Daly supposes that NT writers were familiar with targumic haggadah on Akedah, which had an influence on several NT allusions that he categorises as certain, probable and possible references.[123] He shares Vermes' idea on the origins of Akedah tradition: "Gen 22 was interpreted in association with Isaiah 53; i.e., the link between them was established in the Jewish tradition independently of, and almost certainly, prior to the NT" and martyrdom "led to the formation of this exegetical tradition."[124]

Le Déaut's *La Nuit Pascale* investigates targumic evidence, especially the "Poem of the Four Nights" (Neofiti 1 at Exod 12:42) which he considers as representing traditions extant during NT times.[125] Relating the targumic tradition to *Jubilees, Josephus,* 4 Maccabees, and *Pseudo-Philo*, Le Déaut draws conclusions about the antiquity of the Akedah tradition. He stresses the importance of Passover in Jewish interpretations, which also "leads him to stress the Passover in his approach to the relevance of the sacrifice of Isaac for the NT."[126] Further,"for Le Déaut, Isaiah 53 is the source of ideas on redemption, not Genesis 22."[127] Nonetheless, he raises the possibility of "a jonction des deux figures d'Isaac et du Serviteur."[128] Le Déaut differs from Lévi and Schoeps in thinking that Paul did not use Akedah as a model for his soteriology, but rather, the idea of expiation in Christianity comes from the founder himself. Nonetheless,

---

[121] Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac*, 203.
[122] Daly, "Soteriological Significance,"47. In his later work, *Sacrifice Unveiled* (London: T&T Clark International, 2009),49, Daly states: "we cannot advance much beyond probabilities in determining relationships to specific New Testament texts". . .[though] the sacrificial soteriology of the New Testament cannot be adequately discussed apart from the Akedah."
[123] ibid., 72.
[124] ibid., 63.
[125] Roger Le Déaut, C.S.Sp., *La Nuit Pascale. Essai sur le signification de la Paque juive a partir du targum d'Exode XII 42, AnBib 22.* (Rome : PBI 1963). Also see Swetnam's concise evaluation, *Jesus and Isaac*, 12-14.
[126] Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac,*12-13.
[127] ibid., 13 n.24.
[128] Le Déaut, *La Nuit,* 205.

Vermes, Lévi, Daly and Le Déaut all share a common but disputed position in accepting the antiquity of targumic evidence and texts like *L.A.B.* and 4 Macc., with their conclusions dependent on an early dating for these materials. Kessler notes, "one of the difficulties with a historical approach such as Vermes is its dependence upon the dating of key-non-rabbinic texts."[129] Daly admits, "the targumic tradition is the main carrier of the early Jewish theology of the Akedah," but they "cannot be dated with certitude."[130] Since scholars today "accept a later [than 1st century CE] dating for the Palestinian Targums,"[131] and a post-70 CE dating for 4 Macc and *L.A.B.*, some of these critics' assertions have been questioned.

Davies and Chilton oppose Vermes and Daly's stance on Akedah theology, with their essay[132] marking a pivotal moment in this debate.[133] They begin by redefining the term Akedah in expiatory terms as "a haggadic presentation of the vicariously atoning sacrifice of Isaac in which he is said, e.g., to have shed blood and /or to have been reduced to ashes."[134] They discuss four sources on Gen 22 -- *Jubilees,* Philo, Josephus and *L.A.B.* -- dating the latter three texts as post-70CE, and downplaying the Akedah's link to Passover in *Jubilees*. The gist of their argument is as follows: the NT "does not even attest the existence of the Akedah" and the rabbis invented it in the Tannaitic period, in response to the cessation of the temple cult, as a deliberate and explicit substitute for the Tamid lamb, which was the previous source of expiation.[135] The creation of "Akedah" (i.e. the offering of Isaac viewed as having expiatory value) was a deliberate Rabbinic reformulation of Jewish liturgy and doctrine, almost certainly during the 2nd century CE.[136] The link between the Akedah and the Jewish New Year feast was established in

---

[129] Kessler, *Bound*, 23.
[130] Daly, "Soteriological Significance," 65.
[131] Kessler, *Bound,* 35.
[132] Davies and Chilton,"The Aqedah: A Revised Tradition History."
[133] See Vermes' subsequent response to Davies and Chilton in "New Light on the Sacrifice of Isaac from 4Q225" *JJS* 47 (1996): 514-546, that the DSS (4Q225) provides evidence of 'the pre-Christian skeleton of the Targumic-midrashic representation of the sacrifice of Isaac' thus rendering the Amoraic origin of the Aqedah as highly improbable. See Fitzmyer's critique of Vermes' assertions, in "The Sacrifice of Isaac in Qumran Literature."
[134] Davies and Chilton, "Aqedah," 515. Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac*, 18, while acknowledging the contribution of Davies and Chilton, nonetheless, state that theirs is a "narrow definition which automatically rules out the use of the term in the Christian tradition [as well as]for other purposes."
[135] Davies and Chilton,"Aqedah," 515-516.
[136] ibid., 536.

the post-70CE reform of the Jewish liturgy.[137] In the Amoraic period, the Akedah was employed "to combat Christian claims of Passion-atonement, and Gen 22 was even recalled at Passover time. The Amoraim went so far as to appropriate details of the Passion to heighten the drama of Isaac's offering and thereby to deny the uniqueness of Jesus' Offering."[138]

Davies and Chilton's position provoked counter-responses, most ably by Hayward.[139] Segal too comments, "[their] overly strict caution leaves out important parts of the evidence because they appear to want to preserve the integrity of the concept of atoning sacrifice in Christianity."[140] Fisk, however, deems their study "a success; the authors of many studies published before 1980 defined the Aqedah too loosely, or retrojected later Christian or rabbinic theological developments onto the early evidence, or attached too much significance to a mere handful of references."[141] In balance, Davies and Chilton's essay had an impact on the debate on Akedah theology and NT implications, as an alternative interpretation to the axis of Lévi, Schoeps, Vermes and Daly. These two groups represent the "either/or" polarities of modern criticism on this topic. As Segal observes, "one may go too far to either extreme, as Vermes on the one hand, or Davies and Chilton on the other do . . . it is clearly wrong to say that there was no Jewish tradition of the sacrifice of Isaac before Christianity or that the exegesis of that biblical passage was not involved in martyrology or traditions of vicarious atonement. It is just as wrong to assume that there was a single paradigmatic tradition which could be picked up by the church as a type for Jesus, as Vermes does."[142]

More moderate perspectives have been offered by Hayward, Swetnam and Segal.[143] Hayward suggests the separateness of the two traditions, maintaining that the Jewish Akedah tradition with regard to the phrase "blood of Isaac" is linked to the concept of Merit of the

---

[137] Davies and Chilton,"Aqedah," 534.
[138] ibid., 517.
[139] see Hayward, "The Present State of Research into the Targumic Account of the Sacrifice of Isaac," *JJS* 32 (1981): 127–50, and also "The Sacrifice of Isaac."
[140] Segal,"He Who,"173.
[141] Bruce Fisk, "Offering Isaac Again and Again: Pseudo-Philo's Use of the Aqedah as Intertext." *CBQ* 62 (2000): 481-507, p.504.
[142] Segal,"He Who,"179.
[143] Robert Hayward, "The Sacrifice of Isaac and Jewish Polemic Against Christianity," James Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac,* Alan Segal "He Who Did Not Spare His Own Son: Jesus, Paul and the Akedah."

Fathers, and has no reference to Christianity.[144] Any resemblances to the Christian doctrine of atonement and universal efficacy of Christ's sacrificial blood is only superficial.[145] He notes that "other apparent similarities of details in the Akedah and the Christian Passion Narratives are not necessarily the result of antagonism between Judaism and Christianity in the period of the Tannaim or Amorian . . . Jewish and Christian writers have quite different ends in view."[146]

Segal examines Akedah's role in Jewish and Christian traditions with regard to the (pre-70 CE) theme of martyrdom (i.e. 4 Macc).[147] Later Christian and rabbinic exegeses of Isaac's sacrifice are influenced by this early Jewish Akedah tradition, although their reception differs. Developments in rabbinic Judaism include the "connection between Isaac and the word *akedah* through the agency of the *tamid* sacrifice," and "midrashim stressing explicit sacrificial typologies."[148] Christianity integrates the martyred figure of Isaac with the notion of a (crucified) messiah and divine sonship.[149] Segal notes the possibility of verbal parallels to Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 in Rom 8:32, but is doubtful.[150] To sum up, "both the Christian and rabbinic exegesis of Isaac's sacrifice are based upon the pre-Christian Jewish exegetical tradition. But each community makes its own significance out of the event" while listening to "what the other community is saying."[151]

Swetnam's classic study, explores how Akedah influenced the epistle to the Hebrews. He surveys a range of Jewish Akedah materials, arriving at the following conclusions:[152]

- The Akedah occupied a key place in Jewish tradition, invoked in various ways at different times: redemption of first born; test of faith; fidelity in face of martyrdom.

- The Akedah was associated with the site of the temple in Jewish tradition.

- The Akedah was regarded from the time of Gen 22's composition and throughout early Judaism as involving a sacrifice.

---

[144] Hayward, "Sacrifice," 302-303.
[145] ibid., 299,303.
[146] ibid., 305-306.
[147] Segal,"He Who," 176-7.
[148] ibid., 183
[149] ibid., 177-8,182.
[150] ibid., 177 n.28.
[151] ibid., 184.
[152] ibid., 76-80.

- Akedah first became associated with vicarious expiation of sin through Jewish attempts to establish a theology of martyrdom, but was intensified by reactions to Christian claims about Christ.

- A link between the Akedah and New Year is certain but probably post-destruction of the temple.

- A connection between Akedah and Passover in Jewish tradition is possible but not certain.

IMPLICATIONS

Having outlined some key critical stances regarding the influence of the Jewish Akedah tradition on the NT, one identifies some considerations for this thesis. Given that many of the arguments hinge on the dating of texts and the admissibility or unreliability of specific textual evidence (i.e. targums, 4 Macc, *L.A.B.*) one agrees with Fitzmyer that "one must try to distinguish clearly just what elements of the Akedah tradition are indeed pre-Christian and what may have been contemporary with the rise of Christianity and its New Testament."[153] In this context, the two stage method proposed by this thesis seems the most effective methodology to maintain chronological / textual boundaries, and yet allow for the exploration of mutual links and interactions within and between the periods.

Another relevant point is the critical emphasis given to soteriology. Many scholars focus on Akedah in terms of sacrifice and atonement, either attempting to establish (Vermes, Lévi, Schoeps, Daly) or deny (i.e. Davies and Chilton) the role played by the Akedah tradition in shaping NT views on the redemptive death of Christ. The idea of Genesis 22 as a founding narrative which validates the Jewish temple and the sacrificial complex also emerges (Spiegel, Swetnam). Further, scholarly discussions encompass a range of soteriological motifs including ram sacrifice, Passover, paschal lamb sacrifice, the Tamid lamb, Rosh ha-Shana, and Mount Moriah, among others. Closely related to these sacrificial notions is the idea of vicarious suffering and atonement, in particular the connection between Akedah and martyrdom (Segal,

---

[153] Fitzmyer,"Sacrifice," 226.

39

Vermes). These interpretations suggest the Akedah's propensity for a soteriological interpretation, in aligment with the directions of this thesis.

Significant for this thesis is that several scholars specifically mention the linkage of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. Vermes posits the association of the primary texts in the context of martyrdom, (leading to the formation of targumic haggadah). Lévi, Le Déaut, Spiegel, Daly have all raised the possible combining of Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song, in relation to NT soteriology or as underlying specific NT verses (Rom 8:32). This critical tendency to suggest the connecting of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 in contexts of suffering like martyrdom or the death of Christ, strongly supports the premise of this study. Clearly, some modern scholars have recognised the affinity between the primary texts, and also observed a similar tendency to link Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 in contexts of suffering within ancient Jewish and Christian tradition. While their research objectives may diverge from this thesis, nonetheless, the above critical discourse provides a useful matrix for this investigation on the Akedah Servant complex, which in turn, may help clarify the above debate.

2.3 EXEGETICAL ENCOUNTERS

Recent scholarship recognises the inadequacy of discussing ancient Jewish and early Christian exegetical traditions, without considering the possibility of interactions between them. Kessler observes, "in order to understand properly Jewish or Christian exegesis in late antiquity it is essential to understand each other's interpretations and the influence of one upon another."[154] In doing so, scholars have shifted from the old paradigm which stressed the "parting of ways" between the two traditions, where a definite break occurred "sometime in the first or second century, after which there was hardly any contact between the two religions," to a dynamic of mutual influence and interaction. To quote Boyarin:[155]

> The story of the so-called parting of ways is a much more ambiguous and complicated narrative than is usually imagined. Jews and Christians, however much they tried to convince themselves and others differently, travelled indeed along similar paths for a

---

[154] Kessler, *Bound,*182
[155] Boyarin, *Dying,*6,41.

long, long time . . .far from a parting of ways, we will observe a startling convergence of roads taken (41).

Yuval presents the interrelationship between the two traditions by employing a familial model: "early Christianity and tannaitic Judaism are two sister religions that took shape during the same period" and "there is no reason not to assume a parallel and mutual development of both religions."[156]

Given this context, scholars have investigated whether and to what extent exegetical interactions may have occured between the rabbinic and patristic traditions on Genesis 22. Wilken who examines the writings of Melito, "the most extensive early Christian commentator on the Akedah," observes that Melito's presentation of the sacrifice of Isaac was shaped by the presence of a "strong and vibrant Jewish community" in Sardis.[157] Wilken concludes, "Melito was aware of the Jewish interpretation [on Akedah] and that his own interpretation is an attempt to rescue Isaac for the Christians."[158] Additionally, Davies examines Clement's and Melito's work in relation to Akedah, concluding that "when both [Jewish and Christian] traditions are assessed critically and in conjunction, a reasonably clear picture can be drawn of the stages in the development of the Akedah on the one hand and Isaac-Christ typology on the other."[159] Kessler's extensive study examines exegetical encounters on Genesis 22 between rabbis and church fathers within the first six centuries CE. One example is the contrasting portrayal of Isaac in rabbinic and patristic texts. Kessler notes,"the rabbis developed the passive, almost peripheral character of Isaac of the biblical story into a central character whose self-offering was the key to a proper understanding of the Akedah. They describe Isaac as a mature adult who was informed in advance of his impending sacrifice, which reinforces their interpretation that Isaac voluntarily gave up his life."[160] Conversely, the church fathers

---

[156] Yuval, "Easter and Passover," 104. However, Boyarin, *Dying*, 8 rejects such "kinship metaphors" and advocates instead "a model of shared and crisscrossing lines of history and religious development."

[157] Robert Wilken, "Melito, the Jewish Community at Sardis, and the Sacrifice of Isaac," *TS* 37 (1976): 53-69, pp. 64, 67.

[158] Wilken, "Melito," 62.

[159] P.R Davies, "Martyrdom and Redemption" in *Studia Patristica* 17/2 (Oxford: Pergamon,1982),652-8, p.657.

[160] Kessler, *Bound,*118.

downplay Isaac's role. He is portrayed as a child or youth, "an outline, an immature image of what lay ahead. The child (Isaac) was to be fulfilled by the adult Christ."[161] Kessler's overall findings have pertinence for this study in confirming encounters between ancient Jewish and Christian exegetes on Akedah.

It is relevant to mention that exegetical encounters cannot be seen in relation to the Fourth Servant Song. Although extensive references to Isaiah 53 exist in patristic literature,[162] they are significantly scarce in rabbinic texts. As Rembaum acknowledges, "the meager treatment of Isaiah 53 in rabbinic sources is striking when compared to the patristic interest in the chapter."[163] It is plausible that the prominence of Christological interpretations of Isaiah 53 may have led to either the suppression or avoidance of explicit rabbinic references to this passage.[164] While this thesis lacks the scope to examine patristic and rabbinic writings, nevertheless, this background is useful. This study remains aware of how ancient Jewish and Christian exegeses have shaped one another's views, as well as their own self-understanding, and that past interactions between the two traditions have included "contact and even convergence"[165]

---

[161] Kessler, *Bound*, 113.
[162] See David Cassel, "Patristic Interpretation of Isaiah," in *As Those Who are Taught: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL* (ed. Claire McGinnis and Patricia Tull; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006):145-169 : "the popularity of Isaiah among patristic authors can be documented in two ways: First, Isaiah was the focus of a number of ancient commentaries" including by Theodoret of Cyrus, Eusebius of Caesarea, Cyril of Alexandria, John Chrysostom and Hesychius of Jerusalem; "Second, quotations from the book of Isaiah were frequently used by Christian apologists and theologians" (146-147).
[163] Joel Rembaum, "The Development of a Jewish Exegetical Tradition Regarding Isaiah 53," *HTR* 75:3 (1982): 289-311, p.291.
[164] Michael Fishbane, "Midrash and Messianism; Some Theologies of Suffering and Salvation," in *Toward the Millennium and Messianic Expectations* (ed. Peter Schäfer, Leiden: Brill, 1998),60 n.17, points out the explicit and "glaring" omission of the haftarah reading of Isa 52:13-53:12 in the *Pesikta de Rav Kahana*. For a discussion on the influence of Isaiah 53 in pre-Christian Jewish literature see Martin Hengel, "The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in the Pre-Christian Period" in *The Suffering Servant* (ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher; trans. Daniel Bailey, Mich. Eerdmans, 2004),75-146. But Leroy Huizenga, *The New Isaac: Tradition and Intertextuality in the Gospel of Matthew* (Leiden: Brill, 2009),189-208, downplays the idea that a Suffering Servant figure existed in ancient Judaism except in the MT. Unfortunately, he does not examine 1QIsa,ᵃ overlooking critical views on that text (see Hengel "Effective History,"101-5).
[165] Boyarin, *Dying,*19.

2.4   <u>SOTERIOLOGY OF ISAIAH 53</u>

Another critical issue pertaining to this thesis concerns the idea of atonement with reference to Isaiah 53. Although the Fourth Servant Song has predominantly been interpreted in Christianity in terms of a suffering messiah,[166] ancient and modern commentators have also focused on its soteriological notions. The church fathers who wrote extensively on *Isaiah* (n.163) considered Isaiah 53 as the "highpoint or fulcrum of the book [of Isaiah] . . . as they outlined the life enabled by the new covenant in Christ's blood described in Isaiah LIII."[167] Strikingly, some patristic diction (ransom, release from tyranny of the devil, faith, redemption, act of obedience, destroying death, an innocent person dying for another, taking off the cloak of sin) demonstrates their readings of Isaiah 53 within a *Christus Victor* paradigm.[168] For instance, John Chrysostom writes, "Isaiah established that the slaying of Christ was a ransom for humanity's sin when he said 'he has borne the sins of many.'"[169] The interface between Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 is also suggested. Ephrem the Syrian remarks, "Abraham had many servants. Why did God not command him to offer up one of these? It was because Abraham's love would not have been revealed by a servant. His son, therefore, was necessary so that Abraham's love might be revealed. There were likewise servants of God, but he did not show his love towards his creatures through any of these but rather through his Son, through whom his love for us might be proclaimed."[170] Ephrem's interplay of words (son, servant, and God) hints at a convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. It seems reasonable then to inquire whether and how the Akedah Servant complex may have contributed to early Christian thinking on atonement.

---

[166] For Jewish messiah readings, see Fishbane, "Midrash and Messianism,"69 about "an inner-Jewish development of messianic interpretations based on Isa 53"(69). Also Rembaum, "The Development of a Jewish Exegetical Tradition Regarding Isaiah 53."

[167] *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament XI: Isaiah 40-66* (ed. Mark W. Elliott. IL: Inter Varsity, 2007), xxvii.

[168] Gustaf Aulén, *Christus Victor* (London: SPCK,1931) presents the "classic" idea of atonement labelled the "Christus Victor": humanity is in bondage to the powers of evil (sin, death, the devil) through their disobedience. Christ wins victory over the powers of evil, paying the ransom for the release of humanity, thus effecting atonement (see ch. 7 on "Christus Victor").

[169] John Chrysostom,"Demonstration Against the Pagans," 4.12-13 as cited in Eliott, *Ancient Christian Commentary,* 171.

[170] Cited in Joel Elowsky, *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture New Testament IVA: John 1-10* (IL: Inter Varsity, 2006), 278.

Modern commentators on Isaiah 53 have considered notions of vicarious suffering in relation to the Fourth Servant Song. Childs highlights "the modern debate over the term vicariousness,"[171] while Kasper states, "the unique climax of this theology of vicarious suffering in the Old Testament is the fourth song of the servant of God."[172] Janowski attributes to Kant's work on religion (1793) the influential idea that vicarious suffering is incomprehensible because guilt "is not a *transmissible* liability which can be made over to somebody else in the manner of a financial debt . . . but the *most personal* of liabilities."[173] However, "the question is not 'whether guilt is transferable . . .the question is rather whether there is someone who identifies himself with us in this situation, who steps in between us and our past and makes us once again bearable for God and the world.'"[174] Janowski considers that in Isaiah 53, the "we" speakers come to recognise that "the Servant whom they formerly despised, had already borne their sins by making his life an *asham,* the means of wiping out guilt."[175] Only when the "we" speakers recognise this, "can they acknowledge their guilt as well as its cancellation."[176]

Another issue has been whether atonement in Isaiah 53 involves substitution or representation on the part of the servant.[177] Kasper notes that the idea of substitution is limiting in that such place-taking "renders the person replaced as superfluous," but "representation gives him scope, keeps his place open and vacates the place again."[178] Hofius discusses the implications of *Stellvertretung or* place-taking, making a distinction between *excludierende Stellvertretung* (translated as exclusive place-taking) and *inkludierende Stellvertretung* (inclusive place-taking).[179] In the former, a taking of another's place exempts or excludes the

---

[171] Brevard Childs, *Isaiah* (Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 415-416.
[172] Walter Kasper, *Jesus the Christ* (Kent, UK: Burns and Oates, 1976), 215.
[173] Janowski, "He Bore,"48.
[174] Link, "Für uns gestorben nach der Schrift," 153, cited in Janowski, "He Bore," 72.
[175] Janowski, "He Bore," 48.
[176] ibid., 48.
[177] See Daniel Bailey "Concepts of *Stellvertretung* in the Interpretation of Isaiah 53," in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant* (ed. William Bellinger and William Farmer; Penn: Trinity Press International, 1998) for a discussion on the concept of *Stellvertretung* in recent British and German scholarship.
[178] Kasper, *Jesus*, 222
[179] Otfried Hofius, "The Fourth Servant Song in the New Testament Letters" in *The Suffering Servant* (ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher; trans. Daniel Bailey; Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004), 163-188, p.170,173.

other party (i.e. Isa 53), while in the latter (i.e. NT) Christ always takes the place of another in a way that still includes them as persons, thus affecting their very being."[180]

The reference to אשם in Isa 53:10 has stimulated debate on the text's links to cultic sacrifice. North observes that the word appears "in the priestly legislation (Lev 5:14- 6:7) and [is] also mentioned elsewhere (ie. Ezek 40. 39) and [it] denotes a specific class of offering, the 'guilt-offering.'. . . there is reason to think that the word was chosen deliberately."[181] Zimmerli also notes the connection to cultic sacrifice, noting that "the language of bearing iniquity was by no means used for the first time with reference to the Suffering Servant."[182] Westermann comments, "The first part [of verse 12b] could also be translated 'because he poured out his blood (*nepes*) to death.' This suggests a sacrifice of expiation, corresponding to the sacrificial term *asam* (guilt offering) in v.10. These [are] clear pointers to an expiatory sacrifice as the explanation of the meaning of the Servant's suffering and death . . .[and] to the sacrificial character of the cult."[183] Contrastingly, Janowski states that "cultic vocabulary is lacking in the Fourth Servant Song."[184] He and Spieckermann remain unconvinced about the cultic association of the word אשם arguing instead that the term came from other non-cultic contexts (cf. Gen 26:10, 1 Sam 6:3-4,8:17).[185] However, Ekblad observes that several intertextual connections exist between LXX Isaiah 53 and Leviticus, which imply a cultic link.[186] Sapp notes the textual differences between LXX and MT versions of Isaiah 53, and their implications for atonement theology.[187] He argues that the MT version of the Fourth Servant Song has more sacrificial overtones, and that "the Christian doctrine of atonement rests upon an understanding of Isaiah 53 that is fully preserved only in the Hebrew version."[188]

---

[180] Hofius, "The Fourth Servant Song,"163.
[181] Christopher North, *The Second Isaiah* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964),16.
[182] W. Zimmerli (1968) "Zur Vorgeshichte von Jes. liii," cited in Hermann Spieckermann,"The Conception and Prehistory of the Idea of Vicarious Suffering in the Old Testament" in *The Suffering Servant* (ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher; trans. Daniel Bailey; Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004), 2.
[183] Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66* (London: SCM, 1966), 268.
[184] Janowski,"He Bore," 68.
[185] ibid., 69. Spieckermann,"Conception and Prehistory," 3.
[186] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant*, 213-214,228,242.
[187] Sapp, "The LXX, 1 QIsa, and MT."
[188] ibid., 187.

To sum up, scholarly discussions on Isaiah 53 have focused on ideas of atonement, vicariousness and cultic sacrifice in this passage. Most critics agree that the Fourth Servant Song is unique in its presentation of a righteous human being whose vicarious suffering effects the expiation of others' sins. As Hengel observes, "vicarious atonement outside the legally regulated sacrificial cult in the sanctuary . . . is foreign to the Old Testament. This is precisely why the only real exception [is] Isaiah 53."[189] While scholars have different understandings of Isaiah 53's soteriology, this thesis will attempt to understand its meaning as part of the Akedah Servant complex.

2.5   CONCLUSION

This chapter has surveyed some recent scholarship on Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song, and highlighted four critical issues of pertinence to this study. Among the topics raised were: the dearth of explicit (soteriological) references to Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 in the NT, the question of influence of Akedah tradition on early Christian soteriology, exegetical exchange between rabbinic and patristic writings with regard to Akedah, and atonement in relation to the Fourth Servant Song. Broadly, these critical debates tend to revolve on questions of precedence, tradition, influence and interaction among ancient Jewish and early Christian exegeses.

Two critical tendencies bear importance for this research project. Firstly, several scholars in their discussions of the Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song tend to emphasize notions of sacrifice and atonement in each of of the primary texts. In relation to Akedah, they mention the Tamid sacrifice, redemption of first born, paschal lamb and the link to Passover and Rosh haShana, theme of martyrdom, and the temple, to list a few. Regarding Isaiah 53, the references included אשם sacrifice, atonement concepts like *Stellvertretung*/substitution or representation, and vicariousness. Such critical perspectives affirm the presupposition of this

---

[189] Hengel, "Effective History," 93.

thesis that Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 lend themselves well to soteriological interpretations, as expressed in ancient and modern exegeses.

Secondly, many scholars comment on the association of Isaiah 53 and and Genesis 22. While some posit the combining of the texts in relation to martyrdom, others suggested their linkage in NT verses (i.e. Rom 8:32) or as underlying Pauline/NT soteriology. Such views lend further credence to this thesis that the convergence of the primary texts occurs in contexts of suffering and sacrifice like martyrdom or Christ's atoning death. While none of the critical discussions propose the idea of an atonement tradition based on an Akedah Servant complex, nevertheless, these scholarly interpretations have value for the research directions proposed here. In turn, a careful investigation of the manifestation of an Akedah Servant complex in selected Jewish and Christian texts may serve to clarify some of the critical issues raised in this chapter, and contribute to the ongoing discourse.

CHAPTER THREE

TEXT CRITICAL ISSUES

This third chapter will focus on text criticism of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. The sources of each biblical passage will be discussed, with attention to variants and relevant text-critical issues. The implications of these variations will be considered, with reference to recent scholarship. The following authoritative critical editions have been used: for the Septuagint texts, J. W. Wevers' (Göttingen) edition of *Genesis*,[190] and J. Ziegler's (Göttingen) edition of *Isaias*;[191] the Masoretic text referred to is *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS); [192] for 1QIsa[a] the manuscripts referred to are DJD's *Qumran Cave 1:11: The Isaiah Scrolls*[193] and *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery: The Isaiah Manuscripts and the Habakkuk Commentary*.[194] Translations of the primary texts are appended (Appendix I and II).[195]

3.1   GENESIS 22 : TEXTUAL SOURCES AND VARIANTS

As the first book of the Torah, Genesis has held a priority place within the biblical tradition, which is reflected in the multiplicity and variety of extant textual sources. The major sources relevant for text criticism include the Masoretic Text (MT), the Septuagint (LXX), the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP), and fragments of Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS). This current study will mainly focus on MT and LXX which have bearings for the reading of Genesis 22.

---

[190] J. W. Wevers, ed., *Genesis. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum,* vol.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

[191] J. Ziegler, ed., *Isaias. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis Editum,* vol.14 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939).

[192] Elliger, K. and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1987).

[193] Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint, eds., *Qumran Cave 1: The Isaiah Scrolls. DJD* XXXII, 2 vols, (Oxford: Clarendon, 2010). See also E.Tiegechelaar, review of *Qumran Cave 1•II: The Isaiah Scrolls,* by Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint, http://kuleuven.academia.edu/EibertTigchelaar (13 August 2011).

[194] Millar Burrows, with John C Trever and William H. Brownlee, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery: The Isaiah Mansucripts and the Habakkuk Commentary*, vol 1 (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950).

[195]The translations are mine, in consultation with Prof. Hayward.

3.1.1 MASORETIC TEXT (MT)

The MT refers to the standard text of the Hebrew Bible, with its tripartite arrangement developed by the rabbis: תורה, נביאים, כתובים. The MT derives from the tradition of the Masoretes of Tiberias, or the "Tiberian Tradition," and has three main components: the letters, the vowel signs, and the accents.[196] While the text as represented in the DSS from Qumran (ca. 300 BCE – 68 CE) reveals some degree of fluidity, the scrolls from Wadi Murabba'at (ca. 135 CE) contain little variation from the later standard text.[197] Overall, "the indications are that the text form which became standard in rabbinical Judaism had been preserved unchanged. . .from a considerably earlier period."[198] The MT version of Genesis "has preserved one Hebrew text with remarkable fidelity from pre-Christian times. This conclusion, reached originally by comparing the MT with other versions, was confirmed by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls."[199] Futhermore, "fragments of fifteen manuscripts of Genesis have been found at Qumran dating from about the first century B.C. [which] show few variants from the traditional text. Readings agreeing with the LXX are rare, suggesting that the text of Genesis [is] already standardized in this era."[200]

3.1.2 THE SEPTUAGINT (LXX)

The Septuagint (which famously receives its name from the legendary account in the *Letter of Aristeas*) is the first known translation of the Hebrew scriptures, widely used among the Greek-speaking Diaspora.[201] Peters defines it as "a single set of original translations of the Hebrew scriptures into Greek which was effected in several stages," the earliest part (most

---

[196] For background, see E. J. Revell, "Masoretic Text," n.p., *ABD on CD-ROM*. Version 2.1. 1997. Among extant MT manuscripts are the "Aleppo Codex," which (although incomplete) represents the Standard Tiberian tradition in its best available form, while the Leningrad Codex (1009) is the best complete manuscript, whose text is printed in the *BHS*.

[197] ibid., n.p.

[198] ibid., n.p.

[199] Gordon Wenham, "Genesis 1-15" *Word Biblical Commentary on CD-ROM*. Version 2.1. 1998

[200] ibid., n.p.

[201] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,* 17. For reference: Marguerite Harl, Gilles Dorival and Olivier Munnich, *La Bible Grecque des Septante* (Paris: Éditions du CERF, 1988) for a comprehensive study of LXX, including Jewish revisions (Aquila, Symmachus,Theodotion) and Christian recensions (Origen's Hexapla, Lucien and Hesychius' recensions); Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000); Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968).

likely the Torah) about the 3rd century BCE in Alexandria, and the last parts probably completed by early 1st century BCE.[202] Some debate has centered on the Herbew *Vorlage* of the Greek text. Harl acknowledges the difficulty: "nous ne connaissons exactement ni l'état du texte hébraïque traduit par les LXX, ni l'état premier de la traduction grecque."[203] Besides, "la version grecque de la Bible présente un grand nombre de divergences par rapport au 'texte massorétique.'" [204] Fernández Marcos observes:

> [LXX's] disagreements with the *textus receptus* may in theory go back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* which is earlier than the standardisation of the consonantal text. Furthermore, in some books the Greek translation was made before the final redaction of the book had been completed in the form it has today in the MT. That is why LXX has become the chief source of information that affects the literary criticism of the OT.[205]

Stuckenbruck too mentions that one cannot be fully assured that the translation we have today of LXX is tied to the Hebrew text we know as MT and that their *Vorlagen* are the same, while noting that scholars often do make that assumption with valid reasons.[206] Regarding LXX Genesis, Wevers remarks, "the Hebrew text which the Jewish community of Alexandria had in the 3rd century BCE could not have been as wildly different from MT as earlier scholars of Genesis sometimes maintained. After all, it was a canonical text, it was divine law, God's instruction. It was special and had to be approached with reverence."[207] Nonetheless, even among the Greek manuscripts, subtle differences exist. For instance, in v.22:5 the MT's נשׁובה is translated as ἀναστρέψομεν (we will return) in some MSS, but appears in the subjunctive form ἀναστρέφωμεν (we intend to return) in A D readings.[208] Overall, however, the Greek text reveals a stable tradition which played an influential role.[209]

---

[202] Melvin Peters "Septuagint," n.p., *ABD on CD-ROM*. Version 2.1. 1997. Stanley Porter and Brook Pearson, "Isaiah through Greek Eyes," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, vol 2, (eds. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 531-546, suggest a Greek translation was necessary since "the target audience did not have facility with the original language of the translated document" (532).
[203] M. Harl, "Les Divergences entre la Septante et le Texte Massoretique" in *La Bible Grecque des Septante* (ed. M. Harl, Dorival and Munnich; Paris: Éditions du CERF, 1988), 201.
[204] ibid., 201.
[205] Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint*, (76-77).
[206] Loren Stuckenbruck, personal communication, March 2009.
[207] J W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta: Scholars,1993), xiii.
[208] Wevers, *Notes* 319. He explains this "simply as an itacistic spelling." For other Greek variants see p.316-326.

3.1.3   COMPARISON OF MT AND LXX VERSIONS ON AKEDAH

This section will consider some differences between LXX and MT in relation to Gen 22. The reason for such divergences may be manifold.[210] Some have suggested that LXX presents an interpretation rather than a translation.[211] Watson employs the term "mistranslation" to cover "not only the translator's errors but every feature of the Greek text that could not in principle have been predicted in advance on the basis of the Hebrew" including a range of linguistic phenomena like omissions, insertions, or substitutions, grammatical or syntactical modifications, and debatable semantic decisions.[212] In understanding the discrepancies between the MT and LXX versions, Wevers offers the following presuppositions:

> The translators [of LXX] were consciously at work on a canonical text . . . [which] meant that the translators considered their task thoughtfully, did not simply put Hebrew words into equivalent Greek lexemes, but tried to put into Greek dress what they believed God intended to say to his people. . .Their translation may not have been perfect, but it made sense to them; they did not create nonsense. . .this means that the one must at least try to explain difficulties, seeming contradictions and problems of language from their point of view rather than from our own rationalist sense of logic and consistency (xii-xiv).

Some variations between LXX and MT may be broadly categorised as follows[213] (see Appendix I for my translations of LXX and MT Gen 22):

a)   Clarifications:

In certain cases, the LXX serves to clarify words or phrases and make distinctions where the MT lacks specificity or is repetitive. The LXX does not "slavishly follow the Hebrew."[214]

---

[209] Noteworthy is LXX's impact on the early Church as a canonical text (as it remains in the Eastern Orthodox Church) influencing NT writers and the Greek Church fathers. Harl, *La Bible Grecque,* 276: "la majorité des citations des livres de [l'Ancien Testament] dans le NT sont conformes au texte de la LXX sous l'une de ses formes." Hellenistic Jewish writers like Philo also depended on the LXX. Porter and Pearson,"Isaiah," 532: "even a scholar such as Philo, does not make recourse to the original Hebrew in his commentaries on the LXX."

[210] see Harl, *"La Bible Grecque,"* 201-22, for different scholarly views, including differences in *Vorlage*, linguistic and translation issues, targum-type interventions, and theological interpretations. See also Jellicoe, *Septuagint,* 314-337.

[211] Jellicoe, *Septuagint,* 319,321.

[212] Watson,"Mistranslation," 215.

[213] cf. Wevers, *Notes,* for useful textual comments.

[214] ibid., 320.

Examples:

- In v.5, MT employs the noun נער to refer to both Abraham's servants as well as to his son. The LXX makes a distinction by using different lexemes: ταῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ for(נעריו) and τὸ παιδάριον for הנער to distinguish differences in rank.[215]

- In vv.1,7 and 11 the MT repeats the same word הנני to indicate Abraham's response, *Here I am*. However, LXX uses the equivalent ἰδοὺ ἐγώ only in vv.1 and 11, in response to God or his angel's addressing of Abraham. When a human being (Isaac) addresses him in verse 7, Abraham responds τί ἐστιν. [216]

- A similar avoidance of repetition can be observed in vv.6 and 8 where the MT uses the words שניהם יחדו but the LXX uses two distinct phrases each time, οἱ δύο ἅμα and ἀμφότεροι ἅμα perhaps for stylistic reasons.

- In the blessings promised to Abraham in v.17, the Hebrew has the phrase שער איביו (gate of his enemies) which the LXX translates as πόλεις τῶν ὑπεναντίων (cities of their enemies). Wevers observes, "of course the gate is the gates of the cities, and inheriting the gate of city does mean conquering the city. [LXX] has simply realised the pars pro toto figure of the Hebrew."[217]

b) **Misreadings:**

Some of the variants in LXX Gen 22 may be the consequence of a linguistic misunderstanding. In v.13 the ram is described as איל אחר (the adverb meaning "behind" or "after") which LXX seems to misread as איל אחד ie. (a single ram) and translates as κριὸς εἷς. However, it could also be that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX contained the latter phrase, for as Hayward notes "in v.13, MT presents manuscript variants. Editors of BHS have opted for *'hr* . . . while many of MT's manuscripts read rather *'hd*. The second of these readings would mean 'one' and is supported by the Samaritan Pentateuch, LXX, Peshitta, and some Targum. The

---

[215] Wevers, *Notes*, 319.
[216] ibid., 317,322. Wevers observes that the word הנני occurs 13 times in the book, and in seven cases it is literally rendered ἰδοὺ ἐγώ 'here I am,' twice with the words reversed, and three times it is idiomatically rendered by τί ἐστιν, and once by ᾤμην.
[217] ibid., 326.

reading might suggest a particular ram, and raise questions about its origin and status."[218] Another linguistic confusion seems to occur in MT v.13, where the word סבך refers to a thicket, which the LXX writer transcribes it as φυτῷ σαβεκ (sabek bush). It may have been a misreading or a deliberate choice. Hayward suggests that the LXX translator chooses to transcribe Sabek, because it resonates with the Aramaic term שׁבק for forgiveness, a soteriological term that LXX's original readers may have recognised.[219]

c) Nuances:

The LXX translator shows sensitivity to the nuances of the Hebrew text. When MT uses the word אלוהים for God (vv.1,3,8,9,and 12) the LXX employs the term θέος and when the Hebrew switches to יהוה (vv.11,14,14,15,16) the LXX uses the term κύριος. Wevers offers a theological interpretation that "the change [in divine titles] signals a new stage in the relations between the deity and Abraam. Abraam has sustained the test of obedience; the covenant relationship is now sealed but not just on God's part but also by Abraam's faith."[220]

Slight differences in tone may be observed between LXX and MT in vv.7 and 8. The MT highlights the intimacy between Abraham and his son as when Isaac calls his father אבי (7) and Abraham responds by saying בני on two occasions (vv.7, 8) whereas the LXX employs the less personal terms τέκνον and πάτερ, instead of possessives. Nonetheless, LXX too demonstrates emotional resonance in translating יחיד (vv.2,12, 16) with ἀγαπητός rather than μονογενής which is the corresponding Greek term (i.e. Psalms 21:20,24:16, 34:17).[221] Wevers remarks, "the narrative identifies τὸν υἱόν σου as τὸν ἀγαπητόν, and it became in later tradition (see Amos 8:10, Zach 12:10, Jer 38:20) synonymous with an 'only child' as being one particularly 'beloved.'"[222]

---

[218] Hayward, personal communication, 10 Oct 2009.
[219] ibid., July 21,2011.
[220] Wevers, *Notes,* 322.
[221] Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, 192.
[222] Wevers, *Notes*, 316.

d) Other Grammatical and Semantic Changes:

Some LXX modifications may reflect the translator's attempt to better express the MT:

The Septuagint is also sensitive to the sense of the text, and renders that sense for its readers in a manner somewhat more explicit than the Masoretic text . . . [In Gen 22:8] Abraham had promised his son, "God will see for himself" a lamb for sacrifice, and the Septuagint renders it as a future. The form of the verb is exactly the same as in the place name, '[YHWH] will see.' But the [LXX] asserts that God fulfilled Abraham's promise to his son, because the Lord indeed "saw" on the mount just what should be sacrificed. This in turn, is underlined as a revelation because the [LXX] presents the understanding that the Lord 'was seen' on the mount.[223]

Further, Wevers posits that the LXX adds the temporal phrase "on the third day" to (v.3) to modify ἦλθεν, and states that "the Masorete have the words ביום השלישי as part of v.4, i.e. before וישא [while] the Gen interpretation in my opinion correctly understood the Hebrew text (which of course had no verse numbers)."[224] In v.14 the Hebrew has a relative clause יראה אשר יאמר היום בהר יהוה which the LXX translates as "a ἵνα clause plus subjunctive mood which here seems to mean result rather than purpose, thus 'so that they may say today: 'in this mountain the Lord appeared.'"[225]

Hayward remarks on the significance of the MT's use of עקד (v.9) a *hapax legomenon* in MT which became the name for the entire Gen 22 narrative and its Jewish exegetical tradition, and asks "what Jewish readers might have thought this meant. LXX are our oldest dateable interpreters here, and they have put for it *sumpodisas*, 'tying feet together.'"[226]

e) Theological Perspectives:

The divergences between the LXX and MT may reflect theological stances. MT Gen 22:12 reads: "For now I know that you fear God for you have not withheld your only son from me," while LXX states: "For now I know that you fear God for you did not spare your beloved son on account of me." Similar as these phrases may sound, they have different theological implications. While they both involve a reverential fear of God and an act of giving up Isaac, in the MT the stress lies on the right action (Abraham does not hold back anything, not even his

---

[223] Flesher and Chilton, *Targums*, 343
[224] Wevers, *Notes,* 318.
[225] ibid., 324.
[226] Hayward, personal communication,10th October 2009.

only son from God) while in the LXX, emphasis lies on the right motive for the action (i.e. on account of God, Abraham does not spare his son).

Further, in Gen 22:2, where the MT reads המריה (referring to the land of Moriah) which the LXX reads as τὴν γῆν τὴν ὑψηλήν (the high land), Wevers suggests it may have been the result of an understanding based on the root רום.[227] Could it be that the LXX reflects the ambiguous attitude of the Alexandrian Diaspora Jews towards the temple in Jerusalem?[228] Whereas Wevers observes (cf. Gen 22:14): "[it] reflects the old and popular interpretation which identifies this mountain as Jerusalem or Mt. Zion," nonetheless, the LXX is less explicit than MT in making the connection.[229]

Gen 22:18 has also stimulated critical interpretations. In the MT, the verb is in the hithpael (3rd person masculine plural) form (התברכו) which one would expect to be translated in a reflexive sense as "bless themselves." However, in LXX v.18 the verb ἐνευλογηθήσονται is in passive voice "And in your seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." In other related passages where the verb occurs (12:3, 18:18 and 28:14) the verb is in niphal form נברכו which the LXX consistently translates in passive form. There is also another occurrence in 26:4 of (התברכו) which again the LXX translates as passive.[230] The LXX is then consistent in its translation, whether the verb form is niphal or hithpael by using the passive (be blessed) rather than the reflexive form (bless themselves). This LXX translation has puzzled scholars since

---

[227] Wevers, *Notes,* 317. He states that the rendering of המריה by τὴν ὑψηλήν is probably triggered by the interpretation of אלון מורה as τὴν δρῦν τὴν ὑψηλήν at 12:6 (and see also Deut 11:30) and the notion is probably based on an understanding of the word as related to the the root רום with two graphemes transposed.

[228] Daniel Schwartz, *2 Maccabees* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 46-47 holds that in diaspora texts (as opposed to *Eretz Israel* texts) the Jewish God is not defined so much in terms of a holy place (i.e.God of Zion who dwells in the temple) but rather the "God of Heavens." A Jewish-Hellenistic point of view displays "little interest in the Temple *per se* and in the sacrificial cult characteristic of it – a type of worship in which diaspora Jews can only rarely participate." Rather "than being enthused about any terrestrial House of God," a diaspora perspective prefers "God to be God of Heaven, hence equally accessible to all;" also course notes from "Classical Jewish Literature," Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Fall 2006.

[229] Wevers, *Notes,* 325. Hayward affirms the MT's link with the Jerusalem temple given that in Gen. 22:2 "the land of Moriah…one of the mountains" resonates with "2 Chron. 3:1 [where] the site of the Jerusalem temple is identified as being 'on the mountain of Moriah.' The Chronicler's text should be carefully noted: it is the place where 'the Lord had appeared' to David. [In Gen 22] this short prose section presents us with heavy stress on 'seeing,' using verb *r'h* (vv. 4, 8, 13, 14 twice) and forms of *hnh* (vv. 1, 7 twice, and 11)."

[230] Here the meaning is similar to 22:18 in that it is a repetition to Isaac of the promise given to Abraham.

grammatically one would expect a niphal to be translated as passive and a hithpael as reflexive, although as Wevers notes "the Hithpael can occasionally be understood as passive as well."[231] Why does the LXX give preference to the rarer form rather than the more common and accurate translation of hithpael as reflexive? Could theological considerations have played a role? Admittedly, the MT version of 22:18 of future generations "blessing themselves" by appealing to Abraham's name is more reductive (limited in scope and purpose) than the LXX notion of their "being blessed" in and through Abraham, which lends itself to a theologically richer understanding.[232] In the LXX Abraham is not just an exemplar in whose name one blesses oneself, but rather he becomes the source and means of blessing for all nations through his seed. It seems reasonable to conclude that the LXX translator's choice in this case was dictated more by exegetical rather than grammatical concerns.

To sum up, the LXX and MT versions of Gen 22 display some variant readings. Most divergences are minor in character, probably resulting from the translator's attempt to clarify meaning, be sensitive to nuances, or from a misreading or linguistic difficulty. While not completely excluding the possibility that the LXX *Vorlage* may have been different, nonetheless, some variants could stem from divergent theological stances. LXX's perspective may reflect Diaspora attitudes, including reverence for the "the high land" without a specific focus on the temple, and a universalistic view that all the nations of world will "be blessed" through Abraham's seed. Despite such variations, Brown comments, "in Genesis, differences between the text furnished by the MT and that supposed by the LXX are comparatively limited and the evidence for Genesis shows a high degree of uniformity in the manuscript tradition."[233]

---

[231] Refer Wevers, *Notes,* 164, and Moberly, *Bible, Theology and Faith*, 123.
[232] See Moberly, *Bible, Theology and Faith,*124-27, on the notions of "be blessed" and "bless themselves." He refutes the opinion that the reflexive sense makes the text "trivial," and locates the text within its pentateuchal context, and argues that the prime reason for reinterpreting the passage [as "being blessed"] is its broader canonical context and its reception within Jewish and Christian faiths (126).
[233] Brown, *New Jerome,* 1092.

3.1.4 SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH (SP) ON GENESIS.

The SP is preserved by the Samaritan community, which decisively separated from Judaism and developed their own cultic practices and traditions, with a temple in Gerizim as its spiritual locus. SP is a "developed Palestinian text, by no means sectarian in origin . . . that began its separate history among the Samaritans no earlier than the days of John Hyrcanus at the end of the 2nd cent. BCE."[234] While the SP diverges from the MT in several details, "these textual distinctions ought not to obscure the fact that SP is closer to MT than the LXX."[235] SP has an expansionist and harmonizing nature, but it is not manifest in the patriarchal narratives (except SP's additions to Gen 30:36 from 31:11–13).[236] SP's Genesis 22 contains a few variations from the MT, which only sometimes align with LXX. In v.22:2, the MT reads המריה while SP states המוראה meaning the "land of revelation."[237] One may speculate whether המוראה is a deliberate avoidance of the site המריה which is associated with the temple in Jerusalem (cf. 2 Chr 3:1) thus competing with the Samaritan's own claims for their temple. In v.22:13 SP matches LXX in reading אחד (one) rather than (the BHS) אחר. In v.16 where the LXX phrase δι' ἐμέ has no Hebrew counterpart, the SP follows the LXX with ממני. Overall, SP's variations on Genesis 22 are not significant.

3.1.5 DEAD SEA SCROLLS (DSS)

The popularity of Genesis in Qumran is attested by the number of its biblical manuscripts, and the collection of scrolls involved with retelling its stories[238] (i.e. *Genesis Apocryphon, Jubilees*). The remains of "possibly twenty MSS were unearthed at Qumran."[239] Despite their quantity, Genesis MSS are relatively fragmentary and "preserve only thirty two

---

[234] Brown, *New Jerome,* 1089.

[235]James Purvis, *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect* (MA: Harvard UP, 1968), 73.

[236]Bruce Waltke, "Samaritan Pentateuch," n.p., *ABD on CD-ROM.* Version 2.1. 1997.

[237] Wevers, *Notes,* 317 notes that Aquila and Symmachus agree on this root.

[238] Martin Abegg, Peter Flint & Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), 3.

[239] Abegg, *DSS Bible,* 3: 1QGen, 2QGen, 4QGen-Exod[a], 4QGen[b]-4QGen[g], 4QGen[h1], 4QGen[h2],4QGen[h-title], 4QGen[j], 4QGen[k], 4QpaleoGen-Exod[l], 4QpaleoGen[m], 4QGen[n], and pap4QGen(4Q483), 6QGen and 8QGen. Genesis MSS were also found in Wadi Murabba'at and Masada (3). Genesis is also attested in paleo-Hebrew script "(4QpaleoGen-Exod and 4QpaleoGen[m] -- the latter being the oldest scroll of Genesis," ca. middle of 2nd century BCE).

chapters."[240] Nonetheless, the "manuscripts found at Qumran show a comparatively uniform text. Readings that coincide with LXX do exist, but a high degree of standardization for the Genesis text clearly antedates all our evidence."[241] The extant Qumran manuscripts "reveal a text of Genesis that is generally very close to the traditional Hebrew text," with the few variants showing no real pattern.[242] In relation to Genesis 22, only two DSS manuscripts contain fragmentary verses: 1Q Gen contains vv.13-15, and 4Q Gen-Exod[a] has v.14. These fragments align with MT, and the only variation is in v.14 of 4Q Gen-Exod[a] where the word אלוהים is mentioned, whereas the MT, LXX and SP refer to יהוה. While this naming of God may bear relevance for source criticism,[243] the DSS texts on Akedah are insufficient to effect text criticism or bear exegetical implications.

3.1.6 IMPLICATIONS

Having discussed the four sources of MT, LXX, SP and DSS, one observes that scholars concur on the stability of the Genesis textual tradition. Regarding Akedah, the Hebrew texts (MT, DSS and SP) appear consistent, except for a few minor changes. The same applies to the Greek text on Genesis 22. However, divergences between LXX and MT merit some attention. While many of these differences involve slight alterations in wording or nuance, a few changes seem to reflect a shift in theological perspective. The overall consistency of the Hebrew and Greek texts serves as a reliable base from which to undertake an analysis of Akedah.

3.2   ISAIAH 53: TEXTUAL SOURCES AND VARIANTS

Textual sources for Isaiah mainly consist of the LXX, the MT, and several manuscripts among the DSS, including the Great Isaiah Scroll which as the "longest preserved biblical

---

[240] Abegg, *DSS Bible*, 4.
[241] Brown, *New Jerome,* 1087.
[242] Abegg, *DSS Bible*, 4.
[243] ibid., 10: "since, according to the Bible itself the name [יהוה]. . .was later revealed to Moses in [Exod 3:13-15] students of the Pentateuch have long debated the use of [יהוה] in the book of Genesis."

scroll," containing the entire text, had a major impact on Isaiah scholarship.[244] This section will discuss some text-critical issues in the MT, LXX and DSS versions of Isaiah 53.

3.2.1   MASORETIC TEXT

The stability of the MT text of Isaiah received support from Qumran findings. Tov remarks on the affinity between the medieval text and the Qumran proto-Masoretic group: "when comparing 1QIsa[b], dating from the first century BCE, with [MT] codex L written one thousand years later, one easily recognizes the close relationship between the two texts, which sometimes are almost identical."[245] Despite the continuity of the MT, some ancient manuscripts also deviate from this traditional form of the Hebrew text (see 3.2.3). While the relationships between variants of Isaiah, and their underlying *Vorlagen* has been debated, Tov remarks that "the bottom line of any comparative analysis of the texts of Isaiah is that the amount of variation is relatively limited. The present textual data for Isaiah thus points to a picture of textual unity."[246]

3.2.2   SEPTUAGINT (LXX)

The book of Isaiah is one of the earliest prophetic books to be translated into Greek, probably between 150-170BCE. [247] The LXX deviates to varying degrees from the MT and other ancient Hebrew versions, which scholars have explained in different ways:[248] a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, scribal errors, stylistic reasons, misreadings, Hellenistic influence, linguistic difficulties, a "'free' approach towards its Hebrew original,"[249] or theological and exegetical reasons.[250] Despite LXX's deviations, "the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah, though often difficult to reconstruct, does not differ much from the MT. This is not only the opinion of scholars like

---

[244] Emmanuel Tov,"The Text of Isaiah at Qumran," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition,* vol. 2 (eds. Craig Broyles and Craig Evans; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 491-512, p.494. For some studies see 496-503.

[245] Tov, "Text," 506.

[246] Tov, "Text," 505

[247] Harl, *La Bible,* 111. Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,* 30. For LXX Isaiah studies see A. van der Kooij, "Isaiah in the Septuagint," *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* mentions some LXX Isaiah studies (514-516).

[248] Porter and Pearson, "Isaiah through Greek Eyes," 532-535.

[249] van der Kooij, "Isaiah," 518.

[250] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant*, focuses on the servant poems, claiming that the differences in LXX Isaiah is a reflection of its particular theology (21).

Ziegler and Seeligmann . . . but it has also been confirmed generally speaking by the Isaiah texts of Qumran, first of all 1QIsa[a].[251] Tov too observes, "although the LXX translation often deviates much from the MT because of the former's extensive exegesis, there is no reason to believe that its underlying Hebrew text differed much from the latter."[252] Ulrich and Flint state, "the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts of Isaiah . . . all witness to [a] single edition."[253] An additional consideration is that in ancient times the Septuagint in itself was probably not one fixed text, but variants likely existed among different communities.[254] Nonetheless, differences among the Greek tradition of Isaiah 53 are relatively minor,[255] and "like its Hebrew counterpart, Isaiah 53 in Greek is a relatively stable text by the first century CE."[256]

3.2.3   DEAD SEA SCROLLS

The Qumran caves have yielded "not less than 21 copies" of Isaiah, revealing its popularity among the covenanters.[257] Best known are the complete large Isaiah scroll (1QIsa[a]) and the well preserved small Isaiah scroll (1QIsa[b])[258] but they are not representatives of the whole, and "each mansucript should be understood as an independent witness to the transmission of its contents."[259] Textual differences among the Isaiah texts have been investigated. Tov identifies two groups, the proto-masoretic group which shows affinity to the MT codex L (1QIsa[b] and almost all cave 4 Isaiah texts) and the "Qumran scribal Practice" a cluster of texts linked by "idiosyncracies in orthography, morphology, and scribal habits" (ex.

---

[251] van der Kooij, "Isaiah," 517.

[252] Tov, "Text," 508.

[253] Ulrich and Flint, *Qumran Cave 1,* 90.

[254] Loren Stuckenbruck, personal communication, March 2009.

[255] For instance, in 53:2 Ziegler's Göttingen editon prefers ἀνέτειλε μέν instead of ἀνηγγείλαμεν where he cites other instances where the two verbs have been confused in the manuscript tradition. Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,*199, disagrees since ἀνηγγείλαμεν is the more difficult reading, and is "unanimously attested by the uncials, minuscules and Church fathers." See also Watson, "Mistranslation," 225.

[256] Watson, "Mistranslation," 222.

[257] Tov, "Text"491 states, the number of copies of biblical books found at Qumran "should always be considered conjectural," given the difficulty of identifying whether fragments come from one scroll or from different ones.   For Isaiah these include: 1QIsa[a],1QIsa[b], 4QIsa[a],4QIsa[b],4QIsa[c],4QIsa[d], 4QIsa[e], 4QIsa[f], 4QIsa[g], 4QIsa[h], 4QIsa[i], 4QIsa[j], 4QIsa[k], 4QIsa[l], 4QIsa[m], 4QIsa[n], 4QIsa[o], 4QpapIsa[p10], 4QIsa[q], 4QIsa[r], 5QIsa. In addition, a single copy (MurIsaiah) has been found at Wadi Murabba`at).

[258] For studies on 1QIsa[a] see Tov, "Text" (496-503).

[259] Brooke, "On Isaiah," 77.

1QIsa[a] and 4QIsa[c]).[260] While the *Vorlagen* of the latter group of texts remains debated, Tov allows for the possibility that 1QIsa[a] and 4QIsa[c] may have been copied from a text like a proto-masoretic, and "ultimately reflects the same text."[261] According to VanderKam and Flint, the textual status of the DSS is as follows:

> For the book of Isaiah the scrolls and other ancient witnesses preserve apparently only one edition, with no consistent patterns of variant readings or rearrangements. Some manuscripts are especially close to the Masoretic text: 1QIsa[b], 4QIsa[a], 4QIsa[b], 4QIsa[d], 4QIsa[e], 4QIsa[f], and 4QIsa[g]. Other scrolls, most notably 1QIsa[a] (and 4QIsa[c]), contain many highly instructive variants from the traditional form of the Hebrew text.[262]

The scrolls which contain Isaiah 53 are: 1QIsa[a] (all); 1QIsa[b] (53:1-12), 4QIsa[c](52:10-15,53:1-3,6-8), 4QIsa[d] (53:8-12) and 4QIsa[b] 53:11-12.[263] In its comparative analysis, this research study will mainly focus on 1QIsa[a] which is the only scroll containing the entire pericope. According to Ulrich and Flint's list, 1QIsa[a] manifests 40 textual variants for Isaiah 53 alone, while "well over 2600" textual variants have been identified in the entire 1QIsa[a].[264] Van der Kooij observes that LXX and 1QIsa[a] "deviate from MT in many instances," but "in a large number of cases they are mutually divergent, whereas the number of common readings against MT is relatively very small" although they cannot be shown to attest to the same Hebrew text since LXX and 1QIsa[a] both "reflect a free approach."[265]

Some differences of Isaiah 53 with MT are listed below, involving grammatical changes (i.e. number, person, tenses, insertion or deletion of waw conjunction), word alterations, and a few shifts in meaning.

52:14: משׁחתי (1QIsa[a]), משׁחת (MT)

52:14 מבני אדם (1QIsa[a]), מבני האדם (MT)

52:15 וקפצו (1QIsa[a]), יקפצו (MT)

---

[260] Tov, "Text," 508. Tigchelaar, "Review," 7 notes that Abegg and Tigchelaar have questioned the "dichotomy of Qumran Scribal Practice [QSP] and non-QSP."

[261] ibid., 508,511.

[262] James VanderKam and Peter Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 131-32, as cited in Brooke, "On Isaiah,"73.

[263] Ulrich and Flint, *Qumran Cave 1.11,* 256. Abegg, *DSS Bible,* 359.

[264] See list in Ulrich and Flint, *Qumran Cave 1*, 89; Tigchelaar, Review,12, notes: "since 1QIsa[a] contains virtually the entire book of Isaiah, this listing of textual variants where 1QIsa[a] [is] different from another Qumran scroll or the later Masoretic tradition, is at the same time a full overview of all Qumran Isaiah textual variants."

[265] van der Kooij "Isaiah," 517-518.

53:2 הדר לו (1QIsa[a]), הדר (MT)

53:2: ונראהו (1QIsa[a]), ונראנו (MT)

53:2 ונחמדהו (1QIsa[a]), ונחמדנו (MT)

53:3 ויודע (1QIsa[a]), וידוע (MT)

53:3 ונבוזהו (1QIsa[a]), נבזה (MT)

53:5 ובחברתו (1QIsa[a]), ובחבורתיו (MT)

53:7 פתח (1QIsa[a]), יפתח (MT)

53:8: עמו (1QIsa[a]), עמי (MT)

53:8 נוגע (1QIsa[a]), נגע (MT)

53:9: ויתן (1QIsa[a]), ויתנו (MT)

53:9 בומתו (1QIsa[a]), במתיו (MT)

53:10: ויחללהו (1QIsa[a]), החלי (MT)

53:10 ויאריך (1QIsa[a]), יאריך (MT) 53:9

53:11 addition of word אור (not in MT)

53:12 חטאי (1QIsa[a]), חטא (MT)

53:12 לפשעיהמה (1QIsa[a]), לפשעים (MT)

53:12 יפגע (1QIsa[a]), יפגיע (MT)

While the above list may seem extensive, the variations between the Hebrew texts of Isaiah 53 are relatively minor, with only a few striking deviations (like the addition of אור in 53:11). Some of these modifications will be discussed below, keeping in view that "all available manuscript traditions of Isaiah, despite their pluriformity, witness to a single edition [although] they contain myriad textual variants."[266]

---

[266] Ulrich and Flint, *Qumran Cave I:II,* 91.

3.2.4   FOURTH SERVANT SONG AND TEXTUAL VARIATIONS

This section aims to highlight some of the textual differences between the LXX, MT and 1QIsa[a] in relation to the Fourth Servant Song, and to consider any semantic implications as relevant for this thesis. For clarity, the variations will be categorized as follows: [267]

A) Changes in Wording:

This covers a range of translation choices at word-level including the addition, omission, substitution or contraction of words.

Example 1: (Isa 52:13) : the word choice of συνήσει for שׂכל [268]

LXX   : Ἰδοὺ συνήσει ὁ παῖς (Behold my servant will understand)

1QIsa[a]/MT: הנה ישׂכיל עבדי (Behold my servant will prosper)

Example 2: (Isa 53:2): word choice of παιδίον for יונק[269]

LXX: ἀνηγγείλαμεν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὡς παιδίον (we announced before him as a child)[270]

1QIsa[a/] MT : ויעל כיונק לפניו (He grew up before him like a young plant)

Example 3: (Isa 53:1): addition of the word κύριε in the LXX[271]

LXX: κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν (Lord who believed our report)

1QIsa[a]/MT: מי האמין לשׁמועתנו (who has believed our report?)

Example 4: (Isa 53:8): differences in each version, possibly due to mistranslation.

LXX: ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον (for the transgressions of my people

    he was led to death)

1QIsa[a]: מפשׁע עמו נוגע למו (for the transgressions of his people he was stricken)

MT: מפשׁע עמי נגע למו (for the transgressions of my people, a stroke to him).

---

[267] See Sapp, "LXX, 1QIsa and MT," 189-192, for an useful appendix (A): "The Qumran Variant Textual Readings Compared to the MT and LXX in Isaiah 53" analysing some differences.

[268] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,* 179, this is the only place in LXX Isaiah where συνίημι matches the hiphil of שׂכל. Although it is a common semantic equivalent elsewhere in LXX, in Isaiah it mostly matches some form of בין.

[269] For the translation of יונק as παιδίον Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,* 201, notes that this is the only place in the entire LXX where יונק matches παιδίον. Hengel, *Effective History,* 135, considers this unusual usage as pointing back to the messianic child in Isaiah 9:5 and 7:14-16.

[270] Ziegler's textual amendment reads: ἀνέτειλε μὲν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὡς παιδίον (he rose before him as a child)

[271] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,*194, suggests that "the speakers invoke God by his proper name, addressing their reflection to him in the form of a prayer."

In the above example, the LXX mentions "death" which is absent from both Hebrew versions.[272] The LXX and the MT refer to "my people" while 1QIsa[a] refers to "his people" (also attested in 4QIsa[d]) which may be an attempt to be consistent with the 3rd person perspective. Further, MT presents נגע as a noun while 1QIsa[a] gives נוגע as a pual perfect.[273]

Example 5:

In 52:14 1QIsa[a] contains the variant משחתי for MT's משחת (noun for "disfigurement"). While this variant does not occur in other MSS and one cannot rule out a scribal error, scholars have responded to this variant differently. Some early scholars like Brownlee suggest a messianic interpretation: "I so anointed his appearance beyond anyone else,"[274] more recently revisited by Hengel "so have I anointed his appearance beyond that of any other man"[275] and George Brooke.[276] Abegg, Flint and Ulrich avoid any messianic connotations in their translation: "so was he marred" or "my marring."[277] This variant, among others, merits closer attention.

B) Grammatical changes:

This category covers changes in tenses, switching of subject/object in sentences, shifts in perspectives, among others (singular / plural,etc) which have semantic effects.

a) <u>Differences in Tenses</u>

Example (Isa 53:7b): The LXX and the MT conveys the verb in the present or imperfect tense, while 1QIsa[a] employs the past tense.

LXX: οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ (ind. 3rd p sing present active) he opens not his mouth

1QIsa[a]: לא פתח פיהו (Qal perfect 3rd person masc. sing): he opened not his mouth

MT: לא יפתח פיו (Qal imperfect 3rd person masc. sing): he shall open not his mouth

---

[272] Watson, "Mistranslation," 228, suggests that the LXX translator either read למות in his exemplar, or more likely decided that this is what למו must mean.
[273] See Sapp, "The LXX, 1QIsa and MT,"190.
[274] As cited in Brooke, "On Isaiah," 75.
[275] Hengel, "Effective History," 103;
[276] See Brooke, "On Isaiah," 77. He reads it as "I anointed" (75).
[277] Abegg, *DSS Bible*, 359.

Example (52:14): MT and 1QIsaᵃ share the same tense while LXX deviates [278]

LXX: ὅν τρόπον ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ σὲ πολλοί (many will be astonished)

1QIsaᵃ: כאשר שממו עליכה רבים (many were appalled)

MT: כאשר שממו עליך רבים (many were appalled)

b) Shifts in Perspectives

Isaiah 53 presents first, second and third person perspectives. The main first person speakers are the Lord who utters the opening and concluding verses (52:13-15, 53:11-12) and an unidentified group of plural first person speakers (53:1-6), besides people referred to in the third person plural (v.9).[279] The Servant himself is directly addressed only once in the second person masculine singular (52:14) but remains voiceless in this text, although he is frequently referred to in the third person (vv.3-5,7-9). The LXX displays more shifts in perspectives than the MT (i.e. 52:14, 53:9; 53:12) often resulting in added emphasis. For example, in Isa 53:9, the LXX shifts to a first person speaker καὶ δώσω τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ [and I will give the wicked for his tomb], while the MT employs a third person singular perspective throughout: ויתן [He gave] and the 1QIsaᵃ uses a 3ʳᵈ person plural verb ויתנו [They gave]. Ekblad observes, "the LXX clarifies more than 1QIsaᵃ and the MT that the Lord is the speaker in 53:8-9. In addition, the LXX's future tense combined with other differences reflects its distinct interpretation that the Lord speaks here of his future retribution against the wicked and the rich. The LXX offers a completely different interpretation from that of the MT."[280]

c) Inversions in Subject/Object

Example (Isa 52:15) :

---

[278] Watson, "Mistranslation, 223: "in MT this refers to a past event שממו, in LXX to a future one (ἐκστήσονται, ἀδοξήσει)."

[279] While commentators have explored the the identities of the various speakers, suggesting a range of possibilities for the Servant (messiah, Israel, prophet,etc.) and the plural group (Israel, nations, kings, all people) David Clines *I, He, We & They* (England: JSOT, 1976), 33 observes that these multiple voices add to the "ambiguity of the poem" and that it is "open-ended and allows for multiple interpretations."

[280] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,* 237.

LXX: οὕτως θαυμάσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ (So shall many nations be amazed at him)[281]

MT/ QIsaᵃ: כן יזה גוים רבים עליו (So shall he sprinkle many nations)

d) Shifts in Emphasis

In Isa 52:15b, Watson observes that in LXX the phrase "those to whom it was not announced concerning him" replaces MT's "that which was not told them." In the same way, LXX's "those who have not heard" replaces MT's "what they did not hear." In the Greek, the emphasis lies on the potential addressees rather than the potential message.[282]

e) Changes in Passive/ Active Voice (Isa 53:3)[283]

LXX: καὶ εἰδώς active participle perfect nom masculine singular (knowing)

1QIsa: ויודע Qal imperfect active participle (and knowing)

MT: וידע Qal imperfect passive participle (and being known to)

f) Singular/Plural

Example 1) In 53:12 the word "sins" is plural in the LXX (ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν) and 1QIsaᵃ

(חטאי רבים), while the MT employs the singular form (חטא רבים).

Example 2) In Isa 53:9 the MT refers to במתיו which translates as "in his deaths." 1QIsaᵃ has a

singular form: בומתו or in his death. The LXX also takes a singular form: τοῦ θανάτου

αὐτοῦ (his death).

C) Semantic Changes:

While the above changes in grammar and diction result in relatively minor variations between the MT, 1QIsaᵃ and the LXX, in some verses the discrepancies between the source texts have a significant impact on meaning.

---

[281] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,*187, notes that the LXX translates the MT יזה with the middle deponent θαυμάσονται only here in the LXX. He cites the suggestion (of Ziegler *Untersuchungen 163*and Ottley *The Book of Isaih 344*) that the LXX may have read יחזו from חזה understood as seeing in amazement, but thinks it more likely that LXX reflects "contextual exegesis typical of the translators of the LXX of Isaiah." Ekblad translates יזה as startled, noting that since it occurs in parallelism with 52:14 שממו lexicons commonly render it as "spring, leap startle." Ekblad also notes its common usage in (the hiphil form) in the Torah to describe the priestly act of sprinkling blood for atonement, although this form occurs only here in Isaiah.

[282] Watson, "Mistranslation," 224.

[283] Sapp, "LXX,1QIsaᵃ and MT," 190.

Verse 4

LXX: ἡμεῖς ἐλογισάμεθα αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν πόνῳ καὶ ἐν πληγῇ καὶ ἐν κακώσει (we considered him to be in pain, in affliction and and in oppression).

MT: ואנחנו חשבנהו נגוע מכה אלוהים ומענה (And we thought him stricken, smitten by God and afflicted).

1QIsa[a]: ואנחנו חשבנוהי נגוע ומוכה אלוהים ומעונה (And we considered him stricken and smitten by God and afflicted).

In the above verse, the LXX lacks the phrase (מכה אלוהים) which in the Hebrew texts holds God responsible for the Servant's affliction. Sapp observes, "At this early stage in Isaiah 53, the LXX has removed any suggestion of divine intent in the Servant's misfortune."[284] Ekblad agrees that "through the omission of God's name, the LXX makes it difficult to interpret God as the one who inflicts suffering on his servant." [285]

Verse 8

LXX: ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη (in the humiliation, his justice was taken away)

MT : מעצר וממשפט לקח   (By coercion and judgement he was taken away)

1QIsa[a]: מעצר וממשפט לוקח (By coercion and judgement he was taken away)

In the Hebrew texts, the Servant's oppression emerges strongly through forceful words such as coercion and judgement. Contrastingly, the LXX "shifts the focus of the sentence from the coercive actions of wicked people who have held the Servant for judgment to the humiliating effect of those actions on the Servant."[286]

Verse 10

LXX: καὶ κύριος βούλεται καθαρίσαι αὐτὸν τῆς πληγῆς (the Lord desires to purify him from the stroke)

MT: ויהוה חפץ דכאו החלי (But it pleased the Lord to crush him, made [him] sick)

1QIsa[a] ויהוה חפץ דכאו ויחללהו (But it pleased the Lord to crush him and he pierced him)

---

[284] Sapp, "The LXX,1QIsa[a] and MT," 176.
[285] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,* 217.
[286] Sapp, "The LXX,1QIsa[a] and MT," 176.

All three versions differ. The MT and 1QIsa^a each employs a different word והללה / החלי (he pierced him/made sick) but both Hebrew texts unambiguously implicate the Lord in deliberately causing the servant's suffering. [287] However, in the LXX, "the MT's description of the Lord's delight in crushing the servant is radically transformed."[288] By translating the verb דכאו as καθαρίσαι, and treating החלי as a noun with an article rather than a verb,[289] the verse conveys the notion that the Lord desires to purify rather than to crush the servant.[290] Consequently, "the effect of the LXX's translation is to avoid identifying the Servant's suffering with the Lord's will."[291]

Verse 10

LXX: ἐὰν δῶτε περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ὄψεται σπέρμα μακρόβιον (if you give a sin offering, your soul shall see a long-lived seed).

MT: אם תשים אשם נפשו יראה זרע יאריך ימים (if you make his soul a guilt offering, he shall see seed and he will prolong days).

IQIsa^a: אם תשים נפשו אשם יראה זרע ויארך ימים (if you make his soul a guilt offering, he shall see seed and his days will be long).

The meaning of this verse depends on the identity of the second person addressee. The "you" in LXX is in masculine plural which suggests a group is being addressed, while in MT and 1QIsa^a the "you" is in masculine singular, presumably being addressed to the Lord.[292] It is clearly not the Servant who is addressed as "you" in the Hebrew texts. Rather, the Servant fits the passive position of the third person (masculine) referent whose soul is to be an אשם offering, which remains consistent with the Servant's vicarious suffering throughout the passage. While

---

[287] Hengel, "Effective History," 105, observes that this verb חלל (in 1QIsa^a) also appears in Isa 53: "I wonder whether this twofold usage of the language of 'piercing' might not in fact suggest a connection with the 'pierced one' of Zechariah 12:10."
[288] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant*, 241.
[289] Watson, "Mistranslation," 229.
[290] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant* 241: "Isaiah 53:10 is the only place where καθαρίζω matches the MT's דכא in the entire LXX."
[291] Sapp, "The LXX, 1QIsa^a and MT," 180.
[292] תשים may be either 2nd person masculine singular or 3rd person feminine singular. Ekblad, 244 reads it as the latter, that the verb takes the feminine נפשו as its subject thus reading "if his soul would make a guilt-offering." However, Sapp, "The LXX, 1QIsa^a and MT,"n.18 argues: "syntax favours the second-person masculine."

the Hebrew versions stress the Lord's active role, the LXX attempts to mitigate divine complicity in the Servant's suffering by shifting attention to the plural group. As Ekblad notes, "the LXX's use of εαν and following second person plurals mark the beginning of a new phrase."[293] LXX addresses the "you" plural group to make a sin-offering (presumably for inflicting suffering on the Servant) devolving the Lord of any complicity.

Verse 11

LXX: βούλεται κύριος ἀφελεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ πόνου τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς καὶ πλάσαι τῇ συνέσει δικαιῶσαι δίκαιον εὖ δουλεύοντα πολλοῖς (The Lord desires to take away the suffering of his soul, to show him light and to form with understanding, to justify a righteous one serving many well)

MT: מעמל נפשׁו יראה ישׁבע בדעתו יצדיק צדיק עבדי לרבים (By the labour of his soul, he will see, he will be satisfied, by his knowledge my righteous servant will justify many).

1QIsaᵃ: מעמל נפשׁוה יראה אור וישׁבע ובדעתו יצדיק צדיק עבדי לרבים (By the labour of his soul, he will see light and be satisfied, and by his knowledge my righteous servant will justify many).[294]

Each version differs as evident from the above comparison. 1QIsaᵃ converges with the LXX in the adding the word "light," while the rest of the verse is nearly identical with the MT. The LXX not only differs in wording, but its meaning deviates strikingly. Instead of the righteous Servant justifying "many," the Greek text reverses the meaning so that it is the Lord who will justify the righteous servant. As Sapp observes, "The LXX has made the Lord's vindication of the Servant and his righteousness the dominant theme in v.11b, not the Servant's justification of sinners."[295]

Verse 12

LXX: καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκε καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη (And he offered the sins of many, and he was given up on account of their sins).

---

[293] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant*, 244.
[294] Ulrich and Flint, read עבדו while Burrows gives the more preferable reading עבדי.
[295] Sapp, "The LXX,1QIsaᵃ and MT," 176.

1QIsa^a יפגע ולפשעיהמה נשׂא רבים חטאי והואה (He carried the sins of many and he will entreat for their sins).

MT: יפגיע ולפשעים נשׂא רבים חטא והוא (He carried the sin of many and he will make entreaty for transgressors).

The LXX and 1QIsa^a are similar in their reference to sins in the plural, while the MT refers to sin in the singular. Further, in The MT, the Servant's intercession is on behalf of sinners, while in 1QIsa^a he intercedes on behalf of sins. The LXX stresses the vicarious suffering of the Servant by employing a passive aorist παρεδόθη to indicate the Servant "was given up" for their sins.[296]

3.2.5   IMPLICATIONS

The above comparison of textual sources on Isaiah 53 covering the MT, LXX and 1QIsa^a versions reveal many variations, ranging from minor linguistic and grammatical differences to key semantic divergences. While 1QIsa^a sometimes matches the LXX (אור in v.10) frequently it coincides with the MT. Sapp observes, "the only differences that would be required by the Hebrew variants would be the addition of an insignificant word here and there, the use of a plural instead of a singular or vice verse, the use of a different personal pronoun, or the use of a synonym or a different verbal tense."[297] Clearly, "the significant differences are not between the Hebrew versions, but between the Hebrew and the LXX's Greek translation."[298]

The substantial deviations between LXX and MT of Isaiah 53 have led some scholars to interpret them as reflecting theological differences (above). Sapp states, "at crucial points the LXX translators chose grammar, syntax, or vocabulary that reveal a divergent theological presupposition and consequently a different view of the fate of the Lord's Servant."[299] The LXX of Isaiah 53 may be viewed as a theodicy where it "completely disassociates the Lord from any responsibility or pleasure in the servant's suffering in places where the MT could be read as

---

[296] Watson, "Mistranslation," 227, notes the use of παραδιδόναι twice in v.12, where it translates הערה and הפגיע.
[297] Sapp, "LXX,1QIsa^a and MT," 192.
[298] ibid.,191.
[299] ibid., 187.

depicting God as responsible for suffering."[300] A related question has been the significance of variants on the NT. Watson maintains, "it was precisely in the deviations that early Christians first glimpsed the possibility of a positive soteriological interpretation of the death of Christ."[301] Sapp declares, "the Christian doctrine of atonement rests upon an understanding of Isaiah 53 that is fully preserved only in the Hebrew versions."[302] While such theological interpretations may explain some differences between source texts, Ulrich and Flint caution against attributing "intentional re-interpretation or actualising exegesis" to the LXX translator.[303] Rather, textual variants could result from "the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek [being] similar to, but not identical to either 1QIsa^a or [MT]," and as well, the original Greek "has been lost or disturbed at numerous points during the long history of [its] transmission."[304] Hayward raises another key concern, "How did LXX readers understand what the translators had produced?"[305]

This thesis will be aware of textual variants and specific differences in its analysis, nonetheless, one recalls scholarly consensus on the overall unity of the Isaiah textual tradition. Isaiah presents "a closely knit textual tradition" and though "all the sources of Isaiah differ from each other," still "the degrees of their differentiation is not very extensive . . .the known texts do not differ from each other *recensionally*."[306] For Isaiah 53, "it does prove possible to identify relatively stable Hebrew and Greek texts."[307] Finally, having examined the key sources and text critical issues pertaining to Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53, and established their textual stability, one proceeds to the next chapter of this thesis, which is to investigate the intertextual connections between the two primary texts.

---

[300] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,* 286.
[301] Watson, "Mistranslation," 233.
[302] Sapp, "LXX, 1QIsa^a and MT," 187.
[303] Ulrich and Flint, *Qumran Cave I:II,* 92.
[304] ibid., 92.
[305] Hayward, personal correspondence, Nov. 4 2011.
[306] Tov, "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran," 505.
[307] Watson, "Mistranslation," 218.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE AKEDAH SERVANT COMPLEX IN THE PRIMARY TEXTS

This chapter will focus on the primary texts (MT and LXX) of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. Each biblical passage will be analysed and their intertextual relations investigated, keeping in view the nine motifs of the Akedah Servant complex. The ensuing discussion will review the formation of the complex based on the proposed intertextual model (see ch.1.4). This chapter will also consider alternative biblical texts with thematic affinities of righteous suffering like Job, Psalm 22, and prophetic passages from Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and discuss whether this thesis is justified in positing a tradition formed exclusively by the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. The nine elements of the Akedah Servant complex are listed below:

1) The portrayal of a righteous figure who suffers unjustly.

2) The suffering is instigated, or permitted (but not caused) by a supernatural being.

3) The sufferer does not protest, but co-operates.

4) A free and voluntary response is given on the part of the sufferer.

5) Suffering is framed as a test or demonstration of obedience or faithfulness.

6) The sufferer receives reward and exaltation at the end of the ordeal.

7) The recompense has universal consequences, and also involves the nations.

8) The relationship between the sufferer and the permitter/instigator is defined in familial terms.

9) Associations are made with ideas of sacrifice and atonement.

As previously stated (ch. 1.4) this thesis holds that the above list of nine features which characterise the Akedah Servant complex are derived from (nine) mutual elements present in each primary text, and that no other biblical passages besides Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 combine all nine characteristics within one pericope. Further, it maintains that their verbal and conceptual connections led to the association of these passages, resulting in the formation of the Akedah Servant complex. In order to verify these claims, this chapter will analyse the primary texts to

determine the presence of each of the features (4.1.1- 4.1.9) and then discuss their implications for the Akedah Servant Complex.

4.1 ANALYSIS OF PRIMARY TEXTS ACCORDING TO THE NINE MOTIFS

4.1.1 The Portrayal of a Righteous Figure who Suffers Unjustly

The Servant in Isaiah 53 is portrayed as a righteous figure who suffers unjustly. He is described with the adjective צדיק in the MT Isa 53:11 and in LXX as δίκαιον.[308] His sufferings are explicitly conveyed (vv.3,4,7,10,11) through a vocabulary of affliction like סבל ,איש מכאבות, דכא and מענה.[309] His experience of physical violence is connoted by words implying brutal treatment like משחת (52:14), נגוע מכה (4), and נגש (7), and he even faces death: הערה למות נפשו (12) and ואת עשיר במתיו (9). He also endures emotional trauma, facing rejection and misunderstanding by others. The MT employs the niphal form נבזה (3) to indicate he was despised,[310] as well as the phrase וכמסתר פנים ממנו (3) to indicate his alienation, which the LXX construes as ἀπέστραπται τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ meaning his face was turned away, which too effectively conveys the Servant's exclusion. The Servant's treatment is unjust since he has committed no violence or uttered deceit to merit death: על לא־חמס עשׂה ולא מרמה בפי (9). As Story notes, "there is no other place in the [OT] that can compare with this passage in a description of suffering . . . that is vicarious."[311]

In Genesis 22, Abraham qualifies as a righteous figure who suffers unjustly. While Isaac is the one destined to be sacrificed, one finds no confirmation in the biblical text of his suffering or righteousness, though the fact of Isaac's being a young boy (נער) guiltless of any

---

[308] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant*, 255: "in Isaiah no one is righteous (59:4) except for the Lord (41:10,45:21) and a future righteous king (32:1). The servant [צדיק] in 53:11 is one exception."
[309] ibid., 217-8 (observing that Isa 53:4 is the only place that matches מענה with κάκωσις) he sees a link between LXX Isa 53:4 and Exod 3:7:"the use of κάκωσις together with ὀδυνάω and (πληγή) brings the servant's suffering into exegetical rapport" with Exod 3:7: 'I have seen the affliction (κάκωσιν) of my people . . . for I know their pain (ὀδύνη).' The parallel lies between the Lord's seeing his people's oppression and knowing their pain, and the Servant's identification with the people's sin and suffering.
[310] ibid., 206: this niphal form of בזה is a rare Hebrew verb occurring only twice in Isaiah (both in Isa 53:3) and the LXX's adjective ἄτιμον represents an adequate semantic equivalent.
[311] Cullen Story, *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 31 (2009) 100-110, p.107.

specified sin makes his death an unjust one.[312] However, Abraham's righteousness has previously been established (Gen 15:5-6): when God promises him descendants numerous as the stars, because Abraham believes God, the text declares him as righteous (והאמן ביהוה ויחשבה לו צדקה). Genesis 22 intratextually refers back to this verse through verbal resonances between Gen 22:17 ארבה את זרעך ככוכבי השמים and Gen 15:5 where the same words כוכבים, השמים, and זרעך occur in similar contexts of God's promise of abundant future descendants. Clearly, the root צדק is associated with Abraham, as with the Servant, providing a link of righteous figures between the two passages.

Abraham's emotional suffering is evoked in Genesis 22 when he is commanded to sacrifice the son he loves, Isaac, who is described as יחידך אשר אהבת or in LXX as τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν ὃν ἠγάπησας τὸν Ισαακ.[313] The LXX translates יחיד as ἀγαπητός rather than μονογενής which would be the accurate translation. As Harl observes: "Au mot du TM, *yaḥīd,* correspond ailleurs en grec *monogenḗs,* (fils) "unique" (en Ps 21:20; 24,16; 34,17) employé ici aussi par les autres traducteurs, Aquila, Symmache. On trouvera *monogenḗs,* pour designer Isaac en Heb11:17."[314] McHugh observes, "the real problem is to find out why the LXX translators did not render יחיד by a word meaning *only-begotten* or *only-born*, but by a word meaning *dearly beloved.*"[315] Nonetheless, LXX's word choice accentuates Abraham's emotional bond to his "beloved" son, and implies his angst at God's command.[316] Although he does not suffer physically, Abraham like the Servant may be described as a righteous (צדיק) person who suffers unjustly. Similarly, Abraham's suffering has an isolating tendency. Just as

---

[312] In the absence of textual evidence that Isaac suffered, this thesis treats only Abraham as a suffering righteous figure in Gen 22. Nonetheless, the portrayal of a suffering Isaac in later Akedah tradition has been discussed by scholars (see ch. 2.2 and 2.3)

[313] Auerbach, *Mimesis,* 12, describes the fraught quality of Abraham's emotional pain: "he remembers, he is constantly conscious of, what God has promised him and what God has already accomplished for him – his soul is torn between desperate rebellion and hopeful expectation; his silent obedience is multilayered."

[314] Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie,* 192.

[315] John McHugh, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1-4* (London:T&T Clark International, 2009), 99. He notes that in the MT the word יחיד occurs 8 times with the meaning *an only child* and in 7 of these texts LXX translates it as ἀγαπητός, while μονογενής is employed only in Judg 11:34.

[316] Some rabbinic exegetes rightly read this emotional intensification as in (*b. Sanh. 89b*) where a dialogue occurs between God and Abraham: "*Thy son.* I have two sons *Thine only one.* Each is the only one of his mother! *Whom thou lovest.* I love them both! *Isaac!* And why all this? – That his mind should not reel."

the verb ἀπέστραπται (the indicative perfect passive masculine singular form of ἀποστρέφω) is used in Isa 53:3 to convey the Servant's position in relation to others, the same verb occurs as ἀπεστράφη (indicative aorist passive 3rd person singular) in Gen 22:19. Since the verb ἀποστρέφω can mean both to turn away or turn away from, in Isaiah's 53:3 it conveys the Servant's being turned away and rejected by the crowds during his ordeal,[317] while in Gen 22:19, it signals Abraham's turning towards and returning to his servants and society (to Beer Sheva) at the end of his traumatic experience. In both, the verb provides an intertextual connection, serving to define the protagonist's position in relation to others.

4.1.2   The Suffering is Instigated by a Supernatural Being

Both Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 reveal divine complicity in the protagonist's suffering. In Akedah, the divine command to sacrifice Isaac is directly attributed to אלוהים (22:1-2). The passage emphasises God's active involvement throughout the narrative with multiple references to אלוהים or יהוה in the MT (1,3,8,9,11,12,14,15,16) with corresponding uses of θεός or κύριος in the LXX.[318] Clearly, both the Greek and Hebrew versions ascribe to God direct responsibility for the traumatic command given to Abraham.

In Isaiah 53, the issue of divine complicity in the Servant's suffering is more problematic, given that the plural crowd ("we" and "they") have a significant role in his mental and physical oppression. Nonetheless, the divine name receives mention four times in the MT as יהוה and κύριος in the LXX (vv.1, 6,10). The designation אלוהים occurs only once in the MT (v. 4) but lacks the corresponding θεός in the LXX version. As previously discussed, this omission may be an exegetical choice by the LXX to avoid directly attributing the Servant's suffering to the will of God. Despite this circumvention, the LXX too implicates the divine in stating, κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν (53:6). It is the Lord who hands over the Servant

---

[317] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant*, 209 "only in seven out of 43 occurrences does ἀποστρέφω match the hiphil of סתר. The description of the servant's face being turned away in Isa 53:3 paints a picture of suffering and humiliation . . . a figure dishonoured by everyone."

[318] Moberly, *Bible, Theology and Faith,* 95-96 proposes 'elohim to be the generic term, based on the normative understanding of God known to humanity, whereas the tem "*yhwh*" reflects "Israel's particular knowledge" of God. Spiegel, *Last Trial,* 121 notes the Jewish tradition (cf. *Sifre* Deut 27) where יהוה stands for the Mercy attribute of God, while the אלוהים designates the Justice attribute of God.

(presumably to his persecutors) although the LXX does not go as far as the MT. [319] The words

ויהוה חפץ דכאו החליׄ [320] (MT v.10) point to God as the active agent in the Servant's suffering.

While God evidently instigates and is complicit in the Servant's and Abraham's suffering, neither of the protagonists articulates this charge. Rather the omniscient voice of the narrator makes declarations like "it came to pass after these things that God tested Abraham," (v.22:1) or "it pleased the Lord to crush him" (v.53:10) thus lending authority to this perspective. The uniqueness of this feature needs to be highlighted, in contrast to other passages on righteous suffering. In Job, the text attributes to Satan the role of instigator, inciting God to test his servant (1:6); additionally, in related texts of righteous suffering like martyrdom narratives, Psalm 22 and prophetic utterances, God does not directly inflict suffering on a righteous human, commanding or willing an unjust death. Admittedly, some protagonists in these texts refer to God's role in their suffering and interpret it as divine wrath, as just punishment for their own or other people's sins (2 Macc 7:18,32-3) or raise questions about divine justice and mercy (i.e. Jer 12,20; Job 23, Ps 22:2-3). However, none of these texts compare with the distinctive position of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 where the righteous sufferers themselves do not comment on their plight, while the narrative maintains God's direct complicity in willing or commanding an unjust death.

4.1.3/4 The Sufferer does not Protest but Cooperates, and Gives a Free and Voluntary Response

Another thematic parallel between the primary texts is the unprotesting cooperation of the sufferer, giving a free and voluntary response to the divine will (the third and fourth motifs in above list). The Servant's silence receives specific mention in Isa 53:7 with the metaphor of the silent lamb and ewe, and the twice repeated phras ולא יפתח פיו and the word נאלמה meaning "to be dumb." The LXX translation is straightforward: οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα and ἄφωνος.

---

[319] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,* 241 notes that Isa 53:10 is the only place where καθαρίζω matches the Hebrew דכא. He considers (citing Grelot) that LXX read דכאו as a qal infinitive construct of the Aramaic root דכה which signifies to purify.

[320] Watson, "Mistranslation," 230 remarks that in 53:10 (where the word חפץ occurs twice) the Greek translator assumes that חפץ at the end of verseׄ is a verb rather than a substantive, and translates it as [a verb] at the beginning of v.10.

Significantly, the Servant's voice is never heard in Isaiah 53, despite the text's multiple speakers. He is depicted through the perspectives of God, the narrative voice, or the view of the crowds, but the Servant's own motives, thoughts and emotions remain unexpressed. Spieckermann comments on the "passive language – the language of suffering – in which the Servant is presented. There seems to be no room for him to make any decisions. The Servant is 'despised' and 'acquainted' with sickness (53:3); 'stricken, struck down by God and afflicted' (53:4b); 'wounded' and 'crushed' for our sins (53:5); 'oppressed,' 'afflicted,' 'led to the slaughter,' and 'silent'(53:7)."[321] Nonetheless, "we must not let ourselves be deceived. Three times in the text we meet a variation on the theme that the servant has borne our sicknesses and sins (53:4,11,12b)."[322] According to Spieckermann, in v.4, a shift to active voice occurs ("our infirmities – *he* bore them") making it clear that taking up sins upon himself is the Servant's act. Ekblad too comments, "the servant's silence shows his willing participation in his martyrdom."[323] Further, Spieckermann comments, "close connection between the servant's will and God's will already expressed in v.11 becomes . . . in v.12 almost a fusion of their two intentions."[324] The Servant's unprotesting endurance of suffering reflects an active and free choice to cooperate with God's will.

In Akedah, Abraham's behaviour is also one of unprotesting and voluntary compliance with the expressed divine will. Although Abraham, unlike the Servant, does speak briefly (1,5,7,8) his words reveal an attitude of cooperation and assent to God's command. Twice when he hears the divine voice, Abraham answers הנני (22:1,11) a word which occurs 178 times in the MT, with one of its applications (in first person singular form) being "in response to a call, indicating the readiness of the person addressed to listen or obey," like Moses (Exod 3:4), Isaiah (6:8), and Samuel (1 Sam 3:4).[325] Not only his words, but his actions too demonstrate Abraham's prompt and willing response to God's call, as accentuated by a series of active

---

[321]Spieckermann, "Idea of Vicarious Suffering," 5-6.
[322] ibid., 6
[323] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant*, 228
[324] ibid., 6.
[325] *BDB* Lexicon entry, 244 (#2009).

verbs: וישכם, ויחבש, ויקח, ויבקע, ויקם, וילך, all within one sentence (22:3). The grammatical effect of a series of imperfect verbs pre-fixed with vav consecutives is to "represent consecutive actions" which "may be understood as either sequential or consequential."[326] Through this rapid sequence of verbs, the text demonstrates how God's initial command galvanises Abraham into a series of immediate actions in obedient response. One might mention too that the twice repeated phrase וילכו שניהם יחדו (vv. 6, 8) hints at Isaac's possibe union of wills with his father, though it remains implicit.

From a comparative stance, Genesis 22 employs active verbs to illustrate Abraham's cooperation with God, while the Servant's surrender to God's will in Isaiah 53 is expressed through passive verbs. A striking intertextual example of this contrast is found in the word לקח which occurs in both texts. In the Akedah it occurs 6 times (Gen 22:2,3,6,6,10,13). In Gen 22:2 the word occurs in imperative form when God commands Abraham קח־נא את בנך ("Take now your son"). The other occurrences of this word in Akedah are in the grammatical form of qal vav consecutive imperfect (3rd person masculine singular) to indicate the different persons and objects which Abraham takes with him, including the servants and Isaac (3), the wood (6) the fire (6) and the knife (10), as well as the ram which he "takes" from the thicket and offers instead of Isaac (13). In Isaiah 53 the verb לקח occurs once in Isaiah 53:8 in qal passive (perfect) 3rd person masculine singular form מעצר וממשפט לקח ("by coercion and judgment he was taken away").[327] Here the word לקח suggests the Servant's unresisting surrender to his violent oppressors, allowing himself to be led away.[328] The Servant's submission represents his cooperation with God's will, as previously established by Spieckermann. To sum up, the verb לקח provides an intertextual link between Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53, signifying in both passages the protagonist's responsiveness to and free acquiescence with the divine imperative, albeit

---

[326] Page Kelley, *Biblical Hebrew* (Michigan: Erdmann's, 1992),145.
[327] See J. Weingreen, *A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon,1959),151.
[328] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,* 234 notes that in LXX of 53:8, "the aorist passive (ἤρθη) and the present passive (αἴρεται) of αἴρω match לקח and נגזר only here in the entire LXX. These were likely seen as adequate semantic equivalents and functioned to create a parallel between the servant's judgement being taken away and his life being removed from the earth. . . [in] both the MT and LXX the servant loses his life."

Abraham's cooperation is indicated by the verb in active voice, and the Servant's compliance by a passive form.

4.1.5   Suffering is Framed as a Test or Demonstration of Obedience or Faithfulness

In Akedah, Abraham's suffering is framed as a test, since the narrator declares at the outset that "God tested Abraham" by commanding him to sacrifice his son, and employs the verb נסה (1) in the MT (ἐπείραζεν in the LXX).[329] However, the objective of the divine test does not become clear till v.12 when the angel of the Lord intervenes to stop the sacrifice and affirms Abraham: עתה ידעתי כי ירא אלהים אתה ולא חשכת את בנך את יחידך ממני. The latter part of the phrase is repeated in v.16, ולא חשכת את בנך את יחידך implying that the purpose of the test is to verify Abraham's reverence and faithfulness to God in giving up the person he values the most, his "only/ beloved" son.[330]

In Isaiah 53, the word "test" receives no mention. However, as with Abraham, the Servant gives up something of great value, his own life (v.12): הערה למות נפשו.[331] Here the verb הערה is a hiphil form (he has *poured out* his soul to death) indicating that the Servant, like Abraham chooses to obey God, demonstrating his fidelity to the divine. Although he does not receive an explicit command to carry out like Abraham, the Servant complies with the divine will that he suffer on behalf of others and bear their iniquities, as evident in vv.6, 10-11, especially the phrase: ויהוה הפגיע בו את עון כלנו (and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all). Ekblad remarks on the Servant's "willingness to suffer the consequences of [the people's] wanderings."[332] The Servant's demonstration of faithfulness and obedience also receives divine affirmation: וחפץ יהוה בידו יצלח/ מעמל נפשו יראה ישבע ("The delight of the Lord shall prosper in his

---

[329] Wevers, *Notes*, 317, observes that LXX employs ἐπείραζεν ("was tempting") in the imperfect rather than aorist to match the Hebrew piel perfect נסה. Wevers suggests that the verb is in the imperfect since the narrative which follows describes the process by which God tested the loyalty of Abraham.

[330] See Moberly, *Bible, Theology and Faith,* 96-107, on the concepts of "fear of God" and testing in Gen 22.

[331] Sapp, 177 notes that הערה is a hiphil perfect third masculine singular of ערה "be naked or bare," which points to a masculine subject. However, the LXX in 53:12 makes the feminine noun (the soul) the subject of the sentences (his soul was delivered upto death). If that were the case in MT one would expect the verb to be in hiphil perfect third feminine singular form הערתה.

[332] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant*, 228.

hand" v.10).[333] Undoubtedly, in both Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53, the Servant and Abraham endure situations of suffering and sacrifice at God's behest, where they demonstrate faithfulness and obedience, and succeed in meeting the divine objective.

4.1.6   The Sufferer Receives Reward And Exaltation

As recompense for their faithfulness, the protagonists in Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song are exalted and receive rewards. The Angel of the Lord announces to Abraham in Gen 22:17-18 that his obedience in listening to God's voice (שמעת קולי) would be rewarded as follows:

➤ Abraham himself will be blessed by God (ברך אברך)

➤ His seed will be multiplied (והרבה ארבה את זרעך)

➤ His seed will inherit the gate of their enemies (וירש זרעך את שער איביו)

➤ In his seed all the nations of the earth will bless themselves (והתברכו בזרעך כל גויי הארץ)

The LXX version differs slightly, by using the word πόλεις instead of "gate," and the passive form of "be blessed "rather than the reflexive form of "bless themselves" (see 3.1.3.e). Nonetheless, both MT and LXX display a similar trend of magnification of blessings, beginning with God's blessing of the patriarch, and an expansion of the blessing to include Abraham's "seed" or descendants who will triumph over their enemies, and through them the blessing are to encompass all nations of the earth. While the Angel's pronouncement seems an immediate reward for Abraham's obedience, nevertheless, the blessing fits in with the overall pattern of divine blessings and promises which recur within the Abrahamic cycle (12:1-7,13:14-18, 15:5,13; 17:5-22,18:9, and 22:17-18) and throughout Genesis. [334]

---

[333]Given the discrepancy between the LXX and MT regarding בידו יצלח **,** Watson, "Mistranslation,"230, suggests that the LXX may have surmised that צלח was just a variant spelling of שלח and that "in his hand he sent from" must be a Hebrew idiom "to remove."

[334] See Claus Westermann, *The Promises to the Fathers:Studies on Patriarchal Narratives* (trans. David Green, Philadephia: Fortress,1976),2-30, He concludes that three elements – promise of a son, promise of land, blessing and increase - determined the growth and development of the patriarchal history (28); Also Marc Zvi Brettler, "The Promise of the Land of Israel to the Patriarchs in the Pentateuch," *Shnaton: An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* (ed. Moshe Weinfield, Israel Bible Society, Jerusalem: Newman, 1981-82),vii-xxiv, for a source-based discussion on the promise of the land.

The Servant in Isaiah 53 too receives assurances of reward (vv.52:13,15; 53:10-13). As with Abraham, the Servant's reward has a widening scope, not limited to his own glorification, but extending beyond him to encompass "many" (53:11). The Song begins with a promise of exaltation for the Servant הנה ישׂכיל עבדי ירום ונשׂא וגבה מאד which the LXX translates as ἰδοὺ συνήσει ὁ παῖς μου ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα.[335] One observes an intriguing verbal resonance between the opening line of LXX (Isa 52:15) and the Symmachus version of (Gen 22:1) which substitutes the verb ἐδόξασεν for ἐπείραζεν thus implying that God "honoured, exalted Abraham" instead of testing him.[336] By employing the same verb δοξάζω which occurs in the first line of Isaiah 53, and positioning it similarly in the initial verse of Akedah, Symmachus may have been forging a linguistic and thematic connection between Abraham and another well known figure of righteous suffering, the Servant in Isaiah 53. Such a link serves to suggest the exaltation of Abraham, an idea which lacks attention in the LXX of Genesis 22.

Another intertextual connection between the Servant's and Abraham's reward may lie in the word זרע (LXX's σπέρμα). Brettler observes that the word זרע has the semantic range of the English "progeny," denoting a child, or descendants several generations away.[337] In the context of Akedah, זרע applies to Isaac as well as to future generations. The blessings in Gen 22:17-18 represent the final reiteration of God's promise of numerous descendants to Abraham, though it seems somewhat redundant, given that this promise motif has been stated several times before. Perhaps this last repetition serves to reassure Abraham that the promise still remains viable, and is even stronger for his obedience in being ready to sacrifice Isaac, the chief source of his promised descendants.[338] Even as his expectation through Isaac appeared to have been cut off by God's initial command, the renewed promise confirms to Abraham the vastness

---

[335] LXX employs two future passive verbs ὑψωθήσεται and δοξασθήσεται in place of MT's three active verbs (ירום ונשׂא וגבה מאד) which, Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,* 181, suggests may be scribal oversight or stylistic reasons.

[336] Wevers, *Notes,* 316, that it has "an overall understanding of the narrative as an honouring of the unwavering obedience or faith of the patriarch."

[337] Brettler, "Promise of the Land," xix.

[338] While the covenant promise is through Isaac, the blessing of Abraham's "seed" refers to other children of Abraham as well, including Ishmael and his six sons through Keturah (ch. 25), thus proving that the fulfilment of God's promise of multiplying his seed begins during Abraham's own lifetime.

and strength of his descendants who will "inherit" the gate/cities of their enemies.[339] The reiterated blessings have also been read as a renewal of the original covenant with Abraham, that "the story reinforces the reward for the renewed promises which will be realised through Isaac."[340]

The word זרע (and LXX σπέρμα) occurs in Isaiah 53 too. A difference exists between the MT version of Isa 53:10 (יראה זרע יאריך ימים) where the Servant shall see seed and prolong his days, and the LXX version where it is the crowd who will see a long-lived posterity (ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ὄψεται σπέρμα μακρόβιον). Regarding this verse, Ekblad observes "an intertextual link" between LXX Isa 53 and LXX Gen 22: "between the Lord's promise to Abraham in the LXX of Genesis 22:17-18 that he will multiply his seed (σπέρμα) and bless all the nations in his seed (ἐν τῷ σπέρματί) . . . and the promise [in Isa 53] to those who offer sin-offerings".[341] He also sees a connection between MT Gen 22 and MT Isa 53, since the Servant "is identified with Abraham as the one who will see a descendant."[342]

An additional link is that the Servant, like Abraham, has had to abandon any expectation of descendants, as expressed in v.8: ואת דורו מי ישוחח or "who will consider his generation?" The implication seems that as the Servant was put to death or "cut off" (נגזר)[343] from the land of the living, the idea of a future generation could not be considered. However, again like Abraham, a restoration of the unthinkable takes place, as God promises the Servant seed, and the prolongation of his days, which may be a reference not only to his own longevity but the continuity of his generations. While the Servant is not made any promise about the abundance of his seed, nonetheless, the word רבים occurs three times in the passage in verses (52:15, 53:11,12) in association with the Servant's actions: "justify many" "sprinkle many nations" "bore the sin of many." The word רבים could signify the wide-ranging influence of the

---

[339] Westermann, *Promises to the Fathers,* 20 notes that in the patriarchal narratives one can distinguish between an earlier use of blessing (i.e. the blessing takes immediate effect) from a later use (i.e. blessings and increase are established as prospects for a later time).
[340] Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac,*26.
[341] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant*, 247
[342] ibid., 247
[343] Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus1-16, ABD.* (New York: Doubleday,1991),1046: "the verb gāzar can mean "cut off [from the living]"that is, to die (e.g. Isa 53:8)." (cf. גזרה Lev 16:22).

Servant's actions, but more relevantly, it could be allied with the "seed" promised to the Servant.[344] The parallel between the verse "he shall see seed," v.10, and the line "he shall see the labour of his soul," v.11 [presumably referring to the "many" for whom he labours by suffering on their behalf] makes the connection plausible. The Servant's "seed" may well be a reference to the "many" who benefit from his actions, rather than referring to seed of biological definition. Given such semantic possibilities, one may affirm that the word זרע and its corresponding σπέρμα represents a promised reward of descendants (whether of physical descent or beneficiaries) while providing an intertextual link between the primary texts.

Akedah and the LXX version of the Fourth Servant Song share a further linguistic tie in the verb κληρονομήσει or "inherit" which occurs in identical form (indicative future active) in both texts. As Ekblad notes, the verb κληρονομηέω in Isa 53:12 provides "an intertextual link that draws the reader back to Genesis 22:17-18,"[345] where Abraham's descendants are said to "inherit" the cities (LXX) or gate (MT) of their enemies. The implication could be one of military conquest or it could be a metaphorical expression of the potency of Abraham's descendants and the continuity of his lineage which no opposition can hinder. In Isaiah 53, the word "inherit" occurs in v.12 (αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλοὺς -- he will inherit many). Here again the word "many" may be a reference to the Servant's seed or descendants as previously discussed. Further, this phrase "inheriting of the many" is also couched (like Gen 22:17) in language of a military victory in v.12: τῶν ἰσχυῶν μερεῖ σκῦλα ("he will divide the spoils of the mighty"). One possible interpretation is that the Servant inherits "many" (descendants) by bearing their iniquities and justifying them, and since he is victorious on their behalf, he strengthens them by the "dividing of spoils" or the sharing of blessings with them. This reading strengthens the ties between Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song, as the word κληρονομήσει is employed in both to indicate blessings which empower the protagonist's descendants.

---

[344] Hans-Jürgen Hermisson,"The Fourth Servant Song in the Context of Isaiah," in *The Suffering Servant* (eds. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher; trans. Daniel Bailey; Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004), 16-47, p.33, distinguishes between the different referents of רבים. He sees "an intensification in the sequence of the text," from רבים in 52:14 and גוים רבים in 52:15, with the latter pointing to "an expanded, universal circle that is evident only at the end, in the Servant's future."

[345] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant*, 262.

Admittedly, slight differences exist in the usage of κληρονομήσει in Genesis 22 (where the inheritors are Abraham's seed) and in Isaiah 53 (where it is the Servant who inherits the "many"). Nonetheless, the semantic closeness between them is clear, with the verb κληρονομήσει providing an intertextual bond which connotes the strengthening blessings that are transmitted through the protagonists to "many"/ descendants.

4.1.7 The Recompense has Universal Consequences and Involves the Nations

The blessings conferred on the Servant and Abraham are to bear universal consequences. This idea receives emphasis by the word גוי which occurs in both Isa 52:15 and Gen 22:18 in the MT, with the corresponding LXX term being ἔθνη. This Greek word has also been used in LXX Isaiah to translate other Hebrew words as such as איים (Isa 42:4) and עם (Isa 49:8). The term גוי which means nation or people refers "usually to non-Hebrew peoples [or gentiles]" though it can also specify descendants of Abraham (cf. Gen 12:2, 17:6, 16,18) as well as refer to Israel itself (cf. Exod 19:6).[346] In the context of Akedah, however, the phrase to גוי הארץ connotes the extension of the divine blessing from Abraham to his descendants, to encompass all the nations of the earth. His seed becomes the medium of divine blessings to the other nations as in the phrase התברכו בזרעך כל גוי הארץ. While this phrase has generated some critical debate (see 3.1.3) its central idea remains that divine blessing is not limited to Abraham or his own descendants. Such a notion of universalism exists in the prior promises pertaining to Isaac's birth: נתתיך לגוים ומלכים ממך יצאו (Nations and kings are to descend from Abraham and Sarah, cf. 17:6,16). How then does one reconcile this idea of universal blessing, and Abraham as a unifying figure, with the preceding phrase that his descendants will possess or inherit the gate/cities of their "enemies," which seems an oblique reference to conquest of other nations?[347] Is the text suggesting that the means of overcoming their "enemies" is not by dominion, but by extension of the blessings to these same nations?

---

[346] *BDB*, Lexicon entry (p.156,1471).
[347] Brettler, "The Promise of the Land," xix, considers Gen 22:17 as a promise of military expansion rather than land possession.

Isaiah 53 too refers to nations and kings: כן יזה גוים רבים עליו יקפצו מלכים פיהם (52:15).[348]

While the multiple speakers in this passage makes it difficult to identify the different voices, nonetheless, a significant theme is the transformation of "others" attitudes towards the Servant. Kings and nations undergo a shift in their stance towards the Servant and are "startled" into a new understanding about him as expressed: כי אשר לא ספר להם ראו / ואשר לא שמעו התבוננו (v.52:15). Similarly, the "we" speakers (from v.53:1) declare their own transformed views of the Servant. Vv. 1-6 sets up a contrast of their assumptions in the past ("We thought him stricken by God" v.4; "he was despised and we did not esteem him" v.3) and their changed perspectives about the Servant ("The chastisement for our peace was upon him" v.5; "He was wounded for our sins"). While the passage does not identify the "we" speakers with the nations and the kings, and their identities may be discrete, one may still group them together as a general category of people who first rejected or misunderstood the Servant and later modified their views and arrived at a new realisation. They shift from a position of hostility and rejection, to a heightened awareness of the Servant's innocence and a sense of their indebtedness to him. Although the precise nature of their relationship with the Servant remains undefined, nonetheless, given the reference to רבים in 52:15, one may surmise that they may be the same as the רבים that the Servant vindicates in 53:11 and the רבים whose sins he bears in 53:12. As argued previously, they may comprise the "seed" which the Servant is promised. Here again one finds conceptual and verbal resonances to the blessings pronounced in the Akedah. As in the case of Abraham, the Servant is associated with nations and kings who may comprise his "seed." Moreover, just as Genesis 22 suggests the notion of overcoming one's "enemies" by extending blessings to them, likewise in Isaiah 53, the Servant overcomes the hostility of other people by vindicating them, rather than through vengeance. In both primary texts, the word גוי or ἔθνη provides the intertextual verbal tie which connotes the universal implications of the reward received by the Servant and Abraham.

---

[348] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant*, 187, translates יזה as startled, noting that since it occurs in parallelism with 52:14 שממו lexicons commonly render it as "spring, leap startle," though it is commonly used in the Torah to describe the priestly act of sprinkling blood for atonement.

4.1.8 The Relationship between the Sufferer and Instigator is Defined in Familial Terms

In Isaiah 53, the Lord and Servant relationship prevails, since God may be considered the instigator, while the Servant fits the role of the sufferer. In Genesis 22, the father and son relationship predominates, for although God instigates the suffering, the prime actor is Abraham, with Isaac as the intended offering. While the relationships of Lord/servant and father/son are evident, a study of terms in the primary texts reveals some fluidity and overlapping between these categories. The MT version employs the word עבד in Isa 52:13 to identify the Servant, a term which the LXX translates as παῖς. One may have expected the Greek translation to employ δοῦλος which is an unambiguous rendering of servant or slave, while παῖς has a range of meanings from child, youth, attendant, as well as slave or servant. [349] Although the LXX Isaiah elsewhere uses both terms to translate עבד, Ekblad notes, "one striking difference between παῖς and δοῦλος in Isaiah is that with the exception of Isa 49:3, the Lord never addresses the singular servant (or Israel) as δοῦλος μου or speaks about a singular δοῦλος . . . it is likely that the LXX deliberately used δοῦλος whenever human speakers (i.e. the prophet, narrator, people) refer to themselves or others as a way of showing respect to God."[350] While Ekblad's explanation is plausible, one wonders whether the LXX gave preference to the word παῖς over δοῦλος because it offers more hermeneutical possibilities. Such exegetical potential becomes clear in comparing (LXX) Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 where one finds the following verbal resonances: παῖς (Isa 52:13), παιδίον (Isa 53:2), παισίν (Gen 22:5), παῖδας (Gen 22:3,19), παιδάριον (Gen 22:5,12). These words may function intertextually to subvert the clear-cut relationships in the primary texts (father/son; Lord/servant; lord/servants) and create new relationship dynamics. For instance, the use of παῖς in Isa 52:13 (in view of the verbal resonances with Akedah) suggest that instead of a tightly defined God/servant definition, the relationship of θέος and παῖς could also be one of parent and child, including God and son.

---

[349] See Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant Poems,* 97, 98, on the translation of עבד: LXX Isaiah matches עבד with δοῦλος (9 times), with δουλεύω (7), with παῖς (20) and once each with οἰκέτης, σεβόμενοι,ἀγγελοι, and θεραπεύω.
[350] ibid.,97-98.

From this perspective, the Servant's compliance with God's will, and God's solicitous concern to exalt the Servant and guarantee a great reward may be understood as expressing a parent/child relationship.

Another example lies in the reference to Abraham's servants as παισίν and to Isaac as παιδάριον in Gen 22:5,12.[351] Since παιδάριον is a diminutive of παῖς one may suggest that (in conjunction with Isaiah 53) the word choice allows for the blurring of linguistic boundaries, so that the sufferer may be son and/or servant. [352] Although Wevers observes that in Gen 22:5 the translator uses two different lexemes to distinguish between the son (παιδάριον) and Abraham's servants (παισίν), the distinctions may be minimised, since they are inter-related and both words translate the same Hebrew word נער. In the MT version, נער applies indiscriminately to Isaac as well as to Abraham's two servants (Gen 22:5). Like παῖς the MT's word choice of נער covers a range of meanings, including youth, lad, boy, as well as a servant or retainer.[353] It lends supports to the notion of the fluidity of terms, allowing for new relationship combinations, including the son/servant dynamic. It allows for a reading of Akedah not only in terms of father-son relations, but also as [master]lord/servant, or even Lord/servant. Given this context, the obedient submission and prompt actions of Abraham (saddling his donkeys, splitting the wood, carrying the knife and the fire, building an altar) can be interpreted as a demonstration of his servanthood, not unlike the figure in Isaiah 53. Clearly, Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 present close relationships, such as Lord-servant and father–son pairs; at the same time, they manifest intertextual verbal links (the words παῖς and נער) which allows for a blurring of well-defined boundaries and the blending of categories to allow for new familial dynamics, such as God-son, and lord-servant.

---

[351] Isaac is also referred to by terms like τέκνον (53:8) and υἱός (2,3,13).
[352] Such a fusion may explain the enigmatic reference in a targum to Job (3:17-19) which identifies Isaac as "the servant of the Lord"(see Segal, "He Who," 180) which suggests that ancient exegetes recognised the intertextual resonances between Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22.
[353] *BDB* Lexicon entry (p.654, #5289).

4.1.9 Association with Ideas of Atonement and Sacrifice

A significant feature of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 is their association with concepts and vocabulary of sacrifice and atonement. MT Akedah signals the cultic context by its reference to עלה (LXX ὁλοκάρπωσις) which occurs six times (22:2,3,6,7,8,13) beginning with God's initial command: והעלהו שם לעלה. The word עלה refers to one of five key types of sacrifice pertaining to cultic practise (cf. Lev 1:3-17).[354] It literally means "an ascending offering" since the עלה was wholly burnt on the altar and its smoke "directed toward the heavenly realm, where the deity was thought to have 'inhaled' it."[355] The עלה served a variety of functions, from homage, thanksgiving, appeasement and expiation, and was widely used, including the daily (or Tamid) sacrifice of an עלה (lamb) offered to the deity morning and evening (cf. Exod 29:38–42).[356] It may have been the earliest and only expiatory sacrifice (later amplified by אשם and חטאת) with its antiquity supported by Genesis 22 "[which is] based on an old tradition, [where] Isaac assumes that the sole sacrifice his father will offer is the *ola*."[357]

Another cultic notion in the MT is the reference to ארץ המריה (22:2). Significantly, "the Jewish tradition associates Mt. Moriah with the site of the Temple" including in 2 Chr 3:1, *Jubilees*, Josephus, Targums, and the Talmud (Taʻan.16a).[358] The earliest reference in 2 Chr 3:1 identifies the location of the temple as בירושלים בהר המוריה. Further, Akedah's reference to והעלהו (hiphil imperative of עלה) and a 3 day pilgrimage-like journey "up" to a high place is suggestive of Jerusalem. The city is often described in terms of elevation in the Songs of Ascents (i.e. Ps 122:4 employs the same root עלה to express ascending up to the city). Gen 22:2 linguistically plays on this idea of height and ascent:[359] לך-לך אל ארץ המריה והעלהו שם לעלה על אחד ההרים אשר אמר אליך. The LXX too displays sensitivity to the idea of exaltation as it translates ארץ המריה as

---

[354] See Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus1-16, ABD* (NY: Doubleday,1991),172-177. For a concise overview on OT sacrifice, see Gary Anderson, "Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings," *ABD on CD-ROM*. Version 2.1. 1997.

[355] Anderson, "Sacrifice," n.p.

[356] Rabbinic sources associated the Tamid with the Akedah. עקדה was the term used in the Mishnah for the way of tying the Tamid lamb before slaughter (*m. Tamid 4:1*); Anderson, "Sacrifices," n.p.; Milgrom, *Leviticus,*174.

[357] Milgrom, *Leviticus,*174.

[358] Sarna, *Genesis,*391-2. See his discussion on Moriah's etymology.

[359] The rabbis recognised this word play, stating that although Abraham assumed that God wanted an עלה sacrifice, God actually meant עלה in the sense of "to go up" (Tarja Philip, notes).

τὴν γῆν τὴν ὑψηλὴν (the high land).[360] Additional verbal support reinforcing the temple /Akedah connection may be found in Abraham's utterance of the word נשתחוה or "we will worship" in Gen 22:5 thus linking the idea of sacrifice with a context of worship.[361] This same verb occurs as נשתחוה in another Psalm of Ascent (Ps 132:7) which is a celebration of, and call to worship at the temple. All these connotations strengthen Akedah's association of Mount Moriah and the Jerusalem temple.

Gen 22 also contains several references to cultic appurtenances. The altar/מזבח (LXX θυσιαστήριον –v.9) resonates with cultic laws (המזבח appears over 50 times in Leviticus), as does the mention of sacrificial animals, both the generic term for flock שׂה (vv. 7, 8) and the specific type, איל (v.13) or κριός in LXX. The unblemished male ram is one of the permitted animals for the עלה sacrifice (cf. Exod 29:15-18). Further, Harl notes of the sacrificial knife (v.6) that "le mot grec qui désigne le couteau du sacrificateur, *mákhaira,* est un bon équivalent de l'hébreu ma'akèlèt par contraste avec le couteau domestique."[362] Additionally, the phrase "ויערך את העצים" echoes with the arranging of wood in the priestly cult (Lev. 1:7). Overall, Genesis 22 displays awareness of sacrificial procedures. Even Isaac knowledgeably questions his father: הנה האשׁ והעצים ואיה השׂה לעלה (v.7). Hayward observes, "Genesis 22:2 takes for granted that Abraham is familiar with the rules of sacrifice, and uses terminology which is familiar from the priestly legislation of the Pentateuch: especially we have *'lh,*[ola] . . . a Jewish reader of Second Temple times would almost certainly deduce from this that Abraham was a priest who knew how to build an altar (22:8) and arrange the wood and the sacrifice in the approved manner (22:9)."[363] Moberly too remarks, "once Abraham sees the ram, he does not need to be told what to do, but directly grasps its significance and so he sacrifices the ram instead of Isaac."[364]

---

[360] Wevers, *Notes,* 317, considers it to be "based on an understanding of the word as related to the root of רום, i.e. with two graphemes transposed."

[361] B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake,1990), 360 notes the modern debate whether השתחוה is an hishtaphel with the root חוה on the basis of Ugaritic, or a Hithpael form from שׁחה.

[362] Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie,*193.

[363] Hayward, personal communication, 10th October 2009

[364] Moberly, *Bible,Theology and Faith*,118

Allied with sacrificial elements, Genesis 22 presents a notion of atonement. As stated, the עלה sacrifice could have an atoning function (cf. Lev 1:4, Job 1:5). Although Genesis 22 does not explain why an עלה is required, the narrative makes clear that the burnt offering is accomplished, with the ram taking the place of Isaac (v.13). MT employs תחת (instead) to indicate this substitution or place-taking.[365] The substitution of the ram for Isaac could be interpreted as an act of vicariousness, though the text does not indicate that the ram atoned for Isaac's sins (such an idea is paradoxical, since Isaac was initially to be the sacrifice, so he could hardly atone for himself). Nonetheless, the ram sacrifice warrants attention. If the narrative's main concern is a test of Abraham's faithfulness, the Akedah could have ended in v.12, once the patriarch passes the test successfully and God acknowledges his fidelity. Significantly, it is only after the עלה has been completed by Abraham, that the Angel of Lord calls him a second time (v.15) and reveals his reward and blessings, including the the multiplicity of Abraham's lineage. Does the ram sacrifice result in atonement, enabling the release of divine blessings?[366]

The significance of the ram sacrifice may be better understood in relation to vv.14-15: ויקרא אברהם שם המקם ההוא יהוה יראה אשר יאמר היום בהר יהוה יראֶה ("And Abraham called the name of the place the Lord will provide as it is said today 'in the mountain of the Lord it will be provided'). The line connects intratextually with v.8 where Abraham responds to Isaac that God will provide [יראה] the lamb for the burnt offering.[367] This repetition suggests that in Akedah the concepts of locus and sacrificial offering intersect in terms of divine provision. The text accentuates God's timely supply of a ram on the mountain, but not as a mere one-off demonstration of divine providence. Rather, the narrative establishes the continuing efficacy

---

[365]Janowski, "He Bore," 52-53 observes that in the NT the idea of place-taking is expressed with verbs qualified by the prepositions ἀντί, διά, περί, ὑπέρ, and by prepositionally augmented nouns like ἀντάλλαγμα, ἀντίλυτρον, and περικάθαρμα. Similarly, the OT employs prepositionally qualified verbs like נתן תחת (eg. Isa 43:4) or expressions like סבל or נשׂא plus a term for sin or sickness (Isa 53:4,11-12). It always means that one person by some action or suffering, takes the place of others who are not willing or able to take it up themselves.

[366] Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac*, 77: "the sacrifice of the ram is regarded as essential to the call of Abraham by God to sacrifice, as implied not only by the fact that in v.13 Abraham is said to offer the ram as a burnt offering, but also that in v.8 Abraham assures Isaac that God will provide the lamb for the burnt offering."

[367] Moberly, *Bible, Theology and Faith,* 108 notes it is customary to render this "seeing about/seeing to" as "provide." The sense of the verb thus determined in v.8 is then transferred to v.14, where the place name chosen by Abraham enunciates a theological principle of considerable importance [the concept of divine providence].

("as it is said today") of sacrifice in this specific place as a means of mediating divine blessings even in the future ("in the mountain of the Lord it will be provided"). Keeping in view the connection between Moriah and the Jerusalem temple, the ram offering at Moriah may be interpreted as a validation of the cultic complex. As Swetnam observes, Genesis 22 is "more easily interpreted by Israel as a text applicable to its own contemporary worship in the temple."[368] Spiegel affirms, "in the biblical account of the Akedah the legend of the *name of the place* was amalgamated with the legend on the *institution of substitutes* in sacrifice."[369] Within this context, the burnt offering of the ram in Akedah is not an isolated or incidental act, but it stands for the temple sacrificial system. According to Spiegel, "here were laid the foundation and cornerstone of the entire complex of divine service in the Temple Mount," forbidding human sacrifice and permitting the substitution of another living creature for the human."[370]

Spiegel's perspective that Genesis 22 serves to "abolish human sacrifice [and] substitute animals instead," merits qualification.[371] Sarna objects to the idea that "the Akedah is a polemic against human sacrifice . . . marking the transition from the ritual killing of human beings to animal substitution."[372] He points to the absence of condemnation against child sacrifice in the narrative, that animal sacrifice has always been the norm, and that Akedah has "nothing in common with pagan human sacrifice."[373] Levenson argues from a contrasting standpoint that the Akedah serves to illustrate his notion that the Bible does not reject, but rather sublimates the concept of child sacrifice.[374] Regarding Akedah, he states "it is passing strange to condemn child sacrifice through a narrative in which a father is richly rewarded for his willingness to carry out that very practice."[375] Nonetheless, the narrative's emphasis on divine intervention which halts Isaac's sacrifice, and the decisive shift of the sacrificial offering from a person

[368] Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac*, 27
[369] Spiegel, *Last Trial*, 69
[370] ibid.,72-73.
[371] ibid., 64.
[372] Sarna, *Genesis,* 392.
[373] ibid.,, 392-3.
[374] Jon Levenson, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son* (Yale UP, 1993).
[375] ibid., 13.

(Isaac) to animal (the ram)[376] can plausibly be interpreted as an inherent protest against human sacrifice. Admittedly, the Akedah appears to validate child sacrifice through God's initial command, but it articulates the notion only to destabilise it through the cancellation of the divine command, by framing the episode as a test, and by establishing an alternate form of cultic sacrifice. However, it would be reductive to consider Genesis 22 as primarily a polemic against human sacrifice. Akedah's images, concepts and vocabulary emphasize a temple cultic context. Childs observes, the three "key words in ch. 22 are 'ram,' 'burnt offering' and 'appear' which "in a remarkable way are found in Leviticus 8-9 and 16. . . Abraham's uniquely private experience is thus linked to Israel's collective public worship."[377] In addition, the verb ἀναφέρω (Gen 22:2) is a Levitical cultic term (Lev 8:20,8:27) which strengthens the text's cultic connections. This thesis maintains that the Akedah serves as a founding narrative linking the temple locus and animal sacrifice, and affirming the efficacy of the cultic complex as a site of divine providence and presence.

The Fourth Servant Song too displays associations with the sacrificial context. The term אשם (Isa 53:10) refers to a main type of expiatory atoning sacrifice as delineated in Lev 5:14-6:7.[378] The word derives from the root אשם (guilt/offense)[379] but Milgrom and Anderson prefer "reparation offering" to "guilt offering": "though feelings of guilt are integral to the atonement process, the basic feature of the sacrifice is its function as a means of reparation."[380] As the only category of sacrifice which is commutable to currency, it can be literally paid to the priest for the damage incurred, as well as the purchase of a sacrificial animal.[381] While the conditions which necessiate an אשם vary,[382] the relevance for Isaiah 53 is its special emphasis on

---

[376] Spiegel, *The Last Trial,* 72.
[377] Brevard Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments* (London: SCM, 1992).
[378] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 339-378.
[379] ibid., 345: אשם has four usages in cultic texts: the nouns "reparation" and "reparation offering;" the verbs "incur liability to someone" and "feel guilt."
[380] Anderson,"Sacrifice," n.p. Unlike other sacrifices which one "offers" *(hiqrîb),* the [*ašam*] can "be paid" [š*illem,hešib*].
[381] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 326-27: the priest assesses both the equivalent value of the animal and the monetary equivalent of the involved desecration (v.16a). The priest charges the supplicant the amount of the desecrated sanctum plus the amount needed to purchase the requisite animal.
[382] Reparation offerings mostly involve sacrilege against sancta or sacrilege against oaths. Anderson lists the situations: (1) the act of misappropriating or misusing an item of sacred value (Lev 5:14–16); (2)

compensation for damage. The reference in Isa 53:10 suggests that the Servant is an אשם

offering "in compensation for the sins of people"[383] thus effecting expiation of sins.

Some scholars like Janowski hold that "the term אשם comes originally not from the cult,

but from contexts in which -- as in Gen 26:10 and 1 Sam 6:3-4,8,17 etc. -- guilt-incurring

encroachments and their reparation are the theme. From there the term made its way, after

several intermediate stages and *after the composition of Isaiah 53* into the priestly sacrificial

torah (Lev 4-5,7, passim)."[384] Admittedly, the word אשם is not unique to cultic laws, and like

some other sacrificial terms, it may have originated in a secular context.[385] Nonetheless, one

questions Janowski's confidence that אשם entered priestly vocabulary only following the

composition of Isaiah 53. Milgrom and Knohl convincingly argue for the antiquity of Leviticus

P, that "not just its teachings but its very texts" date "not later than the middle of the [8th]

century (ca.750BCE)."[386] Further, Milgrom notes that אשם belongs to the [pre-exillic] priestly

lexicon of repentance, which terms were subsequently displaced by שוב (in prophetic texts like

Jeremiah and Ezekiel) a point which supports the argument that אשם entered the priestly

vocabulary prior to Isaiah 53.[387] Given that "sacrifice was the central official form of worship

for ancient Israel,"[388] one may assume that אשם held cultic resonance by the time of Isaiah 53's

composition. Undoubtedly, "אשם occurs most frequently in ritual prescriptions of the books of

---

sinning inadvertently and not knowing it (Lev 5:17–19); (3) swearing falsely in regard to damages done
to another person (Lev 5:20–26—Eng 6:1–7); (4) the rite of purification of the leper; (5) the rite of
renewing the vow of the Nazirite who has become unclean (Num 6:10–12); (6) having sexual relations
with a slave who has been betrothed to another man (Lev 19:20–21).[382] See Milgrom,50 for ethical
dimensions of אשם.

[383] *BDB Lexicon,* 80.

[384] Janowski, "He Bore," 68-9. He defines אשם as "the obligation to discharge guilt that arises from a
situtation of guilt." See also Childs, *Isaiah,*418 and Spieckermann, "Idea of Vicarious Suffering," 3.

[385] Baruch Levine, *JPS Torah Commentary* (New York:Jewish Publication Society) xxiii, observes that
the term *minha* (grain offerings) originally derived from the political and administrative vocabulary where
it has the meaning of "tribute, gift." Similarly, *Tamid* (regular,daily sacrifice, daily rite) derived from
administrative vocabulary.

[386] Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 28. Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence* (Indiana: Eisenbrauns,
2007), 209, dates the Holiness Code was composed between 743 and 701 BCE, and that "P writings
commenced its literary activity with the construction of Solomon's Temple" (226).

[387] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 377.

[388] Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of
Ancient Judaism* (Oxford UP, 2006), 80.

Leviticus and Numbers in the so-called Priestly source within the Pentateuch"[389] It seems reasonable then to locate אשם in Isa 53:10 within its primary biblical context, the cultic setting.

Another cultic term occurs in Isa 52:15 where the Servant is said to "sprinkle [יזה] the nations." Deriving from the root נזה, in its hiphil form it takes the meaning "to sprinkle," and "is a common verb used in the *Torah* to describe the priestly act of sprinkling blood"[390] (cf. Lev 4:6,17;5:9;16:14,19). The action of sprinkling has an effect of purgation from impurities,[391] and bears special importance in rituals on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16) and the purification offering (Lev 4). In Isa 52:15, the term נזה has been interpreted to mean that "like a priest, the servant will sprinkle many nations to purify them from sin."[392] Some critics have objected to a cultic reading of נזה.[393] Hermisson states, "the hiphil of נזה followed by an accusative object does not mean to "sprinkle (an implied fluid) on an object such as the nations, but simply to sprinkle the fluid. The object upon which or toward the fluid is sprinkled is then always preceded by one of the prepositions לפני, אל נכח אל, על; it never appears as the verb's direct object."[394] His comment is valid, but given that Isa 52:15 lacks both a preposition and any reference to a "fluid," one may still interpret יזה according to the lexical meaning of the Hebrew hiphil form (sprinkling) albeit recognising its modified usage. [395]

The animals in Isaiah 53 provide a further cultic connection. The words שׂה (v.7) and צאן (v.6) commonly occur in Leviticus' prescriptions of sacrificial animals (cf. Lev 1:2,3:6, 5:7). The image of a sheep being led to slaughter (Isa 53:7) too evokes Levitical procedures which usually begin with the animal being led by the offerer towards the altar of sacrifice. Specifically, Isaiah 53 bears resonances with the "scapegoat" (עזאזל) of the Day of Atonement ritual in Lev

---

[389] Childs, *Isaiah,* 417-18, (Lev. 5:6-25; 6:10;7:1-2,5-7,37; 14:12,19:21-22; Num 6:12;18:9) however, maintains that there is no contextual preparation in ch. 53 to alert the reader to a cultic interpretation.
[390] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,*187.
[391] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 233.
[392] Hengel, "Effective History,"104.
[393] Childs, *Isaiah,* 412, "the verb *nzh* (hiphil) never designates the person or thing sprinkled, but the blood being applied. . . .the distinction [is] between sprinkling a liquid and besprinkling a person."
[394] Hermisson, "Fourth Servant Song," 29.
[395] See BDB 633. Hayward, personal communication, Dec 10th 2009 clarifies that in Leviticus one finds a series of legal rulings in very precise formulae, technical language proper for ritual practices. In Isaiah 53 which is poetry one cannot expect the same particular and precise use of words, but the term נזה still resonates within the Levitical context.

16. Both the Servant and the goat serve as means for the removal of inquities, with the two figures linked by the Hebew root גזר. The scapegoat is banished to the land of גזרה in Lev 16:22, a noun meaning separation or cutting off, while the servant in 53:8 is "cut off" or גזר (a verb) from the land of the living. Collins too notes their connection: "the phrase 'he bore the sin of many' in Isa. 53:12 [alludes] . . . to the description of the ritual involving the scapegoat in Leviticus 16 [where]. . . .'the goat shall bear all their iniquities on him.'"[396] Although Janowski objects, "in Isa 52:13-53:12 Israel's guilt is 'not gotten rid of' by a scapegoat in some remote area; it is rather endured, *borne* by the Servant,"[397] one sees a figurative parallel between the Servant and the scapegoat who both "bear" the sins of others, intertextually linked by the verb נשׁא.

Moreover, Isaiah 53 employs vocabulary consonant with the sacrificial cult. Words of transgression (in MT) such as חטא (53:12), פשׁע (53:5), and עון (53:6) resonate with priestly texts (Lev.4:2,16:16,21). Further, Leviticus' "language of inquity bearing"[398] prevails in Isaiah 53, notably in the phrase נשׁא עון (Lev 5:1,17,10:17 and 16:22). Anderson notes the primary meaning of נשׁא עון with נשׁא meaning to bear or carry, and עון meaning to sin, and its secondary meanings of punishment and forgiveness, depending on the context (more below).[399] The LXX too manifests language resonant with the Levitical cult such as ἀνομία (Lev 16:21, Isa 53:5); καθαρίζω (Lev 16:30, Isa 53:10). Ekblad notes several intertextual examples with Leviticus:[400] φέρω and ἁμαρτία occur together, like Lev 5:6-8 cf. (Isa 53:4); πρόβατον (53:6, 53:7) links with ritual sacrifice texts (cf. Lev. 5:6-7); ἀμνός (v.7) is the standard semantic equivalent for MT's כבשׂ designating the male lamb commonly used in Israel's ritual sacrifice; LXX's σφαγή is a common semantic equivalent for טבה in MT; LXX's σφαγή also matches MT's שׁחט (Lev 1:10-11; 4; 29-35; 17:3; 22:28) in texts that describe the ritual sacrifice of πρόβατον through σφαγή;

[396]Adela Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning in the Death of Jesus," *The Journal of Religion* 78 (1998): 175-196, p.178.

[397] Janowski, "He Bore,"68.

[398] Walter Zimmerli, "Zur Vorgeschichte von Jes. liii," cited in Spieckermann, "Idea of Vicarious Suffering," 2.

[399] Gary Anderson, *Sin: A History* (New Haven: Yale UP, 2009), 20.

[400] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,* 213-214, 228-229.

LXX matches MT's אשם with περὶ ἁμαρτίας only here in Isaiah (Isa 53:10) while περὶ ἁμαρτίας serves as the semantic equivalent of החטאת ("sin offering") in the Pentateuch.[401] In addition, the verb ἀναφέρω (Isa 53:12) links LXX Isa 53 with the Levitical cult (Lev 8:20,8:27) as well as intertextually tying with (Gen 22:2).

Undoubtedly, Isaiah 53 (MT and LXX) contain numerous sacrificial associations, contrary to critical views that deny or downplay its cultic connections.[402] In sum, the text's eclectic range of sacrificial motifs and cultic terminology include reparation offering, the priestly act of sprinkling, scapegoat ritual, sacrificial animals, and Levitical vocabulary. Significantly, these different cultic elements in Isaiah 53 relate to the figure of the Servant. He is an *asham* offering, comparable to a sheep led to slaughter or a scapegoat bearing sins, he sprinkles like a priest, and is considered a sinner. Ekblad remarks, "Isaiah 53 is clearly the first place in the entire OT where a human being is described as bearing sin on behalf of others . . . the servant displaces the sinner, priest and animal [of sacrifice] by becoming himself the bearer of sin."[403]

While the Servant plays a sacrificial role, a more precise understanding of the atonement posited in Isaiah 53 may be arrived at by considering the concept of נשא עון (as above). Anderson observes that the phrase can mean both the state of culpability ("to bear the weight of a sin") and its removal (to bear away the weight of sin").[404] In Isaiah 53, the original formula נשא עון is "varied with great freedom."[405] Hence סבל replaces נשא in vv. 4 and 11(ie.He has borne [סבל] our sorrows (4); he has borne [סבל] our inquities (11). Instead of עון (iniquity) other words are substituted: חלי (he has borne our diseases v.4); חטא he has borne our sins (v.12).[406] Despite these variations, the underlying point is that the Servant "bears" the sins of the others, and in doing so the weight of sin is removed from the people. To recapitulate, he

---

[401] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,* 245-6.

[402] Childs, *Isaiah,*418: "the lack of a cultic context in the chapter is apparent;" Janowski, "He Bore,"68, "cultic vocabulary is also lacking in the rest of Isa 52:13-53:12."

[403] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant*, 214. He refers to LXX Isaiah, but it is equally applicable to MT.

[404] Anderson, *Sin,* 20. Also Anderson, "From Israel's Burden to Israel's Debt" in *Re-working the Bible* (ed. Esther Chazon, Devorah Dimant and Ruth Clements; Brill: Leiden,2005),1-30.

[405] Adapted from Zimmerli (cited in Spieckermann, 2) .

[406] ibid.

vicariously suffers on behalf of others ["he was pierced for our sins"v.5] which results in their being released from their sins ["by his stripes we are healed"v.5]. This notion of vicarious atonement is accentuated in v.11: "my righteous servant will justify many and he will bear their inquities." It would be misleading, however, to ignore God's active role in the Servant's atoning work. Childs states, "the point of the Isaiah text is that God himself took the initiative in accepting the servant's life as the means of Israel's forgiveness. In the first divine speech (52:13) the success of the servant is promised because of what God has done."[407] Clearly, God remains the dominant figure directing the Servant's vicarious suffering and atonement: "it is God who "laid [הפגיע]on him inquity of us all" (v.6) and it "pleased" [חפץ] the Lord to crush him" (v.10). The question remains whether the atonement effected by the Servant is expiatory or propitiatory. Given that God is instrumental in the Servant's suffering and death, and is "pleased," can it be understood as a propitiatory sacrifice to satisfy the demands of the divine and appease the deity's wrath?

One critical term is הפגיע which occurs twice (in 53:6 and 53:12).[408] The hiphil form employed in both instances has multiple meanings, including "cause to light upon" which seems to be the sense in 53:6, while in 53:12 the meaning is "to make entreaty/intercede." In the former, it refers to the Lord's action towards the Servant (laying iniquity on him) and in the latter it refers to the Servant's act of entreating / interceding for sinners. Spieckermann argues on the basis of this double usage of the hiphil form of the verb פגע (vv. 6 and 12) that "by using this one verb differently both of God and of the Servant, the agreement of their wills is made evident."[409] Likewise, the word חפץ merits attention. In 53:10 it occurs twice, once as a verb suggesting that God is pleased with the Servant's suffering, and חפץ as a noun meaning that God's delight in the Servant will ensure his prospering. Spieckermann views 53:10 as evidence of God's deep personal involvement in the Servant's fate and work: "God's will or 'pleasure' in

[407] Childs, *Isaiah*, 418.
[408] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant,* 228 notes that this Hebrew word הפגיע is matched with παραδιδόμαι only in Isa 53:6, 12 and 47:3 in the entire LXX.[408] Watson, "Mistranslation,"227 states that παραδιδοναι recurs twice in v.12 where it translates הערה and הפגיע noting that the verb from here corresponds to Rom 4:25.
[409] Spieckermann,"Idea of Vicarious Suffering," 6.

afflicting the Servant is not sadism, but rather the manifestation of his loving intention that the wiping out of guilt אשם through the Servant's suffering should succeed."[410] Clearly, God does not delight in the Servant's suffering for its own sake, (but for the sake of others) and manifests concern for the Servant's exaltation.This is confirmed by the dual use of נשא: "the Servant's being borne up [נשא (52:15] by the same God who requires him *to bear* the guilt of others."[411] This view significantly differs from propitiatory sacrifice. The Lord does not will the Servant's death for the Lord's satisfaction but for the sake of sinful "others," for the removal of their sins. Besides, the Servant is not compelled to suffer, but does so in union with the Lord's will. This understanding fits the definition that "in expiation God (or His representative) is always the subject, not the object of the action in question; the object is always [the removal of] sin or its effects."[412] Isaiah 53 presents the Servant as suffering vicariously and effecting an expiatory atoning sacrifice.[413] It is an unique text in its conceptualistaion of a righteous human who bears the sins of others, suffering on their behalf and atoning for their sins, taking on the roles of priest, sinner and sacrificial offering, in union with God.

IMPLICATIONS

Having examined Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 one may affirm the presence of the nine elements in each passage, as well as their intertextual ties. Both texts present righteous individuals (the Servant and Abraham) who unprotestingly and willingly cooperate with God in situations of unjust suffering and death. God is complict in their suffering, but in each text, the protagonist demonstrates faithfulness and obedience. Relationships within each passage are defined in familial terms, including fluid categories of God/son, father/son, Lord/servant. At the end of their trauma, the sufferers receive reward and exaltation, with universal implications. The two texts also contain concepts, images and vocabulary associated with sacrifice and atonement.

---

[410] Spieckermann,"Idea of Vicarious Suffering," 8.
[411] ibid.,7.
[412] C.M. Tuckett, " Atonement in the NT," n.p., *ABD on CD-ROM*. Version 2.1. 1997. Also see
C.H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1954), 82-95.
[413] Frances Young, *The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers* (MA: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation,1979), 67 states that the Servant's death in Isa 53 "is expiatory because God chose to use this method of cleansing the sins of the onlookers."

The emphasis on the cultic complex is a defining characteristic of both passages. Each text makes specific references to a key type of expiatory atoning sacrifice (עלה in Gen 22, and אשם in Isa 53). Both mention sacrificial animals, and share a verbal tie in referring to שׂה (Gen 22:7,8 and Isa 53:7). Further, the Servant and Abraham tend to engage in priestly functions, with Abraham making preparations for the burnt offering, building the altar, as well as sacrificing the ram, while the Servant performs an act of "sprinkling" like a priest, and "intercedes" for sinners/ transgressions. Further, the Levitical cultic term ἀναφέρω provides another sacrificial link between LXX Isaiah 53 and Gen 22. They also share the notion of voluntary sacrifice in union with the divine will. The idea of vicariousness occurs in both, where the ram and the Servant suffer/die instead of others, resulting in atonement. In Akedah, atonement effects the release of divine blessings for the multiplicity of Abraham's lineage, whereas in Isaiah 53 it involves the removal of sins and the Servant's exaltation.

Besides the verbal resonances already discussed, some additional word plays help to cement the passages' intertextuality. The root עלה in Gen 22:2 refers to both the burnt-offering, and the notion of "going up" to sacrifice (2). עלה in Isa 53:2 (ויעל כיונק) conveys the Servant's "growing up" like a young plant. The root ראה (seeing)[414] appears in Isaiah 53 as follows: the noun מראה (52:14) regarding the Servant's appearance; ראו (52:15) refers to kings and nations who will "see" something untold; נראהו (53:2) conveys unidentified speakers' perceptions of the Servant; יראה (53:10,11) concerns what the Servant will see in recompense. In Akedah, וירא (22:4) occurs when Abraham first sees the site of sacrifice. Again יראה recurs thrice in v.8, and twice in v.14. It occurs in v.8 when Abraham assures Isaac that God will "see to /provide" the sacrificial offering, and v.14 identifies the locus as "God will provide" (ie. "see to"). Further, וירא (13) is used when Abraham sees the ram caught in a thicket. Besides, the word מריה, the place of sacrifice (Gen 22:2) may also be a verbal play on ראה.[415] Hayward notes "the heavy stress on 'seeing' [in Akedah] using verb *r'h* (vv. 4, 8, 13, 14 twice) and forms of *hnh* (vv. 1, 7

---

[414] Ekblad, *Isaiah Servant*, 204, notes that LXX Isaiah matches the MT's verb (qal) ראה with ἰδεῖν in 33 of its 52 occurrences.
[415] Moberly, *Bible, Theology and Faith*, 111, observes that "the regular use of *ra'ah* (see/provide) makes it likely that Moriah is to be understood as a noun formed from the verbal root *ra'ah*.

twice, and 11)."[416] Finally, נשא too provides an intertextual link. In v.4 Abraham "lifts up" his eyes to the place where God has commanded him to offer up Isaac, and again in v.13 he "lifts up" his eyes to see the ram (v.13). In both instances, נשא relates to the place or object of expiatory sacrifice. In Isa 53: 4 and 12 נשא relates to the "language of bearing iniquity." In both texts then נשא appears in a cultic context.

Clearly, Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 contain many lexical and thematic ties, and share mutual notions of sacrifice, vicariousness, atonement, union of wills and righteous suffering. The Akedah may be interpreted as a founding narrative validating the sacrificial complex, bringing together the temple locus and the animal sacrificial cult. Isaiah 53 presents a unique portrayal of a human being who vicariously suffers and effects expiatory atonement, in union with God.

4.2   THE AKEDAH SERVANT COMPLEX

The detailed analysis of the primary texts above confirms the presence of the nine motifs of the complex in each passage, as well as revealing the correspondences between Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. Based on the proposed intertextual model (ch.1.4), this study posits that the two biblical passages, as richly connotative base texts with shared conceptual and linguistic elements, would have been associated together by ancient exegetes, which resulted in the formation of the Akedah Servant complex, with its characteristic nine motifs. It may be questioned why this thesis singles out only Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 as source texts for the Akedah Servant complex, and not other similar passages of suffering righteousness.[417] Cannot

---

[416] Hayward, personal communication, 10 October 2009.
[417] Henning Reventlow, "Basic Issues in the Interpretation of Isaiah 53," in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant* (eds. William Bellinger and William Farmer; Penn: Trinity Press International, 1998) 23-38, p.34, observes that the motif of suffering righteous belongs to the genre of the complaint psalms and seems to have its origins there. Janowski, "He Bore,"49-50 states that the common theme of suffering righteous texts is that "the righteous live by their faithfulness and suffer *because* they are righteous." However, distinctive to Israel is that "it associates the suffering of the righteous with the hope of beng rescued by God."

the same set of features be found in other biblical texts as well?[418] One needs to assess other writings with close thematic affinities including Job, Psalm 22 and selected pericopes from the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel.[419]

In the book of Job, the protagonist is depicted as an upright, God-fearing man (וישר וירא אלוהים, 1:1) who suffers unjustly, with the phrase וירא אלֹהים providing a verbal link to Gen 22:12. Intertextual connections abound between the texts as Huizenga notes: Job offers burnt offerings (העלה עלות, 1.5) as Abraham is commanded to offer Isaac as a burnt offering (שם העלהו לעלה 22.2); Job rises early in the morning (והשכים בבוקר, 1.5) to carry out sacrifices, while Abraham rose early in the morning to set out on the journey for the sacrifice (וישכם אברהם בבקר 22.3); like Abraham, Job is old and full of days (Gen 25.8; Job 42.17); Abraham stretches forth his hand to slay Isaac (וישלח אברהם את ידו, 22.10, cf. v.12) just as God is directed by Satan to put forth his hand to afflict Job (שלח־נא ידך,1.11; 2.5)." [420] In Job 1:5 and 42:8, Job offers sacrifice and interecedes for others, like a priest. Job also displays parallels with Isaiah 53. His physical disfigurement, as well as the mockery and misunderstanding that Job endures, resembles the Servant's suffering. Several semantic and syntactic correpondences also exist between Job and Isaiah 53. [421]

Job manifests some motifs of the Akedah Servant complex. His sufferings are instigated by a supernatural being (Satan, but permitted by God), his sufferings are framed as a test of faithfulness, he receives reward and exaltation, and develops a close relationship with God. Nonetheless, the text also deviates significantly. Job, unlike Abraham and the Servant, does not

---

[418] For example, Douglas Campbell, *The Deliverance of God* (Michigan: Eerdmans,2009) 748, identifies a set of biblical texts whose "grouping and memorization" is facilitated by the motif ὁ δίκαιος, which may have influenced the NT presentation of Jesus' death (see ch. 7).

[419] *Wisdom of Solomon* will be discussed in ch.5 as a Stage I text which manifests the complex.

[420] Huizenga, "Battle for Isaac,"53. Also see van Ruiten,"Abraham, Job and the Book of Jubilees,"in *The Sacrifice of Isaac* (eds.Noort and Tigchelaar; Brill: Boston.2003),58-85; James Crenshaw, "The Book of Job," n.p., *ABD on CD-ROM*. Version 2.1. 1997; Moberly *Bible, Theology and Faith,* 84-86, observes that both figures come from the land of Uz, while noting that "the conceptual links have been noted since antiquity."

[421] J. Bastiaens, "Job 16-19 and the Suffering Servant Passages," *Studies in the Book of Isaiah* (Leuven: UP, 1997),421-432 notes links between Job 16:7-17 and Isa 53:7-10; Job 17:1-9 and Isa 52:13-14; Job 19:7-27 and Isa: 52:14, 53:2-3;53:4, 53:11; Job 18:5-21 and Isa:52:14, 53:4 and 53:8. He suggests that "the final editing of the book of Job occured after the completion of the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah" which may serve to explain the connection between the two texts (424).

unprotestingly accept his suffering and cooperate voluntarily with God. Job has no choice in his sufferings (contrasting with Abraham who could have refused to sacrifice his son, and the Servant who presumably could have resisted and retaliated against his oppressors, even verbally). Job's speeches constitute a protest against the divine injustice done to him, and an argument of his righteousness, contrasting with Abraham's and the Servant's uncomplaining silence. Further, the text ends with the restoration of Job's fortunes and mentions his immediate descendants, but it lacks the universal scope and inclusiveness which mark Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. Its references to sacrifice and atonement are limited. Clearly, the book of Job lacks some defining features present in Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53, and cannot be accorded a formative role in the Akedah Servant complex.

In Psalm 22, "the suffering individual praying in such a psalm feels persecuted by his enemies, though he knows himself innocent, a righteous man."[422] The Psalm thematically resembles Isaiah 53 in the protagonist's experience of physical and emotional abuse. The two texts share an impressive array of linguistic links: הסתיר פנים, שבע, פיהם, רבים, גוים, חלק, זרע בזה,מות, צדק, ספר,חפץ. The Psalm displays some features of the complex, including the unjust suffering of a righteous individual, a demonstration of faithfulness, the sufferer's unresisting acceptance of his suffering, and recompense at the end of the ordeal. Despite these commonalities, two differences deserve mention. Firstly, the Psalm makes no reference to cultic sacrifice and atonement, and does not imply that the protagonist suffers vicariously on behalf of his oppressors, unlike Isaiah 53. Secondly, while the speaker appears to anticipate some restoration (i.e. he will praise the Lord in the assembly) nevertheless, it is the Lord who receives exaltation and has an universal impact which extends to all "families of the nations," unlike Abraham and the Servant who themselves become means of blessings. It is unlikely then that the Akedah Servant Complex derived from Psalm 22.

Some prophetic passages in Jeremiah and Ezekiel also give utterance to righteous suffering. Although space precludes a detailed analysis, noteworthy are two studies which have

---

[422] Reventlow, "Basic Issues," 34.

examined whether the roots of vicarious suffering lie in prophetic works. According to Reventlow, "the narratives in Jeremiah 37-43 show the prophet suffering because of his prophetic office; the prophet is personally involved in the failure of his message" but "this is not vicarious suffering but it is a suffering close to the Servant's experience."[423] Further, in Ezek 4:4-8 (where the prophet is asked to lie on one side, symbolically bearing the iniquity of Israel [נשׂא עון]) one finds some resonances with Isaiah 53, but Ezek 4 also diverges since "it is not said that guilt or punishment is taken away."[424] Spieckermann also comments that while Isaiah 53 may have emerged in the context of prophetic suffering, it differs that in the Fourth Servant's Song "prophetic suffering acquires a new sense. It becomes suffering for the guilt of others that is intended by God and the Servant together . . . the dimension of prophetic suffering is thereby transcended so decisively that the Servant can no longer be identified with any particular prophetic figure."[425] Further, "if in the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel the themes of prophetic suffering, intercession and individual retribution were oriented strictly to Israel, then . . . the Fourth Servant Song goes a step further [to include 'many nations']."[426] These studies lend support to the perspective that despite parallel themes of righteous suffering, passages in Jeremiah and Ezekiel are unlikely candidates for the origins of the Akedah Servant complex.

Having excluded other prominent texts on righteous suffering, one may reiterate with confidence that the nine motifs which characterise the Akedah Servant complex are derived from Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53, and that no other biblical passage besides them, combine all nine characteristics within a single pericope. To qualify, the motifs of the Akedah Servant complex originate from, and have nine elements in common with Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53, but the composite is not necessarily identical with or limited to the components of the base texts, and may show some degree of fluidity and variation in its manifestations in secondary texts (see ch.1.4).

---

[423] Reventlow, "Basic Issues," 36.
[424] ibid., 37 citing Steck, *Aspekte des Gottesknechts,*41.n.62.
[425] Spieckermann, "Idea of Vicarious Suffering," 214.
[426] ibid.,14. Despite Jer 1:5's reference to (נביא לגוים) his mission primarily focuses on Israel, and refers to the nations in so far as they concern Israel.

In considering the convergence of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22, one may question why ancient exegetes and writers associated these passages together, resulting in the Akedah Servant complex. Admittedly the two passages may be deemed "suggestive base texts" that suggest each other, given their extensive thematic and lexical links as analysed above, including the following verbal ties: צדיק,יהוה/ אלוהים, נשׂא, עלה,זרע,לקח,גוי, שׂה ראה, נער, ἀποστρέφω,σπέρμα, κληρονομήσει, ἔθνη, πρόβατον and different forms of παῖς. The intertextual connections between Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 likely resulted in the linkage of these passages. Moreover, one recalls the priority status accorded to Genesis (as the first book of the תורה) and to Isaiah (first among the נביאים) as ranking among the earliest and pre-eminent biblical texts. Narratives such as Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song, by their very locus within these authoritative sacred texts presumably received wide attention and yielded influence.[427] Further, these passages possess distinctive features. Even among biblical literature on righteous suffering, Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 are unique in their notion of God as inflicting suffering on a righteous human, commanding or willing an unjust death, while the sufferers themselves do not comment or complain. Additionally, both texts emphasise cultic sacrifice. Genesis 22 unites the temple locus and animal sacrifice, highlighting the cultic complex as a site of divine providence and presence. While Isaiah 53 does not mention the temple locus, it evokes the Levitical cult, and presents a new sacrificial perspective of a human being suffering vicariously and effecting expiatory atonement, in union with God, with the Servant playing the roles of priest, offering and sinner. These multiple reasons support the likelihood (or inevitability) that Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song were linked together by ancient exegetes in contexts of suffering and sacrifice. Further, this thesis proposes that the convergence of the primary texts occured through an intertextual dialogic process (see ch. 1.4) leading to the formation of the Akedah Servant complex in the early reception of the tradition. In being taken up and transmitted by other texts,

---

[427] Intrabiblical exegesis for Akedah includes: 2 Chr 3:1, Neh 9:8, Judith 8:25-27and Ben Sirach 44:19-21 in the LXX Bible (see also Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac*). Links to Isaiah 53 occur in *Wisdom of Solomon* and prophetic texts (Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Habakkuk). See J. van Ruiten and M. Vervenne, eds., *Studies in the Book of Isaiah* (Leuven: UP, 1997). Clearly, the level of influence and authority wielded by Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 made them ideal texts for tradition formation.

this complex tended to be allied with soteriological notions, and may be considered an atonement tradition, as will be investigated.

This study has attempted to define the Akedah Servant complex with a check-list of nine motifs. It facilitates easy identification of the complex in a range of passages, including those which lack explicit reference to either one or both primary texts (ch. 1.4). The underlying assumption is that if a text contains the nine characteristics, it manifests the Akedah Servant complex (i.e. the convergence of both Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53). Admittedly, this nine-point definition of the Akedah Servant complex may appear an overly schematised construct imposed on selected texts. Not all passages will fit neatly into such a framework and one anticipates some variations. While there may be drawbacks to defining the Akedah Servant complex in such concrete terms, one confirms that these motifs are not invented categories but derive directly from the primary texts. They provide the best means to ascertain the presence of the Akedah Servant complex in selected passages, and to determine whether and how the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 may have led to an atonement tradition.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE AKEDAH SERVANT COMPLEX IN STAGE I TEXTS

This chapter examines passages from *Jubilees,* 4Q225*,* Philo's *De Abrahamo,* 2 Maccabees*,* and *Wisdom of Solomon* which are classified as Stage I texts. By scholarly consensus, all five texts are dated to the pre-70CE period and identified as Jewish in origin, devoid of Christian influence. This chapter will anlayse the selected passages to investigate the presence of the Akedah Servant complex in ancient Jewish writings. Stage I texts merit attention as they demonstrate an early phase of the reception of the Akedah Servant complex into tradition.

Most Stage I texts have traditionally been categorised as Apocryphal/ Deuterocanonical[428] or Pseudepigraphal,[429] but recent critical discussions have focused on definitions and nomenclature. Stuckenbruck observes that the term apocrypha "is anachronistic, and it remains a problem to find terminology that more accurately accords with the respective ways the books present themselves," while recognizing their history of reception among Jews and Christians.[430] Stone comments on "an unfortunate terminological overlap between 'pseudepigrapha,' the more or less fixed body of writings and 'pseuepigraphy,' [and] the literary practice of attributing one's writings to someone else, usually an ancient seer, worthy or other dignitary."[431] For simplification, this thesis will refer to the selected Stage I texts as pre-70CE

---

[428] J. Charlesworth, "OT Apocrypha" n.p., *ABD on CD-ROM*. Version 2.1. 1997: Apocrypha (Protestant tradition) and Deuterocanonical (Catholic tradition) refers to "an ancient literary collection of 13 works found in the Greek OT codices." J. Davila, *The Provenance of Pseudepigrapha* (Leiden: Boston, 2005), 218 observes that these works (omitted from the Hebrew Bible canon) "obtained canonical status in most of Christendom in antiquity and retain it today, apart from in the Protestant canon."

[429] J. Charlesworth,"Why the Pseudepigrapha?" *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation,* (JSOT, 1993),15. Loren Stuckenbruck, "Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha and the Septuagint" (paper presented at the NT Research Seminar, Durham University, 18 May 2009). Pseudepigrapha is the Protestant term, while the Catholic 'apocrypha' means other religious writings outside canonical/Deuterocanonical collections.

[430] Stuckenbruck, "Apocrypha," n.p.

[431] Michael Stone, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Philadelphia: Van Gorcum, 1994), 427.

Jewish writings, albeit acknowledging the inadequacy of any label to do justice to this vast body

of work, varied in linguistic origin, literary genre, date, and canonical status.[432]

5.1   THE BOOK OF *JUBILEES*

Jubilees presents itself authoritatively as a revelation disclosed to Moses on Mt.

Sinai,[433] containing modified material from Gen 1 to Exod 19, including Akedah. Composed

between 160-150 BCE,[434] the text has been classified as Rewritten Bible.[435] In *Jubilees* "all

events from creation until the entry into the Promised Land are dated according to a

chronological system of jubilees," over a period of a 'jubilee of jubilees'/2450 years.[436] *Jubilees*

shares affinities with *1 Enoch*[437] and some Qumran texts,[438] though its authorship, redaction and

sources remain debated.[439] Among its topics are: sacred laws (heavenly tablets, legal

prescriptions in patriarchal narratives) covenant and renewal, a 364 day solar calendar, festivals

(Passover),[440] purity issues,[441] covenantal figures, endogamy, angelology and demonology,

---

[432] Davila, *Provenance,* 218: some pseudepigrapha are canonical -- *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* in the Ethiopic Church.

[433] Critical text by J. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Louvain:Peeters, 1989). Also J. VanderKam, "The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (eds. Boccaccini and Ibba; Cambridge: Eerdman's, 2009),3-21. The complete text of *Jubilees* is extant in Ethopic (Ge'ez), but 14 MS in Hebrew were found at Qumran, the oldest 4Q216 dating from 125 to100 BCE. They confirmed textual stability, that "despite a long history of copying and multiple translations," the Ethiopic text is in "good shape."

[434] VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 21; VanderKam, *Jubilees* (1989),v; J. Goldstein, "The Date of the Book of Jubilees," *American Academy for Jewish Research* 50 (1983), 63-86.

[435] Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees,* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 4. In rewriting the Torah a new work is created, but the underlying biblical passage is identifiable. Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai* (Brill: Leiden, 2003),7 critiques that the term could suggest "the replacement of an authentic, older biblical text with a new version."

[436]Segal, *Book of Jubilees,*7.

[437] See J. Bergsma, "The Relationship between Jubilees and the Early Enochic Books," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah* (eds. Boccaccini and Ibba; Cambridge: Eerdman's, 2009), 36-51; Annette Reed, "Enochic and Mosaic Torah Traditions in Jubilees," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah* (eds. Boccaccini and Ibba; Cambridge: Eerdman's, 2009), 353-368.

[438] L.Schiffmann, "The Book of Jubilees and the Temple Scroll," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah* (eds. Boccaccini and Ibba; Cambridge: Eerdman's, 2009), 99-115.

[439] For recent studies, see VanderKam, "Recent Scholarship on the Book of Jubilees," *Currents in Biblical Research* 6 (2008):405-431.

[440]Betsy Halpern-Amaru,"The festivals of Pesah and Massot," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah* (eds. Boccaccini and Ibba; Cambridge: Eerdman's, 2009), 309-322.

[441] For the critical debate see L. Ravid,"Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees, *JSP* 13.1(2002):61-86; J.VanderKam "Viewed from Another Angle," *JSP* 13.2 (2002): 209-215; L.Doering, "Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah* (eds. Boccaccini and Ibba; Cambridge:

blood prohibition, and sacrifice,[442] including sin offerings (6:2), Tamid (6:14), paschal sacrifice (49:11). All covenantal figures "function as priests, offering sacrifices and performing other sarcedotal duties."[443] Some of these themes appear in *Jubilees*' Akedah, as will be analysed.

5.1.1 THE AKEDAH SERVANT COMPLEX IN JUBILEES' AKEDAH

Jubilees' Akedah is set within the Abraham narratives, beginning with his youth (ch.11) key biblical episodes, and ending with his death (ch.22) following testaments/blessings to his descendants. *Jub.*17:15-18:19 contains the "earliest extant retelling of the Aqedah narrative."[444] While it omits "no section or even any verse" and "reflects the order of Genesis,"[445] nonetheless, *Jubilees* makes important changes, adding a preface (17:15-17:18), altering/adding a few verses (i.e. 18:9,12,14, 18,19), and having a first person angelic speaker, instead of Genesis 22's omniscient narrator. The passage will be analysed below in relation to the nine motifs of the Akedah Servant Complex. Although *Jubilees*' Akedah has its origins in Genesis 22, nevertheless, one may validly investigate the Akedah Servant complex here (inclusive of Isaiah 53) in keeping with this thesis' intertextual model (ch.1.4). Given the convergence of base texts and their suggestiveness of each other, one assumes that if the complex's nine motifs are present, then not only Genesis 22 but Isaiah 53 too is evoked.

1) The Portrayal of a Righteous Figure who Suffers Unjustly

The preface depicts Abraham as a "faithful" man who has endured severe sufferings involving six trials (17:17): external hardships (famine, land), physical pain (circumcision), temptation (wealth of kings), and loss of loved ones (forcible taking away of Sarah, and sending away of Ishmael and Hagar). The refrain "he had tested him" in introducing each trial, builds a

---

Eerdman's, 2009), 261-275; D. Suter, "Jubilees, the Temple and the Aaronite Priesthood" *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah,* 397-410.

[442]E. Larson, "Worship in Jubilees and Enoch," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah,* (eds. Boccaccini and Ibba; Cambridge: Eerdman's, 2009), 369-83.

[443] VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees,* (2001), 141.

[444] M. Bernstein, "Angels at the Aqedah," *DSD* 7 (2000): 263-291.

[445] J.VanderKam, "The Aqedah, Jubilees and Pseudojubilees," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning* (eds. C. Evans and S. Talmon, Brill: Leiden, 1997), 241-261,p.256,n.36 notes *Jubilees'* text-critical deviations from MT as attested in other ancient versions of the Bible: *Jub.*18:2= Gen 22:2: ידידך [=LXX τòν ἀγαπητόν] for MT's יחידך; *Jub.*18:12=Gen 22:13: אחד [=Samaritan Pentateuch, LXX, etc] for MT's אחר; *Jub.*18:15=Gen 22:17: ערי[?=Peshitta, LXX, etc] for MT's שער. Also van Ruiten, "Abraham, Job," 79-83, for more differences.

sense of the tension and prolongation of Abraham's struggles. The command to sacrifice Isaac is "the significant seventh in the divine pedagogy of Abraham."[446] This portrayal of a long-afflicted Abraham is heightened by resonances with Job, the biblical figure who epitomises unjust suffering. Allison remarks, "when Abraham is commanded to sacrifice his only son, he becomes obviously a Job-like figure."[447] VanderKam observes, "*Jubilees* takes up the virtues of Abraham" especially "by noting that God had subjected him to a number of trials" which is "reminiscent of Job."[448] Abraham resembles another figure of extensive suffering, the Servant in Isaiah 53. Like the Servant, Abraham silently endures physical and emotional struggles and "does not grow impatient" (17:18). Although *Jubilees* does not mention the Servant, nevertheless, given correpondences between Isaiah 53 and Job (see 4.2) and the stress on Abraham's sustained suffering, the Servant may well lie in the background. Concerning Abraham's righteousness, previously the text states, "And he believed the Lord and it was credited to him as something righteous" (*Jub.*14:6 = Gen 15:6). Faith is the decisive factor of Abraham's righteousness, with his "faithfulness" stressed seven times (17:15,15,16,17,18,18; 18:16). His afflictions are clearly undeserved for he is "faithful and a lover of the Lord" (17:18) and "Abraham's virtues were being reported [by the voices] in heaven."[449] *Jubilees*' Abraham is a righteous figure who suffers unjustly.

2)   The Suffering is Instigated by a Supernatural Being but Permitted by God

Deviating from the biblical version, *Jubilees* introduces a character named Mastema who instigates Abraham's suffering by bringing a charge against him:[450] "then Prince Mastema came and said before God: 'Abraham does indeed love his son Isaac and finds him more pleasing than anything else. Tell him to offer him as a sacrifice on the altar'" (17:16). Mastema derives from an "accusing angel" motif which is "presumably conceptually dependent on the

_____

[446] VanderKam, "Aqedah," 250. The passage lists six trials but *Jub.*19:8 mentions a tenth test (death of Sarah) but omits eighth and ninth. Later rabbinic tradition mentions Abraham's ten trials.
[447] See D. Allison, "Job in the Testament of Abraham," *JSP* 12 (2001): 131-147, p.144 for parallels.
[448] VanderKam, "Aqedah," 251.
[449] ibid, 249.
[450] VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees,* (2001),128-9 notes משטמה which means animosity appears twice in the Bible (Hos 9:7-8). In *Jubilees,* Mastema is designated the ruler of the evil realm, and identified with Satan (*Jub.* 10:11). The phrase "Prince of Mastema" in *Jubilees* designates an individual who bears this title, while Mastema alone seems to have become a name.

parallels between the Aqedah and the story of Job, where Satan challenges God to test Job's loyalty."[451] Mastema serves to resolve the problem of "an omniscient God needing to test, or the sense that a test such as the Aqedah is fundamentally evil and therefore could not have been instigated by a just God."[452] While he may deflect blame from God, "there is no explicit reason offered for Mastema's animosity towards Abraham" [except for] "his being completely evil."[453] Besides, the question remains why God allows Mastema to instigate suffering, although he can act only so far as God permits. The text stresses divine control, as when the Angel intervenes: "Then I stood in front of him and in front of the prince of Mastema. The Lord said: 'Tell him not to let his hand go down on the child'" (18:9).

3) and 4) <u>The Sufferer does not Protest, but Co-operates with a Free and Voluntary Response</u>

Similar to Genesis 22, *Jubilees* presents Abraham as freely and uncomplainingly complying with God's command: "he got up early in the morning, loaded his donkey, and took with him his two servants as well as his son Isaac" (*Jub*.18:3=Gen 22:3). Moreover, *Jubilees* adds to the biblical narrative in affirming Abraham's willing promptness: "[Abraham] himself did not grow impatient, nor was he slow to act" (17:18). It also explains his motivation: "for he was faithful and one who loved the Lord"(17:18).

5) <u>The Suffering is Framed as a Test of Faithfulness</u>

Jubilees emphasises Akedah as a "test" (17:16,17,18) being the climax in a series of trials to prove Abraham. As Mastema states, "then you will see whether he performs this order and will know whether he is faithful in everything through which you test him" (17:16). Huizenga states, Mastema "challenges God to test Abraham's love and faithfulness by means of a command to sacrifice Isaac."[454] *Jubilees* also addresses a lacuna in the biblical version regarding the purpose of the test. Gen (22:12) states "Now I know that you fear God," which

---

[451] Bernstein,"Angels," 268, notes that the "persecuting angel" Mastema is found frequently in Qumran literature.
[452] ibid.,266
[453] Segal, "*Book of Jubilees*, 190.
[454] Huizenga,"Battle,"38.

implies that previously God did not know about Abraham's character, thus undermining divine omniscience. *Jubilees* clarifies the matter at the outset: "Now the Lord was aware that Abraham was faithful in every difficulty which he had told him" (17:17) and "in everything through which he tested him he was found faithful" (17:18). VanderKam remarks, "of course, God knew, but the Prince of Mastemah had issued a challenge and he was the one who had to be educated."[455] Another reason might be that the Lord wants "to publicize Abraham's loyalty."[456] The test then is executed "in the first place for Mastema, but also for others."[457]

6) and 7) <u>The Sufferer Receives Reward and Exaltation with Universal Consequences</u>

As in Genesis 22, the Lord declares that Abraham will receive blessings himself, and reiterates the promise of multiple descendants who will "possess the cities of their enemies" (18:15 = LXX 22:17). Universal consequences also follow: "all the nations of the earth will be blessed through your descendants because of the fact that you have obeyed my command" (18:16= LXX 22:18). Admittedly, such rewards align with the biblical account, but additionally, *Jubilees* magnifies Abraham's recompense: "I have made known to everyone that you are faithful to me in everything that I have told you" (18:16).[458] "Everyone" (18:16) may mean his future descendants, including the nations, or the "voices in heaven" (17:15) who had initially spotlighted Abraham, and to whom God might choose to reconfirm Abraham's fidelity. Apparently, "there is a celestial drama established both before and during the Aqedah which requires the participation of both 'good' and 'bad' angels."[459] The exaltation of Abraham as "faithful" takes place before a cosmic audience, exceeding the divine tribute in Genesis 22, where only God, the Angel of the Lord, Abraham and Isaac are present. Abraham's magnification may also be evinced from the high ranking supernatural figures involved, like the

---

[455] VanderKam, "Aqedah,"251.
[456] Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 191.
[457] van Ruiten, "Abraham, Job," 73.
[458] James Kugel, "Exegetical Notes on 4Q225," *DSD* 13 (2006):73-98, suggests that ancient interpreters devised a way to avoid God's saying "Now I know" (which casts doubts on his omniscience). Instead of "Now I know" עתה ידעתי they suggested turning the *qal* form into a *pi'el* form: *yāda'tî* ("I know") could be read as *yidda'tî* ("I have made known"). The solution had one difficulty: how could an exegete indicate that the consonantal text ידעתי was to be read *yidda'tî* and not *yāda'tî?* If God were quoted as saying, "Now I have made known to everyone" עתה ידעתי לכל then there could be no doubt (79).
[459] J Licht, "Testing in the Hebrew Scriptures,"52, cited in Bernstein, "Angels," 267.

Angel of Presence and Prince Mastema (i.e. Jub 18:9) who have leading roles in *Jubilees* (10:7-10;48:12-13). The cosmic implications of Abraham's act is suggested by the humiliation of "the prince of Mastema [who] was put to shame"(18:12). Such a triumphant reward has no counterpart in Genesis 22, although the Servant's exaltation before kings and nations (Isa 52:12,15,53:1) may bear some resonances.

8)   The Relationships between Sufferer and Permitter are Defined in Familial Terms

The primary relationships in Akedah are the father and son bond between Abraham and Isaac, and that between God and Abraham, which best fits a Lord and "faithful" servant paradigm like Isaiah 53, since both Abraham and the Servant remain constant despite enduring the Lord's trials. *Jubilees* defines these relationship-dynamics on the basis of love: "The Lord loved [Abraham]" (17:15) while reciprocally, Abraham "loved the Lord" (17:18). Similarly, Abraham also "loves" his son" (17:16). By redefining the primary relationships in familial affective terms, *Jubilees* provides insight to the protagonist's inner motivations and struggles. Akedah's tension is heightened by Abraham's having to choose between two beings he loves (God and Isaac), and by whom he is loved in turn.

9)   The Association with Ideas of Sacrifice and Atonement

Jubilees' Akedah contains several sacrificial motifs, with some cultic images deriving from Genesis 22, including Abraham's priestly actions of building an altar, arranging the wood, "tying" Isaac, (18:8) and sacrificing the ram (vicariously) instead of his son (18:12). The text identifies the Akedah site as Mount Zion (18:13), where, at the "Sanctuary of the Lord," offerings and atoning sacrifice are continually made (cf. *Jub*. 50:11) thus strengthening Akedah's cultic association with the Jerusalem Temple.

Further, *Jubilees* relates Akedah to Passover,[460] by dating the episode to "the first month – on the twelfth of this month" (17:15). VanderKam reconstructs Abraham's journey:[461] God's

---

[460] Davies and Chilton,"Aqedah," refute a deliberate passover link in *Jubilees*. Huizenga,"Battle,"58 argues that *Jubilees* intentionally linked the Aqedah and the Passover account for dogmatic reasons.

command comes after sunset on the 12th and Abraham's travel begins in the morning of the same day; following a journey of 3 days duration, Abraham and Isaac arrive on the mountain before the close (at sunset) of 14/1, with the Aqedah occurring at afternoon or early evening of 1/14, the very time for the passover meal.[462] Additional ties strengthen this Akedah-Passover nexus in *Jubilees*: Akedah combines four motifs (date, first born son, slaughter of a sheep/ram, Mt Zion) that appear in only one context in the Bible, the Passover Law.[463] Moreover, *Jubilees* intra-textually links its own versions of Akedah and Passover:[464] the title Prince of Mastema occurs only in both contexts (17:16,18:9,12 and 48:2,9,12,15). as does the notion of the Prince of Mastema being put to shame (18:12 and 48:12), amid other verbal/ thematic resonances.[465]

Jubilees' linking of Akedah and Passover bears soteriological implications. Within the Exodus context of the deliverance of the first born, *Jubilees'* reference to Isaac as a "first born" (18:11,15) despite Ishmael preceding him in birth order, is meaningful. Isaac is designated first-born only after his release, suggesting that "the author of *Jubilees* is creating a deliberate association between the rescued Isaac and the first-born sons of the Israelites who are saved from the tenth plague."[466] This connecting of Isaac with Israelites' first-borns suggests another soteriological link relating to the paschal lamb. *Jub* 49:3 states, "on whose door they saw the blood of a year old lamb, they were not to enter the house to kill [the first-born] but were to pass over (it) in order to **save** [my emphasis] all who were in the house because the sign of the blood was on its door" (*Jub* 49:3). Segal notes that "only the slaughter of the lamb and the smearing of its blood at the entrance to their houses saved the Israelite first born."[467] Does *Jubilees* attribute a saving efficacy to the lamb's blood (not specified in Exod 12)? For "save" in *Jub*. 49:3 the

---

[461] Given *Jubilees'* understanding that evening is the beginning of the day, VanderKam,"Aqedah,"247, suggests: from 12/1 to 14/1 for the onward journey, 15/1 to 17/1 for the return journey, with 18/1 as Sabbath rest, which fits in with a seven day festival (18:19).

[462] Halpern-Amaru, "A Note on Isaac as First Born in *Jubilees* and Only Son in 4Q225." *DSD* 13 (2006):127-133,p.130, sees the binding and release as separate rather than a single event: "the actual rescue, the release that transforms Isaac into a first-born son, takes place, like the rescue of the Israelite first-born sons, only after the sun has set, i.e. "at night on the evening of the fifteenth from the time of sunset" (Jub. 49:1)."

[463] Segal, *Book of Jubilees,* 196.

[464] VanderKam, "*Akedah,*"248.

[465] See Huizenga, "Battle,"44-5.

[466] Halpern-Amaru, "Note,"128.

[467] Segal, *Book of Jubilees,*196.

Ethiopic uses "*dexna* (lexical form) which is used both in the Ethiopic text of Exod. 12:27 and in Jubilees 49:3," and "the Ethiopic word itself reflects a broad range of meanings, including to 'save' in the religious sense, as well as to 'deliver' or 'rescue.'"[468] In a sample study of OT passages, *Dexna* translates Greek σῴζω and ῥύομαι, where the underlying Hebrew is ישׁע or נצל.[469] It seems possible then to keep both meanings in view in *Jub*. 49.3. A parallel may underlie the sacrificial lamb which "saves /delivers" the first-born Israelites, and the sacrificial ram in Akedah which in effect saves Isaac the "first born." This saving efficacy of a slaughtered animal's (blood)[470] seems an indirect affirmation of the sacrificial cult. A soteriological dimension seems implicit to *Jubilees'* linking of Passover with Akedah.

5.1.2 IMPLICATIONS

Jubilees' Akedah derives from Genesis 22, but it also diverges from the biblical account, including Abraham's multiple trials, Mastema's instigating the test, primary relationships defined by love and faithfulness, the Angel of Presence and "heavenly voices," and cosmic exaltation of Abraham. Some of its cultic motifs are drawn from Genesis 22 (priestly image of Abraham, vicarious sacrifice of the ram) but *Jubilees* is distinct in locating Akedah at Mt Zion (associating it with the temple complex) and connecting Akedah with Passover, in relation to the first born, thus linking the salvific effects of the paschal lamb's blood and the ram sacrifice.

While reflecting *Jubilees'* own interests (i.e. feasts, angelology, calendar) the Akedah also draws on other traditions, notably the book of Job, as in the Mastema/Satan parallel and the portrayal of Abraham as having endured heavy testing and losses. Moreover, Isaiah 53 (through the Akedah Servant tradition) may underlie *Jubilees'* depiction of Abraham like the suffering

---

[468] L. Stuckenbruck, personal communication,14th March 2010: the term [dexna] in Exodus, mostly translates Greek ῥύομαι which, in turn, probably reflects Hebrew נצל. VanderKam's edition could just as well have used "delivers" as "saves" for Jubilees 49:3 (which could easily lead one to think that the Greek verb σῴζω rather than ῥύομαι lies in the background). An argument could also be made for 'deliver' instead."

[469] With appreciation to Ted Erho who checked 14 instances of the word ישׁע in the MT, *w*hich was translated in Greek predominantly by σῴζω/διασῴζω (8) and ῥύομαι (2) and the Ethiopic used *dexna* (8) for both Greek terms. Also 18 occurences of נצל translated in to Greek by ῥύομαι (7) ἐξαιρέω (6), σῴζω (1), and Ethiopic employed *dexna* (14) for all three Greek terms.

[470] See William Gilders,"Blood and Covenant," JSP 15 (2006): 83-118, on the priority given to blood treatment in *Jubilees*.

Servant who (unlike Job) unprotestingly endures great physical and emotional hardships. Further, Abraham's relationship to God resembles that of a "faithful" servant like in Isaiah 53, as does the grandeur of his exaltation. It remains to be stressed that Abraham is the protagonist of *Jubilees*, and Isaac remains passive.

Clearly, this passage manifests all nine features of the Akedah Servant complex. It serves to suggest *Jubilees*' receptivity to this tradition, in dialogue with primary and secondary texts (i.e. Job) in keeping with the proposed intertextual model. Given that Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 converge in a context of suffering righteousness and sacrifice, and strongly allies with soteriological motifs, *Jubilees* may be considered one of the earliest examples of the complex in pre-70CE ancient Jewish literature.

5.2 4Q225 (PSEUDO-JUBILEES)

4Q225, a Qumran text labelled Pseudo-Jubilees (along with 4Q226-7) has been palaeographically dated to 30BCE-20CE, and survives in 3 fragments.[471] This thesis will focus on the largest frg 2, consisting of 2 columns (henceforth 2i amd 2ii) which mentions the promise of a child to Abraham, birth of Isaac, Akedah, Isaac's genealogy, and (possible) Exodus links. This text displays convergences and divergences with Genesis 22 and *Jubilees*' Akedah. While VanderKam considers 4Q225 to be "a markedly different composition" from *Jubilees*, Kugler says it "traded on its audience's awareness of *Jubilees*."[472] Given the fragmentary nature of 4Q225, with several missing words reconstructed by scholars,[473] one needs to examine its contents, prior to discussing the Akedah Servant complex.

Frg 2 (i) consists of 14 lines of text,[474] with the amount of blank space above line 1 suggesting it begins a column. Lines 1-2 read: " . . . that per[son]will be cut off / [from among]

---

[471] Critical text (and translation) in the edition by J.T. Milik and J.C.VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4;VIII; Parabiblical Texts. Part I* (DJD XIII, Oxford: Clarendon, 1994),141-155; J. VanderKam, "Aqedah," 241-42.

[472] R.Kugler,"4Q225 2i 1-2: A Possible Reconstruction and Explanation" *JBL* 126 (2007): 172-182, p.174.

[473] G.Nicklesburg, *Book Review* JSP 21 (2000)124, cautions that the "confident answers and solutions that we often give are more fragile than we recognize or admit."

[474] The interpretation offered follows VanderKam, "Aqedah," (251-55).

his [peo]ple . . ." Since the rest of frg 2 concerns the Abraham cycle, the phrase probably refers to the only Abrahamic text where כרת /"cut off" occurs (Gen 17:14 = Jub 15:14), which mentions the penalty for the uncircumcised. Line 2 ends with "[. . . he sta]yed in Haran twenty [ye]ars," which may allude to Jacob's 20 years in Haran (Gen 31:38,41=Jub 27:19, 29:50) or to Abraham's shorter stay. Though the links remain unclear, the text continues without a break to lines (3-4) based on Gen 15:2-3: "[And A]braham [said] to God: 'My Lord, I go on being childless and Eli[ezer] / is the [son of my household,] and he will be my heir." A break follows, with the next lines 5-8 based on Gen 15:5-6, where God promises progeny to Abraham, and it ends with the words: "And [Abraham] be[lieved] [in] G[o]d, and righteousness was accounted to him" (cf. Gen 15:6). Lines 8-9 present Isaac's birth announcement (cf Gen 21:2-3). Then 4Q225 begins the Akedah narrative, with Mastema's accusation (9-10) as in Jub 17:16. God's command to Abraham follows(11-12), and Col 1 ends with the lines "And He got [up and w]en[t] from the wells up to M[t Moriah]/ . . . And Ab[raham] lifted."

Column 2 (ii) appears contiguous with 2(i), beginning with the word עי]נ[יו]. Lines (1-3) bear parallels to Gen 22: 6-8 in the exchange between Abraham and Isaac. Line 4 contains an unexpected second speech by Isaac (absent in Gen 22 and *Jubilees*) although only the first letter כ of his words survive, with the reconstruction suggesting "t[ie me well]." Lines (5-8) present a new feature of weeping holy angels and the angels of Mastema watching the impending sacrifice. Divine intervention follows in line 9-10 (cf. Gen 22:11-12, Jub 18:11) and a puzzling utterance: "N[ow I know that he will not be loving." Lines 10-12 deviate from Gen 22:17 (Jub 18:15) in that God blesses Isaac (not Abraham), and also presents a genealogy of Isaac, Jacob and the priestly ancestor, Levi, and declares the [missing] total of the patriarchs' years. The concluding lines (13-14) mention the Prince of Mastema thrice, and his being bound, as well as refering to the holy angels and Belial, seeming to bear resonances with *Jubilees*' Exodus events (cf. Jub 48:15).[475]

---

[475] See VanderKam, "Aqedah," 255.

5.2.1 THE AKEDAH SERVANT COMPLEX in 4Q225

The Akedah version in 4Q225 draws on Genesis 22 and *Jubilees'* Akedah, but it also displays selectivity and innovation.[476] Stylistically, 4Q225 omits some verses (i.e. Gen 22:13-16, *Jub*.18:12-13 on the ram; and Gen 22:5 on the servants), compresses sentences (cf. *Jub*. 17:16 on Mastema), adds new details (the "wells" in 2(i)13), changes syntax (compare 2(i)10-12 with Gen 22:1-2), and interrupts the narrative sequence with insertions (i.e. weeping angels). Further, 4Q225 links the Akedah with other biblical passages (i.e. 2(i) connects Gen 17:14,15:2-3 and 21:2-3, with Gen 22) enabling 4Q225 to evoke and relate diverse motifs to a central theme in a compact manner. 4Q225's overarching theme is the promise and preservation of the covenantal line, and it strings together related texts: the covenantal obligation of circumcision, promise, birth of the promised child, threats to continuity (Mastema), and genealogy from Isaac through Levi (the priestly line).[477]

4Q225 contains some elements lacking in Genesis 22 and *Jubilees*. Among them is a possible reference to אש in 2(ii)2: "[his ey]es [and there was a] fire," with the fire possibly identifying the sacrificial site.[478] Distinctive too is the weeping (holy) angels motif, in contrast to Mastema's angels. 4Q225 is "the earliest text that shows the "weeping angels" and "is virtually unique in having two groups of watchers."[479] Significantly, 4Q225 seems to assign a second speech to Isaac in 2(ii) 4, following the exchange between Abraham and Isaac in 2(ii) 2-3 (cf. Gen 22:7-8). Isaac's extra speech has no basis either in Genesis 22 or *Jubilees*, and only the initial letter כ remains visible. DJD's reconstruction (כפות אותי יפה), influenced by later targums (*Ps-J*, *Neof.* and *Frg.* targums to Gen 22:10) and midrash (Gen Rab. 56:7), "must be right, even if כפת is a rare Hebrew word, not appearing in Biblical Hebrew or otherwise."[480] The above motifs are found in later rabbinic texts which led Vermes to designate 4Q225 as "a pre-

---

[476] For 4Q225's parallels with *Jubilees*, see VanderKam, "Aqedah," 260.

[477] R. Kugler,"Hearing 4Q225," *DSD* 10 (2001):81-103,p.99, reads a patten of promise and fufillment.

[478] VanderKam, *Qumran cave 4,* 151, connects it to later Jewish (targumic) tradition. Florentino García Martinez, "The Sacrifice of Isaac in 4Q225" in *The Sacrifice of Isaac* (ed. Ed Noort and Eibert Tigchelaar. Brill: Leiden, 2002), 44-57, p.52, thinks "אש is problematic; the letter *shin* is certain" but no trace of aleph can be discerned.

[479] See Bernstein, "4Q225,"278, on angelic motifs in 4Q225.

[480] Fitzmyer,"Sacrifice," n.16.

Christian skeleton of the targumic-midrashic representation of sacrifice of Isaac," raising critical debate.[481]

Keeping in view the fragmentary nature of 4Q225, and the tentativeness of some reconstructions, one examines 4Q225 for the motifs of the Akedah Servant complex.

1) The Portrayal of a Righteous Figure Who Suffers Unjustly

4Q225 explicitly mentions Abraham's righteousness (צדקה) which "was accounted to him" due to his belief in God's promise 1(i)7: תחשב לו צדקה (cf.Gen 15:6). While Abraham does not endure multiple trials (cf. *Jub.*17) nonetheless, 4Q225 evokes Abraham's suffering by mentioning his regret at being childless: הנני בא עררי ואליעזר...הואה וירשני 2(i)3. In this context, בא could convey the idea of "going about one's [daily] affairs" but it could also connote Abraham's sense of approaching age or death (ie. בא בימים).[482] The words suggest Abraham's anguish at his continuing childessness and at the idea of dying heirless, so Eleazar will inherit his weath. Ironically, Abraham seems the deprived one, rather than his servant. Here one might read a conceptual parallel to Isaiah 53 where like Abraham the suffering Servant lacks "generation" (Isa 53:8) probably implying his lack of heirs, cut off by death.

2) The Suffering is Instigated by a Supernatural Being

In 4Q225, Mastema plays an instigative role in Abraham's suffering by accusing him "regarding Isaac" to God: ויבוא שר המשטמה אל אלוהים וישטים את אברהם בישחק 2 (i)10. The scene is "strongly reminscent of *Jubilees* in that 4Q225 too, envisages the action as occuring within a Joban context."[483] Further, 4Q225 shares a verbal link with Job (16:9, 30:21) through וישטים (accuse).[484] Mastema's charges against Abraham specifically concerns Isaac, but unlike in *Jubilees*, he doesn't tell God to order Abraham to sacrifice his son. Although the divine command follows immediately, it appears to be issued on God's authority. 4Q225 avoids the

---

[481] Vermes, "New Light," 140. For a critique, see Fitzmyer,"The Sacrifice of Isaac in Qumran Literature." See also ch 7.

[482] BDB 98. Gen 15:2 states ואנכי הולך עריר

[483] VanderKam, "Aqedah,"253.

[484] Bernstein, "Angels," 269, n.16: "the root שטם occurs in Qal 6 times in the Hebrew Bible, but this is the first recorded occurrence of the hiphil."

ambivalent issue of God being manipulated by Mastema, and preserves the idea of divine control.

3) & 4) <u>The Sufferer does not Protest, but Co-operates with a Free and Voluntary Response</u>

4Q225 omits the detailed preparations by Abraham (cf.Gen 22:3-5) and it conveys his swift action by the concise phrase: ויקום וילך מן הבארות על הר המוריה which suggests that Abraham set out directly on receiving the command. Abraham's willing cooperation is aligned with Genesis 22 and *Jubilees*. However, exceptionally among Stage I texts, 4Q225 appears to convey Isaac's voluntary participation by stating "Tie me well." If the DJD reconstruction is correct, then Isaac's second speech implies his willingness to be sacrificed, an innovation that may have originated from the martyrdom tradition, or had its basis in the union of wills suggested in Gen 22:6,8: "שניהם יחדו".

5) <u>The Suffering is Framed as a Test of Faithfulness</u>

The notion of a test clearly underlies 4Q225. Although the word נסה does not appear in the extant lines, the reconstruction states: בכול זה ינסה שר המשטמה אם ימצא כחש ואם לא ימצא נאמן. García Martinez objects to this idea of Mastema doing the testing since "in other versions of the story it is God who tests Abraham."[485] Nonetheless, the idea of a test is inherent to 4Q225, as the word נאמן encapsulates. Kugler affirms that נאמן had become (cf. Neh.9:7–8) "the adjective for Abraham, a reference to his willingness to offer his son to God."[486] Accordingly,"what [2(ii)8] thus seems to be doing is presenting two equally unpleasant outcomes to this test: either 'Abraham will be found to be false, or if not, he will be found to be faithful.'In the first instance, he fails the test; in the second, he passes, but at the cost of his own son's life."[487]

6) and 7) <u>The Sufferer Receives Reward and Exaltation with Universal Consequences</u>

4Q225 deviates from Gen 22:17 and *Jub.*18:15-17 as Isaac, rather than Abraham, receives the divine blessing: ויברך אל יהוה את ישחק 2 (ii)10. By blessing Isaac, 4Q225 concludes

---

[485] García Martinez, "Sacrifice of Isaac" 49.
[486] Kugel, "Notes," 95.
[487] ibid., 95.

its retelling of Akedah with "the fidelity of God to his promise [of posterity]."[488] Strikingly, 4Q225 eliminates the notion of Abraham as a blessing to the "nations," and his descendants as "possessing the gate of their enemies." Its focus lies exclusively on the covenantal line. 4Q225 also diverges from Genesis 22 and *Jubilees* by adding a genealogy (2 (ii)10-12), as confirmation of God's promise of descendants: "all the days of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Levi" 2(ii)12. While Abraham's stature may seem diminished in 4Q225 compared to his predominance in Genesis 22 and *Jubilees,* the text does affirm his cosmic significance. In 2(ii)7, the angels of Mastema state: עכשיו יאבד ("now he will perish"). Although it could refer to Isaac's imminent demise, Kugel interprets it as a "slightly metaphorical" reference to Abraham's state.[489] Since Mastema intends to "make ineffective the promise to Abraham of a [numerous] progeny," the phrase "he will perish" probably relates to the original childless, heirless state of Abraham, leaving no descendants.[490] In 4Q225, Abraham's act has cosmic significance, being the cynosure of Mastema, the weeping angels and Mastema's angels. Bernstein observes, "the heavenly spectators have taken sides as if at a contest, with the holy angels hoping that Abraham will triumph, and the evil ones that he will fail."[491] The taunting of the opposing angels ("now he will perish") resonate with the Servant's abusers in Isaiah 53, and in both cases, the adversaries are proved wrong.

8)   The Relationships between Sufferer and Permitter are Closely Defined

In 4Q225 the primary relationships between God and Abraham, as well as Abraham and Isaac and his descendants are best defined in covenantal terms. God's first exchange with Abraham (2 (ii)2-4) conveys a covenantal promise of multiple descendants. Halpern-Amaru notes, "Isaac's birth is announced immediately thereafter (2 1 8–9a)" and "explicitly portrayed as the fulfillment of the preceding divine promise of a son."[492] She also stresses 4Q225's reference to Isaac as יחידכה: "In 4Q225 Ishmael is never born. Consequently, when God

---

[488] García Martinez, "Sacrifice of Isaac," 56.
[489] Kugel, "Notes," 94.
[490] García Martinez, "Sacrifice of Isaac" 50.
[491] Bernstein, "Angels,"278
[492] Halpern-Amaru, "A Note on Isaac,"132

commands Abraham to sacrifice his only son (2 i 11), Isaac is quite literally a יחיד, the only son othe patriarch has."[493] By listing Isaac's decendants in a genealogy, 4Q225 again signals the covenant, and "God's fidelity to his promise."[494] While emphasising covenantal relationships, 4Q225 maintains affective bonds. In 2(ii)9b-10a, God utters a puzzling phrase: עתה ידעתי כי לא יהיה אהב. Kugler considers that "in 4Q225's characteristically condensed form" the verse 2 ii 9b-10a "confirms God's confidence that Abraham would not let love of Isaac trump faithfulness to God."[495]

9)   Association with Ideas of Sacrifice and Atonement

4Q225 lacks some sacrificial and atoning motifs present in Gen 22 and *Jubilees*, presumably due to its compression. It neither mentions Abraham's sacrifice of the ram, nor identifies the site of sacrifice as Mt Zion (cf. Jub 18:13), and it does not link Akedah to Passover.[496] However, some associations with the sacrificial cult remain, including references to עלה in 2(ii)3, and (in reconstruction) to הר מוריה (2(i)13) and מזבח (2(ii)5). Moreover, Abraham and Isaac are united in will in carrying out the sacrifice in 4Q225, since (as reconstructed) Isaac requests to be tied. However, the key link to the sacrificial cult lies in Isaac's genealogy. Contrary to expectations, "the genealogy lists not the first-born son, but the sons through whom the priesthood itself or the priestly writings were transmitted according to *Jubilees* [ie. Levi]."[497] 4Q225 could have chosen the alternative lineage of Judah, who in *Jubilees* is the only other son of Jacob (along with Levi) to receive a covenantal blessing from Isaac (*Jub*.31:18). Instead, 4Q225 makes a distinctive point in giving priority to Levi. Kugler agrees, "4Q225 2 (ii) 11–12 links the two tests of God's promise with a priestly genealogy, suggesting that the fulfillment of God's pledge leads not just to progeny for Abraham, but ultimately to the founding of the pure priesthood."[498] By accentuating Levi's priestly line, 4Q225 affirms the sacrificial cult.

---

[493] Halpern-Amaru, "A Note on Isaac,"132.
[494] García Martinez,"Sacrifice of Isaac," 56
[495] Kugler,"Reconstruction," 175.
[496] Kugler,"Possible Reconstruction,"177-179, reads Passover references in fr 1 and fr 2(ii). However, VanderKam "The Aqedah," 255 states, "the Exodus themes in frag 1 stand in unclear relationship to the Aqedah account in 2(i-ii)."
[497] DJD,"4Q225," 153.
[498] Kugler,"Hearing 4Q225," 98.

5.2.2 IMPLICATIONS

Despite its fragmentary (reconstructed) state, 4Q225 presents a distinctive shaping of Akedah. 4Q225 "was familiar with *Jubilees* and considered it an authoritative text," but "felt free to incorporate in [its] retelling exegetical traditions from elsewhere,"[499] including *Job,* and possibly martyrdom (a consenting Isaac) and angelic traditions.[500] The above analysis of features reveals that the Akedah Servant complex is manifest in 4Q225. Although the text lacks a reference to the "nations" (the eighth feature) this absence may be explained by 4Q225's exclusive focus on the covenantal line, shifting importance to the cosmic dimension of Abraham's act, than a universalist view, including the nations.

Nonetheless, the portrayal of a "righteous"Abraham suffering childlessness, his prompt obedience to the divine command, Mastema's instigating a test, the reward of descendants, Abraham's exaltation, close (covenantal) relationships, and sacrificial elements, all fit within the rubrics of the Akedah Servant complex. Innovations peculiar to 4Q225, including Isaac's (apparent) willingness to be a sacrificial offering, and a priestly genealogy, strengthen the text's cultic affliations. Moreover, 4Q225's depiction of Abraham resonates with the Isaianic Servant who similarly is a "righteous" figure lacking the potential of "generation," and faces mockery and opposition. This slant towards suffering and sacrifice typifies the Akedah Servant complex. One may suggest that 4Q225, in dialoguing with primary and secondary texts (like *Jubilees* and Job) was receptive to the Akedah Servant Complex, and serves as another witness to this emerging tradition.

Finally, in view of the critical debate on 4Q225, one notes that (despite additional references to Isaac than in Genesis 22 or *Jubilees*) Abraham remains its protagonist. The narrator, angelic/demonic figures, as well as God, spotlight Abraham, and his is the decisive act which determines the outcome: defeating Mastema, bringing blessings on Isaac and his

---

[499] Kugel,"Notes," 98.
[500] See Bernstein, "Angels at the Aqedah."

descendants, and resulting in a priestly genealogy. As Kugel notes, "it is Abraham who is being tested, and the whole focus . . . is on him and his dilemma, not on Isaac."[501]

5.3   *DE ABRAHAMO*

The prominent Alexandrian Jew (ca. 15BCE to 45CE) Philo's "primary heritage was that of biblical Judaism," and he sought to interpret Scriptures by reference to Greek philosophy.[502] Scholars have variously attempted to define Philonic thought, as a synthesis of Judaism[503] and Hellenism, as an exegete of the Law of Moses,[504] or a mix of Platonic, Pythagorean, and Stoic concepts/Middle-Platonism.[505] Philo's philosophical notions often emerge through his allegorising tendency.[506] His target audience were probably Hellenised Jews.[507] Philo's work later yielded influence on early Christianity, resulting in patristic preservation / transmission of his writings[508] contrasted by a "neglect of Philo's works in Jewish circles."[509] Philo's major writings include three Pentateuch commentaries, *Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus*, *Allegorical Commentary,* and *Exposition of the Law*.[510]

---

[501] Kugel, "Notes," 94, refers to 2(ii)7-8, but it applies to 4Q225 as a whole.

[502] Adam Kamesar, "Introduction" in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo* (ed. Adam Kamesar; Cambridge University, 2009), 1-5, Cambridge Collections Online. (October 16, 2011). John Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora* (Edinburgh,T&T Clark, 1996),158-9. For recent research and a classified bibliography, see *The Cambridge Companion to Philo* (as above).

[503] For a Jewish perspective, see Naomi Cohen, *Philo's Scriptures: Citations from the Prophets and Writings* (Brill: Leiden, 2007) who traces a possible early haftarah series based on Philo's prophetic citations. His indebtedness to Jewish scriptural traditions and tools include lexical aids/a concordance, literary sources like translations of Jewish-Aramaic midrashic material, and an onomastical list for Hebrew etymologies.

[504] Peder Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete of His Time.* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

[505] David Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato* (Leiden: Brill, 1986) ch.4.

[506] Lester Grabbe, *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation* (Atlanta: Scholars,1988) 77-87.

[507] Runia, *Philo of Alexandria* 37; Hans Lewy, *Three Jewish Philosophers* (eds. Hans Lewy et al.,; New York: 1972) 8-25 suggests some were aimed at a gentile audience.

[508] David Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993)1,31. See also Folker Siegert, "Philo and the New Testament," in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo* (ed. Adam Kamesar; Cambridge University, 2009), 175-209, Cambridge Collections Online (16 October 2011).

[509] Abraham Terian, "Had the Works of Philo Been Newly Discovered," *The Biblical Archaeologist* 57 (1994), 86-97,p.90

[510] James Royse, "The Works of Philo," in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo* (ed. Adam Kamesar. Cambridge University, 2009), 32-64, Cambridge Collections Online (16 October 2011). Extant Philonic works are preserved in the original Greek, an Armenian translation (ca.6CE), and a limited Latin version.

5.3.1   THE AKEDAH SERVANT COMPLEX IN PHILO'S *DE ABRAHAMO*

Philo's *De Abrahamo* (*Abr.*) appears in the *Exposition of the Law*. [511] The initial section (7-47) presents the triad of Enos, Enoch and Noah, while the greater second triad (Abraham, Isaac and Jacob) who are "symbols of virtue" (53). *Abr.* presents Abraham's central life events, including the Akedah (chs. 32-36) which contains some additions/omissions to the biblical account.[512] The Akedah begins with Abraham's feelings for Isaac, followed by a modified version of Genesis 22, and ends abruptly after God commands Abraham to halt the sacrifice (177). From (178-200) Philo shifts attention to "quarrelsome critics" (φιλαπεχθήμοσι) who depreciate Abraham's act and "misconstrue everything" (178).[513] For Feldman, Philo's is "an apologetic narrative defending Abraham."[514] The Akedah ends with an allegorical interpretation (200-207): Isaac's name means laughter (γέλως) in the sense of "the good emotion of the understanding that is joy." Abraham is prepared to sacrifice this joy as his duty to God, who, in turn "fitly rewards by returning the gift" of joy. This text reflects Philo's Greek and Jewish heritage, as emerges in the analysis of *Abr.* for the Akedah Servant complex motifs.

1)   <u>The Portrayal of a Righteous Figure who Suffers Unjustly</u>

In *Abr.*, although the term righteous is absent, Abraham's moral perfection is connoted by Greek values, especially εὐσέβεια (177,198,199), which piety is "the highest and greatest of virtues" (60). Philo intimates Abraham's unjust suffering by portraying his love for Isaac, "his only and cherished son," enhanced by Isaac's "perfection of virtues beyond his years" (168). Further, "[Abraham] had a most potent incentive to love in that he had begotten the boy in his old age and not in his years of vigour" and "one who gives his only darling son performs an action for which no language is adequate"(196). While intimating Abraham's inexpressible

---

[511] Philo, *De Abrahamo* (trans. F. Colson and G. Whitaker; LCL vol.6; London: Heinemann, 1929-1943); L.Cohn and P.Wendland (eds.) *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt* (vol. 3; Berlin, 1896-1915).

[512] *Abr.*'s divergences from LXX: Isaac (not Abraham) carries the fire, Abraham has extra lines (175), the ram is absent, Isaac is not bound, there is no angel, no divine blessings or a promise of future descendants, the servants are θεραπείας (170) not παῖδας (22:5), Isaac is labelled ἀγαπητὸς with an added μόνος (168, 196).

[513] L. Feldman,"Philo's Version" in *The Studia Philonica Annual* XIV (2002): 66-86. The quarrelsome critics could most likely be non-Jews who had condemned the Jews for misanthropy, and some errant Jews (72,74).

[514] ibid.,76.

anguish at his potential loss, *Abr.* also hints that Abraham may have endured prior sufferings through God's commands that he met without "repining or discontent, however charged with toils or pains they might be"(192). This portrait of Abraham as a suffering figure, facing "toil" and "pain" without "repining or discontent," resonates with the Isaianic Servant. Similarly, Abraham and the Servant both suffer from detractors who "mar the virtues of men who have lived a good life" (191).

2)   The Suffering is Instigated by a Supernatural Being

Unlike in *Jubilees* and 4Q225 where blame is deflected onto a demonic figure, Philo aligns with Genesis 22 where God instigates the suffering: "suddenly to his surprise there came a divine message that he should sacrifice his son" (169). *Abr.* provides no explanation for this baffling command. As Feldman notes, Philo does not "raise the question as to why God had given him such a command" and "the closest that Philo comes to raising any questions at all appears in the statement that God's message 'came suddenly and to Abraham's surprise.'"[515] A possible reason may be that Philo's primary objective is not a theodicy, but to justify Abraham against detractors (178) so he attempts to explain Abraham's rather than God's behaviour.

3)   The Sufferer does not Protest, but Co-operates

Abraham is portrayed as cooperating without protest: "[he] shewed no change of colour nor weakening of soul, but remained steadfast as ever with a judgement that never bent nor wavered" (170). Acting in silence, "he told [of] the divine call to none of his household" (170). His determination to carrry out God's command emerges in that "Abraham admitted no swerving of body or mind, and with visage and thought alike unmoved" (175). Further, *Abr.* reveals that "he mightily overcame all the fascination expressed in fond terms of family affection" (170). Philo's portrait of "Abraham as a veritable Stoic in accepting [God's command] unquestioningly"[516] again evokes the Servant in Isaiah 53 who expresses neither emotion nor complaint in bearing his sufferings, but maintains a strict silence. Philo also hints at

---

[515] Feldman,"Philo's Version,"79.
[516] ibid., 612.

Isaac's cooperation: "they walked with equal speed of mind rather than body" (172) suggesting the union of wills between father and son.[517]

4) A Free and Voluntary Response by the Sufferer

Abraham's motivation to sacrifice Isaac preoccupies Philo, in response to "quarrelsome critics" who attempt to devalue his act and compare Abraham's deed with examples of child sacrifice by other nations (180-3): καὶ ἰδιῶται καὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ὅλα ἔθνη δρῶσιν ἐν καιροῖς (183). Philo counterargues that Abraham was not driven by custom, fear, or love of honour, in contrast to those who "give their children partly under compulsion" and "partly through desire for glory and honour" (185). As Green comments, "it was love, not fear of God, that motivated him."[518]

5) The Suffering is Framed as a Test of Obedience

The word "test" does not occur in *Abr.*, possibly because Philo seems troubled "by the thought that God, who is omniscient has to test someone."[519] Nonetheless, the situation clearly involves a test, where Abraham has to choose between his "only and dearly cherished son" and obedience to God. Philo stresses that Abraham's obedient response stems from a long-term habit, having "made a special practice of obedience to God" and "he had not neglected any of God's commands" (192).

6) and 7) The Sufferer Receives Reward and Exaltation with Universal Consequences

Since Philo's Akedah ends abruptly with God's halting the sacrifice (176), it omits divine promises and blessings to Abraham, his descendants, and the nations (Gen 22:13-19). The only reward mentioned is Isaac's return: "God returned the gift of him and used the offering which piety rendered to Him to repay the offerer" (177). *Abr.* then diverges to address "quarrelsome critics" (178-199). Here one notes an emphasis on the nations, with the word ἔθνη recurring thrice (181,183,188), and references to Greeks (180), Barabarian nations (181), India

---

[517] R. Hayward, "The Present State of Research into the Targumic Account of the Sacrifice of Isaac," *JJS* 32 (1981): 127-50, interprets it as "Isaac's active and voluntary assent to the act" (135).
[518] Ronald Green, "Abraham, Isaac and the Jewish Tradition: an Ethical Reappraisal," *JRE* 10 (1982): 1-21, p.11
[519] Feldman,"Philo's Version," 83.

126

(181), Babylonia, Mesopotamia and the Chaldeans (188). Abraham stands in contrast to the nations as a morally superior man who "devoted his whole soul through and through to holiness" and his sacrifice is beyond compare with others (198-9). Having set up this contrast, the narrator urges Abraham's detractors to "be overwhelmed with admiration for his extraordinary piety" (199). They must "not mar the virtues of men who have lived a good life, virtue which they should rather help to glorify by their good report" and "that the deed really deserves our praise and love,"(191). In defending Abraham's reputation and upholding him as an exemplar of virtue and piety (presumably to Greek and Jewish readers), Philo seems to be actualizing the promise inherent in Gen 22:17-8 of Abraham's being a blessing to the nations.

8)   Relationships Between the Sufferer and Instigator is defined in Familial Terms

Prior to the Akedah narrative, *Abr.* defines the relationships between God and the three patriarchs on the basis of love: "All alike are God-lovers and God-beloved, and their affection for the true God was returned by Him" (50). As Cavadini notes, "God's act of self-identification . . .becomes the basis of their identity as well"[520] (i.e. the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob). In Akedah too, familial bonds hold prime importance, with love being a recurring word, expressing Abraham's relationship to God (170) and his son (195). The tension in Philo's Akedah lies in Abraham's love for God and his love for Isaac coming into conflict. Abraham "mastered by his love for God, he mightily overcame. . .the fond terms of family affection" (170).

9)   Association with Ideas of Sacrifice and Atonement

Philo's Akedah lacks some key sacrificial motifs of Genesis 22, including references to the ram,[521] and Moriah (MT). Nonetheless, sacrificial ideas are present. When Abraham gives Isaac to carry the fire and wood "for he thought it good that the victim himself should bear the load of the instruments of sacrifice," (171) the images resonate with a scapegoat bearing

---

[520] J. Cavadini, "Exegetical Transformations," in *In Dominico Eloquio* (ed.Paul Blowers et al.; Michigan: Eerdmans,2002), 35-49,p.37.
[521] In Philo's *De Fuga et Inventione* (132) which briefly refers to the Akedah, Philo mentions a ram, and offers an allegorical interpretation: "a ram is found caught by his horns;" that is to say, reason is found silent and withholding its assent."

iniquities (cf.Lev 16:21). The reference to ὁλοκαύτωμα (198) too evokes the sacrificial complex (cf. Lev 6:1) as does the cultic image of Abraham "beginning the sacrificial rite as a priest with the very best of sons for victim. Perhaps too, following the law of burnt offering, he would have dismembered his son limb by limb" (198). Kessler remarks (cf. 198), "the near sacrifice of Isaac led Philo to make a comparison between Isaac and the Tamid lamb, an atonement offering that was sacrificed twice daily at the Temple."[522] Hayward states, "since the Tamid had expiatory significance, we should argue too that Isaac's 'complete and perfect sacrifice' [in Philo] had expiatory meaning."[523] Admittedly, *Abr.* makes a cultic connection to the Tamid lamb, but Isaac does not fulfil the part of a perfect expiatory sacrifice, since "God the Saviour stopped the deed" and "Isaac was saved" (176). This soteriological stress (ὁ σωτὴρ θεός, 176) and (διασῴζεται, 177) accentuates that for Philo, Isaac needs saving himself, and it is God who directly effects the salvation. Nonetheless, by portraying God as saving Isaac without the intermediary role of a sacrificed ram, does Philo denigrate the efficacy of cultic sacrifice? Feldman suggests, "Philo apparently sought to avoid the theological implications that the ram was sacrifice for sin, and so he omits the ram completely."[524] The answer may lie here: "for Abraham, the action, though not followed by the intended ending, was complete and perfect"(177). Proper sacrifice requires purity of motive, like Abraham "devot[ing] his whole soul" (198) to the will of God which makes his offering complete and perfect. In his arguments against Abraham's detractors, Philo never denigrates the value of sacrificial acts *per se*, but questions the underlying motives, justifying "Abraham's greatest action" on the basis of his purity of intention. The sacrificial system serves it purpose and has its place in *Abr.* (cultic images and motifs) but the ultimate focus should be on ὁ σωτὴρ θεός. The perfect sacrifice is when the act of offering and intention unite.[525]

---

[522] Kessler, *Bound,* 139.
[523] Hayward, "Present State," n.57.
[524] Feldman,"Philo's Version,"84.
[525] Jean Laporte, "Sacrifice and Forgiveness in Philo of Alexandria in *The Studia Philonica Annual: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* (ed. David Runia; vol 1; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989),34-42, states,"like the prophets, Philo does not condemn purifications and sacrifices, but precisely because he takes them very

5.3.2   IMPLICATIONS

Abr. contains distinctive elements, and functions as a response to Abraham's maligners. Philo's familiarity with Jewish exegetical traditions may explain the presence of the Akedah Servant complex, though infused with Greek values. Abraham is depicted as stoical and silent in his suffering, and his actions misunderstood and slandered by detractors, like the Servant in Isaiah 53. Abraham willingly responds to God's command, not through negative motives, but motivated by love which defines his familial ties to God and Isaac. He remains an exemplar to the nations in his piety/εὐσέβεια (199). *Abr.* displays cultic images (Abraham as a priest conducting a sacrificial rite, *yom kippur* scapegoat, Tamid lamb/burnt offering). While Isaac's sacrifice does not happen, Abraham's action is "complete and perfect." *Abr.* introduces the concept that authentic sacrifice requires purity of intention and emphasises God's role in saving Isaac. Finally, "Philo's embellished treatment *(Abr* 169-207) is focused exclusively on Abraham, his motives, and his piety (with Isaac's minor role described briefly at §173)."[526] In this respect, Philo's Akedah shares a similarity with *Jubilees* and *4Q225*, two other stage I texts.

5.4   2 MACCABEES

2 Maccabees is also a Hellenistic-Jewish text. Self-described as an ἐπιτομή of a work by Jason of Cyrene, it presents the Jewish rebellion led by Judas Maccabaeus against Antiochus Epiphanes,[527] covering "the history of the city of Jerusalem from the beginning of institutionalised Hellenization" (175BCE) until Judas' victory (161BCE).[528] Dated to 143/142BCE,[529] and written in *koine* Greek, 2 Macc overlaps partly with 1Macc, but their

---

seriously as God-given remedies to sin, he opposes those. . .who ignore the moral and religious implications of the ritual" (35).
[526] Bruce Fisk, "Offering Isaac Again and Again: Pseudo-Philo's Use of the Aqedah as Intertext," *CBQ* 62 (2000): 481-507, n.79.
[527] Martha Himmelfarb, "Judaism and Hellenism in 2 Maccabees," *Poetics Today* 19 (1998): 19-40, p.20.
[528] Daniel Schwartz, *2 Maccabees* (Germany:Walter de Gruyter,2008),p.3. For recent studies, see D.Williams, "Recent Research in 2 Maccabees," *Currents in Biblical Research* 2003; 2; 69
[529] ibid., *2 Macc,* 14. van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 53, proposes 124 BCE.

perspectives differ.[530] In 2 Macc, Jewish laws designate the Jewish way of life,[531] and are sacred (ἅγιος) and hereditary/ancestral (οἱ πατρίοι νόμοι). Schwartz presents the theology of 2 Macc[532]: God watches over the Jews, but their sins can cause Him to look away (5:17) at which point troubles arise through the agency of non-Jews, (i.e. Antiochus) who do not realize they are acting as God's agents. These troubles are meant to 'edify'(6:16) and return the Jews to righteousness, after which God is 'reconciled'(5:20). In 2 Macc martyrs are key to reconciliation, reflecting a Diaspora view of martyrdom as an "effective death."[533]

5.4.1   THE AKEDAH SERVANT COMPLEX IN 2 MACCABEES

This section will analyse the martyrdoms in 2 Macc 7 (1-42).[534] A martyr text describes how a person "in an extremely hostile situation, has preferred a violent death to compliance with a decree or demand of the (usually) pagan authorities" and "the execution should at least be mentioned."[535] Martyrs are upheld as exemplary figures, [536] with narratives features like a tyrannical oppressor, a decree carrying death penalty, choice between obeying or betraying one's beliefs/loyalties, heroic endurance, torture, martyr's speech, public setting, victory inherent in the death itself, posthumous recognition/ anticipated reward.[537] The martyrdom context in 2 Macc is "not only religious, but political and patriotic,[538] following Antiochus'

---

[530] Schwartz, "The Other in 1 and 2 Maccabees," *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism.* (eds. Graham Stanton and Guy Stroumsa, Cambridge UP, 1998,30-17); George Nickelsburg, "1 and 2 Maccabees - Same Story, Different Meaning," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 42, 1971. Schwartz, *2 Macc.,* 55 holds that 2 Macc reflects a Diaspora outlook (ch.III) while 1 Macc is rooted in *Eretz Israel.*

[531] Himmelfarb, "Judaism and Hellenism," 25.

[532] Schwartz, *2 Macc,* 21.

[533] ibid., 50. In 1 Macc warriors are the real heroes, while the few martyrs mentioned exemplify the problem.

[534] Edition used: Robert Hanhart, ed. *Maccabaeorum Liber II* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum, IX/2. Göttingen:Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht,1959).

[535] van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs,*7.

[536] The noun μάρτυς or witness first appears in Christian texts referring to a person who has "chosen death rather than renounce Christ. Although this terminology does not appear in the Maccabean books, the analogy is clear" (Collins, "Death," 181). Moshe Herr, "Persecutions and Martyrdoms in Hadrian's Days" *Scripta Heirosolymitana* 23 (1972) 85-125: later rabbinic martyrology developed the notion of *Kiddush Hashem* and *Asarah Haruge Malkhut*. In Graeco-Roman tradition, martyrdom includes the idea of Noble Death (Seeley, *Noble Death*).

[537] See Tessa Rajak, "Dying for the Law: The Martyr's Portrait,"*Portrait* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997); van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs, 8,* and Boyarin, *Dying for God,* 21,95. J. van Henten, *Martyrdom and Noble Death:Selected Texts From Graeco-Roman, Jewish and Christian Antiquity* (London: Routledge, 2002),5, notes that "pagans rarely have been willing to sacrifice their life for religious motives."

[538] Marie Baslez, "The Origin of the Martyrdom Images," in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology* (Leiden: Brill, 2007),124.

decrees forbidding the practise of οἱ πατρίοι νόμοι and τοῦ θεοῦ νόμοις (6:1). Jewish practices of circumcision, Sabbath observance and abstention from pork are specific targets, since "these three practices were central to Jewish self-definition and their observance was a symbol of their loyalty to the Law."[539] The desecration of the temple and persecution of faithful Jews result (6:1-12) with the martyrs including "the ostensibly weak in society: the women, children and the aged,"[540] like Eleazar (6:18-31). The narrative on the mother and seven sons (7:1-42) who resist Antiochus' decrees, choosing death rather than to eat swine flesh, is analysed below:

1) The Portrayal of Righteous Figures who Suffer Unjustly

The passage intimates the martyrs' "righteousness" through Greek categories: γενναῖος/noble (7:5,11,21),[541] θαυμαστὴ καὶ μνήμης ἀγαθῆς ἀξία/worthy of being remembered well (7:20), καθαρὸς (7:40). The supreme value the family places on divine laws (7:2,9,11,23,30,37) suggests their godliness. Contrastingly, negative associations define the king, including ἀνόσιος/impious (7:34), ἔκθυμος γενόμενος/losing his temper (7:3), ὑπερηφανία/arrogance, (7:36), ὠμὸν τύραννον/cruel tyrant (7:27). His methods of torture, especially περισκυθίζω the Scythian method of scalping (7:4) convey his brutality as "the cruelty of the Scythians was a *topos* in the Hellenistic period."[542] Graphic descriptions of torture (7:4-7) endured by the martyrs, and words like πάσχω (7:18,32), αἰκίζω (7:1) and βάσανος (7:8) reveal the extent of their unjust suffering. Violence resulting in the death of the martyrs' parallels the situation of the righteous Servant of Isaiah 53. The word πόνος (2 Macc 7:36; Isa 53:4) provides a mutual verbal link accentuating the protagonists' pain.

2) The Suffering is Permitted by a Supernatural Being

The brothers impute their suffering to the tyrant king: "you having devised all the Hebrews' troubles" (31) and "since you have authority among men, you do what you want to do" (16). Nonetheless, the martyrs acknowledge that the king's actions come under divine

---

[539] Susan Haber, "Living and Dying for the Law," *Women in Judaism: A Multidisciplinary Journal 4* (2006), n.p. http://wjudaism.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/wjudaism/article/view/247/320 (14 Oct 2011)
[540] ibid., n.p.
[541] Himmelfarb, "Judaism and Hellenism," 34, notes the tranformation of this Greek value, that *gennaios* and derivatives in 2 Macc describe courage in the face of force, whether of torturers or an opposing army.
[542] van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs,* 109.

authority, and that it is ultimately God, the king of the κόσμος (7:9,23) who permits their suffering as a just penalty: "we are suffering these things on our own account, having sinned against our own God" (18-19). Schwartz states, "Antiochus, fulfilling Deut 32:27, did not understand that he was successful against the Jews only because their God was using him to punish them."[543] Antiochus is labelled ἀλάστωρ (avenger 7:9) meaning "the persecutor is in fact God's agent to punish his sinful people."[544] In Isaiah 53 too, God is responsible for the Servant's suffering, as confirmed by the lingustic tie of παιδεία or divine chastisement (2 Macc 7:33; Isa 53:5).

3) <u>The Sufferers do not Protest but Co-operate</u>

While the martyrs distinguish between God who permits their suffering, and the king who inflicts torture, they neither argue nor complain against the divine, but encourage one another to die nobly, confident that "God is watching over us" (6). Contrasting with their respectful silence towards God, the martyrs verbally challenge the king, demonstrating "open rebellion, the martyr's speech."[545] Their verbal weaponry includes use of irony,[546] name calling (ἄνθρωπος μιαρός 7:34), and threats (7:17). Baslez remarks, "each of the seven brothers challenged the king with the worst possible insults."[547]

4) <u>A Free and Voluntary Response</u>

Although the martyrs engage in an oral battle, they offer no physical resistance to their executioners, freely yielding their bodies to torture. The first states, "we are ready to die and not transgress" (7:2) and the last demands,"What are you waiting for?"(7:31). The third son "when his tongue was demanded he immediately stuck it out (ταχέως προέβαλε;7:10). Schwartz notes that sticking-out the tongue was "a martyrological topos."[548] Here too the martyrs' unresisting

---

[543] Schwartz, *2 Macc,* 307.
[544] ibid., 304.
[545] Boyarin, *Dying,* 46.
[546] Tobias Nicklaus, "Irony in 2 Maccabees," in *The Books of the Maccabees* (eds.Géza Xeravits and J.Zsengellér; Leiden: Brill, 2007),101-111, p109.
[547] Baslez ,"Origin," 122.
[548] Schwartz, *2 Macc,* 305.

surrender to violence parallels the Servant's own non-resistance and surrender to his maltreaters.

5)   The Suffering is Framed as a Test of Obedience and Faithfulness

The martyrs "are locked in a sort of combat with their persecutor,"[549] whom they accuse of "hav[ing] undertaken to fight God"(7:19). The martyrs face a test of loyalty between an earthly and divine king, given that "the Lord and the king oppose each other as competing rulers."[550] By choosing to obey divine law, the martyrs display their allegiance to the παντοκράτωρ (7:35,38). Recognising that "his dignity is at stake, [Antiochus] does his utmost to persuade at least the [youngest] not to die,"[551] and appeals to the mother to persuade him. She demonstrates her faithfulnes to God by outmanoeuvring the king, through emotional appeals ("pity me who carried you" 7:27) and a theological argument of creation *ex nihilo* and resurrection (7:28-9).[552] Speaking in their ancestral tongue, she exhibits "cultural patriotism," and embodies the "Jewish mother [who] passes on her love for ancestral language, culture and religion."[553] She succeeds, since the boy declares: "I will not obey the decree of the king, for I listen instead to the decree of the Law" (30). The mother's complicity in her "only" remaining son's death evokes another parent figure, Abraham (Gen 22), who prepares to sacrifice his "only" son, a conceptual resonance explicitly developed later in 4 Macc (14:20).

6)   The Sufferers Receive Reward and Exaltation

The divine recompense expected by the martyrs is resurrection, "an innovative concept in 2 Macc."[554] One states, "The king of the cosmos will "raise us up" (7:9). Another clarifies: "[I am] hoping to receive [these limbs] again from him"(7:11). The mother too affirms belief in resurrection: "[God] will in mercy return you to both spirit and life," (7:23) and "I will receive you back together with your brothers" (7:29). Akedah may underlie this resurrection idea, since, in effect, Abraham receives back his doomed son (cf. Heb.11:19). Shepkaru comments, "the

---

[549] Seeley, *Noble Death,*13, refers to 4 Macc.
[550] van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs,*114
[551] ibid.,114
[552] See Schwartz, *2Macc,* 312
[553] Baslez,"Origin,"124.
[554] Shmuel Shepkaru,"After Death," *AJSR* 24 (1999):1-44,p.3.

martyrs pronounce their conviction of their physical resurrection after death. In contrast to the ephemeral physical torture by the human king, the heavenly King will grant them an eternal reward here and now - corporeal resurrection." The verb ἀνίστημι signifes resurrection (7:9,14) and also the noun ἀνάστασις (7:14). While the martyrs receive recompense, the evil king is denied resurrection (7:14) and "shall in the divine judgment incur the just punishments" (7:36) and the king and his posterity (σπέρμα) will suffer torment (7:16-17). There is an "obvious connection between the actions of the individuals" and their rewards or punishments.[555]

7) The Recompense has Universal Consequences, and Involves the Nations

Martyrdoms in 2 Macc bear national and universal implications, heightened by references to ἔθνος (7:37), γένος (7:16, 7:23) and God of the κόσμος (7:9,7:23). The martyrs defend God and their nation: "do not think that our nation has been abandoned by God" (7:16). They see themselves as fighting for its liberation, "calling upon God that He speedily become merciful to the people" (7:37). Van Henten notes, "the martyrs and Judas' soldiers fight for the same cause" and the martyrdoms have "an impact on political circumstance," ending "in the restoration of the Jewish polity."[556] The martyrdoms hold consequences for the gentiles too. The youngest son prophesies that Antiochus will eventually confess the Jewish God (7:37), which occurs in 2 Macc 9:17 where the Greek king wants to convert ('Ιουδαῖον ἔσεσθαι). This idea that the death of the righteous sufferer bears wider implications, transforming attitudes of others, connects the martyrs with the Isaianic Servant, as reinforced by the verbal link ἔθνος (2 Macc 7:37, Isa 52:15).

8) The Relationship Between Sufferers and Permitter

Familial ties are important in 2 Macc, where the mother and seven brothers "act as a unified collective."[557] In relating to God, the martyrs employ the word δοῦλος (7:6,7:33) connoting a Lord/servant bond, as well as παῖδας (7:34) which suggests both parent/child and master/servant dynamics. Παῖδας intertextually ties with παῖς in Isaiah 53, with the Servant like

---

[555] van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 163.
[556] ibid., 268,153.
[557] ibid., 103.

the martyrs showing deference towards the Lord. Strikingly παῖδας also occurs twice in Gen 22 (vv.3,19) thus further connecting Akedah with the martyr narrative. The conceptual parallel lies in the parent-child relationship where in both, a parent figure (the mother/ Abraham) willingly gives priority to divine commands even at the cost of their children's lives. In 2 Macc the mother bears sole parental responsibility as one of "the mother-martyrs" who "speak to their children in the language of their ancestors as they nurse, rear and educate them in accordance with Jewish tradition."[558]

9) Association with Ideas of Sacrifice and Atonement

2 Macc contains vocabulary and concepts evoking sacrificial atonement. The martyrs identify their sufferings with their nation's sinfulness. The phrase "we are suffering for our own sins"/ἑαυτῶν ἁμαρτίας πάσχομεν (7:32, cf.7:18) "refers not so much to individual sins of the martyrs but to the sins of the people as a whole."[559] Their representative role is emphasised by the martyrs' anonymity, as in a collective union of wills, they encourage each other to sacrifice their lives (7:5). The martyrs view their nation's oppression as a consequence of God's wrath due to its sinfulness: "for the sake of punishment and edification our living Lord briefly became angry" (7:33). This punishment is temporary, and God "will be reconciled with his servants" (7:33). The passive use of καταλλαγήσεται "may suggest that the Lord is not the one who takes the initiative in the reconciliation. Since the temple cult has stopped functioning . . .the narrative strongly suggests that it is the martyrs themselves who bring about the reconciliation."[560] They give up body and soul "calling upon God that he speedily become merciful to the people" and "with me and my brothers, shall be stayed the anger" (37-8). The text links martyrdom and atonement, for shortly after their deaths, Judas successfully launches his attacks, calling upon God to "listen to the blood which is calling out to him" (8:3).[561] Schwartz observes,"martyrdom makes for atonement, and allows for reconciliation and salvation" since "the martyr's blood

---

[558] Haber,"Living and Dying" n.p. 9/14.
[559] van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 137
[560] ibid., 142, notes the rare occure of καταλλάσσω in the LXX, and that in non-Jewish texts, the verb often refers to reconciliation between people.
[561] Himmelfarb,"Judaism," 31: "the connection between Judah's victory and the deaths of the martyrs is clear."

calls out of the ground to God, whose wrath turns into mercy (8:4,5)."[562] The martyrdoms function as a propitiatory vicarious sacrifice which appeases the wrath of God, and establishes reconciliation.[563] Baslez views martyrdom as a form of vicarious atonement "which was first expounded in Isaiah 53," a notion shared by Freyne.[564] The unnamed Servant like the anonymous martyrs plays a representative role, suffering vicariously for others' sins, and effecting atonement. The texts' intertextual link is stressed by verbal resonances (bearing/φέρω (7:20;53:4); sin/ἁμαρτία (7:32;53:4). In both, a variation of διδωμι (προδίδωμι7:37; παραδίδωμι 53:12) combines with (ψυχὴ), to convey the idea of a vicarious atoning death.

5.4.2   IMPLICATIONS

2 Macc manifests the nine motifs of the Akedah Servant complex in its portrayal of the martyrs, drawing on Hellenistic Jewish tradition. The martyrs are portrayed as "noble" godly figures who, in a context of persecution, willingly die rather than disobey ancestral laws. The martyrs suffer torture, which is a consequence of divine wrath against their people's sinfulness. While uncomplaining towards God, the martyrs display antagonism towards the king, predicting divine judgment. The martyrs remain faithful to divine laws, anticipating a bodily resurrection, an innovative concept in 2 Macc. They share close familial ties, united with one another in obeying the will of God, and collectively play a representative role, suffering vicariously for their nation. Their deaths serve as an atoning propitiatory sacrifice, appeasing divine wrath, and effecting reconciliation with God, and the restoration of their nation.

2 Macc is a critical witness to the Akedah Servant complex, being the first Stage I text examined so far that is not framed by the Akedah narrative (cf. *Jubilees, Abr.,* 4Q225). Since the same set of nine motifs appears in 2 Macc, it validates the existence of an Akedah Servant complex even in passages that lack an explicit basis on the primary texts. Nevertheless, 2 Macc reveals the underlying influence of the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 not only by manifesting the nine motifs but also through lexical and semantic resonances with the primary

---

[562] Schwartz, *2 Macc,*272, 65.
[563] Seeley, *Noble Death,* 89 denies a vicarious aspect to the martyrdoms.
[564] Baslez, "Origin" 127; Sean Freyne, "Sacrifice for Sin," *The Furrow* 25 (1974):193-212,p.201.

texts. It shares with Isaiah 53 the following linguistic ties: πλανάω, πόνος, πλάσσω, παιδεία, παῖς, ἔθνος, σπέρμα, φέρω, ἁμαρτία, ψυχή. Thematically too, the Servant and the martyrs face abuse and violent deaths, in compliance with the Lord's will, suffering vicariously and atoning for others' sins.[565] This text also resonates with Genesis 22, sharing a few verbal links (παῖδας, ἔθνος, σπέρμα) and conceptual ties, of a parent figure who is complicit in sacrificing an "only" son and complies with divine commandments. Presumably, 2 Macc came into contact with the Akedah Servant complex in dialogue with primary and/or secondary texts. It remains a compelling witness of the convergence of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 in a context of sacrifice and suffering righteuosness, displaying the soteriological implications of martyrdom.

5.5   WISDOM OF SOLOMON

Σοφία Σαλωμῶνος (*Wis.*)[566] pseudonymously attributed to King Solomon, is another Hellenistic Jewish work, composed in "literary koine,"[567] and classified as an encomium.[568] It also displays features of Jewish sapiential literature (i.e. Solomon as the archetypal sage king)[569] as well as associations with Jewish apocalyptic tradition (i.e. judgement scenes in chs.1-5, divine warrior in 5:17-23).[570] While its composition date is uncertain, most scholars propose the reign of Augustus (30BCE to 14CE) and that it reflects social tensions in an Alexandrian provenance.[571] *Wis.* received "early and widespread Christian use [which] must presuppose

---

[565] Isaiah 53 does not mention the wrath of God, and is expiatory rather than propitiatory (see 4.1.9).
[566] Greek text from Joseph Ziegler, *Sapientia Salomonis*, Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 12/1, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962).
[567] James Reese, *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom* (Rome: Biblical Institute,1970). *Wis.*'s Greek heritage includes: use of rhetoric, cardinal virtues, concepts like σοφια, immortality of the soul, and Middle Platonism. Lester Grabbe, *Wisdom of Solomon* (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1997). David Winston, "A Century of Research on the Book of Wisdom," in *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research* (ed. Angelo Passaro and Giussepe Bellia; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005),1-18.
[568] Michal Stone,"Wisdom of Solomon," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. Michael Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1994), 307.
[569] See Leo Purdue's *Wisdom Literature: A Theological History* (Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 2007). Other sapiential texts include *Proverbs, Quoholeth, Job 28,* and *Ben Sira,*
[570] John Collins, "The Reinterpretation of Apocalyptic Traditions," in *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research* (ed. Angelo Passaro and Giussepe Bellia; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005),145. Shannon Burkes, "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Wisdom of Solomon," *HTR* 9 (2002):21-44.
[571] Grabbe, *Wisdom of Solomon,* 90; Stone, "Wisdom Literature,"312; M. Baslez "The Author of Wisdom and the Cultured Environment of   Alexandria." 33-52 in *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research*. (ed.Angelo Passaro and Giussepe Bellia. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005). However, Winston, *Wisdom of*

considerable prior Jewish circulation and esteem."[572] Structurally, the text has three sections:[573] 1-5 (Book of Eschatology), 6-9 (Book of Wisdom), and 11-19 (Book of History).

5.5.1 THE AKEDAH SERVANT COMPLEX IN WISDOM (1-5)

This chapter focuses on (*Wis*. 1-5) which Nickelsburg sums as "unrighteousness leads to death and destruction" while "righteousness leads to life and immortality."[574] The section may be divided into four verse clusters: (1:1-1:15); (1:16-2:24); (3:1-4:20); (5:1-23).[575] The first addresses rulers of the earth, urging the practice of righteousness/δικαιοσύνη, and contrasts wisdom with error/πλάνη which leads to death (1:12). The next (1:16-2:24) describes the ungodly/ἀσεβής who decide to pursue pleasure, and persecute the righteous. The third (3:1-4:20) contrasts the destinies of the righteous and the ungodly. The righteous may seem punished (3:4) but their immortal reward lies with God. The last set (5:1-23) presents eschatological judgement, where the righteous stand exalted before their former persecutors, who belatedly realise their error.[576] *Wis*. 1-5 will be analysed below in relation to the Akedah Servant complex.

1) The Portrayal of Righteous Persons Who Suffer Unjustly

In *Wis*., righteousness/δικαιοσύνη[577] is a key concept (1:1,1:15,5:18). The text differentiates between those who live righteously/δίκαιος (2:10,12,3:1) and the ungodly. The former display knowledge of God, uphold the law/νόμος (2:12), identify themselves as divine offspring (2:16), keep aloof of the ungodly (2:15), and live in the expectation of final happiness (μακαρίζει ἔσχατα; 2:16). The ungodly choose to "enjoy" (ἀπολαύω) "the good things that exist" (2:6) and oppress (καταδυναστεύω) the virtuous, the widow and aged (2:10). Winston

---

Solomon,n.p.,"Wisdom of Solomon," n.p., *ABD on CD-ROM*. Version 2.1; 1997 suggests the reign of Gaius "Caligula" (37–41 CE) given the riots and pogrom (38 CE) against the Jewish community.

[572] William Horbury, "The Christian use and the Jewish origins of the Wisdom of Solomon" in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridg UP, 1995,182-196),184. However, controversially, Davila, *Provenance,* 225, questions its Jewish origin.

[573] Grabbe, *Wisdom*,18.

[574] G. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortallity and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1972), 48.

[575] Grabbe, *Wisdom*, 19.

[576] Purdue, *Wisdom,* 303-304 notes the traditional apocalyptic themes like the origins of evil, eschatological judgment, punishment of the wicked and immortalty of the righteous, divine revelation and a new creation."

[577] ibid.,297: "the literary structure and content of this initial part are shaped in part by the word "righteousness" occurring in the first (v.1) and last lines (v.15).

observes, "the author is simply not concerned with wicked acts as such, but with the irrationality in which they are rooted.[578] The oppressors' attitudes are shaped by their disbelief: "we were born by mere chance" (αὐτοσχεδίως) and "hereafter we shall be as though we had never been" (2:2). The righteous are a source of reproof (ἔλεγχος) to the impious, who unjustly inflict physical harm and death (2:19-20) as connoted by βάσανος which provides a verbal link to martyrdom texts (2 Macc 7:8, 4 Macc 9:5). The extent of the righteous' suffering like torture, mockery (4:18) and premature death (3:13-4:16) resonates with the Isaianic Servant who too is described as δίκαιος (Isa 53:11) with both texts employing πόνος (Isa 53:11, Wis 5:1) to convey the sufferer's pain.

2) The Suffering is Instigated/Permitted by a Supernatural Being:

Three agents seem responsible for the righteous' sufferings. The ungodly have a direct instigative role as evident from the phrase, "let us condemn him to a shameful death" (2:20). God too appears to be implicated, as intimated by the simile "like gold in the furnace he tried them," (3:6) with the furnace signifying a place of oppression (cf. 1 Kings 8:51 in which the same word χωνευτήριον refers to slavery in Egypt) where God allows the righteous to endure trials to prove their worth. A third agent is the devil. *Wis.* asserts that God did not create death and does not delight in it (1:13) and blames the devil/διάβολος that through the devil's envy, death enters the world (2:24). Given that the ungodly are in partnership with death (1:16), one may assume the devil's indirect but implicit role in the righteous' suffering.

3) The Sufferers do not Protest but Cooperate

The righteous lack direct speech in this section, and unlike the ungodly, their inner thoughts are not given voice. Despite this absence, the text indicates (through the perspectives of the ungodly) that the righteous engage in a defence of God and the law (2:12-13). Verbs like ἐναντιόομαι/oppose, ἐπιφημίζω/accuse and ὀνειδίζω/reproach, from within the "semantic field

---

[578] Winston, "Century of Research," 8

of derison and shame,"[579] connote the vigorousness of the righteous' criticism of the ungodly, and also the scorn of the ungodly. While the righteous oppose the ungodly and persevere in theodicy, they neither question nor protest to God about their sufferings. This uncomplaining silence towards the divine in the midst of suffering links them to the martyrs and the Servant.

4)   A Free and Voluntary Response by the Sufferers

The righteous actively reject the reasoning and lifestyle of the ungodly who complain that the righteous' "manner of life is unlike others" and "[they] avoid our ways as unclean" (2:16). Manfredi remarks, "the derison directed towards the typical figure of the just man speaks also of contempt towards the God whom he serves."[580] The righteous willingly choose to practise divine precepts, and live a life "pleasing to God" (4:10,14). Phrases like οἱ πιστοὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ (3:9) and "there were some who pleased God and were loved by him" (4:10) convey the union of wills between the righteous and God, based on a free choice of faithful love.

5)   Suffering is Framed as a Test of Obedience and Faithfulness

Various forms of πειράζω recur in this section (1:2, 2:17,2:24,3:5) with the suffering of the righteous portrayed in terms of a test. They are tested by the ungodly who inflict them with torture and death saying "let us test what will happen at the end of his life" (πειράσωμεν; 2:17). This persecution "becomes not only a way of trying the patience and gentleness of the man who places his whole trust in God and in his law, but also puts God himself, his existence and the truthfulness of his particular revelation in that law by which the just man lives, to the test."[581] However, apart from the ungodly, God too puts the righteous to the test: "God tested them and found them worthy of himself" (ἐπείρασεν 3:5). This notion of God testing a righteous being evokes the situation of Abraham in Genesis 22, with shared verbal links of πειράζω (Gen 22:1) and φείδομαι (Wis 2:10;Gen 22:16) evoking their intertextuality.

---

[579] S.Manfredi, "The Trial of the Righteous in Wis 5:1-14(1-7) and in the Prophetic Traditions"   in *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research* (ed. Angelo Passaro and Giussepe Bellia. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 159-178, p.167.
[580] Manfredi, "Trial," 161.
[581] ibid., 161.

6) <u>The Sufferer Receives Reward and Exaltation at the End of the Ordeal</u>

Despite their apparent failure, where "in the eyes of the foolish they seemed to have died, and their departure was thought to be a disaster," (3:2) the text affirms that the "souls of the righteous are in the hands of God" (3:1) and they receive recompense in the after-life. Nickelsburg comments, "this story posits a post-mortem judgment as an answer to the persecution of the righteous," and that the "[righteous'] former conduct is vindicated and his claims are authenticated."[582] As reward, the righteous receive exalted status (see below) as well as peace/εἰρήν (Wis 3:3). Manfredi observes, "to the life and suffering of the just, the perfect divine recompense is life after death, in the presence of God, in peace and love."[583] εἰρήν also resonates with Isa 53:5, connoting a link between the Servant and the righteous, as does συνίημι (Isa LXX 52:15, Wis 3:9) where in both texts the righteous figures arrive at a new understanding after their ordeals. In contrast, the ungodly receives punishment, as depicted with apocalyptic imagery (5:17-23).[584]

7) <u>The Recompense Bears Universal Consequences and Involves The Nations</u>

The reward of the righteous involves that "they will govern nations and rule over peoples, and the Lord will reign over them forever" (3:8). This mention of the nations or ἔθνη may be a reference to the ungodly who are depicted in ch. 5 as having to face "the righteous [who] will stand with great confidence in the presence of those who have oppressed them" (5:1). Manfredi remarks, "in the truth of the judgment that is carried out, [the ungodly] themselves will reckon the folly of their sinful actions and above all of their fury in their relations with the just man. They will recognise the truth of the hope of the persecuted just man and they will see the reward that he has received from his God and defender."[585] This exaltation of the righteous to the amazement of others/nations connects with the Servant's own situation in Isa 52:14-5, as supported by the verbal link ἐξίστημι (Isa 52:14, Wis 5:2).

---

[582] Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life,* 48.
[583] Manfredi, "Trial of the Righhteous,"176.
[584] Purdue, *Wisdom,* 303.
[585] Manfredi, "Trial of the Righhteous,"161.

8)   <u>Relationships Between the Sufferer and Permitter is Defined in Familial Terms</u>

Ch.2 describes the relationship between God and the righteous in familial terms designating God as father, and the righteous as son.[586] Verse 2:13 employs the phrase παῖδα κυρίου that "[he] calls himself a son of the Lord," while in 2:16, the righteous are said to boast that God is his father (πατέρα θεόν), and in 2:18, the ungodly refer to the righteous as υἱὸς θεοῦ. Although different Greek words (παῖς and υἱὸς) are used to connote divine sonship,[587] both terms connote a close filial bond. These word choices resonate with Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. Suggs notes "Wisdom's dependence upon Isaiah for his παῖς figure" and that "Wisdom's treatment of the suffering and vindication of the 'child of God' shows itself on close examination to be a homily based chiefly on Isa 52,13-53."[588] Gen 22 may possibly underlie *Wis.*'s notion of divine sonship, given its multiple references like παισίν (Gen 22:5), παῖδας (Gen 22:3,19), παιδάριον (Gen 22:5,12), as well as υἱός (22:2) and τέκνον (22:7). This fluidity of terms might have influenced the author of *Wis.* who also uses different lexemes υἱός (2:18) and παῖς (2:13) in referring to the righteous to indicate divine sonship.

9)   <u>Association with Ideas of Sacrifice and Atonement</u>

Wis. seems to lack overt references to sacrifice and atonement, but Bellia notes priestly vocabulary like "the description of the just welcomed as a sacrifice of holocaust (ὁλοκάρπωμα) by God (3:6) of the monstrous sacrifices carried out by the pagans (12:4,14:15,23) and the ritual memory of the paschal liturgy (18:9). Finally, it extols the fate reserved for the faithful eunuch in the temple of the Lord (3:14) and records the task entrusted to Solomon to construct an imitation of the holy tent (9:8)."[589] In chs.1-5, the key image of cultic atoning sacrifice is

---

[586] Ch 5:5 also refers to υἱοις θεοῦ.

[587] By divine sonship here one means the idea of a human being, having a special filial relationship with God by virtue of their righteousness, and does not imply the person's divine origin or nature. The appellation "son of God" occurs in ancient Jewish texts (2 Sam 7:14, Ps 2, Ps 89:26-27, DSS 4Q246, 1QM) with variable meanings: Davidic/messianic king, an angelic being, or a godly person (see ch.6).

[588] Jack Suggs, "Wisdom of Solomon 2:10-5,"*JBL* 76 (1957): 26-33.p.29.

[589] Giuseppe Bellia, "Historical and Anthropological Reading," in *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research* (ed. Angelo Passaro and Giussepe Bellia; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005): 83-115,p. 92-93.

ὁλοκάρπωμα θυσία that "like a sacrificial burnt offering he accepted them" (3:6).[590] One wonders on whose behalf the righteous are acceptable to the Lord as a sacrificial offering (in Lev16:24, the high priest offers ὁλοκάρπωμα to "make atonement for himself and for the people"). However, in *Wis.*, the righteous do not suffer vicariously for the ungodly, and "there is no mention of any close connection of solidarity between the just man and his adversaries, and obviously none of an assumption of their guilt leading to their justification."[591] Neither do the righteous claim to represent their own people/nation like the martyrs. Rather, ὁλοκάρπωμα suggests an analogy, that the suffering of the righteous is effective like a sacrificial offering in bringing forth a response from God, who ensures the "unexpected salvation of the righteous" or σωτηρία (5:2), as in the direct divine intervention in *Abr.*

5.5.2 IMPLICATIONS

One observes the nine motifs comprising the Akedah Servant complex in *Wis.* chs.1-5. The righteous endure unjust persecution by the ungodly, resulting in death. The ungodly seem to instigate the oppression in collusion with the devil. God too subjects the righteous to testing, and they freely choose to follow divine precepts, rejecting the ways of the ungodly. *Wis.* also introduces the notion of divine sonship, with the righteous defining their relationship to God in filial terms of father and son. Another distinct concept is immortality, where the righteous are exalted and experience peace in the after-life, while the ungodly face eschatological judgement, framed by apocalyptic imagery. Further, the righteous are linked to the cultic sacrifice of ὁλοκάρπωμα θυσία (3:6), although they do not suffer vicariously for others, but receive salvation through God.

The presence of the Akedah Servant complex is buttressed by *Wis.*'s intertextuality with the primary texts. Scholars recognise resonances with Isaiah 53,"[592] as Nickelsburg observes:

---

[590] ὁλοκαύτωμα is the common term for burnt offerings in Levitical sacrificial texts (Lev 3:5,4:24,4:29). Nonetheless, ὁλοκάρπωμα occurs twice (Lev16:24) in reference to an expiatory burnt offering on the Day of Atonement.
[591] Manfredi, "Trial," 176; Suggs, "Wisdom," 31.
[592] Suggs, "Wisdom," 2:10-5," 29, idenitifies the following parallels: Wis 2:13 and Isa 52:13; Wis 2:14 and Isa 53:2; Wis 2:16 and Isa 53:2; Wis 2:19-20 and Isa 53:7-9; Wis 3:2-3 and Isa 53:4;Wis 3:6 and Isa 53:7-10; Wis 4:19 and Isa 52:15; Wis 5:2 and Isa 52:14; Wis 5:3-4 and Isa 53:3,10; Wis 5:6 and Isa 53:6.

"in Wis 2,4-5, the materials in Isa 52-53 are reshaped to conform more closely to the form of the wisdom tale."[593] Thematic parallels with the Servant include violence and untimely death, apparent failure and disgrace, and ultimate reward of the righteous to the persecutors' amazement. Among extensive verbal correspondences are παῖς, παιδεία, ἁμαρτία, εἰρήν, πλανάω, ἔθνος, συνίημι, ῥίζα, δίδωμι, σπέρμα, πόνος, ἐξίστημι, βραχίων, φέρω, and πληγή. Similarly, *Wis.* bears connections with Gen 22 like the notion of divine testing, and of a righteous father's willingness to sacrifice his son as a burnt offering (cf. Wis 3:6). Moreover, Wis 10:5 clearly alludes to the Akedah, confirming its importance for *Wis.* The two texts also share the following linguistic resonances: πειράζω, υἱός, πατήρ, τέκνον, ἀναστρέφω, φείδομαι, ἔθνος, and σπέρμα. Undoubtedly, *Wis.* reveals significant semantic and lexical links with Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53, which may result from direct dialogue with primary texts or secondary texts within a Jewish Hellenistic milieu, like 2 Macc and *Abr.* As in the case of 2 Macc, *Wis.* serves to prove that the same set of nine motifs appears in passages which are not explicitly framed by Akedah or directly based on the primary texts (i.e. *Jubilees*). *Wis.* affirms the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 in a context of suffering (persecution) and sacrifice, and remains another important witness to the Akedah Servant complex.

5.6   CONCLUSION

This chapter has examined passages from five stage I or pre-Christian (pre-70CE) ancient Jewish texts, *Jubilees,* 4Q225*, De Abrahamo*, 2 Maccabees and *Wisdom of Solomon*, to ascertain the presence of the Akedah Servant complex, and to investigate the early reception of this tradition. The nine features of the complex have been identified in the selections. One finds slight variations in the manifestation of the motifs, given each work's distinctive theological, literary, cultural and historical background. In *Jubilees,* 4Q225 and *Abr.*, the righteous figure (Abraham) suffers emotionally, whereas in 2 Macc and *Wis.*, the martyrs and the righteous

---

[593] Nickelsburg, *Resurrection,* 66 identifies four correspondences: exaltation (Isa 52:13;Wis 5:1a); comment on former state of servant and righteous (Isa 52:14; Wis 5:1bc); reaction of nations and kings/ persecutors (Isa 52:15;Wis 5:2); their confession (Isa 53:1-6;Wis 5:3-8).

endure physical violence. Regarding the instigation of suffering, *Jubilees* and *4Q225* deflect blame onto Mastema, while *Abr.* upholds God's responsibility. In *Wis.*, three agents (the ungodly, the devil, as well as God) are implicated in the righteous' suffering. In 2 Macc the martyrs distinguish between God (who permits suffering in just wrath for their nation's sins) and the tyrant king who subjects their bodies to torture. They maintain a reverential silence towards the former, but utter defiant speeeches against the king. In *Wis.* too, the righteous are silent towards God, but reproach the ungodly. In *Jubilees,* 4Q225 and *Abr.*, the protagonist complies unprotestingly with God's command.

Further, in *Jubilees* and *Abr.*, Abraham acts voluntarily, while 4Q225 seems to express Isaac's willingness to be sacrificed, which bears affinity to (and was possibly influenced by) the Maccabean martyrs' readiness to die. In *Wis.* too the righteous face persecution without resistance, while persevering in obeying divine precepts. The idea of a test underlies the five passages although only *Jubilees* and *Wis.* state so explicitly. In all, however, the protagonist has to choose between allegiance to God or serving his own self-interests (i.e. Abraham safeguarding the life of his son, the martyr preserving his life by obeying the king, or the righteous colluding with the ungodly). They all choose to obey God at (potential) loss to themselves. The sufferer's recompense involves blessings and promises to Abraham's descendants and the nations, and cosmic exaltation of Abraham in *Jubilees*. 4Q225 too elevates Abraham's action as having cosmic import, and he is the cynosure of a celestial audience. *Abr.* upholds Abraham as an exemplar of piety to his detractors (non-Jews and Jews presumably) which may be interpreted as actualising the promise of Abraham's being a future blessing (cf. Gen 22:17-8). In *Wis.*, the righteous receive immortality and rewards after death, including being appointed as judges, while 2 Macc presents resurrection as the martyrs' reward. In terms of relationships, family dynamics are important, with *Jubilees,* 4Q225, *Abr.*, and *Wis.* mentioning "love." In 2 Macc the word "love" does not occur, but is implied in highlighting a "martyr-mother" who urges her sons to sacrifice their lives in faithfulness to God. *Wis.* is unique in introducing the idea of divine sonship, defining the relationship between God and the righteous in filial terms, as a father and son. Noteworthily, all Stage I texts which refer to the

Akedah (*Jubilees,* 4Q225, *Abr.*, and Wis 10:5) give prominence to Abraham rather than to Isaac.[594]

A significant feature is the texts' associations with sacrifice and atonement, which reflect three dimensions. Firstly, the selected passages display images and motifs related to the cultic complex: (in *Jubilees*) the ram sacrifice, altar, passover/lamb's blood, Mt. Zion; (in 4Q225) עלה, הר מוריה and מזבח and a priestly genealogy; in *Abr.*, the image of a priestly Abraham carrying out a sacrificial rite, Tamid (burnt) offering, a scapegoat image of a creature bearing a load; 2 Macc contains no Jewish cultic images[595] perhaps given the desecration of the temple under Antiochus but it alludes to the martyrs' blood (8:3-4); in *Wis.*, one finds a reference to ὁλοκάρπωμα/burnt offering.

Secondly, the selected passages contain the concept of "union of wills." It means that the sufferer is fully devoted to doing the will of God (or if a group, the members are in unity with each other and God). Consequently, the sufferer offers the sacrifice or participates in it with a pure intention, which makes for authentic sacrifice. In *Jubilees*, Abraham's commitment to doing God's will is implied (17:18), just as the text hints at a union of wills between Abraham and Isaac ("the two of them went together"[18:15] as in Genesis 22). 4Q225's reconstructed phrase "tie me well," explicitly conveys the union of wills between Abraham and Isaac in doing God's command, fully committed to the sacrifice. *Abr.* too expresses the union of wills between Abraham and Isaac ("they walked with equal speed of mind"172). Further, it stresses Abraham's purity of intention which makes his action of offering "complete and perfect" (177). In 2 Macc a collective union of wills exists between the martyrs who encourage each other to die faithful to God by keeping the divine law, and offer their lives with purity ([καθαρὸς 7:40]). *Wis.* too expresses the union of wills between God and the righteous, as the latter chooses to please God, and receive divine love in return (4:10).

---

[594]Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac*, 15, affirms "the primacy of Abraham's role in the Akedah in Jewish texts before the 1st Century AD."

[595] It refers to pagan sacrifice (σπλαγχνισμός, 7:42).

The third element is the idea of vicarious suffering and sacrifice, resulting in atonement. In *Jubilees*, the ram dies "instead of" Isaac, which results in blessings for Abraham's lineage. Further, the reference to Mt Zion, also connotes expiatory sacrifice and atonement related to the temple complex. Moreover, the idea of salvation emerges in *Jubilees'* association of Akedah with Passover, linking Israel's first born being "saved/delivered" by the paschal's lamb's blood to Isaac being delivered by the ram's sacrifice. In both 4Q225 and *Abr.,* the motiff of ram sacrifice is absent, but they contain notions of vicarious atoning sacrifice. In 4Q225, its priestly genealogy connotes the foundation of Levitical priesthood and the cultic complex. *Abr.* alludes to the expiatory Tamid offering, as well as explicitly referring to salvation in terms of God as the saviour whose direct intervention saves Isaac. 2 Macc explicitly presents the idea of vicarious suffering by the martyrs who represent their sinful nation, and suffer for its collective sin, and effect a propitiatory sacrifice through the martyrs' blood which serves to appease the wrath of God, and ushers reconciliation. Clearly, the saving efficacy of the blood motif is crucial in both 2 Macc and *Jubilees*. *Wis.* does not mention vicarious suffering, although the reference to ὁλοκάρπωμα forges a link with expiatory sacrifice, but the righteous' salvation, like in *Abr.*, comes from God (5:2).

Finally, the presence of the Akedah Servant complex is evident in several stage I texts. The complex is found in passages which are explicitly based on Akedah like *Jubilees,* 4Q225 and *Abr.* Despite their origins in Genesis 22, one may still validly speak of the Akedah Servant complex (inclusive of Isaiah 53) in relation to these Akedah passages, given the intertextual model applied in this thesis (ch.1.4) where the primary texts suggest each other. Although the content appears to explicitly concern only Genesis 22, the complex is still operative. More compellingly, the same set of nine features appear in passages in *Wis.* and 2 Maccabees which are not directly derivative from Genesis 22. These texts serve to independently verify the convergence of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 in contexts of suffering righteousness and sacrifice like martyrdom or persecution. Further, their extensive verbal and conceptual resonances with the primary texts affirm that it is the Akedah Servant complex (and not another source) which is responsible for the presence of the nine motifs.

The above observations confirm the wide applicability of the Akedah Servant complex in Stage I texts, diverse in content, genre and background. According to this thesis' intertextual model, one maintains that the selected texts received the Akedah Servant complex, either by directly engaging with the biblical passages (i.e. *Jubilees* with Genesis 22) or in conversation with related secondary texts (possibly, 4Q225 in dialogue with *Jubilees* and Job, or *Wis.* with Isaiah 53). Either method or both is plausible, considering that the five selected passages demonstrate receptivity to various Jewish, Hellenistic and biblical traditions. As it finds expression in these texts, the Akedah Servant complex appears strongly affiliated with soteriological elements (passover, lamb's blood, ram, Tamid, cultic sacrifice, etc). The five selected passages provide clear proof of the existence of the Akedah Servant complex in Stage I texts, and reveal the early phase of an atonement tradition linking Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 in pre-70CE Jewish texts.

CHAPTER SIX

THE AKEDAH SERVANT COMPLEX IN STAGE II TEXTS

Having confirmed the presence of the Akedah Servant complex in selected pre-Christian Jewish (Stage I) texts, this chapter will examine the possible reception of this tradition in New Testament writings (Stage II). Three verses (John 3:16, Rom 8:32, and Heb 9:28) will be analysed to determine whether, and if so how, the convergence of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 may have shaped these texts. The verses have been selected on the basis of diversity (a Gospel, Pauline epistle, and non-Pauline epistle) as well as their apparent intertextual links to the primary texts, suggesting the likely influence of the Akedah Servant complex. Although NT texts like Heb 11:17 and Jas 2:21 may seem better choices, given their direct references to Akedah, nonetheless, their very indebtedness to Genesis 22 in the context of illustrating notions of faith, limits their usefulness.[596] In contrast, the selected verses suggest the combined presence of both primary texts, and reveal a strong soteriological tendency.[597] One does not expect to find all nine motifs of the complex within the scope of a single verse. Rather, these verses (while containing key motifs) provide a base from which to investigate the presence of the Akedah Servant complex in the overall text, and trace an atonement tradition. John 3:16, Rom 8:32, and Heb 9:28 will be examined within its larger context, with attention to relevant intra/inter-textual connections.

6.1   THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN

The Fourth Gospel's uniqueness has long been noted. Clement of Alexandria referred to it as "the spiritual Gospel," while Irenaeus advocated its inclusion into the four-fold canon.[598]

---

[596] While Heb 11:17 and Jas 2:21 refer to Gen 22 and employ sacrificial terminology (ἀναφέρω and προσφέρω), they primarily concern faith issues, and lack soteriological implications. One does not observe the complex at work here.

[597] For background on early Christian notions of sacrifice, see Robert Daly, *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice* (London: Fortress,1978).

[598] Moody Smith, *John Among the Gospels* (South Carolina:University of South Carolina, 2001), 7.

"The Johannine question"[599] has stirred debate, concerning its origins,[600] authorship, its relation to the Synoptics,[601] and to Johannine literature.[602] Dated between 90-100CE, [603] it was probably composed at Ephesus,[604] and may be divided into four parts: prologue (1:1-18); book of signs, concerning Jesus' public ministry (1:19-12:50); book of glory, including his crucifixion and resurrection (13:1-20:31); epilogue (21:1-25).[605] John's sources and compositional process has raised critical discussion,[606] including on Hermetic and Wisdom literature, Philo, Platonic tradition, and Gnosticism.[607] Its Jewish background has received recent emphasis such as its Jewish Hellenistic features,[608] affinities to DSS,[609] and the need for sensitivity to polemical language to avoid "dangerous consequences."[610] John's theological themes include ecclesiology, pneumatology, sacramentalism, revelation, salvation, Christology.[611] Intertextually, John displays familiarity with Isaiah, containing four quotations[612] including to Isa 53:1 (cf. 12:38). Brown remarks on John's use of Akedah (cf. 3:16) and "the possibility of more Isaac typology" in John19:17.[613] Such observations support the validity of this investigation.

---

[599] Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to John* (New York: Herder & Herder,1968), 11.
[600] R. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist,1979); for a Jewish perspective, see Adele Reinhartz, "John and Judaism," in *Life in Abundance* (MN: Liturgical, 2005), 108-116.
[601] For debate on John's dependence/independence on Synoptics, see M. Smith, *John Among the Gospels*.
[602] Johannine Literature comprises the Gospel, three Letters of John, and *Revelation*. The latter is considered to be the work of a different author than of the Gospel and Epistles. See Francis Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (SP 4; MN: Liturgical,1998),1.
[603] Pheme Perkins,"The Gospel of John," in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (London: Chapman, 1990), 942-985, p.949: The earliest papyrus is P^{52} (*ca* 130AD).
[604] Raymond Brown, *The Gospel According to John (i-xii)*, AB 29 (London: Geoffrey Chapman,1971), lxxxvi,ciii; Moloney, *Gospel*, 6.
[605] Brown, *Gospel*, cxxxviii
[606] Brown, *Gospel,* xxiv-xxxix); R.Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G.R. Beasley-Murray; Oxford: Basil Blackwell,1971).
[607] C.H.Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: University,1968); Thomas Rasimus, "Introduction," in *Legacy of John* (ed. T Rasimus; Brill: Leiden, 2010):1-16.
[608] Peder Borgen,"The Gospel of John and Hellenism," in *Exploring the Gospel of John* (eds. Alan Culpepper and C. Black; Kentucky:Westminster John Knox, 1996),98-123.
[609] Joseph Fitzmyer,"Qumran Literature and the Johannine Writings," in *Life in Abundance* (ed. John Donahue; MN: Liturgical, 2005), 117-133.
[610] Moloney, *Gospel,* 8.
[611] see Brown, *Gospel*, cv-cxxi.
[612] John 1:23=Isa 40:3; John 6:45=Isa 54:13; John 12:38=Isa 53:1; John 12:40=Isa 6:10.
[613] Brown, *Gospel*, 147.

6.1.1   JOHN 3:16 AND THE AKEDAH SERVANT COMPLEX

John 3:16 occurs within the pericope (3:1-21) of the first Johannine discourse, between Jesus and Nicodemus, a Pharisee/ἄρχων των Ἰουδαίων. The discourse is punctuated by three utterances of Nicodemus (2,4,9) to which Jesus gives progressively lengthy responses. Nicodemus is "both individual and representative, a foil and a character."[614] The initial verses (3-8) stress the necesity of being born from above, of water and the spirit, to enter God's kingdom (3:4) with possible baptismal connotations.[615] Nicodemus' further query (3:9) leads Jesus to reveal his identity and mission (3: 13-21). He is the "Son of Man" the only one who has been in heaven and come down (3:13) implying pre-existence. He is to be "lifted up," like the serpent in the desert (3:14-15) referring to his crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension.[616] In 3:16, "the kerygmatic discourse sums up the whole Christian message of redemption."[617]

Regarding intertextuality in John 3:16,[618] Barrett observes a possible "allusion to Gen 22:16,"[619] while MacGregor affirms "a reference to Gen 22:2," as does Brown: "many scholars (Westcott, Bernard, Barrett, Glasson) think [Gen 22:2,12] lies behind 'God *loved* the world so much that He gave the *only* Son.'"[620] Stibbe too sees "intertextual echoes with the story of Abraham and Isaac in Gen 22:1-19."[621] Isa 52:13 has been linked by Keener to John 3:14, given verbal ties (ὑψόω, δοξάζω)[622] which heighten its relevance for this pericope. John 3:16 will be analysed below within the context of the Gospel, in relation to the Akedah Servant complex.

---

[614] Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress,1983).

[615] John McHugh, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1-4* (London:T&T Clark International), 227.

[616] Brown, *Gospel,* 145.

[617] Schnackenburg, *Gospel,* 398.

[618] Johannes Beutler,sj, "The Use of 'Scripture' in the Gospel of John," in *Exploring the Gospel of John* (eds. Alan Culpepper and C. Black; Kentucky: Westminster John Knox,1996),147-159.

[619] Barret, *Gospel,* 180

[620] G. MacGregor, *The Gospel of John* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928),81. Brown, *The Gospel,* 147.

[621] Mark W. G. Stibbe, *John* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 58.

[622] Craig Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Mass: Hendrickson ,2003), 566.

1) The Portrayal of a Righteous Person who Suffers Unjustly

In John 3:16 (unlike in vv.13-15) the "role of God the father now becomes prominent."[623] The phrase, God "gave his only Son" may be interpreted as God "giving up" Jesus to death (cf. Gal 1:4,2:2; Rom 8:32).[624] Stibbe comments, "since the previous verses (14-15) have been about the 'lifting up' of the Son of Man on the cross, the supreme divine act of love referred to in 3:16 must be the death of Jesus."[625] While Jesus is the righteous person who suffers an unjust death, one may also highlight God's role as a suffering protagonist who gives [i.e.δίδωμι] his only son. The notion that a father suffers greatly in "giving" his only son appears in early Akedah tradition, like Philo's *Abr.*: "For a father to surrender one of a numerous family as a tithe to God is nothing extraordinary" but "one who gives [i.e. δίδωμι] his only darling son performs an action for which no language is adequate" (196). John seems to invert this convention (of a human father offering his son to God) by presenting God as giving his only Son for the sake of humans. Scholars agree on an allusion to Gen 22:2 in the Johannine use of μονογενής (which corresponds to the Hebrew יחיד cf. Gen 22:2) which "came to connote 'beloved' as much as 'only'" child in Jewish tradition.[626] Keener notes, "in John as in the oft-told Akedah this emphasis on being the only one of his kind increases the pathos of sacrifice."[627] Both God and Jesus may be identified then as suffering righteous figures.

2) The Suffering is Instigated by a Supernatural Being

Paradoxically, God seems to instigate his own suffering by "giving" his only Son, without any external compulsion. The active verb ἔδωκεν stresses God's direct involvement in the giving of the Son. However, the Gospel also mentions the "Ruler of the world" (cf. 12:31,14:30) though he seems to lack any instigative power over God unlike Mastema. It may be that the text wants to preserve a distinction between God who freely gives the Son to effect a salvific purpose, and the evil which inflicts suffering and death (like the devil in Wis 2:24). The

---

[623] Brown, *Gospel,*147
[624] See Perkins,"Gospel,"956.
[625] Stibbe, *John,* 57.
[626] Keener, *Gospel,* 412-416; see McHugh, *John,* 97-103, 239; Barrett, *Gospel,* 180.
[627] ibid., *Gospel,*416.

152

text justifies God by providing an inner motive and reason for his action. In verse 3:16, love is the motivation behind God's "giving" the Son, for the purpose of making eternal life accessible to all. Keener comments, "God demonstrates his love for humanity by self-sacrifice."[628]

3) The Sufferer Does Not Protest but Co-operates

By depicting God and the Son as participating in one salvific action, John 3:16 suggests the accord between them. This unity is evident throughout the Gospel, as Jesus affirms, the "Father and I are one" (10:30,38). Bruce remarks, "the relationship which the Father and Son eternally bear to each other is declared to be a coinherence or mutual indwelling of love. Jesus is in the Father; the Father is in him."[629] Meyer notes, "behind Jesus' life and activity lie the Father's will (6:40), the Father's life (6:57), the Father's acting (14:10), the Father's word (14:24) and the Father's love (15:10)."[630] This unity suggests their complete cooperation in accomplishing the salvific goal, regardless of the consequences of suffering implicit in John 3:16. Meyer comments, "the unity of Father and Son is continually set before the reader as a total coalescence of the two in the actual activity of giving life to the world."[631] This unity resonates with Akedah where father and son "walk on together" (22:6,8).

4) A Free and Voluntary Response

John 3:16 presents God's "giving" of the Son as a free, voluntary act, rooted in his love for the world. Keener remarks on the gift dimension of "giving" (δίδωμι) in the gospel, and that [cf. 3:16] "God gives the gift of his Son to the world."[632] McHugh too stresses, "God was not *handing over his Son* to suffering but rather *giving him* as a gift to the world."[633] From the Son's perspective, one wonders whether his "being given" is a voluntary choice, and if the Son's free will can co-exist with his dependence on the Father. Thompson observes, "Jesus repeatedly asserts that he does only what the Father tells him to do" and "because the Son depends upon

---

[628] Keener, *Gospel,* 567.
[629] F.F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John* (UK: Pickering & Inglis,1983),14.
[630] Paul W. Meyer, "'The Father': The Presentation of God in the Fourth Gospel,"in *Exploring the Gospel of John* (ed. Alan Culpepper and C. Black; Kentucky:Westminster John Knox, 1996):255-273, p.260.
[631] ibid.,260.
[632] Keener, *The Gospel*, 567.
[633] McHugh, *John 1-4,* 239.

the Father for all he does, he does not engage in an independent or separate work, but carries out the work of the one God."[634] Even the language of being "sent" (cf .3:17) accentuates Jesus' dependence on the Father, "the source from which Jesus has come into the world, and the goal to which he is going."[635] Does such dependence imply Jesus' will is subordinated to the Father, or does he choose to act freely? Thompson comments, "Jesus receives and carries out the Father's commandments" yet "this does not imply that the Johannine Jesus has no will, rather that it is fully in harmony with that of the Father."[636] Similarly, Meyer remarks that Jesus acted on his "own initiative and authority which is grounded in the relationship of mutual knowledge and love between Jesus and his Father" (10:15,17). Jesus' explicit utterance in John 10:18 ("I lay it down of my own free will") confirms his voluntariness, like the Isaianic Servant who chooses to comply with the divine will.

5) The Suffering is Framed as a Demonstration/Test of Faithfulness

The divine act of "giving" the Son serves as a demonstration of God's faithful love, as well as a test of faith for believers. In 3:16, ἀγαπάω expresses God's love, revealing Johannine preference for "the use of verbs [instead of the noun *agapē*] for the concept of love," and, in particular, *agapan* to *philein*.[637] Divine love is qualified by the adverb οὕτως which stresses "the quality and depth of God's love [i.e. God loved the world so dearly]."[638] For Keener, John's language is qualitative rather than quantitative, with οὕτως meaning "'this is *how* God loved the world,' [with] the cross as the ultimate expression of his love."[639] One prefers to interpret οὕτως as denoting both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the "world-embracing love of God," which is "limitless, but it can only be appropriated by faith."[640] Regarding "faith," the Gospel again employs a verb (πιστεύω), suggesting that the "evangelist is not thinking of faith as an

---

[634] Thompson, *The God of the Gospel of John* (Cambridge:Eerdmans, 2001),53.
[635] Meyer, "The Father," 265.
[636] Thompson, *God,* 95.
[637] Brown, *Gospel* 497. Though some scholars distinguish between them, Brown considers *agapan* and *philein* to be interchangable, lacking any meaningful difference.
[638] McHugh, *John,* 239
[639] Keener, *Gospel*, 566. Also Robert Gundry and Russell Howell,"The Sense and Syntax of John 3:14-17," in *NovT* 41 (1999):24-39, p.25.
[640] MacGregor,*Gospel*, 81.

internal disposition, but as an active commitment."[641] John tends to use the unusual form *pisteuein eis* (i.e. "believe into" 3:16) which conveys "belief in(to) a person," and serves to express "true, salvific faith," that involves "an acceptance of Jesus and of what he claims to be and a dedication of one's life to him."[642] Acceptance or rejection of the Son then becomes the test of faith for each human being, as implicit in John 3:16.

6) The Sufferer Receives Reward and Exaltation

In 3:16, the suffering of God and the Son benefits the believers who gain access to eternal life (ζωὴ αἰώνιος).[643] In John, eternal life "is the life by which God Himself lives, and which the Son of God possesses from the Father" and "belief in the Son of God is the only way in which [humans] can receive God's life (3:16)."[644] Bruce comments, "the purpose of Jesus' coming to reveal the Father is that men and women may, through faith in him, have eternal life" and "be drawn into this divine fellowship of love, dwelling in God as God dwells in them."[645] An idea of realized eschatology seems suggested in 3:16, that eternal life is already available to the believer (i.e. the use of ἔχῃ in the present subjunctive),[646] although this does not preclude a final eschatology.[647] While eternal life is the reward for believers, the alternative consequence of unbelief is to perish (ἀπόλλυμι). Barrett remarks, "destruction is the inevitable fate of all things and persons separated from God" and "this is a corollary of the fact that only in God the Father, the Word, and the Spirit does life exist."[648]

The Son too is rewarded as indicated in John 3:14. The word lifting up/ὑψόω in 3:14 is a "double-meaning verb [which] indicates that Jesus' crucifixion will also be his exaltation."[649] Jesus' exaltation includes his resurrection and ascension, receiving his rightful position as the divine Son. According to Brown, the chief influence on these "lifting of the son of Man"

---

[641] Brown, *Gospel*, 512.
[642] ibid., 513.
[643] McHugh, *John,* 237-38: αἰώνιος does not simply mean unending, but also belonging to the Other world where God will grant us to share fully in his own life.
[644] Brown, *Gospel*, 507.
[645] Bruce, *Gospel,* 14
[646] Keener, *Gospel,*569.
[647] Brown, *Gospel,*cxxix
[648] Barrett, *Gospel,* 180.
[649] Moloney, *Gospel* 95.

sayings (cf. 3:14, 8:28 and 12:32-34) "seems to be the theme of the Suffering Servant (Isa lii 13)."[650]

7) <u>The Recompense has Universal Consequences, and Involves the Nations</u>

Borgen observes in John's Gospel a "cosmic broadening of national and ethnic concepts [which] is combined with a movement towards internationalization."[651] Jesus is the "'Saviour of the world'(4:42), a universalist viewpoint which is deeply rooted in the basic structure of the Johannine concept of the 'world.'"[652] The word κόσμος occurs 78 times in the Gospel,[653] including in John 3:16. κόσμος in John has been diversely interpreted. Dodd observes that κόσμος is "the world of human kind which God loved (iii.16) and which Christ came to save."[654] However, Koester mentions negative connotations: "in John's gospel God loves the world that hates him; he gives his Son for the world that rejects him; he offers his love to a world estranged from him in order to overcome its hostility and bring the world back into relationship with [God]." [655] Brown notes a shift in the Johannine attitude to κόσμος, from God's benevolence and salvific intent toward the world" in (chs.1-12) to a later negative identification of the world with Jesus' opponents.[656] Nonetheless, in 3:16, κόσμος expresses the inclusiveness and openness of God's love and salvation for all peoples/nations.

8) <u>The Relationship between the Sufferer and the Instigator is Closely Defined</u>

Three key relationships in John 3:16 are between God and Son, God and the world/people, and the Son and believers. God's parenthood is stated in τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ which clearly alludes to Genesis 22:2 (as discussed above) evoking the father and son bond. In John, the term Father is "the most common designation of God" occuring about 120 times.[657] This designation defines Jesus' identity in terms of his filial relationship to God, but also "God

---

[650] Brown, *Gospel,*146.
[651] Borgen, *Gospel,* 112.
[652] Shnackenburg, *Gospel,*156
[653] Barrett, *Gospel,* 6
[654] Dodd, *Interpretation,* 371.
[655] Koester, "Death,"147.
[656] Brown, *Gospel*, 509.
[657] Thompson, *God,* 57.

is most characteristically identified and named in relationship to Jesus"[658] Their relationship expresses "at one and the same time an indissoluble unity and a clear separateness" and "the Son derives his life from the Father, and yet has his life in a distinct way."[659] Jesus' unique bond with the Father is linguistically demarcated from God's relation to other people, as McHugh notes: "Jesus alone is called υἱὸς θεοῦ and the others are designated as τέκνα. This usage itself implies that in John the title 'Son of God' is considered to belong to Jesus alone, and to apply to him in a unique way," as the pre-existent Logos.[660] Thompson remarks, "while there are many children of God, there is only one Son" and "all those who have faith are said to be born of God, but Jesus is the one who *comes from God,* the Son of God."[661] Believers relate to God through the Son who "receives life [and] in turn gives it to others" where "the exclusivity of Jesus' sonship actually becomes the means through which others may receive. . . life and freedom."[662] John 3:16 highlights that the believers' faith in Jesus and their acceptance of his identity as "the Son," becomes the means of realising their own salvific destiny as children of God. Clearly, the Father/Son, and God/children relationships are central to John, with God's universal parenthood established at the end: "I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God" (20:17). The salvific objective then seems one of accomplishing a relationship of familial unity between the divine and human beings.

9) <u>Association with Ideas of Sacrifice and Atonement</u>

Some key sacrificial aspects of John relate to Isaiah 53. Koester notes "the gospel combines Passover imagery with that of the suffering servant of Isaiah 53, who is compared to a lamb that is led to the slaughter and who is said to bear the sins of many."[663] Heil comments, "the imagery of Jesus as lamb of God [John 1:29,36] associates him with the rich sacrificial connotations of both, the Passover lamb slaughtered for the benefit of the people (Exodus 12) and the suffering servant of the Lord slaughtered as a lamb for the sins of the people (Isa 52:13-

---

[658] Thompson, *God,* 51.
[659] ibid., 72.
[660] McHugh, *John,* 58.
[661] Thompson, *God,* 70.
[662] ibid., 70,96.
[663] See Koester, "Death," 146; Schnackenburg, *Gospel,* 298-300.

53:12)."[664] Another soteriological link with Isaiah 53 has already been observed in John 3:14, where the "lifting up" of the Son of Man relates to Isa 52:13, which "is an exaltation that must be understood in terms of the crucifixion."[665] It is significant that for John, Jesus' death is inherently connected to his resurrection, and thereby effecting universal salvation.

Pertinently, Shnackenburg draws a parallel to 1 John 4:10 which "agrees with Jn 3:16 in form and content."[666] However, 1 John 4:10 is explicit regarding the "son being delivered up to death in expiation for sin" by referring to ἱλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν,[667] whereas John 3:16 seems to lack motifs of blood sacrifice and expiation of sin. Van der Watt articulates, "the question whether the death of Jesus is an act of atonement in the thinking of John is significant" but it is problematic given "the complete lack of references to the blood, expiation, or propitiation that are so common [in Pauline literature]."[668] Van der Watt's explanation that "[the Gospel] focused on the revelatory nature of Jesus rather than on his atoning treatment" remains unsatisfactory.[669]

John's Gospel may be less overt than 1 John in its use of sacrificial imagery, nonetheless, it contains soteriological notions. Verbal and conceptual connections with Akedah (cited above) link John 3:16 to the cultic context, given that Genesis 22 is a founding narrative of the sacrificial complex (see 4.1.9). By correspondence then, God's giving of his Son (like Abraham's offering of Isaac/ram) is framed in terms of sacrifice. Further, John 3:16's intertextuality with Isaiah 53 too bears soteriological implications. The verb δίδωμι resonates with Isaiah 53 where it occurs twice (v.9, in relation to the Servant's burial place; v.10, the giving of his life as a sin offering) thus connecting the Son's "being given" and the Servant's vicarious suffering and expiatory death. Brown notes, "[*didonai*] is similar to the use of

---

[664] John Paul Heil, "Jesus as the Unique High Priest in the Gospel of John," *CBQ* 57 (1995): 729-745, p.732,

[665] Koester, "Death"142; Keener, *Gospel,* 566, Barrett, *Gospel,*179.

[666] Shnackenburg, *Gospel,* 399

[667] ibid., 399

[668] Jan van der Watt, *An Introduction to the Johannine Gospel and the Letters.* (London:T&T Clark, 2007),p.56. However, Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, 157-8, maintains that "redemption through the expiatory sacrifice of the Cross is integrated into Johannine thought."

[669] ibid., 57.

paradidonai in Rom viii 32 and Gal ii 20,"[670] which is "the standard term in early Christianity for Jesus' being delivered up to be crucified, probably a reminiscence of the expiatory sufferings of the Servant of the Lord [*paradidonai* occurs in Isa 53:6,12])."[671] Additionally, Gal 1:4 conveys expiatory sacrifice by using a form of δίδωμι which too evokes Isaiah 53.[672] Given this NT usage,"the background [to John 3:16's usage of δίδωμι] is clearly of the suffering servant."[673] This association between the Son and the Servant strengthens the idea of Jesus' death as a vicarious sacrifice effecting atonement. Moreover, John 3:16's use of δίδωμι provides a connection to the Levitical cult. The sacrificial laws employ δίδωμι, either in relation to someone "giving" an offering to the priest (5:16,17:32,15:14), or God "giving" something (7:34,10:14,10:17). In Lev 17:11, God declares, "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given (δέδωκα) it to you for making atonement for your lives on the altar." These resonances too support God's "giving" of the Son as an atoning sacrifice.

Clearly, John 3:16 contains cultic elements as buttressed by its intertextual ties to Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22, as well as to Leviticus. In sacrificial terms, God's "giving" of his "only Son" in John 3:16 may be understood as a divine offering of Jesus who suffers and dies vicariously, effecting universal atonement. This atonement is not propitiatory, since the object is not to satisfy divine justice or honour, or appease the wrath of an angry God.[674] Rather, motivated by love, God "gives" the Son in a union of wills, on behalf of the "world." One agrees with Keener that "John assumes an expiatory theology."[675]

6.1.2   IMPLICATIONS

The above analysis of John 3:16 within its context, reveals the nine elements of the Akedah Servant complex, with some distinctive perspectives. Unlike Stage I texts, the suffering

---

[670] Brown, *Gospel,* 134

[671] Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, 399

[672] Brown, *Gospel, 134*.

[673] ibid.,134.

[674] Paul Fiddes, *Past Event and Present Salvation:The Christian Idea of Atonement* (London: Darton,Longman &Todd,1989), 68-75: propitiatory" sacrifice may be described as averting the anger of a personal deity, while "expiatory" stresses nullifying the effects of sin. Propitiatory is something humans do to God, or God directed action, while expiatory is something God does to humans or creature-directed action.

[675] Keener, *Gospel,* 566.

protagonist is not a human being, but God who engages in a self-sacrificial act of giving "his only Son." Another figure of cosmic import is the Son, who reciprocates self-sacrificially, by his implicit acceptance of being given (to death). John 3:16 contains no Mastema-like instigator manipulating the divine, albeit it refers to a "Ruler of the world" (cf.12:31,14:30) perhaps akin to the devil in *Wis.* which inflicts death. Nevertheless, God is the sole initiator in giving his Son, motivated by love for the κόσμος, a love which is universal in scope, and encompasses all humanity. The unity of God and the Son emerge in their salvific goal of securing eternal life for everyone. While the benefit is unmerited, people face a test of faith, either to accept the Son and receive eternal life, or to reject him and perish. Faith remains a defining element in John, requiring a specific belief in the person of the Son. Another emphasis in John 3:16 is Jesus' divine sonship. Although the title "Son of God" is not unknown in Jewish tradition[676] (i.e. Wis 2:13,2:18) John 3:16 sets up a critical distinction between God's only Son (τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ) and people (i.e. πᾶς, κόσμος) whose salvation lies through him. Plausibly, Genesis 22 may have influenced this conceptualising of a relationship between a loving Father and an "only/beloved" Son, within a sacrificial context. The accomplishing of familial unity between the divine and human appears to be a salvific objective.

Furthermore, John 3:16 reveals the convergence of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 in the context of Jesus' atoning sacrifice. While Akedah provides a cultic context for locating the divine Father's giving of the Son, Isaiah 53 with its notions of vicarious suffering and expiation of sins, as well as Levitical resonances, shape the portrayal of the Son, like the Servant, "given" to a death which effects expiatory atonement. The complex enables the Gospel to convey its understanding of Jesus' unique status and mission as the only Son of God, but it also transforms the received tradition. Particularly its emphasis on God's self-giving and generous love directed towards humanity, contrasts with a divinity whose wrath needs to be appeased (i.e. 2 Macc). Besides, the Johannine God does not demand a human being to sacrifice what is most precious (i.e. Akedah versions) but makes an offering of God's own. Further, unlike Stage I texts where

---

[676] On the Jewish background of divine sonship, see J.Fitzmyer, *Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Michigan: Eerdmanns, 2000): 31-33.

the sacrificial offering is an animal (ram) or an ordinary human (martyrs, the persecuted righteous, the Servant) in John 3:16 the one "given" is of the highest status, the unique Son of God, who atones vicariously for all humanity. Finally, unlike sacrificial contexts where the beneficiary remains passive, John 3:16 requires an active decision of faith by each believer. Salvation is available on condition of belief. While the Gospel shares nine motifs in common with Stage I texts, John 3:16 adds new insights. It presents a love driven God-Son soteriology not previously envisioned within the scope of the Akedah Servant Complex.

This text's manifestation of the nine features confirms that it came into contact with the Akedah Servant complex. It may have received the tradition in dialogue with primary texts, or with pre-70CE Jewish texts (where the tradition likely evolved long prior to its advent in the NT) given the Gospel's apparent affinity to other ancient traditions like Philo, Wisdom literature, and DSS. John's Gospel may also have encountered the tradition through other NT texts which manifest the complex (for instance, scholars have noticed parallels to Romans 8:32).[677]

6.2   THE LETTER TO THE ROMANS

The *Letter to the Romans*[678] was probably composed in Corinth during the winter of 57-58, just prior to Paul's visit to Jerusalem,[679] and is addressed to a community "he had neither founded nor as yet visited."[680] Given the complexity of Roman Christianity, a major concern for Paul seems to have been "defining the relationship between Jew and Gentile in God's plan for salvation."[681] The text's theological thesis has been identified as Rom 1:17 which upholds that

---

[677] See Barrett,*Gospel,*180.MacGregor, *Gospel,* 81.
[678] C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans 1-8* (vol.1; London: T & T Clark,1975), 2: "today no responsible criticism disputes its Pauline origin."
[679] For background: Brendan Byrne, *Romans* (SP 6; MN: Liturgical,1996); James Dunn, *Romans 1-8* (WBC 38; Texas :Word Books, 1988); Richard Dillon, "The Spirit as Taskmaster and Troublemaker in Romans 8," *CBQ* 60 (1998): 682-702; Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary* (MN: Fortress,2007); *The Romans Debate* (ed. Karl P. Donfried; Massachusetts: Hendrickson,1991).
[680]Joseph Fitzmyer, *Romans.* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday,1993),85-87; Joseph Fitzmyer, "The Letter to the Romans," in *the New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (London; Geoffrey Chapman, 1993),830-368.
[681] Karl P. Donfried, "Introduction 1991" in *The Romans Debate* (ed. Karl P. Donfried; Massachusetts: Hendrickson,1991),xlix-lxxii,p.lxx-xi. He questions the use of categories like "Jewish Christian" or "gentile Christian"; Francis Watson, "The Two Roman Congregations," in *The Romans Debate* (ed. Karl

"the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith," a theme worked out in the main body of the epistle.[682] Significant too is the saving work of Christ (variously an instrument of justification of believers, expiation of human sin, reconciliation between God and sinful humans, liberating triumph of grace over enslaving sin).[683] Further, Romans contains 28 Isaiah references,[684] and as Hays remarks, "several passages seem to echo the Suffering Servant."[685] Shum notes Paul's "great indebtedness" to the Fourth Servant Song.[686] Abraham too receives mention in Rom 4 and 9:6-10 (though not Akedah). Given this background, one may consider the possible relevance of the Akedah Servant Complex in the shaping of this text.

6.2.1   ROMANS 8:32 AND THE AKEDAH SERVANT COMPLEX

Rom 8:32 belongs to the pericope of Rom 8:31-39, which scholars agree "forms the concluding (perorative) section of the unit chapters 5-8," given stylistic and thematic links. [687] The pericope has two parts: 31-34 (theme: God is for us, who can be against us?); 35-39 (theme: no separation from God's love).[688] In the first, the rhetorical question (v.31) leads to an affirmation (v.32) of God's love and generosity by not sparing his own Son to benefit all. Verses 33 and 34 begin with the questions "who will bring a charge" and "who can condemn," evoking a "final eschatological tribunal in line with the Jewish apocalyptic tradition."[689] The answer refers to Christ's salvific work, including early kerygmatic material (cf. v.34: "Christ

---

P. Donfried; Massachusetts: Hendrickson,1991)203-215; Francis Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective* (rev. and enl. ed.; Michigan: Eerdmans, 2007); Mark D. Nanos, "The Jewish Context of the Gentile Audience Addressed in Paul's Letter to the Romans," *CBQ* 61 (1999):283-304.

[682] Cranfield, *Epistle,* 28. For stylistic/rhetorical devices: Anthony J. Guerra, *Romans and the Apologetic Tradition* (Cambridge UP, 1995); Ben Witherington III, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary,* (Michigan:Eerdmanns,1995),21.

[683] Byrne, *Romans,*23; Fitzmyer, *Romans,* (104-143) identifies key themes: God, christology, pneumatology, anthropology, and Christian conduct.

[684] Jewett, *Romans,* 25; Francis Watson, "The Hermeneutics of Salvation: Paul, Isaiah, and the Servant" (Paper presented at the New Testament Research Seminar. Durham University, 15 October, 2007), 2.

[685] Hays, *Echoes,* 63;

[686] Shiu-Lun Shum, *Paul's Use of Isaiah in Romans* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002),202 notes parallels: Rom 4:25=Isa 53:6,11,17; Rom 5:6,8 =Isa 53:8, Rom 10:16 = Isa 53:1, Rom 5:19 =Isa 53:11, Rom 15:21=Isa 52:15.

[687] A.H. Snyman, "Style and the Rhetorical Situation of Romans 8.31-39," *NTS* 34 (1988): 218-231, p.227. Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 529, Jewett, *Romans,*532-535; Dunn, *Romans* 499, thinks it sums "the whole argument [1-8] upto this point."

[688] Byrne, *Romans,* 275.

[689] ibid.,276.

who died, was raised,"etc.)[690] In the second part, the question, "Who can separate us from God's love?" is followed by a "tribulation list" of seven forms of adversity (35) and an allusion (Ps. 43:23)[691] connoting believers' present hardships. Verse 37 proclaims victory through suffering, by the love of Christ, while vv.38-39 catalogue metaphysical opponents. The pericope ends with a hymnic passage reiterating God's love made manifest in Jesus Christ. Specifically, Rom 8:32 is "formulated in language shaped by the atonement of Christ,"[692] with links to Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. Barrett comments, "Paul seems to allude to the story of Abraham and Isaac, especially 22:16" and "this allusion is at least as likely as that to the Suffering Servant" (Isa 53:12)."[693] Jewett and Fitzmyer too remark on connections to Isa 53:6,12,[694] while Byrne and Dunn note allusions to Gen 22:16.[695] Cranfield affirms intertextual links to both passages.[696] This critical evidence lends credence to the presence of the Akedah Servant complex in Rom 8:32, as will be analysed.

1)   The Portrayal of a Righteous Figure who Suffers Unjustly

Rom 8:32 presents God as a righteous, suffering figure.[697] The righteousness of God or δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is a concept which appears in Romans "in such a central way that it must be characterised as the key term for the letter as a whole (cf. Rom 1:17,3:5,21,22,25,26;10:3)."[698] In Romans, "God manifests [righteousness] toward humanity when through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ he brings about the vindication and acquital of sinful human beings."[699] In v.8:32, God's suffering righteousness lies in not witholding his own Son, but "giving [him] up" to death for the sake of all. Cranfield observes, "the adjective [ἰδίου] serves to

---

[690] Jewett, *Romans,* 533.
[691] Fitmyer, *Romans,* 534.
[692] Byrnes, *Romans,*275.
[693] C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (London: Adam and Charles Black,1957), 172.
[694] Jewett, *Romans,*538; Fitzmyer, *Romans,*532
[695] Byrne, *Romans,*279; Dunn, *Romans,* 501.
[696] Cranfield, *Epistle,* 436.
[697] One does not raise here the theological notion of patripassianism, but of suffering as a category within this textual paradigm.
[698] J. Beker, "The Faithfulness of God and the Priority of Israel in Paul's Letter to the Romans" in *The Romans Debate* (ed. Karl P. Donfried; Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1991), 327-332, p.330.
[699] Fitzmyer, *Romans,*106: the term can be used as a genitive subjective referring to God's own uprightness or as an objective genitive expressive of the uprightness communicated by God to human beings.

heighten the poignancy of the clause, emphasizing the cost to the Father of delivering up His dearest and most precious."[700] Jewett too observes "not even to spare his own son is the ultimate act a father could perform on behalf of others. Its pathos, especially in the ancient context, which assumed an ineradicable emotional bond between father and son, is unmistakable."[701] The text accentuates the suffering of God through intertextual ties to Genesis 22. The phrase τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο contains linguistic resonances to LXX Gen 22:16 οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου, with the verb φείδομαι serving to emphasise the conceptual parallel between the parental figures of God and Abraham, each of whom chose not to spare the person of ultimate value, his "beloved" or "own" son. Dunn observes "an allusion to Gen 22:16," despite "Paul us[ing] ἰδίου rather than ἀγαπητοῦ, the difference is not great."[702] Byrne comments, "the suggestion seems to be that what God did not in the end require of Abraham, he *did* for love of us require of himself: the 'giving up' to death of his 'own Son.' Nowhere else does Paul state the 'vulnerabilitity' to which God exposed himself so poignantly as here."[703]

The Son too qualifies as a suffering righteous figure. His afflictions are connoted by παρέδωκεν, which "certainly echoes a well-established Christian theological understanding of Christ's death"[704] Further, the phrase "ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν" in Rom 8:32 has been connected to "LXX Isa 53:6,12, whence the terminology of vicarious handing over is derived."[705] Jewett too agrees that "this formula is pre-Pauline, and that it echoes the language of Isa 53:6,12."[706] In Isa 53:12 παρέδωκεν occurs twice (the Servant's delivering his soul to death, and his being "given up" for the sins of the others). Through this intertextuality, Rom 8:32 accentuates the unjust suffering and expiatory death endured by the Son on behalf of others.

---

[700] Cranfield, *Epistle,* 436.
[701] Jewett, *Romans,* 538.
[702] Dunn, *Romans,* 501; Barret, *Commentary,* 172. Some scholars (Jewett 537, Fitzmyer 532) suggest an allusion to 2 Sam15, while D. Schwartz, "Two Pauline Allusions to the Redemptive Mechanism of the Crucifixion," JBL 102 (1983) 259-268, suggests 2 Sam 21:1-14. However, both texts speak of sparing someone's life, unlike Rom 8:32 (cf.Gen 22) where the father does *not* try to spare his son.
[703] Byrne, *Romans,*275.
[704] Dunn, *Romans,* 500.
[705] Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 532.
[706] Jewett, *Romans,* 538.

The text also hints at a group of sufferers. The pronouns ἡμῶν and ἡμῖν seem to refer to believers, made righteous through faith (8:33), who are in need of reassurance that they will be given τὰ πάντα. Verses (35-39) suggest that they endure present hardships. Jewett remarks, "that the exile imposed by the Edict of Claudius would have placed such burdens on some of the Jewish Christians."[707] Regardless, the relevant point is that the believers' struggle is framed as a share in the righteous sufferings of Christ/God (cf. 8:17): "we suffer with him so that we may also be glorified with him." Nonetheless, their suffering is not self-redemptive, but their righteousness comes through faith, as Romans consistently emphasizes.

2) The Suffering is Instigated / Permitted by a Supernatural Being

God and Christ suffer as a consequence of the salvific work initiated by God. By employing the active form of παρέδωκεν, Rom 8:32 makes clear that God is solely responsible for "giving up" the Son. This statement contrasts with Rom 4:25 which uses the same verb in a similar context of referring to Christ's expiatory death, but employs the passive form (παρεδόθη) thus avoiding implicating God. In Rom 8:32, however, "the active verb [παρέδωκεν] is drawn from 53:6; both in Paul and in Isaiah, the verb has God as subject," and "the verb serves to highlight the divine causality at work in the Servant's death." [708] While in Rom 8:32 God does "give up" his Son, and thus permits his suffering, Romans seems to assign the role of instigating suffering to sin and death (5:12-2) which entered the world "through one man" (Adam). Jewett notes that sin and death "appear to function here as cosmic forces under which all humans are in bondage."[709]

3) The Sufferer does not Protest but Cooperates

In Rom 8:32 the dominant role belongs to God who is the subject of all three verbs (ἐφείσατο, παρέδωκεν and χαρίσεται). Conversely, the Son is the object of the Father's action (i.e. παρέδωκεν αυτόν) conveying the impression of Christ's unprotesting acquiescence. This image of the compliant Son is consistent with Romans' portrayal elsewhere. For instance,

---

[707] Jewett, *Romans,* 547.
[708] Watson, "Hermeneutics," 9.
[709] ibid., 374.

v.5:19 refers to the obedience of Christ (ὑπακοή) which made many righteous. Fitzmyer comments, "Jesus' obedience to the will of his Father has had an effect on the destiny of all human beings. His whole life was determined by this obedience"[710]

4) A Free and Voluntary Response on the Part of the Sufferer

The tension between the Son's obedience and free will is clarified by Byrne: "Christ did not die as a passive victim of some higher requirement. He willingly accepted death as the cost of total human fidelity to God in an alienated and sinful world."[711] The notion of a union of wills between God and Son finds support in Rom 8:32 with the deployment of the phrase τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ. As Fitzmyer observes, "the emphatic phrase 'his own son' is stronger than the stereotyped formula 'Son of God' and highlights the divine origin of the task to be accomplished by one in close filial relationship with God. Implied is a unique bond of love between the two that is the source of human salvation."[712]

5) Suffering is Framed as a Demonstration of Faithfulness

Faith is a crucial element in Romans (cf.3:22-25), and is "the response required of Greek and Jew alike: only through faith in Jesus Christ can they be saved."[713] Rom 8:32 does not explicitly mention faith, but the allusion to Abraham provides a conceptual link. Rom 4 presents Abraham as an exemplar of one made righteous through faith. Abraham "is depicted here as the honorific parent of all believers, explicitly including those unconnected to his physical lineage."[714] While Rom 4 makes no reference to Akedah, in Rom 8:32, the clear allusion to Genesis 22 draws on the related concept of faithfulness. As Dunn remarks, "Paul indicates that Abraham's offering of his own son serves as a type not of the faithfulness of the devout Jew, but rather of the faithfulness of God."[715] God's faithfulness is also Christ's faithfulness for "the extent of God's commitment to his flawed creation is his giving of his own

---

[710] Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 421.
[711] Byrne, *Romans,* 181
[712] Fitzmyer, *Letter,* 852.
[713] ibid., 137
[714] Jewett, *Romans,* 307
[715] Dunn, *Romans,* 501

Son to death in oneness with and on behalf of creation."[716] This demonstration of divine faithfulness in suffering is presumably meant to encourage believers in their times of testing (i.e. persecution and harships mentioned in 8:35-37). Moreover, the Akedah allusion also stands as an implicit reminder to believers that just as Abraham was given a blessing in response to his faithfulness (i.e. not sparing his son 22:16) likewise as a reward for their faith, believers will be given τὰ πάντα.

6) The Sufferer Receives Reward and Exaltation at the End of Their Ordeal

The pattern of suffering followed by future reward is highlighted in Rom 8:34 through references to Jesus' death and resurrection: "It is Christ Jesus, who died, yes, who was raised, who is at the right hand of God, who indeed intercedes for us." Christ's suffering and death leads to his exaltation, as he is resurrected and takes his authoritative position beside God, interceding for all believers. Rom 8:32 implies a future reward to believers: καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίσεται. Jewett comments, "the verb χαρίζομαι (to give, bestow grace) is used here for the only time in Romans, echoing the concept of χάρις," and he translates the phrase as "[to] graciously give us the universe," with τὰ πάντα signifying "entire creation."[717] Dunn similarly links τὰ πάντα to creation, and "what seems to be envisaged is a sharing in Christ's lordship."[718] Cranfield suggests that τὰ πάντα denotes the fullness of salvation, while Witherington claims, "[Paul] means all that is necessary for salvation, all that is necessary to protect believers from spiritual danger in all sorts of difficult and dangerous circumstances."[719] Fitzmyer states it "refer[s] to everything pertaining to eschatological salvation," while Heil understands that "'τὰ πάντα succinctly and climactically recapitulates all of Paul's previous expressions of future goal of our hope throughout 8:18-32," including sonship, the coming glory and the glorious freedom of the children of God.[720] Despite different interpretations, τὰ πάντα

---

[716] Dunn, *Romans*, 509
[717] Jewett, *Romans,* 538.
[718] Dunn, *Romans,* 502
[719] Witherington, *Paul's Letter,* 232
[720] John Paul Heil, *Paul's Letter to the Romans,* (Orgeon: Wipf and Stock, 2002),93.

assures a future reward of fulfilment for believers, regardless of any present suffering (cf. 8:35-37). As Romans 8:17 confirms, believers are "heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ."

7)   The Recompense has Universal Consequences and Involves the Nations

The phrase ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων (8:32) conveys the universal effects of Christ's salvific work. Jewett remarks on the addition of the word [πάντων] which was not part of the traditional formula [ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν]: "the 'all' reflects Paul's particular concerns for the inclusivity of the gospel. Christ's atoning death encompasses Jews as well Gentiles, weak as well as strong."[721] He adds,"the death of Christ offers universal atonement," and "it conveys divine love for the entire human race."[722] Byrne states, "Paul notes that God gave up his Son 'for us all' a subtle reminder of the 'inclusive' outreach of God's love (to Jew and Gentile alike), in fulfilment of the universalist promise to Abraham (14:6)."[723]

8)   The Relationship between Sufferer and Permitter is Defined in Familial Terms

Romans presents three sets of primary relationships: God and the Son, God and children,[724] and the Son and siblings. The relationship between God and the Son takes priority (cf.1:3,1:4). Fitzmyer comments, "in Romans Paul recognises Jesus' special relationship with the heavenly father as filial, calling him 'his Son,'" while Cranfield observes that "the designation 'Son of God' expresses nothing less than a relationship to God . . . involving a real community of nature."[725] Rom 8:32 accentuates the unique relationship of God with his own Son by deploying an adjective (ἰδίου υἱοῦ) to stress Jesus is God's own Son, thus highlighting the "contrast between the only-begotten Son and adopted sons."[726] The adopted children of God are all believers (ἡμῶν πάντων in 8:32) whose filiality is clarified in Rom 8:14: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God these are sons of God" [οὗτοι υἱοί]. Fitzmyer notes,"the Spirit constitutes adoptive sonship, putting Christians in a special relationship to Christ, the unique

---

[721] Jewett, *Romans,* 538.
[722] ibid. 538
[723] Byrne, *Romans,* 275-6.
[724] To use inclusive language, this chapter will employ the term children instead of the literal translation of "sons," except when quoting.
[725] Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 113, Cranfield, *Epistle,* 58.
[726] Cranfield, *Epistle,* 436

Son and to the Father."[727] The term υἱοθεσία is employed in 8:15 to indicate this notion of adoption,[728] which results in believers "receiv[ing] a Spirit that enables them to be confident that they enjoy filial status" and "in the '*Abba* [Father]' cry the Spirit brings confirmation and support."[729] Believers are also closely related to the Son as suggested in Rom 8:32. It is on their behalf that the Son is handed over and " a new pneumatic sonship is offered in Christ" which makes possible their entry into God's family through faith.[730] This interrelatedness is highlighted in 8:29: "For those whom [God] foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the first-born among many brethren."[731] Clearly, God/Son, God/children, and Christ/siblings are key relationships in Romans which are grounded in love (8:35,39). Accomplishing familial unity seems a key objective of Romans.

9)   Association with Ideas of Sacrifice and Atonement

While justification is the key concept that Romans employs to convey "the effects of the Christ event," the text also contains the notion of expiatory sacrifice[732] (cf. 3;25,4.25,5:9,8:3). Rom 8:32 suggests Christ's death as an atoning sacrifice through allusions to Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. As stated, Dunn, Barrett, Cranfield and Byrne, all mention the verse's intertextuality with Akedah. Dahl comments, "the exegetical pattern must have been one of correspondence: as Abraham did not spare his son, so God did not spare his own Son."[733] While diverging from Dahl's conclusions (see 2.1) one agrees on the correspondence between God and Abraham, with φείδομαι (Gen 22:16) providing the critical tie. Given that Genesis 22 is a founding text of the sacrificial complex (see 4.1.9) by association then, God's act of "not sparing his own Son" in Rom 8:32 bears a cultic context, evoking the idea of expiatory sacrifice.

---

[727] Fitzmyer, "Letter,"853
[728] Susan Eastman, "Whose Apocalypse? The Identity of the Sons of God in Romans 8:19," *JBL*121 (2002): 263-277, p.267 notes υἱοθεσία does not occur in the LXX, and infrequently in the NT (Rom 8:15; Gal 4:5; Eph 1:5). While some view Paul as using a purely Roman metaphor, others see in God's elective relationship with Israel as "my firstborn son" (Exod 4:22) an adoption motif. In this view, the point of "adoption" is that it establishes one in the relationship and status of a son and therefore an heir.
[729] Byrne, *Romans,* 251.
[730] Jewett, *Romans,* 497
[731] Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 525.
[732] ibid. See pp.(116-124) for "different ways Paul describes in Romans [the] effects of the Christ event, making use of different figures of images drawn from his Jewish or Hellenistic background."
[733] Dahl, "Atonement," 139.

Another soteriological connection lies in the text's link to Isaiah 53, as mentioned. The phrase ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν in Rom 8:32 derives from Isa 53:4 as Watson observes: "While the Isaianic περὶ ἡμῶν must mean 'for us' or 'for our sake,' Paul's substitution of ὑπέρ for περί makes the vicarious nature of Christ's sufferings still clearer."[734] Further, the Servant who justifies "many" (Isa 53:11) corresponds with the Son who atones for "all" in Rom 8:32.[735] The verb παρέδωκεν (53:6,12) also intertextually ties the expiatory death of the Servant who is "given up" on account of "others' sins," and the Son who is "given up" on behalf of others. Cranfield comments, "παραδίδοναι is too obvious a verb to use in this connexion" and "in Rom 8:32 it is used of God's delivering up Jesus to the power of men and to death."[736] Clearly, Isaiah 53 provides a sacrificial context to Rom 8:32, in which the Son's salvific work may be understood in relation to the Servant, as a figure who is "given up" for others, enduring vicarious suffering, and an expiatory atoning death.

Additionally, Rom 8:32 is intratextually linked to Rom 3:25, a verse with significant sacrificial overtones. The two texts share the idea of God offering his Son, with conceptual resonances to Akedah, as Dunn notes (cf.3:25) "the possibility of some play on the Akedah theme (the offering of Isaac, Gen 22).[737] In v.3:25 the death of Christ is stated in explicitly sacrificial terms: ὃν προθέτο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ [τῆς] πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματὶ. Here the cultic complex is evoked by προτίθημι (Lev 24:8, Exod 29:23,40:23,) and ἱλαστήριον (Lev 16:2, Exod 25:7-22). The latter is an LXX word which may be interpreted as a "means of expiation" or "place of expiation."[738] While some consider ἱλαστήριον to mean propitiation based on classical Greek usage, Dodd establishes that in 3:25 "the meaning conveyed ([in LXX usage]) is that of expiation, not that of propitiation."[739] Besides, the references to ἱλαστήριον and αἵματί evoke Yom Kippur (cf. Lev 16), where sins are atoned for by means of the blood sprinkled on the ἱλαστήριον. Fitzmyer observes, "in using this image to describe the effect of

---

[734]Watson, "Mistranslation,"243.
[735]Cranfield, *Epistle,* 252 [cf. 4:25].
[736] ibid., 251
[737] Dunn, *Romans,* 170
[738] Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 120.
[739] C.H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1954),94.

the Christ-event, Paul reflects its relation to the Day of Atonement ritual in Lev 16" and "Christ's blood is here implied to be the substitute for the sacrificial blood of the animals in the Day of Atonement rite."[740] Further, Dunn connects 3:25 to martyrdom, noting "similar language in 4 Macc 17:22" which is "another example, roughly contemporaneous with Paul of sacrificial imagery being used to give meaning to. . . horrific and faith-disturbing deaths."[741] Rom 3:25 too incorporates the element of faith (διὰ [τῆς] πίστεως) suggesting "access to this new institution of atonement through the blood of Christ was available to everyone through faith."[742]

Clearly, the concept of sacrificial atonement finds expression in Rom 8:32, through its inter/intra-textual links to Gen 22, Isa 53, Rom 3:25 and the Levitical cult. They enable the Son's being "given up" to be understood in terms of a vicarious expiatory sacrifice, effecting atonement. Associations to Yom Kippur, martyrdom, and the concept of accessing atonement in faith further strengthen these soteriological connotations. Sacrifice may not be the central emphasis of Romans, but in Rom 8:32, it holds significance for understanding Christ's salvific work.

6.2.2   IMPLICATIONS

Having investigated Rom 8:32 and relevant verses, one affirms the presence of the Akedah Servant complex in this text. Clearly, the thematic and theological concerns of Romans inform the reception of this tradition. The notion of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is evident in the act of God's "giving up" his own Son on behalf of all, while Christ too suffers righteously in being "given up" to death. Believers partake in Christ's suffering, but rather than being righteous in themselves, they become righteous through faith. While God is responsible for "giving up" the Son, the text suggests sin and death have an instigative role. God and the Son remain united in accomplishing the salvific goal, cooperating freely, in a union of wills. Faith is a key concept, evoked by the allusion to Abraham who exemplifies those made righteous through faith. The Akedah allusion illustrates the faithfulness of God in offering his Son, while serving to

---

[740] Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 122.
[741] Dunn, *Romans,* 171
[742] Jewett, *Romans,* 288.

encourage believers' faithfulness in times of trial. Believers are to be rewarded with "all things" in the future, which may be a reference to lordship over creation and (eschatological) salvation, universally available to all. Relationships are defined in familial terms including God/Son, God/children, and Son/siblings, though a distinction exists between God's own Son and adopted children/siblings. Finally, sacrifice, though not the dominant soteriological metaphor in Romans, remains important (cf. Rom 8:32) for understanding the "giving up" of Christ as a vicarious and atoning sacrifice.

The presence of the Akedah Servant complex in Romans may be explained either by dialogue with the primary texts, and/or with secondary texts which manifest the complex. Paul displays familiarity with the Abraham narratives (including explicit citations in Rom 4 and 9) and intertextual resonances to Genesis 22. The influence of Isaiah 53 also prevails, as Shum comments, "Paul had good knowledge of the Suffering Servant Song when composing *Romans*."[743] Given the multiple resonances, one may conclude that the convergence of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 (deliberately or unconsciously) shaped Paul's presentation of Rom 8:32. The text's reception of the Akedah Servant complex is consistent with the pattern in stage I and stage II texts, including emphasis on Abraham rather than Isaac, and the soteriological thrust. In Rom 8:32, notions like God "not sparing" the Son, Jesus being "given up" on behalf of "us all," and the understanding of Jesus' death as a vicarious and expiatory sacrifice, are best explained as arising from the Akedah Servant complex. Watson's remark (on Isaiah 53) may apply to the complex: "it was fundamental for [Paul], providing lexical [and conceptual] resources that made it possible to assign positive soteriological significance to Christ's death."[744] In turn, the defining themes of Romans (righteousness of God, righteousness through faith of believers, their sharing in the suffering of Christ, God's own Son and adoptive children, accessing atonement through faith) also emerge, proving this text to be a receptive as well as innovative witness of the Akedah Servant Complex.

---

[743] Shum, *Paul's Use,* 197.
[744] Watson,"Hermeneutics,"1.

6:3   <u>THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS</u>

The Epistle to the Hebrews is traditionally ascribed to Paul,[745] though, as Origen remarks, "as to who actually wrote the epistle, God knows the truth."[746] Probably composed in the 1st century,[747] to a Roman destination (cf.13:24), with attestation in *1 Clement* (ca 96CE)[748] Hebrews targets a Jewish Christian audience.[749] It shares NT themes[750] like Christology,[751] sonship, faith, eschatology, cosmology, and Jesus as the mediator of the new covenant. Its central thesis is "Jesus as the Great High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary, where this salvific work is explicitly compared and contrasted with the cultic practices of the Mosaic covenant."[752] Hebrews has 5 components:[753] The first two (1:15-2:18) and (3:1-5:10) develop its major Christological position;[754] the middle (5:11-10:25) presents Christ's priesthood after the order of Melchizedek, and his atoning death in relation to the High priest's activities at Yom Kippur; the last two (10:26-12:13) and (12:14-13:21) are paranetic, urging its addressees to persevere in faith.

Hebrews contains two intertextual references to Akedah, from a faith perspective: Heb 6:13[755] to Gen 22:16-17, in relation to God's promise to Abraham; Heb 11:17-19 to Akedah, presenting Abraham as an exemplar of faith. Hebrews also contains theological parallels to Isaiah 53 (cf.Heb 9:15,28 with Isa 53:11-12; Heb 9:12, 15 with 53:12) as well as linguistic

---

[745] Craig Koester, *Hebrews:A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* Vol 36, *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 2001),129-31; Harold Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews,* (Philadelphia: Fortress,1989), 32.

[746] F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Michigan: Eerdmans,1990),15.

[747] ibid., 20-22. He suggests the Second Temple was still standing.

[748] Attridge, *Epistle,* 10.

[749] Myles Bourke,"The Epistle to the Hebrews,"in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1990), 920-41, p.921.

[750] See Attridge, *Epistle.* 30-31.

[751] Paul Ellingworth,*The Espistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Michigan: Eerdmans, 1993),70-71: Two major christological titles are Son and High Priest (5:5) and "the two functions cannot be separated."

[752] Darrell Pursiful, *The Cultic Motif in the Sprituality of the Book of Hebrews* (New York: Edward Mellen, 1993),43.

[753] Attridge, *Epistle,*14-19.

[754] ibid. 36.

[755] Bourke, "Epistle," 931.

links:[756] φέρω (Heb 9:16; Isa 53:3,4); ἀναφέρω (Heb 9:28; Isa 53:11,12); θάνατος (Heb 9:15,16; Isa 53:8, 9, 12), ἁμαρτίας (Heb 9:26, 28; Isa 53:4-6, 10-12); κληρονομ- (Heb 9:15; Isa 53:12), καθαρίζω Heb 9:22-23; Isa 53:10); λάος (Heb 9:19, Isa 53:8). This intertextuality with Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 indicates their importance for Hebrews, and validates an investigation of the Akedah Servant complex.

6.3.1   HEBREWS 9:28 AND THE AKEDAH SERVANT COMPLEX

Verse 9:28 occurs in the pericope (8:1-10:18) which "commentators recogniz[e] as a single literary unit," sharing conceptual, rhetorical and linguistic motifs,[757] including words of offering (προσφέρω, ἀναφέρω) and antitheses (flesh/spirit, earth/heaven, many/one, present time/eternity, old/ new, external /internal).[758] The pericope begins (8:1-6) by emphasising Christ's superior priesthood,[759] as a heavenly high priest ministering in the heavenly sanctuary, who is the mediator of a new and better covenant (8:6-13). In ch. 9 the heavenly sanctuary is antithetically contrasted with its earthly copy. It also applies "the model of the Yom Kippur ritual to the death of Christ," interpreting his death as an atoning sacrifice,[760] with the old cultic system contrasted by Christ's self-offering.

Hebrews 9:28 presents the expiatory sacrifice of Christ, and has an eschatalogical dimension, approaching "closer than any other in the NT to speaking of Christ's 'second coming.'"[761] Bruce observes links to Isaiah 53: "the language here is a plain echo of the fourth Servant Song – more especially of Isa 53:12, 'he bore the sin of many,' but also of v.10, 'he makes himself an offering for sin,' and 11, 'by his knowledge shall the righteous one, my servant, make many to be accounted righteous, and he shall bear their iniquities.'"[762] The text is analysed below in relation to the nine motifs.

---

[756] Scott Hahn, "A Broken Covenant and the Curse of Death: A Study of Hebrews 9:15-22," *CBQ* 66 (2004): 416-436, p.433. Barnabas Lindars, *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews* (Cambridge UP,1991),36.

[757] Harold Attridge,"The Uses of Antithesis In Hebrews 8-10," *HTR* 79:1-3 (1986):1-9, p.4.

[758] Attridge, "Uses,"5.

[759] Ch 7 develops the antithesis between the impermanent Levitical priesthood and eternal order of Melchizedek.

[760] Attridge, *Epistle*, 9.

[761] Ellingsworth, *Epistle,* 487-8.

[762] Bruce, *Epistle,* 232.

1) The Portrayal of a Righteous Person who Suffers Unjustly

Heb 9:28 evokes Jesus' suffering and death by employing the (passive) verb προσφέρω a term with associations to the Suffering Servant. Hofius declares, "the sacrificial terminology (προσενεχθείς, from προσφέρεσθαι) [in 9:28] shows clearly enough that the expression from Isaiah 53 LXX has been incorporated."[763] Occuring 21 times in Hebrews, the verb "usually refers to sacrifice in Hebrews" (i.e. 8:3) and also connotes the Levitical cult (cf. Lev 9:2, 21:21).[764] The term προσφέρω in 9:28 further creates a verbal link with 5:7, a key verse which highlights the extent of Jesus' suffering, reminiscent of "the Gethsemane tradition" of "Jesus in deep distress."[765] As Pursiful states, "it is because of Christ's involvement with the human condition that he offers up tearful petitions and entreaties to God. By using the cultic term προσφέρω in 5:7 the author depicts Jesus' prayer as a kind of sacrifice, parallel to the sacrifices offered by high priests in 5:3."[766] This "graphic description of Jesus' suffering in 5:7" illustrates the point that "though he was Son, intimately linked with God, he was made to endure that suffering, which was not merely incidental to his priesthood but was constitutive of it."[767] Other verses too (2:18, 5:8-9) associate Jesus with suffering (πάσχω) which makes him more effective on behalf of others.[768] Christ's suffering is undeserved, since he is deemed as "sinless" (χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας 4:15). Clearly, Heb 9:28 evokes Christ as a righteous and suffering high priest, whose anguish is efficacious.

While God lacks mention in 9:28, nonetheless, the idea that Christ "was offered" implies God's participation. The verb ἀναφέρω (cf. Gen 22:2) links it to the Akedah's notion of a suffering father offering his beloved/only son. Heb 2:10 also supports this idea of God's involvement ("It was fitting that God . . .should, in bringing many sons to glory, make perfect through suffering the leader of their salvation"). Mitchell argues that "at Heb 2:10 [the term]

---

[763] Hofius, "Fourth Servant Song," 184-5.
[764] Ellingsworth, *Epistle*, 404; Attridge, *Epistle*,213, n.102.
[765] Koester, *Hebrews,*107.
[766] Pursiful, *Cultic Motif,* 51.
[767] Alan Mitchell, "The Use of Πρέπειν and Rhetorical Propriety in Hebrews 2:10," *CBQ* 54 (1992): 681-701, p.698.
[768] Ellingworth, *Epistle*,191 observes πάσχω is always used in Hebrews of Christ's suffering, especially in death.

πρέπειν describes "God's participation in Jesus' passion and death," and that "Jesus accomplished something the human high priest did not do. His death involves God in human suffering."[769]

Further, Heb 9:28 apparently refers to a group of righteous sufferers: τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις.[770] These ones eagerly anticipate Christ's Second coming, presumably because of present suffering. They may be the addressees of Hebrews whose situation can be inferred from ch.10:32-36, where words of suffering like πάθημα, θλῖψις, and ὀνειδισμός suggest that "the former experience of the community. . .was one of humiliation, rejection, and marginalization."[771] In their previous trials they had lived righteous lives, demonstrating compassion to prisoners (10:34). In the present too, the author urges them to "endure" (ὑπομονή, 10:36) in doing the will of God, in the face of threats of "persecution and a waning commitment to the community's confessed faith."[772]

2) The Suffering is Permitted by a Supernatural Being

The instigator of Jesus' suffering is not specified in 9:28. However, the use of the passive form (προσενεχθείς) suggests that behind the the act of Christ "having been" offered, "the implied agent is God."[773] It does not mean that God causes suffering (suffering in Hebrews seems attributed to diabolical causes [cf. 2:14-15] though the text does not elaborate) but rather that God allows and uses suffering as a formative means to achieve the salvific goal through the Son. This idea receives affirmation in 5:8-9: "although he was the Son he learned obedience through what he suffered / and having been made perfect, he became the source of eternal salvation for all who obey him." By referring to Jesus as the Son, the text inevitably invokes the (unnamed) Father, whom, presumably, the Son learned to obey. God's direct role in shaping the Son through suffering emerges explicitly in v. 2:10 (discussed above). Attridge comments,

---

[769] Mitchell, "Use Of Πρέπειν, 682,696.
[770] Ellingworth, *Epistle,* 487 notes, "ἀπεκδεχομένοις, not used in the LXX, is used in Phil.3:20 of eager expectation of Christ's return."
[771] David deSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews."* (Michigan: Eerdmans, 2000),16.
[772] deSilva, *Perseverance*, 18.
[773] Ellingworth, *Epistle,* 486.

"Jesus' sufferings have a salvific function."[774] Verse 9:28 hints at God's role in this process but avoids an explicit assertion.

3) The Sufferer does not Protest but Co-operates

Christ's cooperation with God's salvific plan is evinced in Heb 9:28 by the deployment of two passive verbs προσενεχθείς and ὀφθήσεται, suggesting his passive compliance, in being offered up in a sacrificial death and in his second coming. Attridge observes, "Hebrews conceives of conformity to God's will as a characteristic of Christ from his entry into the world."[775] Further, the reference to Ps 39 in Hebrews 10:7 accentuates this idea of accord: "See, God, I have come to do your will." Moreover, Ellingworth notes, "The Son is one with God to such an extent that OT texts are transferred from God to the Son (1:8)."[776] Given this understanding of the Son as expressing the Father's will in Hebrews, how does one reconcile this stance with 5:7 where Christ offers up prayers and supplications to be "saved from death"? Here it seems that the Son does not silently accept the will of God, but pleads to be released from it. What does the text mean by stating that "he was heard," for clearly Hebrews accepts the death of Christ. While Daly considers that Heb 5:7-10 "may well be alluding to the theme of the Suffering Messiah [in Isaiah 53]," Bourke sugggests, "the author takes Jesus' deliverance from death as a reference to his resurrection."[777] In view of this interpretation, the portrayal of Jesus in 5:7 remains consistent in Hebrews, as one who cooperates with the divine salvific plan, as in 9:28.

4) A Free and Voluntary Response on the Part of the Sufferer

Related to the issue of the Son's conformity to God's will, is the matter of volition. One may question whether Christ's sacrifice is a free and voluntary choice, or is his response a consequence of being a dependent and submissive Son to paternal authority? Verses like 5:8 seem to lend weight to the latter perspective. Ellingworth deliberates, "from one point of view,

---

[774] Attridge, *Epistle,* 83.
[775] ibid.141.
[776] Ellingworth, *Epistle,* 66.
[777] Daly, *Origins,*71; Bourke, "Epistle,"929: "Since the prayer of Gethsemane was that he might be kept from dying rather than be rescued from death, once he had undergone it, the author [of Hebrews] uses 'saved from death' with a double meaning."

his death was a submission to the will and purpose of God . . . [but] elsewhere, however, the author stresses repeatedly that Jesus' submission was a willing self-offering."[778] This tension is resolved in the text by the parallel use of the passive and active forms of the verb "to offer." Hebrews 9:28 contains προσενεχθείς where Christ is offered presumably by God, while the active self-reflexive form of the verb appears in 9:25 προσφέρῃ ἑαυτόν and 9:14 ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν which refers to Christ's offering of himself. By correlating the active and passive forms, Hebrews accentuates that God and Christ share the same stance with regard to the offering of the Son. A union of wills exists between them, that the will of one cannot be separated from the other. From this perspective, Jesus' self-offering involves an active and free choice on his part, in harmony with God.

5)   The Suffering is framed as a Test/Demonstration of Faithfulness

Neither the word πειράζω nor πίστις appears in Heb 9:28, but both concepts inform the meaning of this verse. Regarding faith, Hamm notes, "with its thirty-two occurrences of [the noun] *pistis,* the notion of faith is one of the Letter's primary themes."[779] Jesus in 2:17 is described as πιστὸς ἀρχιερεύς," in his role as high priest, with "πιστός [the adjectival form, being] a polyvalent word that can carry both a passive ('trustworthy, firm') and an active ('trusting, faithful') meaning. In 2:17, it appears that πιστός is utilized to describe Christ both as 'a trustworthy or reliable high priest' and as 'one who is faithful to God.'"[780] Again in 3:2, Christ is described as πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αυτὸν in relation to God, where *pistos* in Heb 3:2 "means 'worthy of trust' (because authorized by God)."[781] Jesus is "presented in this epistle as a trustworthy Lord" who was "not only 'faithful over God's house as a son' (3:5), but he was also faithful to God who appointed and sent him (3:1-2; cf. 5:8; 10:7, 9)" as "one who faithfully

---

[778] Ellingworth, *Epistle* 486.
[779] Dennis Hamm, "Faith in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *CBQ* 52 (1990): 270-291, p.272.
[780] Todd Still,"Christos," *CBQ* 69 (2007): 746-755, p.749, highlights "the christological contribution that Hebrews makes to the NT canon by virtue of its presentation of Christ's faith(fulness). Although πιστός appears [67 times in the Greek NT]...the author of Hebrews is the only NT writer who *explicitly* explores and expounds upon the faith(fulness) of Christ in any degree of detail." p.754
[781] Hamm,"Faith,"282.

reflects God to humanity and ably represents and intercedes for sinful people before God (1:3; 7:25; 9:24)."[782]

In verse 9:28, Jesus' faithfulness holds significance for the ἀπεκδεχομένοις who await the second coming of Christ. As mentioned, this group may be linked to the addressees of Hebrews who apparently faced some crisis of faith/persecution (cf. 10:36-38). Presumably, their eagerness for Christ's return may stem from a desire to escape situations of testing and hardship. Hebrews encourages their fidelity by presenting Jesus as one who has been tested like themselves (πειράζω 2:18, 4:15)," and is "both the exemplar and the facilitator of faith."[783] Attridge remarks that "the testing in view [cf.2:18] is not located in the temptations of Jesus, but in his suffering."[784] While Jesus is the supreme model, Hebrews also presents several biblical characters (ch. 11) who remain faithful despite suffering, including Abraham's Akedah (11:17-19) which is highlighted as a climactic event. Swetnam comments: "[the author] singles out Abraham as personifying in a special way this faith in God in the face of death" where "Abraham's supreme test is viewed in Hebrews as having taken place at the moment of his sacrifice of Isaac."[785] The nexus of πίστις and πειράζω in Hebrews 11:17 highlights the connection between these terms. Clearly, a testing of faith in a context of suffering implicitly informs Hebrews 9:28, especially concerning the ἀπεκδεχομένοις.

6)   The Sufferer Receives Reward and Exaltation at the End of the Ordeal

The expectation of a reward features in Hebrews 9:28, as in the persons who eagerly wait for Christ's return with its promise of σωτηρίαν. Salvation is the recompense for righteous sufferers. Marshall comments, "the term salvation occurs seven times, more frequently than in any other NT book. Salvation is a future, eternal state of affairs (9:28; 5:9) to which people can confidently look "forward."[786] Holmes too remarks, "salvation appears in the text mainly as a future promise based on a past event. The incarnation (2:11-17), life of obedience and

---

[782] Still, "Christos,"275.
[783] Hamm,"Faith," 286.
[784] Attridge, *Epistle* 96
[785] Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac,*128
[786] Howard Marshall, "Soteriology in Hebrews," in *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology* (ed. Richard Bauckham et al.; Mich: Eerdmans, 2009), 253-277,p.255.

submission (5:7-9), sacrificial death (9:14), and heavenly session (9:25-28) of Christ have won salvation; but there remains a second advent (9:28) and a promised rest (4:1-11) when this salvation will become fully actual."[787] While the fullness of salvation may be a future event, it also has past and present implications. Christ by his death set "free those who all their lives were held in slavery by the fear of death" (2:15). However, the final echatological event that is longed for "is the promise of the entrance into God's presence" (cf. 12:23).[788] Verse 9:28 stresses this anticipation of the faithful.

The second coming may also be viewed as a reward for Christ for his own righteous sufferings. Unlike his first coming which involved expiatory self-sacrifice, in Heb 9:28 Christ "will appear a second time, not to deal with sin," but to save. While the verse does not elaborate, the implication is clear. Through this eschatological event, Christ successfully realizes the soteriological goal of "bringing many sons to glory" (2:10). These followers are part of Christ's recompense as suggested in 2:13: "Here am I and the children whom God has given me." The second coming may be considered as part of the larger backdrop of exaltation and reward for Christ who "is now crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death" (2:9).

7) The Recompense has Universal Consequences

Verse 9:28 connotes the idea of universalism with its phrase τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας, affirming that Christ's sacrificial death is not for a select few or a specific people, but is inclusive and wide-ranging in scope. This phrase corresponds to Isa 53:12 (αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν) connecting the Servant's vicarious sacrifice with Christ's, similarly displaying universalist overtones. Other phrases too convey this notion of openness to many/all. In Heb 2:10 (πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν) the word πολύς suggests the extensiveness of God's salvation "to humanity generally."[789] Emphatically, Heb 2:9 states that Jesus died for everyone (ὑπὲρ παντὸς). Clearly, the universalist concept in Heb 9:28 reflects a wider tendency within the

---

[787] Holmes,"Death," 239; Attridge, *Epistle,*266, observes that "while salvation has been inaugurated by the activity of Christ, it has yet to be consummated. The eschatological overtones are continued in the reference to those who "wait for" Christ, since ἀπέκδεχεσται is a common term" (266).

[788] ibid. 241.

[789] Attridge, *Epistle,* 83.

text. Nevertheless, Hebrews qualifies this notion. While salvation is universally available, it requires fidelity to access, and the text cautions against being among "those who shrink back and so are lost, but [rather] among those who have faith and so are saved" (10:39).

8)   The Relationship between the Sufferer and Permitter is Defined in Familial Terms

According to Scott Mackie, "the author of Hebrews establishes a pattern of reciprocative confessions of familial belonging, modelled successively by the Father and the Son" as well as "the Son's conferral of membership in the family of God [to the addressees who] are exhorted to offer a reciprocative confession of familial mutuality and identification."[790] Hebrews presents three defining sets of relationships: God/Son, God/children and Son/siblings.[791] The initial verses present the God/Son relationship. The word (υἱῷ) first appears in 1:2 in the exordium (1:1-4) which describes the Son in high Christological terms,[792] as pre-existing, superior to all other beings, the radiance of God's glory, an exact imprint of God, creating and sustaining the universe, and seated at the right hand of the divine Majesty. The following catena (1:5-14) though less exalting, refers to "Christ becoming Son" (cf. Ps 2).[793]

The text also refers to God's human children ("sons"; 2:10,12:5) whom God purposes to bring into glory. Attridge observes, "God's sons and daughters have 'glory' as their destiny, the glory that the Son had from all eternity (1:3) and with which he was crowned at their exultation."[794] Although the Son remains distinct from the children, nonetheless, the latter are defined with "familial language [υἱός, ἀδελφός, παιδία], the language of identification [which] is inseparably interwoven with the benefits of familial relatedness conferred by the Son upon his siblings. [The Son] has 'tasted death on behalf of all' (2.9) and is the 'pioneer of their salvation' (2.10). Because 'the one sanctifying and those being sanctified share the same heavenly parent,'

---

[790]Scott D. Mackie, "Confession of the Son of God in Hebrews," *NTS* 53 (2007):114–129.
[791] Except when quoting, this thesis employs the inclusive term "children" rather than sons in describing humanity's relation to God, and "siblings" for Christ's relations to humanity. Regarding the inclusive use of ἀδελφός, see Mackie, "Confession,"118 (n.14).
[792]Attridge, *Epistle,* 30. See Excursus (146-147).
[793]ibid. 54:
[794]ibid., 83.

Jesus is 'not ashamed to publicly identify them as his siblings' (2.11)."[795] However, "although Hebrews tends to use familial language of Jesus and of believers, it is only in the plural that the believers are called 'sons' or 'children.'"[796] Clearly, Hebrews aims to preserve the distinctions between each set of relationships, while highlighting their interconnections.[797]

While Heb 9:28 does not employ God/Son language, nonetheless, the father-son dynamic is evoked by its intertextuality with the Akdah reference in Heb 11:17. The verses ("by faith Abraham, when put to the test, offered [προσφέρω] up Isaac. He who had received the promises was ready to offer up [προσφέρω] his only son") resonate with Hebrews 9:28 of Christ "being offered [προσφέρω]" presumably by his Father (God). Besides evoking Father-Son relations, Hebrews 9:28 also intimates the close bond of fidelity between Son/siblings, as the latter "eagerly" wait for Christ's return. Although the God/children bond does not emerge in Heb 9:28, the phrase εἰς σωτηρίαν points to God's silent but active role in effecting the salvation of his children, through "offering" the Son.

9) Association with Ideas of Sacrifice and Atonement

The sacrificial context in Hebrews is based on the Levitical cultus which provides a framework for interpreting Jesus' death and atonement. Despite its apparent critique of the sacrificial complex,[798] the biblical cult is integral to Hebrews. Cultic motifs include references to the Levitical priesthood (7:5-10), earthly sanctuary (ch 9:1-5), ongoing cultic activities (9:6-9,10:11), animal sacrifices (9:13), the high priest and his role at Yom Kippur[799] (9:7,11-14), blood for the expiation of sin and atonement (9:22)[800] and covenant inauguration. Hebrews sets up a contrast between the Levitical ritual and Christ's self-offering: the former involves yearly

---

[795] Mackie, "Confession,"121.
[796] Ellingworth, *Epistle,* 71. Hebrews use παιδίον (2:13,2:14) but neither παῖς nor δοῦλος.
[797] ibid.,71, observes that Christ's Sonship is closely related to the sonship of believers (2:10), and his high priesthood is equally closely linked to the exaltation which enables Christ to offer eternal salvation to believers (5:9)
[798] Attridge, *Epistle,*199, sees "a pointed critique of the old covenant and of its sacrificial system." However, Lindars, *Theology,* 132 states, "the conditions of the OT sacrifice, particularly the Day of Atonement, define the nature of the subject." Hebrews depends on the Levitical conceptualisation of sacrifice, within which the saving work of Jesus receives meaning.
[799] Lindars, *Theology*, 84: the Day of Atonement "provides the standard which must be met if the death of Jesus is to be accepted as an atoning sacrifice."
[800] Heb 9:22: "without shedding of blood there is no remission" (cf. Lev.17:11).

sacrifice by a high priest who (himself sinful) takes animal blood into a sanctuary made by human hands, which can only effect an exterior cleansing and is unable to remove sin[801] (9:9-10). Conversely, Jesus is both the perfect high priest and ideal offering. Bruce observes, "he who offers up his life to God in unreserved consecration is both priest and sacrifice at once."[802] Jesus is the supreme high priest (4:14; 7:26-8:1), appointed by God (5:5), made perfect through suffering (2:10), sinless (4:15) and compassionate (5:2), who fulfills "both dimensions of his priestly office, expiation and intercession."[803] Jesus' is also "the sacrifice of a willing victim."[804] His blood -- unlike the "blood of goats and bulls" cleanses the conscience (συνείδησιν 9:14-15) and removes sin definitively (9:26). Pursiful remarks, "the blood of sacrificial animals is capable of producing a superficial level of purgation, [but] only the blood of Christ effects total cleanisng (9:14)."[805] Hebrews interplays with cultic rituals (i.e. high priest's taking blood into the inner sanctuary, 4:12; blood sprinkling 9:11) to convey that "the death of Jesus. . . is at once an effective atonement and the solemnization of the new covenant,"[806] with his blood giving divine access to humanity (10:19). While Christ's sacrifice occurs once and for all (9:26,10:12), his priestly ministry continues in the heavenly sanctuary (7:24-25,8:6).[807] Bauckham remarks, "this high priest is the perfect mediator; he not only represents his people to God, in sacrifice and intercession, but also embodies the grace and mercy of God to which his sacrifice now gives permanent expression."[808]

Heb 9:28 displays some sacrificial elements. By employing Levitical cultic vocabulary (ἀναφέρω and προσφέρω) it strengthens the idea of Christ's death as an atoning sacrifice which has lasting salvific effects (ἅπαξ). Westcott observes, "ἀναφέρω means to offer up and refers

---

[801] See Milgrom, *Leviticus*,51, on "the ethical impulse" of Yom Kippur where the scapegoat became the source of "purging the human heart," provided that the people purge themselves through rites of penitence (16:29, 23:27). Hebrews' omission of the scapegoat seems to reflect its selective bias.
[802] Bruce, *Epistle,* 33.
[803] Attridge, *Epistle,* 96.
[804] deSilva, *Perseverance,* 64.
[805] Pursiful, *Cultic Motif*, 156.
[806] deSilva, *Perseverance,* 313.
[807] Jesus' heavenly ministry remains obscure. Attridge, *Epistle,* 220 observes (cf. 8:6): "the lack of specificity here contributed to the debates about Christ's heavenly priesthood that developed following the reformation, occasioned by the controversy whether the Mass was a sacrifice."
[808] Bauckham, "Divinity," 33.

primarily to priestly action, while προσφέρω means to bring for offering and is applied primarily to non-priests."[809] Hahn notes that 'bearing (ἀναφέρω) the sins of many' in 9:28 "may be shaped by the use of φέρω in Isa 53 LXX, where (ἀνα)φέρω is repeatedly used in the sense 'bear something for another' (see Isa 53:3, 4, 11, 12)."[810] Further, Hofius observes (on εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας) "there can be no doubt that Isa 53:12 LXX has been taken up here (αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν),"[811] and it reflects an understanding of "this self-sacrifice [of Christ the high priest] as an event of atonement that sets aside the reality of sin and grants access to God."[812] Hahn sees theological parallels to Isa 53:12 in terms of "the victim [who] undergoes a vicarious death on behalf of the many and then receives his inheritance."[813] Clearly, in Heb 9:28, Isaiah 53 serves to underscore Christ's roles as high priest and sacrificial offering, effecting expiation of sin and atonement.

6.3.2   IMPLICATIONS

The above analysis of verse 9:28 within the overall context of Hebrews reveals the presence of the nine elements of the Akedah Servant complex. These features are shaped by the text's cultic and theological perspectives. Jesus qualifies as a suffering righteous figure, albeit distinctive in status and purpose, as a divine Son and high priest of the eternal order of Melchizedek. As high priest he knows and is compassionate towards human weakness, though sinless himself, and despite being Son he still learns obedience through suffering. His death is viewed both as an act of self-offering and being offered up by God, demonstrating their union of wills in accomplishing the salvific goal. Having faced testings himself, Christ is able to identify with and intercede for those who are subject to temptation themselves, demonstrating faithfulness in the face of testing and adversity. The addressees are exhorted to follow his model, as well as to be exemplars of faith like Abraham (i.e. the Akedah). In return for faithful endurance, the believers will be rewarded by the eschatological event of the second coming of

---

[809] Attridge, *Epistle,* 213n.102.
[810] Hahn, "Broken Covenant,"433.
[811] Hofius, "Fourth Servant Song,"185.
[812] ibid.,185
[813] Hahn, "Broken Covenant," 433.

Christ, who will lead the faithful to salvation. The believers are viewed as children of God, and siblings of Christ, while the Son has a unique relationship with God, a being superior to all others. Familial language conveys the closeness of these three distinct sets of relationships. Sacrifice is the defining feature of Hebrews, with motifs from the Levitical cultus, including Yom Kippur ritual, deployed to present Christ as high priest and sacrificial offering, who "having been offered" as a vicarious, expiatory sacrifice, effects salvation.

Hebrews' receptivity to the Akedah Servant tradition is also evinced from its intertextual links to the primary texts. As noted, Heb 9:28 shares semantic and linguistic resonances with Isaiah 53, including Christ as priest and a sacrifice, the concept of vicariousness in bearing others' sins (ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν), Christ's dying on behalf of "many" and effecting expiatory atonement. Hahn declares, "the clear reference to Isa 53:12 in Heb 9:28 suffices as evidence that Isaiah 53 was in the mind of the author of Hebrews."[814] Genesis 22 too manifests its influence on Heb 9:28 with Abraham's offering of Isaac providing a parallel to Christ being offered [by God], reinforced by a verbal tie (ἀναφέρω). The Akedah reference in Heb 11:17-19 (with the mutual link, προσφέρω) and in 6:13 also reveals the importance of Gen 22 for this text.

One presumes that Hebrews may have received the Akedah Servant tradition directly, in dialogue with Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22. Another means is through secondary texts, since Hebrews demonstrates the "wide use of Wisdom," and "1-4 Maccabees are [also] quite extensively but unevenly used,"[815] and Christ's self-offering may parallel "the martyrs of Maccabean days." [816] While one cannot precisely trace the process, Hebrews clearly manifests the complex, as expressed in Heb 9:28. Further, the text adds nuances to the Akedah Servant tradition by emphasising the significance and centrality of the Levitical sacrificial cult. Hebrews' innovation of Christ as divine son and High priest, with his sacrifice interpreted in relation to Yom Kippur ritual as effecting expiatory atonement, is unique among NT texts.

---

[814] Hahn, "Broken Covenant," 433.
[815] Ellingworth, *Epistle,* 39.
[816] Bruce, *Epistle,* 178.

6.4   <u>CONCLUSION</u>

This chapter examined three NT verses (John 3:16, Rom 8:32, and Heb 9:28) within their overall contexts, in relation to the Akedah Servant Complex. Given that the nine motifs are present in the analysed texts, this chapter concludes that Stage II texts manifest this tradition. It is evident that each verse is rooted in a distinctive theological perspective and socio-cultural/literary context, which impacts on the text's reception of the complex. John 3:16 presents a love-based soteriology of God "giving" his only Son, whom people may choose to believe and gain eternal life, or to reject and be lost. Hebrews 9:28, framed by the Yom Kippur Levitical rite, portrays Christ (who is both high priest and sacrificial offering) being "offered" to expiate for sins, with believers anticipating eschatological salvation. Rom 8:32 expresses that God does not spare but gives his own Son for the sake of all, and assures that believers will receive all things. While the selected texts display particular nuances and emphases, they also reveal some degree of parallelism.

Prior to elaborating on the Akedah Servant complex in the NT, one may compare Stage I and Stage II texts, in order to identify patterns of variations, and to clarify the reception of this tradition. In Stage I passages the suffering protagonists are human figures, including Abraham, the Maccabean martyrs, and the righteous in *Wis*. Contrastingly, the protagonists in Stage II texts are cosmic characters of supreme import like God and Christ, although human sufferers form a third group of righteous sufferers (i.e. Hebrews and Romans). Further, in Stage I texts, God's involvement in human suffering tends to be at a transcendent level, such as issuing commands to Abraham, watching over the martyrs, and vindicating the righteous. In Stage II texts, God is directly and fully involved in suffering, sustaining a personal loss in "not sparing his Son" or by "giving his only Son." Similarly, Christ's own immediate and direct engagement in suffering is evident as the one "given up/offered."

Some Stage I texts shift responsibility for instigating suffering to Mastema (*Jubilees, Pseudo-Jubilees*) or a tyrant king, presumably to deflect blame from God. In Stage II texts, however, God remains solely responsible for permitting suffering, without being subject to the manipulations or stratagems of a supernatural creature. Although Stage II texts do refer to

186

agents like sin, death, ruler of the world, and the devil who appear responsible for inflicting suffering, nevertheless, they lack direct access and the power to pressurize God into doing their will, unlike Mastema. As such, a question of divine control does not arise in Stage II texts. Another feature common to Stage I passages is the "union of wills" where the human protagonists are united and committed to doing the divine will, cooperating freely and voluntarily, in agreement with God and each other (i.e. martyrs encourage one another to die). However, in Stage II texts, the union of wills exists between God and the Son, who act with one accord, towards accomplishing a common salvific goal on behalf of humans.

Additionally, in Stage I passages the sufferers face a test of allegiance/obedience to a divine command (2 Macc, *Jubilees*) whereas in Stage II writings, the test does not require the keeping of positive or negative commands, but demonstrating enduring faith during times of trial (i.e. Romans) just as God and the Son manifest faithful love. Besides, in Stage I passages, only human beings are subject to testing, while in NT texts, the Son of God himself faces temptation and struggles, thus underscoring again divine engagement in the human predicament. Moreover, both Stage I and Stage II texts stress the notion of future reward with universal implications. In Stage I, the rewards range from future blessings (*Jubilees*), immortality (*Wis.*), and resurrection (2 Macc) which are divine recompense for the righteous' obedient and godly behaviour. In Stage II texts, the predominant reward is salvation which is freely made available to all, not as a result of human righteousness or good conduct, but through divine initiative and action. Such salvation is accessible only though faith, an idea which prevails among Stage II texts. Relationship categories in Stage I include God/servant, parent/son and master/servant, while *Wis.* introduces the idea of God/son, a relationship based on the righteous following a godly life, rather than an actual filial bond. NT texts stress three familial relationships: God/(divine) Son, God/(adopted) children, and the Son/siblings. The Son is presented in high Christological terms, as pre-existent, unique, superior to all beings, whereas this notion of divine Sonship is absent in Stage I texts. In the NT texts, the Son is one through whom God and "children" become reconciled. Accomplishing divine and human familial unity is a key priority

in Stage II texts. Both Stage I and Stage II stress the concept of love in defining relationships (i.e. "God so loved the world;" John 3:16; "Mastered by his love for God" in *De Abrahamo*).

The critical difference between Stage and I and Stage II pertains to sacrifice and atonement. Stage I texts employ a range of cultic elements and related motifs including ram sacrifice, Mt. Zion, temple cult, priestly genealogy, passover and paschal lamb's blood, Tamid burnt offering, and martyrs' blood. These motifs relate to the notion of sacrifice in different ways, either by effecting expiation of sins (the temple complex and animal sacrifice) or propitiation of divine wrath (martyr's blood), or having a saving effect (paschal lamb's blood in *Jubilees*). Stage II texts also contain cultic imagery and vocabulary (i.e. Yom Kippur, paschal lamb, blood, sanctuary, high priest, sanctuary) but they come together in a holistic/integrated soteriology: the central act of God's "giving up"/offering his Son is presented as an expiatory sacrifice, atoning for the sins of all people and effecting universal salvation. This focal event ties together the various elements of the Akedah Servant complex. Righteous suffering, vicariousness, union of wills, universal salvation, reward, faith, familial unity -- all relate to this centripetal act and effect of the "giving" of the Son.

The above analysis reveals striking differences between Stage I and Stage II texts, albeit they all manifest the set of nine motifs. NT texts are distinct and innovative in their reception of the Akedah Servant tradition, in incorporating the early Christian understanding of the unique and salvific value of the Christ event. To better clarify the NT expression of the complex, one may compare the findings on John 3:16, Hebrew 9:28 and Roman 8:32. In all three texts, God is the active agent (although Heb 9:28 uses passive voice, God is the implied agent), the one who initiates the act of giving/offering, with the Son compliant and united in will. This dynamic reveals the influence of the Akedah image of Abraham offering his son. NT texts further stress the Son's unique relation to God by phrases like τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ (John 3:16) and ἰδίου υἱοῦ (Rom 8:32) which too evoke the Akedah. Only Heb 9:28 uses the messianic title χριστός, perhaps to stress the special identity and mission of the Son. Additionally, all three verses deploy a verb with sacrificial connotations (παραδίδωμι, δίδωμι, προσφέρω, ἀναφέρω) derived either from the Levitical cultus or Isaiah 53, to signify the Son's being "given" as a vicarious,

expiatory sacrifice. In John 3:16 the word δίδωμι intertextually links the Son to the Servant as well as to the Leviticus cultus, while παραδίδωμι in Rom 8:32 also connects with Isaiah 53. The words προσφέρω and ἀναφέρω have Levitical connotations, which fit Hebrew 9:28's conceptualisation of Christ's sacrifice in relation to Yom Kippur. ἀναφέρω also occurs in Genesis 22 in relation to sacrificial offering.

Another feature among NT texts is that they convey the divine motive or reason underpinning the salvific act. John 3:16 mentions God's love for the world as the motivating factor, while Rom 8:32 similarly stresses the extent of God's self-denying love: "he who did not withhold (φείδομαι) his own son," which echoes the Akedah. Heb 9:28, drawing on Isaiah 53, expresses the expiatory objective of Christ's sacrifice, to bear the sins of many. Additionally, each verse reveals the salvific consequence of God's action (i.e. offering/giving of the Son): "So that all who believe may not perish but have eternal life" (John 3:16); "Christ will appear a second time, not to deal with sin but to save" (Heb 9:28), evoking eschatological salvation; "will he not with him also give us all things?" presumably denoting salvation (Rom 8:32). Finally, the NT texts mention the intended beneficiaries of God's salvific action through Christ: ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (Rom 8:32, which resonates with Isaiah 53); πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων (John 3:16); τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις εἰς σωτηρίαν (Heb 9:28), all of which connote the idea of universal salvation, available to all, but requiring faith/belief to access.

In conclusion, this chapter examined the Akedah Servant complex in Stage II texts. It analysed three verses (John 3:16, Heb 9:28 and Rom 8:32) within their overall contexts to trace their reception of the Akedah Servant complex. While the presence of the complex is evident, one presumes that the NT came into contact with this tradition in dialogue with one another, with other secondary texts, or in direct conversation with the primary texts. Given the NT texts receptivity to a variety of Greek and Jewish traditions including the usage of the OT, these are plausible options. It may be argued that the selected texts may have been shaped by OT passages besides Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 (see n. 418) and one need not privilege the Akedah Servant complex as shaping their soteriology. While conceding the possibility that there may be other composite allusions interplaying in the selected texts, one still upholds the soteriological

significance of this specific convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53, as proven by numerous linguistic and conceptual correspondences. The contribution of this complex to the NT merits final assessment. Firstly, through its Akedah connection, the tradition provides a paradigm of a father offering his beloved son, on which God's sacrificial "giving/ offering" of the Son is predicated in Stage II texts, with emphasis on the uniqueness of the Son's relationship to the Father. Secondly, through its link to Isaiah 53 and associations with the Levitical cult, this complex enables the "giving" of the Son to be interpreted in sacrificial terms as vicarious and effecting expiatory atonement. The complex clarifies the identity, role and salvific objective of God and Christ, and the means of atoning sacrifice by which universal salvation is effected on behalf of all, accomplishing familial unity between the divine and humans. The Akedah Servant complex provides a soteriological basis for understanding the atoning sacrifice of Christ in the selected texts.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

This thesis originated from a few discrete observations: the explicit linkage of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 in patristic passages (i.e. Chrysostom); scholars' remarks (Lévi, Le Déaut, Spiegel) on the possible combining of Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song in relation to Pauline soteriology or as underlying specific NT verses like Rom 8:32; Vermes' and Daly's statements that the association of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 in the context of martyrdom resulted in the formation of Akedah haggadah; the occurrence of conceptual and verbal resonances with Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 in ancient Jewish texts like 2 Macc and *Wis.*(albeit lacking explicit references); the tendency for such convergences to occur in contexts of suffering and sacrifice (martyrdom, persecution). Since no systematic study of this phenomenon had been conducted, this thesis set out to investigate whether the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 reflects an underlying tradition which is manifest in a range of ancient texts. It formulated the following research question: to what extent have the Akedah and the Fourth Servant Song been linked in early Jewish tradition, and in what manner may such links have shaped an early Christian understanding of atonement? This final chapter will discuss the findings of this study, as well as their soteriological implications and relevance for critical debates, and possible future research directions.

7.1 RESEARCH FINDINGS

This study examined a selection of ancient Jewish and early Christian texts, diverse in genre (martyr narrative, commentary, gospel, rewritten Bible, etc.), authorship, milieu, and time-period (ranging between 2nd century BCE to 1st century CE). It categorised the passages chronologically within two stages to facilitate the identification of trends and connections within and between the groups: Stage I (pre-70CE Jewish texts) and Stage II (NT texts). Methodologically, this study developed a model of intertextuality derived from the critical insights of Brooke, among others (ch. 1.4). Accordingly, Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 are

understood as richly connotative "base/primary texts" which, given their mutual lexical and semantic resonances, are suggestive of one another, resulting in their being brought together by ancient exegetes/writers. The process by which they converge is described as an intertextual dialogue (between the primary texts, as well as other secondary passages) leading to the formation of a complex with associated motifs, which is taken up and transmitted by further dialoguing texts, in a continuing tradition. This thesis labelled the composite as the Akedah Servant complex, identifying nine defining elements which serve to verify its presence, even in passages lacking overt references to one or both primary texts. The nine elements are as follows:

1) The portrayal of a righteous figure who suffers unjustly.

2) The suffering is instigated or permitted (but not caused) by a supernatural being.

3) The sufferer does not protest, but co-operates.

4) A free and voluntary response is given on the part of the sufferer.

5) Suffering is framed as a test or demonstration of obedience or faithfulness.

6) The sufferer receives reward and exaltation at the end of the ordeal.

7) The recompense has universal consequence, and involves the nations as well.

8) The relationship between the sufferer and the permitter/instigator is defined in familial terms: father/son; mother/sons; Lord/servant; God/Son; God/children; Son/ siblings.

9) Associations are made with ideas of sacrifice and atonement (temple cult).

This thesis upholds that the above set of motifs result from the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 only, and other likely sources were eliminated (ch. 4.2). While the above criteria may seem overly schematised, nonetheless, they provided the best means to ascertain the presence of the Akedah Servant complex (allowing for some slight variations among texts) given their direct derivation from the primary texts. Stages I and II texts were analysed in relation to the complex using one or more of these approaches: individual analysis of each text for the presence of all nine motifs; analysis of texts for evidence of intertextuality with Genesis 22 and/or Isaiah 53; analysis of texts for evidence of intertextuality with secondary texts which manifest the Akedah Servant complex. Overall, it was found that the passages bear consistent

witness to the presence of the Akedah Servant complex, though, as expected, some diversity was observed in the different texts' expressions of the tradition.

Stage I passages (*Jubilees,* 4Q225, *De Abrahamo,* 2 Maccabees, and *Wisdom of Solomon*) were analysed individually, according to the nine motifs. All five texts manifested the Akedah Servant complex. One need not review the detailed findings (see ch. 5) but one notes the texts' emphasis on a range of sacrificial elements, including Tamid, burnt offering, passover/paschal lamb, ram sacrifice, Mt. Zion and the temple sacrificial complex, priestly genealogy, and martyr's blood. These motifs relate to the notion of sacrifice in different ways, such as expiation of sins by a cultic animal, the martyr's propitiation of divine wrath, or the redemptive effect of the paschal lamb/ram sacrifice. Moreover, nearly all the texts revealed verbal and semantic affinities with Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. Although *Jubilees,* 4Q225 and *De Abrahamo* passages present only Akedah versions, nonetheless, given the intertextuality model of this thesis where the primary texts suggest each other, one may assume Isaiah 53's implicitness, as part of the complex. This assumption was supported by *Jubilees* and 4Q225's portrayal of a suffering Abraham, a figure lacking "generation" like the Servant, among other affinities. Further, two Stage I texts devoid of an Akedah basis (2 Macc and *Wis.*) also manifest the same set of nine motifs, confirming that the complex occurs even without overt reference to the primary texts. Nevertheless, both 2 Macc and *Wis.* share linguistic and conceptual correspondences with Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53, including the theme of suffering righteousness. Additionally, some Stage I texts display evidence of intertextual dialogue with secondary texts (i.e. 4Q225 with *Jubilees* and Job, which bears links to Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53) suggesting that the complex was likely incorporated into Stage I texts in conversation with primary texts and intermediaries. Clearly, pre-70 CE Jewish texts provide early proof of the Akedah Servant complex, resulting from the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53, in situations of suffering (martyrdom, persecution, familial suffering) with strong sacrificial associations.

Stage II or NT texts, specifically John 3:16, Rom 8:32 and Heb 9:28 as analysed within their overall contexts, also manifest the Akedah Servant complex. They portray cosmic characters like God and the Son, with a sacrificial dynamic of God "giving up" the Son,

corresponding to the Akedah image of Abraham offering Isaac, and stressing the unique father/son relationship. Vocabulary from Leviticus and Isaiah 53 are employed to signify this offering of the Son as a vicarious and expiatory sacrifice. Various cultic elements (i.e.Yom Kippur, paschal lamb, sanctuary, blood) are present in Stage II texts, but they all relate to the central event of God giving his Son (in unity of wills) as an atoning sacrifice, motivated by divine love, and effecting universal salvation, accessible to all by faith, resulting in the familial unity of God/Son, God/children and Son/sibling relationships. All three texts demonstrate linguistic and semantic links to Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. Clearly, NT texts reveal their indebtedness to the Akedah Servant complex, likely incorporated through dialogue with primary or secondary texts.

To reiterate, the analysis of Stage I and II texts serves to confirm the presence of the Akedah Servant complex in the selections. These research findings verify the extensiveness of this tradition, establishing that the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 occurs in a range of ancient Jewish and early Christian texts spanning a few centuries, albeit with some variations between and within the periods. That the linkage consists of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 (and not others) is supported by explicit references, allusions, as well as linguistic and semantic resonances to Akedah and the Fourth Servant's Song. Despite the diverse expressions of the motifs in different texts, the complex remains consistent, with the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 taking place in contexts of suffering (martyrdom, persecution, Isaac's sacrifice, and Christ's death) allied with sacrificial elements. All the selected texts are characterised by cultic motifs, which in Stage I texts tend to be discrete (ram, sheep, temple, Moriah, Tamid, Passover/paschal lamb, etc). In Stage II they cluster on a central atoning event of the "giving" of Christ in NT texts: God offers the Son (in a union of wills) as an expiatory sacrifice, atoning for the sins of all people, and effecting universal salvation and familial unity. Given this soteriological emphasis throughout Stage I and II passages, one may justifiably describe the Akedah Servant complex as an atonement tradition.

7.2   SOTERIOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

This section will draw conclusions on the soteriological implications of the Akedah Servant complex for an early Christian understanding of atonement.[817] Prior to doing so, it is helpful to consider some key metaphors and models of atonement. Holmes notes the "multiplicity of models," articulating the prevailing view that "more than one model is useful in attempting to speak of 'so great a salvation.'"[818] Meriting priority is the biblical sacrificial cult, which served to "formalize or reaffirm and, at times, to repair the relationship between the worshiper and God, and between the community of worshipers and God."[819] The system functioned on the basis that God dwells in the temple, but "humans can drive God out of the sanctuary by polluting it with their moral and ritual sins."[820] The blood of sacrificial animals purges (כפר) this pollution[821] "lest [the sanctuary] be abandoned by its resident [God]."[822] Blood is identified with life (Lev 17:11, Gen 9:4; Deut 12:23) where the "blood of the sacrificial animal atones by means of and by the power of the life contained in this sacrificial animal" (cf.17:11).[823] Conversely, impurity is associated with death.[824] The rationale seems to be that sin results in pollution/death, alienating God from his people, while the offering of blood/life through sacrifice purges the impurity and restores the relationship. Two clarifications are useful. The biblical cult is expiatory, rather than propitiatory: "God (or His representative) is always the subject, not the object of the action in question; the object is always sin or its effects [which]

---

[817] For an overview of Jewish notions relating to atonement/repentance, see Urbach, *Sages,*ch.XV, 420-523.

[818] Stephen Holmes, "Death in the Afternoon," in *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology* (ed. Richard Bauckham et al; Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009), 229-252, p.236.

[819] Levine, *Leviticus,* xxiv. For the sake of brevity, this discussion omits distinguishing P and H strata (see Migrom, *Leviticus,*13; Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*).

[820] Milgrom, *Leviticus,*43. For distinction between ritual and moral impurity, see Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, UP, 2000).

[821] On the atoning significance of sacrificial blood: Heb 9:22, "without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins;" *b. Yoma 5a:* "there is no atonement except through blood."

[822] For meanings of כפר see: Milgrom, *Leviticus,* 1079-1084; Jay Sklar "Sin and Impurity" in *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible* (ed. B. Schwartz et al.; NY: T&T Clark, 2008), 18-31. Whether all sacrificial blood atones, see Baruch Schwartz "The Prohibitions Concerning the 'Eating' of Blood in Leviticus 17" in *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel* (ed. Gary Anderson and Saul Olyan, Sheffield: JSOT ,1991), 34-66, n.2

[823] Daly, *Origins*, 32; However, Schwartz "Prohibitions," translates (17:11): "to act as ransom for your lives" (55).

[824] Milgrom, *Leviticus,* 46.

demands an interpretation of expiation, not propitiation."[825] Further, while cultic sacrifice involves the ritual slaughter of an animal, the priority is not the slaying of the animal, but in the releasing /receiving of life and in restoring relations with the divine.[826]

Among biblical metaphors pertaining to atonement, Anderson mentions the concept of נשׂא עון where the metaphor of "sin as a burden" results in dual meanings: the bearing of one's sin (נַשֹא: "carry" the weight) or the forgiveness of sin (נַשֹא: "carrying away or removing" another's burden).[827] The scapegoat ritual (Lev 16) "is dependent on the imagery of sin as a heavy burden."[828] Another biblical metaphor is "of sin as debt and forgiveness as debt release," and virtue as credit,[829] which (Anderson suggests) underlies the Christus Victor and Anselm models.[830] Aulén's "classic idea of atonement" in patristic literature, posits that humankind, due to their disobedience, is under slavery to sin, death and the devil, and that "Christ—Christus Victor—fights against and triumphs over the evil powers of the world" by rising from the dead, and "in Him, God reconciles the world to Himself."[831] A related notion is "that Christ gave himself as a ransom paid to the devil for human deliverance."[832] Another influential model is Anselm's (*Cur Deus Homo*) theory of satisfaction, based on the view that human sin has disrupted the order of the universe and offended God's honour. However, "if God were to compensate for the disturbance out of sheer mercy, that would be contrary to justice. The principle must be: either satisfaction or penalty,"[833] and since the offence is against an infinite God, an infinite satisfaction is necessary. Christ, the God-man, being sinless and not subject to death, through his voluntary death as a man, makes satisfaction, paying human debt through his

---

[825]Tuckett,"Atonement," n.p; Milgrom, *Leviticus,*1079-1083; E. Mulcahy, *The Cause of Our Salvation* (Rome: Gregorian UP, 2007), 429-34.
[826] Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1003 states sacrifice, in the priestly view, means returning life to its creator. The sacrificial system enables Israel to enter the sanctuary and receive, via the sacrifices, the divine blessing of life-giving procreation and life-sustaining produce. But Mark Heim, *Saved from Sacrifice* (Michigan: Eerdmans, 2006) holds the Girardian view, linking cultic sacrifice to sacred violence/death (93-95). For a counterview, see Klawans, *Purity* (chs.1,3).
[827] Anderson, "Israel's Burden," 7.
[828] ibid., 8.
[829] Anderson, "Israel's Burden," 9; *Sin*, 13,
[830] Anderson, *Sin*, 193-199.
[831] Aulén, *Christus Victor,*4. For a contemporary reading, see Mulcahy, *Cause,*329-343.
[832] ibid.44.
[833] Kasper, *Jesus,*219.

merit.[834] Anselm's is a propitiatory model, though divergent from Calvin's idea of penal substitution which is also propitiatory.[835] In the latter, Christ pays the penalty to divine justice, by "offer[ing] himself as a substitutionary victim on whom the penalty of God the Father falls."[836] Finally, Abelard's subjective approach to salvation proposes that God does not need to change or be reconciled, but humans do, and "Abelard believes that the love of God revealed and present in Christ will create that change."[837]

The above models largely fit Holmes' proposition that an account of salvation is analysable into three parts: a problem, a solution, and a promised end.[838] In evaluating the soteriology of the Akedah Servant complex as manifest in early Christian texts, one may likewise employ a tripartite model. The problem which this soteriology pre-supposes is a "radical sense of human alienation from God" as a result of transgressions.[839] From this perspective, sin "essentially is the breaking of relationship with God."[840] Consequently, "salvation depends upon the restoring of a relationship between human beings and God who are estranged from each other."[841] In order to reach this desired goal, the Akedah Servant complex presents a manifold solution as will be expanded below.

The idea of divine initiative is central to Akedah Servant soteriology, where "God is the initiator and offerer."[842] God initiates the process of salvation by the giving/offering of the Son. This act "reveals the graciousness of a God who always takes the initiative in healing alienated

---

[834] See Mulcahy, *Cause,* 343-357.

[835] Mulcahy, personal correspondence, 6 November 2011 notes that "Anselm insisted on '*either* satisfaction *or* punishment' and since Christ offered satisfaction out of the freedom of his love, the need for any punishment was removed. Mulcahy holds that "Anselm's approach of satisfaction through the freedom of Christ's love leading him to death belongs in the category of expiation rather than propitiation." However, by the definitions accepted in this thesis (pp.100,161,252,256), Anselm's soteriology in *Cur Deus Homo* best fits a propitiatory model. See Anselm, "Why God Became Man" in *Anselm of Canterbury: The Major Works,*" ed. B. Davies and G.R. Evans (Oxford: Oxford, UP,1998), 260-356.

[836] Fiddes, *Past Event,* 98.

[837] ibid.,143.

[838] Holmes, "Death," 231.

[839] Koester, *Death,*145 refers to John's Gospel, but is applicable to other stage II texts.

[840] Mulcahy, *Cause,* 162.

[841] Fiddes, *Past Event,*3.

[842] Mulcahy, *Cause,* 362.

parties."[843] However, God is not the sole initiator since the complex clarifies that Christ willingly and voluntarily participates in accomplishing the salvific goal, in a union of wills between God and Son. This notion of a free response by Christ addresses the concern of some scholars that "divine child abuse is paraded as salvific" in Christian tradition.[844] Further, this soteriology shifts away from the Anselm model which "gives very little attention to the reconciliation of relationships between God and humanity, [and] atonement seems the removal of guilt in an external transaction."[845]

Another key notion in this soteriology is divine involvement in the salvific process through suffering and love. The Akedah Servant complex highlights God as a righteous suffering figure in the giving of his "only" son. Mulcahy observes (cf. John 3:16 and Rom 8:32) "Jesus' self-giving is in reality a costly gift from God."[846] Alongside the notion of God's suffering, Christ's suffering and death too is accentuated. Divine involvement also encompasses the notion of love, as declared in John 3:16. By focusing on the affective dimension of God/Christ's salvific work, this atonement tradition veers from commercial metaphors like "ransom" or "debt." Campbell remarks that when pressed too far, monetary metaphors "tend to collapse because they are complex cultural analogies that fail to map accurately the relationship between humanity and God at its deepest level."[847]

The Akedah Servant soteriology also stresses human response to salvation by means of faith and obedience, whereas in the legal models, the emphasis tends to be on Christ's representative or substitutionary role. Fiddes critiques Calvin's and Anselm's theories that "they portray atonement as a transaction, or legal settlement between God the Father and God the Son in which we are not involved, despite being the erring sinners concerned," and "[do] not integrate the human response to God."[848]

---

843 Mulcahy, *Cause*, 362.
844 Joanne Carlson Brown and Rebecca Parker, "For God So Loved the World," in *Christianity, Patriarchy and Abuse* (Ohio; Pilgrim, 1989), 2.
845 Mulcahy,*Cause,*61.
846 Mulcahy, *Cause,* 361.
847 Campbell, *Deliverance,*55.
848 Fiddes, *Past Event,* 99.

Sacrifice is the mode or mechanism of atonement in this soteriology, as evident from the use of cultic motifs, sacrificial vocabulary and images. The Akedah image of a father offering the son, the motifs of a sacrificial ram/sheep, and the concept of vicariousness implicit in Isaiah 53 serve to define the salvific work of God and Christ in sacrificial terms. Some scholars perceive (in Girardian terms)[849] that to employ sacrificial language in describing God's reconciling efforts is "to come perilously close to sacralising the violent death of victims as necessary for the working out of salvation."[850] Heim, whose very title *Saved from Sacrifice* is telling, considers biblical cultic practices as being in continuity with "the logic of founding scapegoat sacrifice" and "the issue is not to interpret Jesus' death in terms drawn from the practice of cultic, ritual sacrifice."[851] Underlying such critiques is a definition of cultic sacrifice which emphasises the killing of the sacrificial victim, who is a substitute for the offerer, bearing punishment or being a scapegoat for another's sin. However, as clarified, expiatory cultic sacrifice, rather than stressing the idea of substitutionary death as a punitive measure, tends to accentuate the offering of life/blood as a means to eradicate death/pollution and restore relations with the divine. Given this context, to interpret Christ's sacrifice in cultic terms is not to sacralise violence or glorify righteous suffering.[852] The Akedah Servant soteriology acknowledges that as part of the salvific process, Christ's sacrifice entails vicarious suffering and death as a result of others' sins, but it also gives weight to the life-giving dimension of sacrifice: as stated, John 3:16 presents a love-based soteriology of God "giving" his only Son, whom people may choose to believe and gain eternal life, while John 3:14 links Christ's crucifixion with his exaltation (i.e. his resurrection and ascension); Hebrews 9:28, portrays Christ who is both high priest and sacrificial offering, being "offered" to expiate for sins, with believers anticipating eschatological salvation; Romans 8:32 expresses that God does not spare but gives his own Son for the sake of all, and assures that believers will receive all things.

---

[849] *The Girard Reader* (ed. James Williams; NY: Crossroad,1996).
[850] Mulcahy, *Cause,*368,381.
[851] Heim, 63,94.
[852] See Brown and Parker, *Christianity,* 26. For a perceptive discussion on the cross and its implications for suffering, see Heim, *Saved,*ch. 8

Ultimately, the "promised end" or recompense of this salvation account is the restoration of relationships, as defined in terms of familial unity: God/Son, God/children, Son/siblings.

To summarise, the soteriology of the Akedah Servant complex pre-supposes a situation of alienation from God through human sin. It presents a solution which includes divine initiation of the salvific process, divine involvement through suffering and love, as well as a human response of faith/obedience. The mechanism is predicated on cultic sacrifice, which is expiatory rather than propitiatory (unlike models of satisfaction or appeasement).[853] It expresses salvation in terms of the reconciling of relationships between God, Son and humanity. As established, this Akedah Servant soteriology has its origins in the long-standing tradition of the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 in ancient Jewish texts. This tradition which was received and transformed through a process of intertextual dialogue with NT texts, led to a familial model of atonement in early Christianity.

7.3   CRITICAL DEBATES

It is relevant to consider whether the research outcomes of this thesis bear implications, if any, on the critical debates outlined in chapter 2. These include: 1) the dearth of explicit (soteriological) references to Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 in the NT; 2) the question of influence of Akedah tradition on early Christian soteriology; 3) exegetical interaction between Jewish and Christian traditions with regard to Akedah; 4) atonement in relation to the Fourth Servant Song. One will not proffer a definitive answer to such complex questions, but the following observations may be of relevance to ongoing critical discourse.

Regarding whether Akedah tradition influenced NT soteriology as claimed by Lévi, Schoeps and Vermes, a proper study of this issue would require a wider and detailed examination of Akedah tradition including materials in the Pentateuchal targums, 4 Maccabees, *L.A.B.*, Josephus, and rabbinic Akedah midrash such as *Genesis Rabbah, Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael and Mekhilta de Rabbi Simeon ben Yohai,* all of which contain significant

---

[853] Fiddes, *Past Event,* 70-71: "propitiation, however sensitively it is stated is all about dealing with the reaction of God against sin, not about the taint of sin in human life."

hermeneutical deviations from the Genesis 22 account. However, as previously stated, some of these texts cannot be dated with certainty or are post-70CE, which make it problematic to draw definitive conclusions on their influence on NT soteriology. According to the findings in this thesis on Stage I or pre-70CE Jewish texts, one notes that none of the selections substantiate the existence of a doctrine of expiation on the binding of Isaac in pre-Christian Jewish texts. Admittedly, 4Q225 does manifest some features absent in other pre-70CE texts.[854] It has been central to a critical debate whether it reveals "the pre-Christian skeleton of the targumic midrashic representation of the sacrifice of Isaac."[855] While 4Q225 contains some features which later appear in the targums and some midrash, it also lacks defining elements present in the targumic tradition such as Isaac being informed, Isaac being identified as the lamb of sacrifice, Isaac's predominance, his redemptive/expiatory role, references to עקדת'ה דיצחק, etc. (see Appendix III for targum translations).[856] One may question then the appropriateness of regarding 4Q225 as "the pre-Christian skeleton." Perhaps a more reasonable position to take is that 4Q225 is one example of early innovation, with *Jubilees* (to which 4Q225 is indebted) also introducing new features (Mastema, Passover link). While 4Q225 holds significance for Akedah tradition, one needs to be cautious in defining its relationship to later texts. Perhaps seeing it as one along a spectrum of change may be best. Another relevant point is that both Stage I and Stage II texts which refer to Akedah tend to give predominance to Abraham rather than to Isaac (including 4Q225) thereby buttressing the stance that NT soteriology is not dependent on the Jewish Akedah tradition. However, as clarified above, this thesis does propose the existence of a pre-Christian Jewish tradition of atoning sacrifice resulting from a convergence of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22, namely, the Akedah Servant complex. This tradition clearly influenced the presentation of Jesus' death in conversation with some NT texts, but one stresses that the

---

[854] Fitzmyer, "Sacrifice," 225, identifies the following important steps in 4Q225: 1) the testing of Abraham at the Prince Mastemah's request; 2) the mention of 'fire' that identifies the mountain to which Abraham was going; 3) Isaac's request that Abraham 'bind' him fast; 4) the mention of holy angels standing by, weeping over (the altar or Isaac's death); 5) the mention of 'angels of Mastemah' rejoicing and saying,'Now he will perish'; and 6) an unclear reference to the 'binding' of Mastemah.

[855] See Vermes,"New Light," and for counter-argument, see Fitzmyer,"The Sacrifice of Isaac."

[856] Appendix III contains the Akedah accounts in the Pentateuchal Targums: *Targum Onkelos, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, *Palestinian Targums: Neofiti* and *Fragmentary* (P and V). The translations are mine, in consultation with Prof Hayward.

Akedah Servant complex was not only received, but it was also transformed by integration with Christian notions. This is the only valid inference that can be made on soteriological influence, in line with the research findings.

The analysis of Stage I and Stage II texts also concerns the issue of exegetical relations between Jewish and Christian traditions. As stated above, the presence of the Akedah Servant complex in New Testament texts indicate that early Christian writings likely came into contact with this Jewish tradition through a process of dialogue, and were receptive and innovative in taking up the complex. It serves to accentuate that past interactions between Jewish and Christian exegeses included "contact and even convergence"[857]

Some critical debates on Isaiah 53 have focused on its soteriology, including notions of cultic sacrifice, vicariousness and atonement. Since this text was analysed in detail (see 4.1.9) one need not repeat the findings, but this thesis concurs with the stance of scholars like Ekblad who affirm the cultic links of Isaiah 53, employing Levitical vocabulary and motifs, rather than the position of those who downplay its sacrificial connections (Janowski, Childs).

The remaining issue is on the dearth of soteriological references to Genesis 22 or Isaiah 53 in the NT (see 2:1).[858] Scholars have questioned why Akedah, given its portrayal of a righteous father offering a beloved son, and Isaiah 53, with its depiction of a righteous sufferer's vicarious suffering and death, have not been overtly deployed in relation to "the meaning of Christ's death," (see ch 2.1) considering obvious affinities. Pertinently, this study established that the NT (Stage II) texts manifest the Akedah Servant tradition, with its implicit convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53. Even though the primary texts may not directly be referred to, nevertheless, the presence of the complex endorses the view that Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 inform the soteriological/sacrificial interpretation of Christ's atoning work in some selected NT texts, contradicting the claims of those who deny their significance for NT soteriology.

---

[857] Boyarin, *Dying,* 19.
[858] Only James 2:21 and Hebrews11:17-19 explicitly refer to Abraham's offering of Isaac in relation to faith, but neither passage raises soteriological implications.

Two questions may follow: why does the NT lack explicit references to the primary texts? and why, given its relevance, does the Akedah Servant complex not appear more frequently in the NT? Regarding the first, one proposes that the NT writers may have internalised this complex, so that it shaped their thinking on soteriology, and they did not see the necessity of direct references to Genesis 22 or Isaiah 53. It is not an implausible suggestion given that the Akedah Servant tradition appears to have been transmitted over a considerable period in ancient Jewish literature (Stage I) prior to its advent in the NT. This tradition might well have been an integral part of the early (Jewish) Christians' conceptual world, that they drew on this complex consciously or unconsciously. It was perhaps sufficient to employ suggestive images, motifs or words like μονογενής, παραδίδωμι, ἀναφέρω or προσφέρω, thus evoking the presence of the tradition, rather than to develop an extended simile or make an explicit analogy between God and Abraham, or the Son and Servant. Daly suggests (concerning Akedah) that perhaps "the slightest allusion would have sufficed to recall its significance to them."[859] Campbell makes a similar suggestion "that Paul can merely echo Isaiah 53 in relation to Jesus in Romans 4:25 and expect his auditors to catch this phraseology."[860] One might say the same for the Akedah Servant complex.

Concerning the limited use of the Akedah Servant complex in the NT, one needs to clarify that the NT presumably contains more examples than the three texts examined in ch. 6. Verses conceptualising God as Father or Jesus as Son, with intertextual connections to Akedah and to Isaiah 53, and employing cultic vocabulary and imagery within a context of suffering and sacrifice, should alert one to the possibility that the Akedah Servant complex may be manifest (John 4:9-10, Rom 5:8, and Gal 1:4 seem likely). Nonetheless, the use of the complex is clearly not widespread. One reason may be that the NT presents God/Christ's saving work in different ways. As Tuckett comments, "one notable feature of NT ideas about the atonement is their variety. Not only are differences found between NT writers, but even the same writer can use

---

[859] Daly,"Soteriological Significance," 66.
[860] Campbell, *Deliverance,* 749.

what appears at times to be a bewildering variety of models and images."[861] The Akedah Servant complex is just one strand in a rich NT soteriological matrix.

7.4   CONCLUSION

Having established the formation of the Akedah Servant complex and tracked its reception in the different stages, explored its soteriological implications, as well as its possible relevance for some critical debates, this study remains aware that vast potential remains for further exploration. One area might be to investigate the beginnings of the Akedah Servant complex. Could the experience of suffering and the loss of cultic sacrifice during exile possibly have played some causative role, leading to the initial convergence of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22? Another line of inquiry might be to delve into the complex's ties to a wider network of passages with related themes of righteous suffering like Job, Psalm 22, and prophetic texts (see 4.2). In this context, Campbell's remark is relevant, "the early church explained the death of the innocent and pious Jesus in terms of certain key texts, linked together through shared words, phrases and stories."[862] He identifies a range of texts including Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22, *Wis.*, Daniel, Habakkuk, Psalms among others. One need not dismiss the possibility that other textual combinations besides the Akedah Servant complex may have influenced NT soteriology to different effect. Such claims do not invalidate this thesis' position that the convergence of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 in the formation of the Akedah Servant complex led to a distinctive familial atonement tradition in early Christianity.

Another avenue of research would be to trace the further development of the complex in the post-70 CE Jewish tradition, particularly giving attention to texts omitted from this study such as the Pentateuchal targums, *L.A.B.,* 4 Maccabees, and rabbinic midrash. Specifically worth investigating is whether the Akedah Servant complex had a shaping influence on the transformed portrayal of Isaac in late Jewish Akedah tradition, as suggested by affinities

---

[861] Tuckett, "Atonement," n.p. He identifies 5 categories of atonement in the NT: sacrifice, redemption, victory over evil powers, reconciliation and revelation.
[862] Campbell, *Deliverance,* 748.

between Isaac and the Servant, and themes shared with the complex. Additionally, the patristic

linkage of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 deserves to be thoroughly investigated.[863] In Melito's *Frag.*

9, the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 occurs not only at a semantic level, but also at a

lexical level, where words/phraseology from each biblical text blends into a single phrase or

sentence. For instance, the line "Isaac was silent, bound like a ram, not opening his mouth nor

uttering a sound" (17) interconnects Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 into a seamless sentence, where

"οὐκ ἀνοίγων τὸ στομα" (cf. Isa 53:7) and the "κριός" (cf.Gen 22:13) derive from the original

texts.[864] Such a research project could also lead to a closer examination of rabbinic and patristic

exegetical interactions, to complement the studies already carried out by Kessler and Boyarin,

among others. Moreover, the soteriological implications of the Akedah Servant complex can be

developed, perhaps integrating the insights of its familial model of atonement with a relational

soteriology that involves "the sphere of right relationships with God, with others, with oneself

and with the whole of creation."[865]

While several directions for future research remain, these last paragraphs look back on

the contributions of this thesis. It established that the association of Isaiah 53 and Genesis 22 by

ancient exegetes/writers is not an arbitrary or isolated occurrence, but that it reflects a tradition

of linkage spanning a variety of texts from different genres, milieus, and time periods. Further,

it developed an appropriate intertextual model (based on scholarly insights) which explains the

convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 through the formation of the Akedah Servant complex,

as well as enabling one to trace its reception (by a process of intertextual dialogue). Moreover, it

revealed an early Christian atonement tradition by analysing the Akedah Servant complex in

two stages, with its tendency for the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 to occur in

contexts of righteous suffering and sacrifice. It clarified this soteriology as a familial model of

---

[863] Among patristic texts which seem to manifest the Akedah Servant complex one may mention the following: Melito of Sardis *On Pascha*; *Fragments 9,10,11*; Clement of Alexandria, *paedagogus* i.5; Athanasius of Alexandria, *Festal Letter 6*; Gregory of Nyssa, *De tridui inter mortem et resurrectionem domini nostri Iesu Christi spatio (vulgo in Christi resurrectionem oratio i)*;Cyril of Alexandria, *Festal Letter 5*; John Chrysostom, *Homily 3* in *In epistula ii ad corinthios*
[864] *Melito of Sardis: On Pascha and Fragments* (ed. Stuart Hall; Oxford: Clarendon,1979).
[865] Mulcahy, *Cause,* 477.

atonement, predicated on the biblical cultic complex. While adding to the range of atonement ideas and metaphors,[866] this familial model may have contemporary relevance, for as Fiddes comments, "the atoning work of Christ will be understood as meeting the questions of our day, which are directed to the fragmenting of personality and loss of social relationships."[867] This soteriology also gives renewed significance to the sacrificial complex in the face of the "current antisacrificial bias,"[868] which overlooks the life-giving dimensions of the biblical cult. In addition, this study highlighted the likely contact between Jewish and Christian exegetical traditions with regard to the Akedah Servant complex.

This thesis has striven to answer its original research question by proving that Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53 have been extensively linked in early Jewish tradition, and that this linkage, through the formation and dialogic reception of the Akedah Servant complex, shaped an early Christian understanding of atonement. Finally, this study hopes to have stimulated discourse on the convergence of Genesis 22 and Isaiah 53, two biblical texts with limitless potential for explication.

---

[866] Mulcahy, *Cause,* 17. He observes that salvation "has never been the object of any official magisterial definition in the way that Christology and Trinity have been," and similarly, Fiddes, *Past Event*, 5 notes, that the Christian church has "never made any one understanding of the atonement official or orthodox. Creeds and Councils . . .have never tried to pin down the exact meaning of the atonement."
[867] Fiddes, *Past Event,*12.
[868] Klawans, *Purity,*10.

TRANSLATIONS OF GENESIS 22 (MT/ LXX)
[Translations by this writer. For text critical notes see ch. 3]

MT VERSION

1) It came to pass after these things that God tested Abraham and he said to him "Abraham" and he said "here I am."

2) And he said, take now your son, your only son, that you love, Isaac, and go to the land of Moriah and offer him there as a burnt offering on one of the mountains that I shall tell you

3) So Abraham rose in the morning and saddled his donkey, and he took two of his boys with him and Isaac his son and he split the wood for the burnt offering and he rose and walked to the place that God had told him.

4) On the third day Abraham lifted his eyes and he saw the place from afar.

5) And Abraham said to his boys, sit here with the donkey, and I and the boy will walk until this and we will worship and we will return to you.

6) And Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering and laid it on Isaac his son and he took in his hand the fire and the knife and the two of them walked together.

7) And Isaac spoke to Abraham his father and he said, "my father." And he said, "here I am, my son." And he said, "behold the fire and the wood, but where is the sheep which is for the burnt offering?"

8) And Abraham said God will provide him, the lamb for the burnt offering, my son and the two of them walked together.

LXX

1) And it came to pass after these things God was testing Abraham and said to him Abraham, Abraham, and he said, Behold I am here.

2) And he said take your son, the beloved one whom you love Isaac and proceed to the high land and offer him there as a burnt offering on one of the mountains which I will tell you.

3) Abraham rose early in the morning and saddled his donkey. He took with him two servants and Isaac his son and having split wood for the burnt offering, he rose and proceeded and came to the place of which God told him.

4) On the third day, looking up with his eyes, Abraham saw the place from afar.

5) And Abraham told his servants, Sit here with the donkey, and I and the boy will go until this place and having worshipped, we will return to you.

6) And Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering and he laid it on Isaac his son, and he took into his hand the fire and the knife and the two proceeded together.

7) And Isaac spoke to Abraham his father saying "father" and he said "What is it, child," And he said, "behold the fire and the wood. Where is the sheep for the burnt offering?"

8) And Abraham said God will provide [see] for himself a sheep for the burnt offering, child. And both proceeded together.

9) And they came to the place that God told him and Abraham built there the altar and he arranged the wood and he bound Isaac his son and he put him on the altar upon the wood.

10) And Abraham stretched forth his hand and he took the knife to slaughter his son

11) And the Angel of the Lord called to him from the heavens and he said Abraham, Abraham, and he said "here I am."

12) And he said, do not lay your hand on the boy, and do not do anything to him for now I know that you fear God and you have not withheld your only son from me.

13) And Abraham lifted his eyes and behold he saw behind him a ram was caught by his horns in a thicket and Abraham went and took the ram and he offered it as a burnt offering instead of his son .

14) And Abraham called the name of the place the Lord will provide [see] as it is said today "in the mountain of the Lord it will be provided."

15) And the Angel of the Lord called Abraham a second time from the sky.

16) And he said, by myself I have sworn says the Lord, because you have done this thing and not withheld your only son

17) That blessing I will bless you, and multiplying I will multiply your seed, as the stars in the heavens and as sand that is on the sea-shore, and your seed will inherit the gate of his enemies.

9) And they came to the place of which God spoke to him and Abraham built there an altar and he laid the wood [on it] and he bound Isaac his son hand and foot, and he laid him on the altar upon the wood.

10) And Abraham stretched his hand to take the knife to slaughter his son.

11) And an Angel of the Lord called him from the heavens and he said to him, "Abraham, Abraham," and he said, "here I am."

12) And he said "do not lay your hand on the child, and do not do anything to him, for now I know that you fear God, and you did not spare your beloved son on account of me.

13) And looking up with his eyes Abraham saw, and behold one ram, was held fast by its horns in a sabek bush, and Abraham went and took the ram and he offered him as a burnt offering instead of Isaac his son.

14) And Abraham called the name of that place the Lord provided [saw] in order that they may say today in this mountain the Lord has provided [seen].

15) And an Angel of the Lord called Abraham a second time out of the Heavens

16) Saying of myself I swear, says the Lord, that because you did this thing and did not spare your beloved son on account of me

17) Surely blessing I will bless you and multiplying I will multiply your seed as the stars of the heaven and as the sand along the seashore, and your seed shall inherit the cities of their enemies.

18) In your seed all the nations of the earth will bless themselves because you have listened [to] my voice.

19) And Abraham returned to his boys and they rose and walked together to Beer Sheva and Abraham dwelt in Beer Sheva.

18) And in your seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because you obeyed my voice.

19) And Abraham returned to his servants and rising they went together to the well of the oath and Abraham settled at the Well of the oath.

MT	1QIsa[a]	LXX
[13]Behold my servant will prosper, he will be high and lifted up and very exalted	[13]Behold my servant will prosper, and he will be high and lifted up and very exalted.	[13]Behold, my servant will understand and be lifted up and glorified exceedingly.
[14]Just as many were appalled at you, so disfigured from a man was his appearance, his form from sons of man.	[14]Just as many were appalled at you, so my anointed one from a man was his appearance, and his form from the sons of man.	[14]As many will be astonished at you, so deglorified will be your appearance among men, and your glory among men.
[15]So shall he sprinkle many nations, kings shall shut their mouths at him for that which had not been recounted to them, they have seen, and what they have not heard they have considered diligently.	[15] So shall he sprinkle many nations, and kings shut their mouths at him for that which had not been recounted to them, they have seen, and what they have not heard they have considered diligently.	[15]So shall many nations be amazed at him, and kings will hold fast their mouths, for those to whom it was not announced about him, shall see, and those who have not heard will understand.
[1]Who has believed our report? And upon whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?	[1]Who has believed our report? And to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?	[1]Lord, who believed our report, and to whom was the arm of the Lord revealed?
[2]For he grew up before him like a young plant, and as a root from dry ground, he had no form and he had no splendour, that we should look at him and he had no appearance that we should desire him.	[2]For he grew up before him like a young plant, and as a root from dry ground, he had no form, and he had no splendour [to him] that we should look at him[us] and he had no appearance that that we should desire him[us].	[2] we announced before him as a child, as a root in thirsty ground, there is no appearance to him nor glory. And we saw him, and he had neither appearance nor beauty.
[3]He was despised and rejected by men, a man of sorrows, known to disease, and like one who hides his face from us, he was despised and we did not esteem him.	[3]He was despised and rejected by men, and a man of sorrows, knowing disease, and like one who is hiding his face from us, and we despised him and we did not esteem him.	[3]But his appearance was dishonoured, failing among all men, a man in affliction, knowing to carry sickness, for his face was turned away, he was dishonoured and not esteemed.
[4]Surely he has carried our diseases, and our sorrows he has borne them, and we thought him stricken, smitten by God and afflicted.	[4]Surely he has carried our diseases, and our sorrows he has borne them, and we thought him stricken, and smitten by God and afflicted.	[4]This one bears our sins, and he suffers for us, and we considered him to be in pain, in affliction, and in oppression

⁵But he was pierced for our sins, he was crushed for our iniquities, the chastisement
for our peace was upon him, and by his stripe it was healed to us

⁶All of us like sheep have wandered, we have turned, each to his own way. And the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all.

⁷He was oppressed and afflicted and he opens not his mouth, like a sheep led to the slaughter place, and an ewe before its shearers is dumb, so he shall open not his mouth.

⁸By coercion and judgment he was taken away, and who will consider his generation?
For he was cut off from the land of the living, and for the transgressions of my people, a stroke to him.

⁹He set his grave with the wicked, and the rich in his deaths, though he had done no violence, and there was no deceit in his mouth.

¹⁰ But it pleased the Lord to crush him, made [him] sick, if you make his soul a guilt offering, he shall see seed, he will prolong days, and the delight of the Lord will prosper in his hand.

¹¹By the labour of his soul, he will see, he will be satisfied, by his knowledge my righteous servant will justify many, and he will bear their iniquities.

⁵But he was pierced for our sins, and he was crushed for our iniquities and the chastisement for our peace was upon him and by his stripes it was healed to us.

⁶All of us like sheep have wandered, we have turned, each to his own way. And the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all.

⁷He was oppressed and afflicted and he opens not his mouth, like a sheep led to slaughter, an ewe before its shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth.

⁸By coercion and judgment he was taken away, and who will consider his generation?
For he was cut off from the land of the living, and for the transgressions of his people, he was stricken.

⁹They set his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death, though he had done no violence, and there was no deceit in his mouth.

¹⁰ But it pleased the Lord to crush him, and he pierced him. If you make his soul a guilt offering, he shall see seed and he prolonged days, and the delight of the Lord will prosper in his hand.

¹¹By the labour of his soul, he will see light and be satisfied, and by his knowledge my righteous servant will justify many, and he will bear their iniquities

⁵But he was wounded for our transgressions, and was weakened on account of our sins. The discipline of our peace was on him and by his wound we were healed.

⁶ Like sheep we have all strayed, each man has strayed in his way, and the Lord gave him up to our sins.

⁷And during the mistreatment, he opens not his mouth, like a sheep led to slaughter, and a lamb before its shearers is dumb, so he opens not his mouth.

⁸In the humiliation, his justice was taken away. Who will tell of his generation? For his life is taken away from the earth. By the transgressions of my people he was led to death.

⁹And I will give the wicked for his tomb, and the rich for his death, for he did no transgression, nor was deceit found in his mouth.

¹⁰and the Lord desires to purify him from the stroke. If you (pl) give a sin offering, your soul shall see a long-lived posterity. And the Lord desires to take away

¹¹ the suffering of his soul, to show him light and to form with understanding, to justify a righteous one serving many well, and he will offer/take away their sins.

¹² Therefore, I will give a portion to him with the great, and he will divide the spoils with the mighty, because he has poured out his soul to death, and he was counted with the transgressors, and he has carried the sin of many, and he will make entreaty for transgressors.

¹²Therefore I will give to him a portion with the great, and he will divide the spoils with the mighty because he has poured out his soul to
death and he was counted among sinners, and he has carried the sins of many, and he will entreat for their transgressions.

¹²Therefore, he shall inherit many and he will divide the spoils of the mighty, because his soul was delivered up to death, and he was numbered among transgressors, and he offered the sins of many, and he was given up on account of their sins.

TARGUMIC TRANSLATIONS

(Translations by this writer in consultation with Prof. Hayward)

Onkelos

1) And it was after these things the Lord tested Abraham and He said to him, Abraham, and he said, Here I am.

2) And he said, take now your son, your only [son], whom you love, Isaac, and go to the land of worship and offer him before me there, as a burnt offering on one of the mountains that I will tell you.

3) And Abraham rose early in the morning and saddled his donkey and took two of his young men with him, and Isaac his son, and clave the wood for the burnt offering and rose and went to the place that the Lord had said to him.

4) on the third day, Abraham raised his eyes and beheld the place from afar.

5)And Abraham said to his young men, Wait you here with the donkey while I and the young man will arrive here, and we will worship and we will return to you.

Neofiti

1) And it was after these things the Lord tested Abraham in the tenth trial and said to him, Abraham. He answered in the language of the sanctuary, and Abraham said to him, here I am.

2) And he said, take now your son, your only [son] that you love, Isaac, and go to the land of Mt.Moriah and offer him there as a burnt offering on one of the mountains that I will tell you.

3) And Abraham rose early in the morning and prepared his donkey and took two of his young men with him, and Isaac his son, and he split wood for the burnt offering, and rose and went to the place that the Lord said to him.

4) On the third day Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw the place from afar.

5) Abraham [said] to his young men, wait here with the donkey, and I and the boy will arrive here, and we will **pray** and return to you.

Fragmentary

1)V: *and God tested:* it was after these things the Lord tested Abraham in the tenth trial and he said to him, Abraham, and he said, here I am.

2) V: *Mount Moriah:* Mount Moriah

Pseudo-Jonathan

1)And it was after these things, after Isaac and Ishmael contended, because that Ishmael was saying, it is fitting for me to be my father['s] heir because I am his firstborn son, and Isaac was saying, it is fitting for me to be my father['s] heir because I am the son of Sarah his wife, but you are the son of Hagar, the maid of my mother. Ishmael answered and said I am more righteous than you because I was circumcised at thirteen years, but if it had been my will to refuse, I would not have handed over myself to be circumcised, but you were circumcised at eight days old, but if the knowledge had been in you, perhaps you would not have handed yourself to be circumcised.

Pseudo Jonathan

Isaac replied and said, behold today I am 37 years old, and if the Holy One, blessed is He, would require all my members, I would not hold back. Immediately these words were heard before the Master of the world and immediately the Word of the Lord tested Abraham and said to him, Abraham and he said to him, Here I am.

2) And he said, take now your son, your only [son] that you love, Isaac, and go to the land of worship, and offer him there as a burnt offering on one of the mountains that I tell you.

3) And Abr. rose early in the morning and saddled his donkey and took two of his boys, Eliezer and Ishmael, with him, and Isaac his son, and he split wood of the olive and fig and palm, which are fitting for the burnt offering, and he rose and went to the place that God told him

4) On the third day Abraham raised his eyes and saw the cloud of glory encircling the mountain and he recognised it from afar.

5)And Abraham said to his young men, wait here with the donkey, and I and the young boy will arrive here to test if it will be fulfilled what I had been told, 'thus will be your son[s],' and we will worship the Master of the World and return to you.

213

ONKELOS

6) And Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering, and placed [it] on Isaac his son, and he took in his hand the fire and the knife, and they went, both [of them] as one.

7) And Isaac said to Abraham his father and said, Father, and he said, here I am my son. And he said, behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for the burnt offering?

8) And Abraham said, the lamb for the burnt offering is revealed before the Lord, my son. And they went, both [of them] as one.

9) They came to the place that the Lord said to him, and Abraham built there the altar and arranged the wood, and bound Isaac his son and placed him on the altar upon the wood.

10) And Abraham stretched his hand and took the knife to slaughter his son.

214

NEOFITI

6) And Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering and put [it] on Isaac his son, and he took in his hand the fire and the knife, and both of them went as one in perfect heart.

7) And Isaac said to Abraham his father and said, father, and he said, here I am, my son, and he said, behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for the burnt offering?

8) And Abraham said, from before the Lord has been prepared for himself the lamb of the burnt offering; and if not you are the lamb of the burnt offering; and they went both of them as one, in perfect heart.

9) And they came to the place that the Lord had said to him, and Abraham built there the altar, and arranged the wood and bound Isaac his son and placed him on the altar above the wood.

10) And Abraham stretched his hand and took the knife to slaughter Isaac his son. Isaac answered and said to Abraham his father, Father, bind me well, that I don't kick you, and your offering becomes unfit for you, and I be thrust to the pit of destruction in the world to come. The eyes of Abraham were on the eyes of Isaac, and the eyes

FRAGMENTARY

8) P: And Abr said, from before, the Lord has been prepared a lamb for the burnt offering my son; and if not, you are the lamb, and both of them walked together as one in perfect heart, Abraham to slaughter, and Isaac his son to be slaughtered.

8) V: And Abraham said, the Word of the Lord will be prepared for me as a lamb; if not, you are the lamb for the burnt offering my son, and the two of them walked as one, quiet hearted.

10) P:And Abraham stretched his hand and took the knife to slaughter Isaac his son; Isaac answered, and said to Abraham his father, Father, bind my hands well, that in my hour of affliction I will not kick and confound you, and your offering will be found unfit and I will be thrust into the pit of destruction in the world to come. The eyes of Abraham were gazing at the eyes of Isaac, and the eyes of Isaac were gazing at the angels on high; Isaac saw them, Abraham did not see them. At that hour a voice came from heaven and said, Come and see two righteous unique ones in the world one slaughters and one is being slaughtered, one that slaughters does not spare, and one being slaughtered stretches his neck.

10) V: At that hour came angels from high and were saying to each other, Come and see two righteous unique ones in the midst of the world, one slaughters and one is being slaughtered, one that

PSEUDO-JON

6) And Abraham took the wood for the burnt offering and laid it on Isaac his son, and he took in his hand the fire and the knife, and both of them went as one

7)And Isaac said to Abraham his father and said, Father, and he said, Here I am, my son, and he said, behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for the burnt offering?

8) And Abraham said the Lord will choose to himself the lamb of the burnt offering my son, and they went both of them in perfect heart as one.

9) And they came to the place that the Lord had told him, and Abraham built there the altar that Adam had built which had come apart in the waters of the deluge, but again Noah had built it which had come apart in the generation of the division, and he arranged on it the wood and bound Isaac son and placed him on the altar upon the wood.

10) And Abraham stretched his hand and took the knife to slaughter his son, Isaac answered and said to his father, bind me well that I will not kick from pain of my soul, and there be found a blemish in your offering, and we be cast into the pit of destruction. The eyes of Abraham were looking at the eyes of Isaac, and the eyes of Isaac were looking at the angels on high; Isaac saw them but Abraham did not see them. The angels on high were answering, Come, see two unique ones that are in the world, one slaughters and one is being slaughtered, and the one slaughtering does not spare, and the one being slaughtered stretches his neck.

ONKELOS

11) And the Angel of the Lord called to him from the heaven and said Abraham, Abraham, and he said, here I am.

12) And he said, do not stretch your hand on the young man and do not do to him anything because now I know that you fear the Lord and you did not withhold your only [son] from me.

13) And Abraham raised his eyes after these, and saw, and behold the ram held in the tree by its horns, and Abraham went and took the ram and offered it for a burnt offering instead of his son.

14) and Abraham worshipped and prayed there in that place. He said before the Lord, here shall generations worship. Thus it will be said, As on this day, on this mountain, Abraham worshipped before the Lord.

NEOFITI

of Isaac were gazing at the angels on high. Abraham was not seeing them. In that hour, a "daughter of a voice" came out from heaven and said, come, see two unique ones in my world. One slaughters, and one is being slaughtered; the one who slaughters does not spare, and the one who is being slaughtered stretches his neck.

11) And the angel of the Lord called to him from the heaven and said, Abraham, Abraham, and he said, here I am.

12) And he said do not stretch your hand against the boy, and do not do anything to him, for now I know that you fear from before the Lord, and did not withhold your son, your only [son] from me.

13) And Abraham lifted his eyes and saw and behold one ram in a tree [מסבך] by its horns, and Abraham went and took the ram and offered it as a burnt offering instead on his son.

14) And Abr worshipped and prayed in the name of the word of the Lord and said, I beseech by the mercies before you, Lord, all is revealed and known before you, that my heart was not divided in the first time that you said to me to offer Isaac my son, to make him dust and ashes before you, but immediately I rose early in the morning and did your word in joy, and fulfilled your decree. So now when his sons are standing in the hour of affliction you will remember the binding

FRAG

slaughters does not spare, and one being slaughtered stretches his neck

11) P and V:
The angel of the Lord called to him from the heaven and said, Abraham, Abraham, and Abraham answered in the language of the sanctuary and said, Here I am.

14)
P: Abraham worshipped and prayed there in the name of the Word of the Lord and said you are the Lord God who sees and is not seen [V: I beseech mercy from before you] all is revealed and known before you, that [V: in my heart] there was no division in the hour [V: time] that you said offer Isaac your son before me [V: offer Isaac your son and to make of him dust and ashes before you, rather] immediately I arose early in the morning and did your precept and kept your decree [V: with joy, and I fulfilled the word of your mouth] and now [I] beseech by the mercies from before you Lord God, when the sons of Isaac my son enter into a hour of groaning remember the binding of Isaac their father, and release and forgive their guilt and deliver [p: פרק v:שזב] them from all distress [that] in the future the generations rising in the future [the generations rising after him] will say, In the mountain of the Temple of the

PSEUDO-JON

11) And the Angel of the Lord called to him from the heaven and said to him, Abraham, Abraham, and he said, here I am.

12) And he said, do not stretch your hand against the boy and do not do anything bad to him because now it has been revealed before me that you fear the Lord since you did not withhold your son, your only [son] from me.

13) And Abraham lifted his eyes and saw, behold the ram, the one that had been created at twilight at the completion of the world, caught by its horns in the thicket of a tree, and Abraham came and took it and offered it as a burnt offering instead of his son.

14) And Abraham thanked and prayed there in that place and said [I] beseech by the mercies from before you Lord, it is revealed before you that there was no trickery in my heart, and I sought to do your decree in joy, thus when the sons of Isaac my son enter a hour of groaning may you remember them and answer them and deliver [פרק] them, and in the future all these generations that will rise will say, On this mountain Abraham bound [כפת]Isaac his son, and there was revealed to him the Shekinah of the Lord.

ONKELOS	NEOFITI	FRAG	PSEUDO-JON
	of Isaac their father and listen to the voice of their prayers, and answer them, and deliver them from all the distress so that future generations that will arise after him will say, In the mountain of the sanctuary of the Lord that Abr offered his son Isaac, and in this mountain the glory of the Shekinah of the Lord was revealed to him.	Lord Abraham offered his son Isaac and on this mountain [of the Temple of the Lord] was revealed to him the glory of God's Shekinah.	
15) And the Angel of the Lord called to Abraham a second time from the heavens.	15) And the angel of the Lord called Abraham a second time from the heaven.		15)The Angel of the Lord called to Abraham a second time from the heaven.
16) And he said, by my Word I have sworn, said the Lord, because you have done this thing and not withheld your son, your only [son]	16) And said, In the name of My Word, I swear, says the Lord, that because you have done this thing and did not withhold your son, your only [son].		16)And he said, By my word I swear, said the Lord, because you did this thing and did not withhold your son, your only [son]
17) that Blessing I will bless you, and increasing I will increase your son[s] as the stars of the sky and as the sand on the sea shore, and inherit the cities of their enemies.	17) that I will indeed bless you and indeed increase your son[s] as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand of the sea which is on the sea shore, and your sons will inherit the cities of their enemies.		17) I will indeed bless you and indeed increase your son[s] as the stars of the heaven and the sand which is on the sea shore, and your son[s] will inherit the cities of their enemies.
18)And on account of your son[s] will be blessed all the peoples of the earth because you received my Word.	18)And in your seed will be blessed all the peoples of the earth because you listened to the voice of His word.		18) On account of your righteous son[s]will be blessed all the peoples of the earth because you obeyed my Word.
19) So Abraham returned to his young men and they rose and went as one to Beer Sheva, and Abraham dwelt in Beer Sheva.	19)And Abraham returned to his young men and they rose and went as one to Beer Sheva, and Abraham dwelt in Beer Sheva.		19)And the angels on high took Isaac and brought him to the bet-*midrash* [schoolhouse] of Shem the Great and he was there for three years, and on that day Abraham returned to his young men and they rose and went as one to Beer Sheva, and Abraham dwelt in Beer Sheeva.

216

BIBLIOGRAPHY

JEWISH PRIMARY SOURCES

Mishnah and Talmud:

Blackman, Philip. *Mishnayoth.* 7 vols. New York: Judaica Press, 1963-4.

Danby, Herbert, ed. *The Mishnah.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1933.

Epstein, I., ed. *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Nezikin.* 8 vols. London: Soncino, 1935.

Targums

Clarke, E. G. et al., eds. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance.*
     New Jersey: Ktav, 1984.

Díez Macho, Alejandro, ed. *Neophyti I: Genesis: Targum Palestinense ms. de la
     Biblioteca Vaticana, Edicion Principe.* vol 1. Madrid: Consejo Superior de
     Investigaciones Científicas,1968-1979.

Klein, Michael, ed. *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to their Extant
     Sources.* 2 vols. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1980.

Maher, Michael, ed. *The Aramaic Bible: The Targums. Vol. 1B. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan:
     Genesis.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark,1992.

Sperber, A., ed. *The Bible in Aramaic, I: The Pentateuch According to Targum Onkelos.*
     Leiden: Brill, 1959.

Midrash

Epstein, J.N. and E.Z. Melamed., eds. מכילתא דרבי שמעון בן יוחאי (*Mekhilta de Rabbi Simeon b.
     Yohai*). Jerusalem: Mekitse Nirdamim, 1955.

Freedman, H., ed. *Midrash Rabbah: Genesis I.* vol 1. London: Soncino, 1951.

Lauterbach, J.Z., ed. *Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael.* vol 1. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication
     Society, 1933.

Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Jewish Writings

Milik, J.T. and J. VanderKam. *Qumran Cave 4. VIII: Parabiblical Texts. Part I. Discoveries
     in the Judaean Desert* XIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

Millar Burrows, with John C Trever and William H. Brownlee, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of
     St. Mark's Monasutery: The Isaiah Mansucripts and the Habakkuk Commentary.* vol 1.
     New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950.

 217

Ulrich, Eugene and Peter W. Flint. *Qumran Cave 1. II: The Isaiah Scrolls*. 2 vols. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* XXXII . Oxford: Clarendon, 2010.

VanderKam, J. *The Book of Jubilees*. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.

Hellenistic Jewish Writings

Josephus. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1925-1965.

Pseudo-Philon. Les Antiquités Bibliques. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. vol I. Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1976.

Pseudo-Philo. *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. Edited by M. R. James. 1917. Prolegomenon by Louis Feldman. Repr., New York: Ktav Publishing Company, 1971.

Philo. Edited by F. Colson and G. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1929-1943.

Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt. Edited by L. Cohn and P Wendland. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1896-1915.

Biblical Texts (MT and Septuagint)

Ellinger, E. and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1987.

Hanhart, Robert, ed. *Maccabaeorum Liber II. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. vol. 9/2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht,1959.

4 Maccabees. BGT BibleWorks on CD-ROM. Version 6.0. Virginia: BibleWorks LLC, 2003 [Based on the Novum Testamentum Graece, Nestle-Aland 27th Edition, Stuttgart, 1993 and LXX Septuaginta (Old Greek Jewish Scriptures) edited by Alfred Rahlfs, Stuttgart,1935].

Wevers, J. W. ed. *Genesis. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum gottingensis editum*. vol.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.

Ziegler, J. ed. *Isaias. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum*. vol.14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939.

Ziegler, J. ed. *Sapientia Salomonis. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. vol. 12/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962.

PATRISTIC PRIMARY SOURCES

Athanasius of Alexandria. *Epistolae Heortasticae VI*. Patrologia graeca. vol. 26. Edited by J.-P. Migne.162 vols. Paris:1857-1886.

Athanasius of Alexandria. *Festal Letter 6. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers on CD ROM*. vol 4.

Logos Roman Catholic Edition, 1995-1999. Print ed.: Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 1885-1887. 10 vols. Repr. Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.

Cyril of Alexandria. *Homilia Paschalis 5*. Patrologia graeca. vol 77. Edited by J.-P. Migne.162 vols. Paris:1857-1886.

Cyril of Alexandria. *Festal Letters 1-12 by St Cyril of Alexandria.* Edited by John J. O'Keefe. Translated by Philip R. Amidon. Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2009.

Clement of Alexandria. *Paedagogus.* Patrologia graeca. vol. 8. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris:1857-1886.

Clement of Alexandria. *The Instructor. Ante-Nicene Fathers*. vol 2. Logos Roman Catholic Edition, 1995-1999. Print ed.: Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 1885-1887. 10 vols. Repr. Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.

Gregory of Nyssa. *De Tridui Inter Mortem et Resurrectionem Domini Nostri Jesu* vulgo *In Christi Resurrectionem Oratio I.* Patrologia graeca. vol 46. Edited by J.-P. Migne.162 vols. Paris:1857-1886.

Gregory of Nyssa. *On the Three-Day Period of the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. Pages 31-50 in The Easter Sermons of Gregory of Nyssa: Proceedings of the Fourth International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa; Cambridge, England: 11-15 September, 1978.* Edited by Andreas Spira and Chrisoph Kloch. Translated by S. G Hall. Massachusetts: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1981.

John Chrysostom. *Homilia 3* in *In epistula ii ad corinthios -- homiliae 1-30.* Patrologia graeca. vol. 61. Edited by J.-P. Migne.162 vols. Paris:1857-1886.

John Chrysostom. *Homily 3* in *Homilies on Second Corinthians. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers on CD ROM.* vol 12. First Series. Logos Roman Catholic Edition, 1995-1999. Print ed.: Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 1885-1887. 10 vols. Repr. Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.

Melito of Sardis. *Melito of Sardis: On Pascha and Fragments.* Edited by Stuart Hall. Oxford: Clarendon Press,1979.

MODERN CRITICAL WORKS

Abegg, Martin, Peter Flint and Eugene Ulrich. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark,1999.

Alexander, Desmond. "Genesis 22 and the Covenant of Circumcision." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 8 (1983): 17-22.

Alexander, Philip. "Targum." *The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM*. Logos Library System. Version 2.1; 1997. Print ed.: David Noel Freedman, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary.* New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Allison, D. "Job in the Testament of Abraham." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 12 (2001): 131-147.

Anderson, Gary. "Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings." *The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM*. Logos Library System Version 2.1; 1997. Print ed.: David Noel Freedman, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

-----. "From Israel's Burden to Israel's Debt." Pages 1-30 in *Re-working the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*. Edited by Esther Chazon, Devorah Dimant and Ruth Clements; Brill: Leiden, 2005.

-----. *Sin: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Attridge, Harold. "The Uses of Antithesis In Hebrews 8-10." *Harvard Theological Review* 79 (1986):1- 9.

-----. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.

Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Translated by W. Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.

Aulén, Gustaf. *Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of Atonement*. London: SPCK,1931.

Bailey, Daniel. "Concepts of *Stellvertretung* in the Interpretation of Isaiah 53." Pages 223-250 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Edited by William Bellinger and William Farmer. Penn: Trinity Press International, 1998.

Barclay, John. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE to 117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T & Clark,1996.

Barrett, C.K. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,* London: Adam and Charles Black,1957.

-----. *The Gospel According to John*. London: SPCK, 1967.

Barthes, Roland. "Theory of the Text." Pages 31-47 in *Untying the Text: A Post Structuralist Reader*. Edited by Robert Young. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

Baslez, Marie-Francoise. "The Author of Wisdom and the Cultured Envirnoment of Alexandria." Pages 33-52 in *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research : Studies on Tradition, Redaction and Theology*. Edited by Angelo Passaro and Giussepe Bellia. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.

-----. "The Origin of the Martyrdom Images." Pages 113-130 in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology*. Edited by G. Xeravits and J. Zsengellér. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Bastiaens, J.C. "Job 16-19 and the Suffering Servant Passages." Pages 421-432 in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah: Festschrift Willem A.M. Beuken*. Leuven: University Press, 1997.

Bauckham, Richard. "The Divinity of Jesus Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 15-36 in *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham et al. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009.

Beavis, Mary Ann "The Resurrection of Jephthath's Daughter : Judges 11:34-40 and Mark 5:21-24, 35-43." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 72 (2010): 46-62.

Beker, J.C. "The Faithfulness of God and the Priority of Israel in Paul's Letter to the Romans." Pages 327-332 in *The Romans Debate.* Edited by Karl P. Donfried. Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1991.

Bellia, Giussepe. "Historical and Anthropological Reading of the Book of Wisdom." Pages 83-115 in *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research: Studies on Tradition, Redaction and Theology* Edited by Angelo Passaro and Giussepe Bellia. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.

Bellinger, William and William Farmer. Introduction to *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins.* Edited by William Bellinger and William Farmer. Penn: Trinity Press International, 1998.

Bergsma, J. "The Relationship between *Jubilees* and the Early Enochic Books." Pages 36-51 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees.* Edited by G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009.

Berman, Louis A. "The Akedah in Music and Literature." Pages 195-213 in *The Akedah: The Binding of Isaac.* New Jersey: Jason Aaronson Inc.,1997.

Bernstein, Moshe. "Angels at the Aqedah: A Study in the Development of a Midrashic Motif." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 7 (2000): 263-291.

Betz, Otto. "Jesus and Isaiah 53." Pages 70-87 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins.* Edited by William H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer. Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1998.

Boccacini, G. "From a Movement of Dissent to a Distinct Form of Judaism." Pages 193-210 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah : The Evidence of Jubilees.* Edited by G.Boccaccini and G.Ibba. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009.

Borgen, Peder. "The Gospel of John and Hellenism." Pages 98-123 in *Exploring the Gospel of John: in Honor of D. Moody Smith.* Edited by Alan Culpepper and Clifton Black. Louisville: Westminster John Knox,1996.

-----. *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete For His Time.* Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Bourke, Myles M. "The Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 920-941 in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary.* Edited by Raymond Brown, Joseph Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Boyarin, Daniel. *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism.* California: Stanford University Press, 1999.

Brenner, Athalya. *Feminist Companion to Genesis.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Brettler, Marc Zvi. "The Promise of the Land of Israel to the Patriarchs in the Pentateuch." Pages vii-xxiv in *Shnaton: An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies.* Edited by Moshe Weinfield. Israel Bible Society, Jerusalem: Newman, 1981.

Brodie, Thomas. *The Birthing of the New Testament: The Intertextual Developemnt of the New Testament Writings.* Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2004.

Brody, Robert. "Introduction to Talmud." (Course Notes). Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Fall 2006.

Brooke, George T. "Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament." Pages 70-94 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament : Essays in Mutual Illumination.* London: SPCK, 2005.

-----. "On Isaiah at Qumran." Pages 69-85 in *As Those Who are Taught: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL.* Edited by Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Brown, Francis, ed. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*.1906. Repr., Mass.: Hendrickson, 2005.

Brown, Joanne Carlson and Rebecca Parker, "For God So Loved the World?" in *Christianity, Patriarchy and Abuse : A Feminist Critique.* Edited by Joanne Carlson Brown and Carole R. Bohn. Ohio: The Pilgrim,1989.

Brown, Raymond. *The Gospel According to John.* vol 1. Anchor Bible 29. New York: Doubleday, 1966. Repr., London: Geoffrey Chapman,1971.

-----. *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*. New York: Paulist, 1979.

Brown, Raymond, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy, eds. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Bruce, F.F. *The Gospel of John.* Basingstoke: Pickering Paperbacks,1983.

-----. *The Epistle to the Hebrews.* Michigan: Eerdmans,1990.

Brueggemann, Walter. *Genesis.* Atlanta: John Knox, 1982.

-----. *Isaiah 40-66.* Kentucky: Westminster: John Knox, 1998.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by G.R. Beaseley Murray. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.

Burkes, Shannon. "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Wisdom of Solomon." *The Harvard Theological Review* 95 (2002): 21-44.

Byrne, Brendan. *Romans.* Sacra Pagina Series 6. Minnesota: Liturgical, 1996.

Campbell, Douglas. *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul.* Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009.

Cassel, David. "Patristic Interpretation of Isaiah." Pages 145-169 in *As Those Who are Taught: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL.* Edited by Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Cavadini, J. "Exegetical Transformations." Pages 35-49 in *In Dominico Eloquio: Essays in Patristic Exegesis in Honor of Robert L. Wilken.* Edited by Paul Blowers et al. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2002.

Charlesworth, J. and Craig Evans, eds. "Why the Pseudepigrapha?" Pages 13-19 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.

Charlesworth, J. "OT Apocrypha." *The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM.* Logos Library System Version 2.1; 1997. Print ed.: David Noel Freedman, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary.* New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Childs, Brevard. *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible.* London: SCM, 1992.

-----. *Isaiah.* Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Clines, David. *I, He, We & They : A Literary Approach to Isaiah 53.* England: JSOT, 1976.

Cohen, Naomi. *Philo's Scriptures: Citations from the Prophets and Writing.* Brill: Leiden, 2007.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. "Finding Meaning in the Death of Jesus." *The Journal of Religion* 78 (1998):175-196.

Collins, John J. "The Reinterpretation of Apocalyptic Traditions in the Wisdom of Solomon." Pages 143-155 in *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research: Studies on Tradition, Redaction and Theology.* Edited by Angelo Passaro and Giussepe Bellia. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.

Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon (CAL), http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/ (14 October 2011).

Cranfield, C.E.B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Epistle to the Romans 1-8.* vol. 1. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975.

Crenshaw, James L. "The Book of Job." *The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM.* Logos Library System Version 2.1; 1997. Print ed.: David Noel Freedman, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary.* New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Culpepper, Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design.* Philadelphia: Fortress,1983.

Dahl, Nils. "The Atonement: An Adequate Reward for the Akedah?" Pages 137-152 in *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine.* Edited by Donal Juel. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Daly, Robert. "The Soteriological Significance of the Sacrifice of Isaac." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39 (1977): 45-75.

-----. *The Origins ofthe Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice.* London: Fortress,1978.

-----. *Sacrifice Unveiled : The True Meaning of Christian Sacrifice.* London: T&T Clark International, 2009.

Davies, P.R and Chilton, B. D. "The Aqedah: A Revised Tradition History." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 514-546.

Davies, P.R."Martyrdom and Redemption." Pages 652- 658 in *Studia Patristica* 17 (Pt.2). Edited by Elizabeth Livingstone. Oxford: Pergamon,1982.

Davila, J. *The Provenance of Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian or Other?* Leiden: Brill, 2005.

DeSilva, David A. *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews."* Michigan: Eerdmans, 2000.

Dillon, Richard. "The Spirit as Taskmaster and Troublemaker in Romans 8." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 60 (1998): 682-702.

Docherty, Susan E. *The Use of the Old Testament in Hebrews: A Case Study in Early Jewish Bible Interpretation.* Tuebingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Dodd, C.H. *The Bible and the Greeks.* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1954.

-----. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.* Cambridge: University Press,1968.

Doering, Lutz. "Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 261-275 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees.* Edited by G.Boccaccini and G. Ibba. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009.

Donfried, Karl P. "Introduction 1991." Pages xlix-lxxii in *The Romans Debate.* Edited by Karl P. Donfried. Massachusetts: Hendrickson,1991.

Donfried, Karl P, ed. *The Romans Debate.* Massachusetts: Hendrickson,1991.

Dorival, Gilles, Marguerite Harl and Olivier Munnich. *La Bible Grecque des Septante : du Judaïsme Hellénistique au Christianisme Ancien.* Paris: Éditions du CERF, 1988.

Driver, S.R., and A. Neubauer, trans. *The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah According to The Jewish Interpreters.* Oxford: James Parker &Co.,1877. Repr., New York: Hermon Press,1969.

Dunn, James. *Romans 1-8.* vol 38. Word Biblical Commentary. Texas : Word Books, 1988.

Eastman, Susan. "Whose Apocalypse? The Identity of the Sons of God in Romans 8:19." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121 (2002): 263-277.

Ekblad, Eugene R. *Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study.* Leuven: Peeters, 1999.

Ellingworth, Paul. *The Espistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text.* Michigan: Eerdmans, 1993.

Elliott, Mark, ed. *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. Old Testament XI: Isaiah 40-66.* Illinois: InterVarsity, 2007.

Elowsky, Joel, ed. *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. New Testament IVA: John 1-10.* Illinois: Inter Varsity, 2006.

Feldman, Louis. "Josephus as a Biblical Interpreter." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 75 (1985): 212-252.

-----. "Josephus." *The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM.* Logos Library System Version 2.1; 1997. Print ed.: David Noel Freedman, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary.* New York: Doubleday, 1992.

-----. "Philo's Version of the Akedah." Pages 66-86 in *The Studia Philonica Annual: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism.* vol. XIV. Edited by David Runia and Gregory Sterling. Providence: Brown Judaic Studies, 2002.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible.* Translated by Wilfred Watson. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Fiddes, Paul. *Past Event and Present Salvation: The Christian Idea of Atonement.* London: Darton, Longman &Todd, 1989.

Fishbane, Michael. "Midrash and Messianism; Some Theologies of Suffering and Salvation." Pages 57-71 in *Toward the Millennium: Messianic Expectations from the Bible to Waco.* Edited by Peter Schäfer and Mark Cohen. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Fisk, Bruce. "Offering Isaac Again and Again: Pseudo-Philo's Use of the Aqedah as Intertext." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62 (2000): 481-507.

Fitzmyer, Joseph. "The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32 (1970): 501-531.

-----. "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 382-407.

-----. "The Aramaic Language and the Study of the New Testament." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980): 5-21.

-----. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* Anchor Bible 33. New York: Doubleday,1993.

-----. "The Letter to the Romans." Pages 830-868 in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary.* Edited by Raymond Brown, Joseph Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1990.

-----. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2000.

-----. "The Sacrifice of Isaac in Qumran literature." *Biblica* 83 (2002): 211-229.

-----. "Qumran Literature and the Johannine Writings." Pages 117-133 in *Life in Abundance: Studies of John's Gospel in Tribute to Raymond E. Brown.* Edited by John Donahue. Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2005.

Flesher, Paul. "What about Isaac? Targumic Rewriting of Genesis 22." Paper presented at the Seminar for the Study of Judaism in Antiquity Series, Department of Theology and Religion, Durham University, Durham. March 16th 2009.

Flesher, Paul and Bruce Chilton. *The Targums: A Critical Introduction.* Texas: Baylor University Press, 2011.

Freyne, Seán and Sean Freyne. "Sacrifice for Sin." *The Furrow* 25 (1974):193-212.

García Martinez, Florentino. "The Sacrifice of Isaac in 4Q225." Pages 44-57 in *The Sacrifice of Isaac: the Aqedah (Genesis 22) and its Interpretations*. Edited by Ed Noort and Eibert Tigchelaar. Brill: Leiden, 2002.

Gilders, William. "Blood and Covenant." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* (2006): 83-118.

Goldstein, J. "The Date of the Book of *Jubilees*."*Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 50 (1983): 63-86.

Grabbe, Lester. *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation: The Hebrew Names in Philo.* Atlanta: Scholars, 1988.

-----. *Wisdom of Solomon.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Grabski, Jozef. "The Sacrifice of Isaac in Medieval Jewish Art." *Artibus et Historiae: An Art Anthology.* IRSA 16 /VIII (1987):67-89.

Green, Ronald. "Abraham, Isaac and the Jewish Tradition: An Ethical Reappraisal." *Journal of Religious Ethics* 10 (1982): 1-21.

Guerra, Anthony. J. *Romans and the Apologetic Tradition: the Purpose, Genre and Audience of Paul's Letter.* Cambridge University Press,1995.

Gundry, Robert and Russell Howell. "The Sense and Syntax of John 3:14-17 with Special Reference to the Use of ὅυτως . . .ὥστε in John 3:16." *Novum Testamentum* 41 (1999): 24-39.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Genesis.* 1910. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Repr., Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1997.

Gutmann, Joseph. *Sacred Images: Studies in Jewish Art from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* Northampton: Variorum Reprints, 1989.

Haber, Susan. "Living and Dying for the Law." *Women in Judaism: A Multidisciplinary Journal 4* (2006), n.p., http://wjudaism.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/wjudaism/article/view/247/320 (14 October 2011).

Hahn, Scott W. "A Broken Covenant and the Curse of Death: A Study of Hebrews 9:15-22." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 66 (2004): 416-436.

Halpern-Amaru, Betsy. "A Note on Isaac as First Born in *Jubilees* and Only Son in 4Q225." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 13 (2006):127-133.

-----. "The Festivals of Pesah and Massot." Pages 309-322 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees.* Edited by G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009.

Hamm, Dennis. "Faith in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52 (1990): 270-291.

Harl, Marguerite. "Les Divergences entre la Septante et le Texte Massoretique." Pages 200-222 in *La Bible Grecque des Septante: du Judaïsme Hellénistique au Christianisme Ancien* by G. Dorival, M. Harl, and O. Munnich. Paris: Éditions du CERF, 1988.

-----. *La Bible d'Alexandrie. Genèse.* vol.1. Paris: Éditions du CERF, 1994.

Harrington, Daniel J. "Pseudo-Philo." *The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM*. Logos Library System. Version 2.1; 1997. Print ed.: David Noel Freedman, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Hays, Richard. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press,1989.

Hayward, Robert. "The Present State of Research into the Targumic Account of the Sacrifice of Isaac." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 32 (1981): 127–150.

-----. "The Sacrifice of Isaac and Jewish Polemic Against Christianity." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52 (1990): 292-306

-----. "Red Heifer and Golden Calf : Dating Targum Pseudo Jonathan." Pages 9-32 in *Textual and Contextual Studies in the Pentateuchal Targums*. Edited by Paul Flesher. *Targum Studies*. vol. 1 Georgia: Scholars, 1992.

Heil, John Paul. "Jesus as the Unique High Priest in the Gospel of John." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57 (1995): 729-745.

-----. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Reader-Response Commentary*. Orgeon: Wipf and Stock, 2002.

Heim, Mark. *Saved from Sacrifice: A Theology of the Cross*. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2006.

Hendel, Roland. "Book of Genesis" in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM*. Logos Library System. Version 2.1; 1997. Print ed.: David Noel Freedman, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Hengel, Martin. "The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in the Pre-Christian Period." Pages75-146 in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*. Edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher. Translated by Daniel Bailey, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2004.

Hermisson, Hans-Jürgen. "The Fourth Servant Song in the Context of Isaiah." Pages 16-47 in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*. Edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher. Translated by Daniel Bailey, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2004.

Herr, Moshe. "Persecutions and Martyrdom in Hadrian's Days." *Scripta Heirosolymitana* 23 (1972): 85-125.

Himmelfarb, Martha. "Judaism and Hellenism in 2 Maccabees." *Poetics Today* 19 (1998): 19-40.

Hofius, Otfried "The Fourth Servant Song in the New Testament Letters." Pages 163-188 in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*. Edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher. Translated by Daniel Bailey. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2004.

Holmes, Stephen. "Death in the Afternoon." Pages 229-252 in *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham et al. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009.

Hooker, Morna. "Did the Use of Isaiah 53 to Interpret His Mission Begin with Jesus"? Pages 88-103 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins.* Edited by William Bellinger and William Farmer. Penn: Trinity Press International, 1998.

Horbury, William. "The Christian Use and the Jewish Origins of the Wisdom of Solomon." Pages 182-196 in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel : Essays in honour of J.A. Emerton*. Edited by John Day, Robert P. Gordon, and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Huizenga, Leroy Andrew. "The Battle for Isaac: Exploring the Composition and Function of the Aqedah in the Book of Jubilees." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 13 (2002): 33-59.

-----. *The New Isaac: Tradition and Intertextuality in the Gospel of Matthew.* Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Hyman, A.   ספר תורה הכתובה והמסורה על תורה, נביאים וכתובים *Sefer Torah ha-ketuva ve-ha-mesura al Torah, Naviim ve Ketuviim.* Tel Aviv: Devir, 1938.

Janowski, Bernd. "He Bore Our Sins: Isaiah 53 and the Drama of Taking Another's Place." Pages 48-74 in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources.* Edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher. Translated by Daniel Bailey, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2004.

Jellicoe, Sidney. *The Septuagint and Modern Study.* Oxford: Clarendon,1968.

Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Commentary.* Minnesota: Fortress, 2007.

Kahana, Menahem I. "Mekhilta of R. Simeon ben Yoḥai." Pages 795-797 in vol. 13 of *Encyclopaedia Judaica.* Edited by Michael Berenbaum and Fred Skolnik. 2nd ed. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007.

Kamesar, Adam. "Introduction." Pages 1-5 in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*. Edited by Adam Kamesar. Cambridge University Press, 2009. Cambridge Collections Online, www.cco.cambridge.org/uid=20896/extract?id=ccol9780521860901_CCOLCCOL9780521860901A002G (16 October 2011).

Kannengiesser, Charles. *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*. Boston: Brill, 2006.

Kasper, Walter. *Jesus the Christ.* Kent: Burns and Oates, 1976.

Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary.* Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2003.

Kelley, Page. *Biblical Hebrew: An Introductory Grammar.* Michigan: Eerdmans, 1992.

Kessler, Edward. "Response to Marc Bregman,"*Journal of TextualReasoning* 10 (2001), n.p., http://etext.virginia.edu/journals/tr/archive/volume10 (17 October 2011).

-----. *Bound By the Bible:Jews, Christians, and the sacrifice of Isaac.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Israel.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

-----. *Purity, Sacrifice and the Temple:Symbolism and Supercessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Knapp, Henry M. "Melito's Use of Scripture in 'Peri Pascha': Second-Century Typology." *Vigiliae Christianae* 54 (2000): 343-374.

Knohl, Israel. *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School.* Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2007.

Koester, Craig. *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* Anchor Bible 36. New York: Doubleday, 2001.

-----. "The Death of Jesus and the Human Condition: Exploring the Theology of John's Gospel." Pages 141-157 in *Life in Abundance: Studies of John's Gospel in Tribute to Raymond E. Brown.* Edited by John Donahue. Minnesota: Liturgical, 2005.

Kristeva, Julia. *The Kristeva Reader.* Edited by Toril Moi. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Kugel, James. "Exegetical Notes on 4Q225." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 13 (2006):73-98.

Kugler, Robert. "Hearing 4Q225: A Case Study in Reconstructing the Religious Imagination of the Qumran Community." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2001): 81-103

----- ."4Q225 2 i 1-2: A Possible Reconstruction and Explanation." *JBL* 126 (2007): 172-182.

Laporte, Jean. "Sacrifice and Forgiveness in Philo of Alexandria." Pages 34-42 in *The Studia Philonica Annual: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism.* vol. 1. Edited by David Runia. Georgia: Scholars, 1989.

Larson, E. "Worship in Jubilees and Enoch." Pages 369-83 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees.* Edited by G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009.

Le Déaut, R. "La presentation targumique du sacrifice d'Isaac et la soteriologie paulinienne." Pages 563-574 in *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus.* vol. 2. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.

-----. *La Nuit Pascale : Essai sur la Signification de la Pâque juive à partir du targum d'Exode XII* 42. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.

Levenson, Jon. *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: the Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Lévi, Israel. "Le sacrifice d'Isaac et la Mort de Jésus." *Revue des Etudes Juives* 64 (1912): 161-184.

Levine, Baruch. *The JPS Torah Commentary: Leviticus.* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.

Lewy, Hans. *Three Jewish Philosophers: Philo, Saadya Gaon, Jehuda Haleui.* Edited by Hans Lewy, Alexander Altmann, and Isaak Heinemann. New York: Atheneum Books, 1972.

Lindars, Barnabas. *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Loewe, Ralph. Prolegomenon to *The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah According to the Jewish Interpreters*. Edited by S.R. Driver and A. Neubauer. Oxford: James Parker & Co.,1877. Repr., New York: Ktav,1969.

MacGregor, G.H.C. *The Gospel of John*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928.

Mackie, Scott D. "Confession of The Son Of God In Hebrews." *New Testament Studies* 53 (2007): 114–129.

Maher, Michael. "The Merit of the Fathers and the Treasury of the Church." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 46 (1979): 256-275.

Manfredi, Silvana. "The Trial of the Righteous in Wis 5:1-14 (1-7) and in the Prophetic Traditions." Pages 159-178 in *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research: Studies on Tradition, Redaction and Theology*. Edited by Angelo Passaro and Giussepe Bellia. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.

Markschies, Christoph. "Jesus Christ as a Man Before God: Two Interpretive Models for Isaiah 53 in the Patristic Literature and Their Development." Pages 225-323 in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*. Edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher. Translated by Daniel Bailey. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2004.

Marshall, Howard. "Soteriology in Hebrews." Pages 253-277 in *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham et al. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009.

McHugh, John. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1-4*. London:T&T Clark International, 2009.

McMorrow. B. "Mosaic of Abraham's Sacrifice of Isaac, Chapel of Calvary, Church of the Holy Sepulchre, www.pbase.com/bmcmorrow/image/124292805 (August 13th 2011).

Mertens, A. "Who was a Christian in the Holy Land?" [on Isaac, Patriarch], www.christusrex.org/www1/ofm/sbf/escurs/wwc/i.html   (13th August 2011).

Meyer, Paul W. "'The Father': The Presentation of God in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 255-273 in *Exploring the Gospel of John: in honor of D. Moody Smith*. Edited by Alan Culpepper and C. Black. Kentucky: Westminster John Knox,1996.

Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 3. New York: Doubleday, 1991.

Mitchell, Alan C. "The Use of Πρέπειν and Rhetorical Propriety In Hebrews 2:10." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54 (1992): 681-701.

Moberly, Walter. *The Bible, Theology and Faith: A Study of Abraham and Jesus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

-----. *The Theology of the Book of Genesis*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Moloney, Francis. *The Gospel of John*. Sacra Pagina Series 4. Minnesota: Liturgical,1998.

Mulcahy, Eamonn. *The Cause of Our Salvation: Soteriological Causality according to some Modern British Theologians*. Rome: Gregorian University Press, 2007.

Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: the Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism.* Brill: Leiden, 2003.

Nanos, Mark. "The Jewish Context of the Gentile Audience Addressed in Paul's Letter to the Romans." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 61 (1999): 283-304.

Nicholson, E. Foreword to *Genesis* by Hermann.Gunkel. 1910. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Repr., Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1997.

Nickelsburg, George. "1 and 2 Maccabees - Same Story, Different Meaning." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 42 (1971): 515-526.

-----. *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.

-----. Review of *Qumran Cave 4. VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* by J. Vanderkam. *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha* 21 (2000): 121-4.

Nicklaus, Tobias. "Irony in 2 Maccabees." Pages 101-111 in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology*. Edited by Géza Xeravits and J.Zsengellér. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

North, Christopher R. *The Second Isaiah.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Paul, Shalom. "Servant of the Lord." *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. Edited by Michael Berenbaum and Fred Skolnik. 2nd ed. vol. 18. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007.

Perdue, Leo G. *Wisdom Literature: a Theological History*. Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.

Perkins, Pheme. "The Gospel According to John." Pages 942-985 in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Peters, Melvin K. "Septuagint." *The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM*. Logos Library System Version 2.1; 1997. Print ed.: David Noel Freedman, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Philip, Tarja. Course titled "Reading the Story of Abraham," Hebrew University, Spring 2008.

Porter, Stanley E. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: a Brief Comment on Method and Terminology." Pages 79-96 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig Evans and James Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Porter, Stanley and Brook Pearson. "Isaiah through Greek Eyes: The Septuagint of Isaiah." Pages 531-546 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. vol 2. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Pursiful, Darrell J. *The Cultic Motif in the Sprituality of the Book of Hebrews.* Lewiston: Mellen Biblical Press, 1993.

Purvis, James D. *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect.* Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Rajak, Tessa. "Dying for the Law: The Martyr's Portrait in Jewish-Greek Literature." Pages 39-67 in *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin literature of the Roman Empire.* Edited by M.J. Edwards and Simon Swain. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Rasimus, Tuomas. *Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel.* Edited by T. Rasimus. Brill: Leiden, 2010.

Ravid, Liora. "Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 13 (2002): 61-86.

Reed, Annette. "Enochic and Mosaic Traditions." Pages 353-368 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees.* Edited by G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009.

Reese, James M. *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequence.* Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970.

Reinhartz, Adele "John and Judaism." Pages 108-116 in *Life in Abundance: Studies of John's Gospel in Tribute to Raymond E. Brown.* Edited by John R. Donahue. Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2005.

Rembaum, Joel."The Development of a Jewish Exegetical Tradition Regarding Isaiah 53." *Harvard Theological Review* 75 (1982): 289-311.

Revell, E. J. "Masoretic Text." *The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM.* Logos Library System Version 2.1c. 1997. Print ed.: David Noel Freedman, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary.* 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Reventlow, Henning Graf. "Basic Issues in the Interpretation of Isaiah 53." Pages 23-38 in *Jesus and the Suffering Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins.* Edited by William Bellinger and William Farmer; Penn: Trinity Press International, 1998.

Rosenthal, F. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic.* Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden, 1961.

Runia, David. *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato.* Leiden: Brill, 1986.

-----. *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey.* Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993.

Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism : A Comparison of Patterns of Religion.* London: SCM Press, 1977.

Sarna, Nahum. *The JPS Torah Commentary: Genesis.* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.

Sapp, David. "The LXX, 1QIsa and MT Versions of Isaiah 53 and the Christian Doctrine of Atonement." Pages 170-192 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins.* Edited by William Bellinger and William Farmer. Penn: Trinity, 1998.

Schein, Sylvia. *Gateway to the Heavenly City.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.

Schiffmann, L. "The Book of Jubilees and the Temple Scroll." Pages 99-115 in *Enoch*

and the Mosaic Torah: Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees. Edited by G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to John*. New York: Herder & Herder,1968.

Schoeps, H. J. "The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's theology." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 65 (1946): 385-92.

Schwartz, Baruch. "The Prohibitions Concerning the 'Eating' of Blood in Leviticus 17." Pages 34-66 in *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel.* Edited by Gary Anderson and Saul Olyan. Sheffield: JSOT Press,1991.

Schwartz, Daniel. "Two Pauline Allusions to the Redemptive Mechanism of the Crucifixion." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 (1983): 259-268.

-----. "The Other in 1 and 2 Maccabees." Pages 30-37 in *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity.* Edited by Graham Stanton and Guy Stroumsa. Cambridge UP, 1998.

-----. *2 Maccabees*. Berlin:Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

Seeley, David. *The Noble Death: Graeco-Roman Martyrology and Paul's concept of salvation.* Sheffield: JSOT Press,1990.

Segal. Alan. "'He who did not spare his own son' . . : Jesus, Paul and the Akeddah." Pages 169-184 in *From Jesus to Paul.* Canada: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 1984.

Segal, Michael. *The Book of Jubilees : Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology, and Theology*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Seitz, Christopher "Second Isaiah." *The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM*. Logos Library System Version 2.1; 1997. Print ed.: David Noel Freedman, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary.*New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Shepkaru, Shmuel. "From After Death to Afterlife: Martyrdom and its Recompense." *Association for Jewish Studies Rev*iew 24 (1999): 1-44.

Shum, Shiu-Lun. *Paul's Use of Isaiah in Romans:A Comparative Study Of Paul's Letter To The Romans And The Sibylline And Qumran Sectarian Texts.* Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Siegert, Folker. "Philo and the New Testament." Pages 175-209 in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo.* Edited by Adam Kamesar. Cambridge University Press, 2009. Cambridge Collections Online, www.cco.cambridge.org/uid=20896/extract?id=ccol9780521860901_CCOLC COL9780521860901A002G (16 October 2011).

Sklar, Jay. "Sin and Impurity: Atoned or Purified? Yes!" Pages 18-31 in *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible.* Edited by Baruch Schwartz et al. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.

Smith, D. Moody. *John Among the Gospels.* South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 2001.

Snyman, A. H. "Style and the Rhetorical Situation of Romans 8.31-39." *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 218-231.

Spieckermann, Hermann. "The Conception and Prehistory of the Idea of Vicarious Suffering in the Old Testament." Pages 1-15 in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*. Edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher. Translated by Daniel Bailey. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2004.

Spiegel, Shalom.*The Last Trial: On the Legends and Lore of the Command to Abraham to Offer Isaac as Sacrifice: The Akedah.* Translated by J. Goldin. NY: Pantheon books, 1967; Repr., New York : Behrman House,1979.

Stibbe, Mark W. G. *John.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.

Still, Todd. "Christos as Pistos: The Faith(fulness) of Jesus in the Epistle to Hebrews." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 69 (2007): 746-755.

Stone, Michael. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian writings, Philo, Josephus.* Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.

-----. "Wisdom of Solomon." Pages 301-313 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period.* Edited by Michael Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.

Story, Cullen "Another Look at the Fourth Servant Song of Second Isaiah," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 31 (2009): 100-110.

Stuckenbruck, Loren. "An Approach to the New Testament Through Aramaic Sources: the Recent Methodological Debate." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 8 (1991): 3-29.

-----. "Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha and the Septuagint." Paper presented at the New Testament Research Seminar. Department of Theology and Religion, Durham University, Durham. May 18 2009.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. "Isaiah 53 in the Gospels and Acts." Pages147-162 in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources.* Edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher. Translated by Daniel Bailey, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004.

Suggs, Jack."Wisdom of Solomon 2:10-5: a Homily Based on the Fourth Servant Song." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 76 (1957): 26-33.

Suter, David. "Jubilees, the Temple and the Aaronite Priesthood." Pages 397-410 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah : The Evidence of Jubilees.* Edited by G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009.

Swetnam, James. *Jesus and Isaac: A Study of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Light of Aqedah.* Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981.

Terian, Abraham."Had the Works of Philo Been Newly Discovered," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, 57 (1994): 86-97.

Thompson, Marianne Meye. *The God of the Gospel of John.* Michigan: Eerdmans, 2001.

Tigchelaar, Eibert. Review of Qumran Cave I.II : The Isaiah Scrolls, by Eugene Ulrich and Peter Flint, http://kuleuven.academia.edu/EibertTigchelaar (August 13th 2011).

Tov, Emmanuel. "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran." Pages 491-512 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition.* vol 2. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Tuckett, C.M. "Atonement in the New Testament." *The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM.* Logos Library System Version 2.1; 1997. Print ed.: David Noel Freedman, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary.* New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Trible, Phyllis. "Genesis 22: The Sacrifice of Sarah." Pages 271-290 in *Women in the Hebrew Bible.* New York: Routledge,1999.

Urbach, Ephraim E. *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs.* Translated by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975.

VanderKam, J. "The *Aqedah, Jubilees* and Pseudojubilees." Pages 241-261 in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders.* Edited by C. Evans and S. Talmon, Brill: Leiden, 1997.

-----. *The Book of Jubilees.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

-----. "Viewed from Another Angle: Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 13 (2002): 209-215.

-----. "Recent Scholarship on the Book of Jubilees." *Currents in Biblical Research* 6 (2008): 405-431.

-----. "The Manuscript Tradition of *Jubilees.*" Pages 3-21 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah:The Evidence of Jubilees.* Edited by G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009.

van den Brink, Eddy. "Abraham's Sacrifice: Early Jewish and Christian Art." Pages 140-151 in *The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and its Interpretations.* Edited by Ed Noort and Eibert Tigchelaar. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

van der Kooij, A. "Isaiah in the Septuagint." Pages 513-529 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition.* vol 2. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

van der Watt, Jan. *An Introduction to the Johannine Gospel and the Letters.* London: T&T Clark, 2007.

van Henten, J. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees.* Leiden: Brill,1997.

-----. *Martyrdom and Noble Death: Selected Texts From Graeco-Roman, Jewish And Christian Antiquity.* London: Routledge, 2002.

van Ruiten, J. and M. Vervenne, eds. *Studies in the Book of Isaiah: Festschrift Willem A.M. Beuken.* Peeters: Leuven University Press, 1997.

van Ruiten, J. "Abraham, Job and the Book of *Jubilees.*" Pages 58-85 in *The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis22) and its Interpretations.* Edited by Ed Noort and Eibert Tigchelaar. Brill: Leiden, 2002.

235

Vermes, G. "Redemption and Genesis 22." Pages 193-227 in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill,1973.

-----. "New Light on the Sacrifice of Isaac from 4Q Pseud0-Jubilees." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 47(1996): 140-146.

von Rad, Gerhard. *Genesis: A Commentary*. London: SCM, 1972.

Waltke, Bruce K. "Samaritan Pentateuch." *The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM*. Logos Library System Version 2.1; 1997. Print ed.: David Noel Freedman, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Waltke, Bruce and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, 1990.

Watson, Francis. "The Two Roman Congregations." Pages 203-215 in *The Romans Debate*. Edited by Karl P. Donfried. Massachusetts: Hendrickson,1991.

-----. *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective*. Rev. and enl. ed. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2007.

-----. "The Hermeneutics of Salvation: Paul, Isaiah, and the Servant." Paper presented at the New Testament Research Seminar. Department of Theology and Religion, Durham University, Durham. 15 October, 2007.

-----. "Mistranslation and the Death of Christ: Isaiah 53, LXX and its Pauline Reception." Pages 215-250 in *Translating the New Testament: Text, Translation, Theology*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Mark J. Boda. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009.

Watts, John. "Isaiah 1-33." *Word Biblical Commentary on CD ROM*. Logos Library System Version 2.1. 1998. Print ed.: David Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, eds. Texas: Word Books, 1994.

Weingreen, J. *A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew*. Oxford: Clarendon Press,1959.

Wenham, Gordon J. "Genesis 16-50," *Word Biblical Commentary on CD-ROM*. Logos Library System Version 2.1. 1998. Print ed.: David Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, eds. Texas: Word Books, 1994.

Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40-66*. Translated by David M. H. Stalker. London: SCM Press, 1969.

-----. *The Promises to the Fathers: Studies on Patriarchal Narratives*. Translated by David Green, Philadephia: Fortress Press, 1976.

-----. *Genesis 12-36*. Vol 2. Minneapolis: Augusburg, 1985-6.

Wevers, John William. *LXX: Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. Georgia: Scholars, 1993.

Wilken, Robert L. "Melito, the Jewish Community at Sardis, and the Sacrifice of Isaac." *Theological Studies* 37 (1976): 53-69.

Williams, D. "Recent Research in 2 Maccabees." *Currents in Biblical Research* 2 (2003): 69-83.

236

Williams, James, ed. *The Girard Reader: René Girard.* New York: Crossroad, 1996.

Williamson, H.G.M. *The Book Called Isaiah:Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

Winston, David. "Wisdom of Solomon," *The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM.* Logos Library System Version 2.1; 1997. Print ed.: David Noel Freedman, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary.* New York: Doubleday, 1992.

-----. "A Century of Research on the Book of Wisdom." Pages 1-18 in *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research: Studies On Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*. Edited by Angelo Passaro and Giussepe Bellia. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.

Witherington, Ben and Darlene Hyatt. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary.* Michigan:Eerdmans, 2004.

Young, Frances. *The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom.*Massachusetts: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979.

Yuval, Israel. "Easter and Passover as Early Jewish-Christian Dialogue." Pages 98-124 in *Passover and Easter: Origin and History to Modern Times* (Two Liturgical Traditions). Edited by Paul F. Bradshaw and Lawrence A. Hoffman. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999.

0