CHAPTER FIVE

THE TEXT OF ISAIAH AT QUMRAN

1. *Number of Copies*

The Qumran caves yielded no less than twenty-one copies of the book of Isaiah.[1] Other books represented at Qumran in large numbers are Deuteronomy, of which twenty-six copies are known,[2] and Psalms with thirty-six copies.[3] The reason for the large number of copies of these books was probably their popularity among the Qumran covenanters. A close affinity with these three books is also manifest in the writings of the Qumranites.[4] The popularity of these books at Qumran does not imply that all the copies of Isaiah were produced there. Some were written at Qumran, while others were produced elsewhere in Palestine and brought to Qumran. It is important to remember this assumption, since the information about the textual condition and transmission of Isaiah

---

[1] The number of copies of biblical books found at Qumran should always be considered conjectural. Most of the fragments are small, containing no more than one-tenth of a biblical book. The script of the texts serves as the main criterion for distinguishing between the supposedly different copies even when only tiny fragments have been preserved. Therefore, one has to be cautious when estimating the number of scrolls on the basis of small fragments. For example, if a scroll of Isaiah was written by more than one scribe, any two fragments of that book written in different scripts could have belonged to that scroll. See further chapter 10*, § 1. At present, twenty-one copies are identified while at an earlier stage, P. W. Skehan ("Qumran Manuscripts," 150) mentioned sixteen copies, of which thirteen were from cave 4, and in 1979 ("Qumran, Littérature de Qumran," esp. 810) he mentioned eighteen copies.

[2] See F. García Martínez, "Les manuscrits du Désert de Juda et le Deutéronome," in *Studies in Deuteronomy in Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez et al.; VTSup 53; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994) 63–82.

[3] See P. W. Flint, "The Psalms Scrolls from the Judaean Desert: Relationships and Textual Affiliations," in Brooke–García Martínez, *New Qumran Texts*, 31–52, esp. 51–2.

[4] The Qumranites wrote several prose compositions in the style of Deuteronomy as well as poetical books influenced by the biblical book of Psalms. Likewise, the writings of the Qumran community often quote from Isaiah, which held a unique place in their thinking. All three books were often quoted in the sectarian writings from Qumran. For 1QH^a, see P. Wernberg-Møller, "The Contribution of the *Hodayot* to Biblical Textual Criticism," *Textus* 4 (1964) 133–75, esp. 173–5; O. J. R. Schwarz, *Der erste Teil der Damaskusschrift und das Alte Testament* (Diest: Lichtland, 1965).

visible in the Qumran scrolls probably reflects the condition of that book in ancient Israel as a whole, and not only at Qumran.

The following copies of Isaiah were found at Qumran:[5]

1QIsa^{a}[6]	4QIsa^{j}
1QIsa^{b}[7]	4QIsa^{k}
4QIsa^{a}[8]	4QIsa^{l}
4QIsa^{b}	4QIsa^{m}
4QIsa^{c}[9]	4QIsa^{n}
4QIsa^{d}	4QIsa^{o}
4QIsa^{e}	4QpapIsa^{p}[10]
4QIsa^{f}	4QIsa^{q}
4QIsa^{g}	4QIsa^{r}
4QIsa^{h}	5QIsa
4QIsa^{i}	

No copies of Isaiah were found at Masada, and a single copy only was among the fragments found at Wadi Murabbaʿat, viz. Mur 3 (MurIsaiah).[11] By far the greatest number of copies of Isaiah thus comes from cave 4, although the only complete copy of Isaiah, probably stored in a jar, was found in cave 1. Due to the better storage conditions, the two copies from cave 1 provide a greater coverage of the text of Isaiah than the eighteen (sometimes very) fragmentary texts from cave 4. Research on the text of Isaiah at Qumran is still very much eclipsed by 1QIsa^{a}, but the time has arrived to review the picture relating to all the fragments. While it is true that the two texts from cave 1 provide a complete scroll (1QIsa^{a}) and one that is well preserved (1QIsa^{b}), there is also one among the cave 4 texts that covers substantial sections,

---

[5] See especially *DJD* XV. For an earlier detailed catalog of the contents of all the Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah, see Skehan, "Qumran, Littérature de Qumran," 811–2. For a short study on the text of Isaiah in Qumran, see F. García Martínez, "Le livre d'Isaïe à Qumran," *MdB* 49 (1987) 43–5. The exact contents of the fragments were recorded by E. Ulrich, "Index of Passages in the 'Biblical Texts'," *DJD* XXXIX, 192–4.

[6] This is the "large" Isaiah scroll from cave 1, also named the "St. Mark's Isaiah."

[7] This is the "small" Isaiah scroll from cave 1, also named the "Hebrew University Isaiah."

[8] Preliminarily published by J. Muilenburg, "Fragments of Another Qumran Isaiah Scroll," *BASOR* 135 (1954) 28–32.

[9] See P. W. Skehan, "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran," *CBQ* 17 (1955) 158–63, esp. 162–3.

[10] This is the only Isaiah fragment written on papyrus. Very few papyrus fragments of the biblical books have been preserved at Qumran, and their background is not clear. The suggestion has been made that some of these were personal rather than official copies. See *Scribal Practices*, 44–53.

[11] Published in *DJD* II, 79–80 and pl. XXII.

including both the beginning and end of the book (4QIsa[b]), and another that is relatively well preserved (4QIsa[c]).

2. *Past Research on 1QIsa[a]*[12]

The scroll that has been studied more than any of the others from Qumran is the "large" Isaiah scroll from cave 1, 1QIsa[a], probably written between 150–125 BCE.[13] This text was named the "large" Isaiah scroll since it was preserved in its entirety, in contradistinction to the "small" Isaiah scroll, 1QIsa[b]. It has also been named the "St. Mark's Isaiah" because it was initially owned by the St. Mark's Monastery. 1QIsa[a] was preserved in its entirety because it was well kept in a jar. It is not known whether this system of storage reflects the Qumran community's special esteem for this particular copy of Isaiah. The Syrian Metropolitan, Mar Athanasius Samuel, took this scroll and three others (1QapGen ar, 1QpHab, and 1QS) to the United States in 1949, where they were purchased on behalf of the State of Israel in 1954. The large Isaiah scroll is the longest preserved biblical scroll among the scroll specimens (7.34 m), surpassed only by a nonbiblical composition, 11QT[a] (8.148 m; reconstructed total length 8.75 m). The two Isaiah scrolls from cave 1 were among the first to be published, 1QIsa[a] as early as 1950,[14] and 1QIsa[b] in 1954[15] and 1955,[16] and as a rule their content and description greatly influenced scholarship. For a long period, these scrolls alone represented for scholarship the Dead Sea scrolls, and many

---

[12] Cf. A. S. van der Woude, "Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974–1988)," *TRu* 57 (1992) 1–57, esp. 1–5; P. W. Flint, "The Book of Isaiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Bible as Book*, 229–51.

[13] Thus Cross, *ALQ*[3], 176 on the basis of paleographical analysis. The radiocarbon date of this text is 335–122 BCE according to the examinations of A. J. T. Jull, D. J. Donahue, M. Broshi, and E. Tov, "Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert," *Radiocarbon* 37 (1995) 11–19. An earlier examination ascribed a date of 199–120 BCE to this text: G. Bonani, M. Broshi, I. Carmi, S. Ivy, J. Strugnell, and W. Wölfli, "Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Atiqot* 20 (1991) 27–32.

[14] Burrows, *Isaiah*. The photographs of the scroll are poorly reproduced, and the transcriptions are not up the standards accepted from 1955 onwards in the *DJD* series, especially with regard to partially preserved letters and reconstructions. Better plates, based on J. C. Trever's photographs, are included in F. M. Cross et al., *Scrolls from Qumrân Cave I: The Great Isaiah Scroll, the Order of the Community, the* Pesher *to Habakkuk* (Jerusalem: Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and the Shrine of the Book, 1972); Parry-Qimron, *Isaiah*, and E. Ulrich and P. W. Flint, *DJD* XXXII, forthcoming.

[15] Sukenik, *'wṣr hmgylwt hgnwzwt*. Several segments of the scroll were published earlier: *Mgylwt gnwzwt, mtwk gnyzh qdwmh shnmṣ'h bmdbr yhwdh, sqyrh r'shwnh* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1948); *Mgylwt gnwzwt, mtwk gnyzh qdwmh shnmṣ'h bmdbr yhwdh, sqyrh shnyh* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1950).

[16] D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *DJD* I, 66–8 and plate XII.

generalizations regarding biblical scrolls or the Qumran scrolls as a whole were made on the basis of their form and content. Thus it became commonplace to say that while the biblical texts from Qumran differed much from MT in small details, they contributed little to our knowledge of the biblical text,[17] since the readings of these scrolls were considered to be more or less identical to MT (1QIsa[b]) or were often described as secondary when compared with MT (1QIsa[a]). While these statements on the intrinsic value of the texts are correct, neither of these texts is representative of the Qumran scrolls,[18] and therefore no generalizations should be made. In fact, none of the scrolls found at Qumran is representative of the *ensemble* of Qumran texts. At this point a general consideration is in order: the study of the biblical (and nonbiblical) texts from Qumran would have been different had the texts from cave 4 been published first or simultaneously with those from cave 1. As it happened, the special characteristics of 1QIsa[a] were often considered by scholars to be the norm with regard to all aspects of the Qumran texts. It is true that other, nonbiblical, Qumran texts were known in the early days of the scroll research, especially from cave 1, but many of their scribal features ran parallel to those of 1QIsa[a] (see further chapter 10*). As a result, the description of the other biblical texts, more so than that of the nonbiblical texts, was based heavily on 1QIsa[a]. The impact of 1QIsa[b] was felt less, especially since it was so similar to MT. A few other Qumran texts were known in the early years: 4QQoh[a] was published preliminarily in 1954,[19] there were scattered pieces of information on sundry texts,[20] and in 1955 fourteen relatively short texts from cave 1 were published in *DJD* I. In the early years of Qumran research, all of these texts were less influential on scholarship than the Isaiah texts from cave 1. This was due partly to the fact that these texts were freely available, and partly because of their book-size publications, the first of their kind, that preceded the *DJD* series by several years.

---

[17] This claim has been made by several scholars, influenced much by a series of studies on this topic by H. M. Orlinsky: "Studies in the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll," *JBL* 69 (1950) 149–66; *JNES* 11 (1952) 153–6; *JJS* 2 (1950–1951) 151–4; *JQR* 43 (1952–1953) 329–40; *IEJ* 4 (1954) 5–8; *HUCA* 25 (1954) 85–92.

[18] This observation was already made in 1979 by Skehan, "Qumran, Littérature de Qumran," 810.

[19] J. Muilenburg, "A Qoheleth Scroll from Qumran," *BASOR* 135 (1954) 20–28.

[20] See especially Cross, *ALQ³*.

3. *Features of 1QIsaᵃ*

Even today, after most of the Qumran texts have either been published or are known in some form or other, 1QIsaᵃ stands out as the scroll about which more aspects have been researched and hence are known better than the other Qumran biblical texts. It has been published in three facsimile editions (Burrows, Cross, Parry-Qimron; see note 14), and two transcribed texts (Burrows and Parry-Qimron). An additional edition is forthcoming (see n. 14). The most extensive linguistic treatment of any of the Qumran texts has been devoted to this scroll.[21] Likewise, the most extensive study to date on scribal habits is devoted to this and several other texts from cave 1.[22] The only biblical text from Qumran on which a "literary analysis" was composed is the Isaiah scroll.[23] More than seventy-five scholarly articles have been written on various aspects of this scroll.[24] Its readings are listed as variants deviating from MT in the third apparatus of the seventh edition[25] of *BH* and in the *HUB*.[26] Since it was a novelty to be able to compare the medieval MT with an ancient manuscript dating from the turn of the eras, virtually every aspect of the scroll was studied in monographic articles.[27] This pertains to the special orthographical and morphological features of the scroll,[28] its scribal

[21] Kutscher, *Language.*

[22] Martin, *Scribal Character*.

[23] J. R. Rosenbloom, *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll—A Literary Analysis. A Comparison with the Masoretic Text and the Biblia Hebraica* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970). See also W. H. Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumrân Scrolls for the Bible, with Special Attention to the Book of Isaiah* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964). This translation is now joined by M. G. Abegg et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999).

[24] For the most recent studies, see García Martínez-Parry, *Bibliography.* Some studies are listed in the following notes.

[25] See chapter 18*, n. 33.

[26] Goshen-Gottstein, *Isaiah.* See also chapter 16*.

[27] Among the monographic studies, beyond Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle* and Kutscher, *Language*, see F. D. James, *A Critical Examination of the Text of Isaiah, Based on the Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah (DSIa), the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint . . .* , unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1959; F. J. Morrow, *The Text of Isaiah at Qumran,* unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., 1973; J. Koenig, *L'Herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaie* (VTSup 33; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1982); J. Høgenhaven, "The First Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (1QIsaᵃ) and the Massoretic Text. Some Reflections with Special Regard to Isaiah 1–12," *JSOT* 28 (1984) 17–35; Pulikottil, *Transmission* (see n. 48 below). The latter study summarizes several aspects of the research on 1QIsaᵃ and provides some bibliography.

[28] The literature on this topic is very extensive. The major monographs remain those of Martin and Kutscher (see notes 21–22). See further M. Burrows, "Orthography, Morphology, and Syntax of the St. Mark's Isaiah Manuscript," *JBL* 68 (1949) 195–211; A. Rubinstein, "Notes on the Use of the Tenses in the Variant Readings of the Isaiah Scroll," *VT* 3 (1953) 92–5; idem, "Formal Agreement of Parallel Clauses in the Isaiah Scroll," *VT* 4 (1954) 316–21; M. Martin, "The Use of Second Person Singular Suffixes in 1QIsᵃ," *Muséon* 70

phenomena,[29] marginal notations,[30] deviations from MT,[31] relation to the ancient versions[32] and medieval Hebrew manuscripts,[33] typological similarity to the SP[34] and the Severus Scroll,[35] the relation to the textual tradition of Kings in the parallel sections of Isaiah and 2 Kings, paleography,[36] writing by two different scribes,[37] system of text division into different units,[38] and its exegetical elements.

(1957) 127–44; J. Leveen, "The Orthography of the Hebrew Scroll of Isaiah A," *Proceedings of the 22nd Congress of Orientalists (Istanbul 1951)* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957) 577–83; P. Wernberg-Møller, "Studies in the Defective Spellings in the Isaiah Scroll of St. Mark's Monastery," *JSS* 3 (1958) 244–64; M. Goshen-Gottstein, "Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran Documents," ScrHier 4 (1958) 101–36, reprinted in *Text and Language in Bible and Qumran* (Tel Aviv: Orient Publishing House, 1960) 97–132; A. González, "La lengua y la base lingüística del Rollo de Isaías," *EstBíb* 19 (1960) 237–44; J. Koenig, "Réouverture du débat sur la première main rédactionnelle du rouleau ancien d'Isaïe de Qumran (1QIsᵃ) en 40,7-8," *RevQ* 11 (1983) 219–37; Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 261–73; F. M. Cross, Jr., "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," in Trebolle, *Madrid Qumran Congress*, 1–14.

[29] Beyond Martin, *Scribal Character*, see C. Kuhl, "Schreibereigentümlichkeiten—Bemerkungen zur Jesajarolle (DSIa)," *VT* 2 (1952) 307–33.

[30] See especially Martin, *Scribal Character*; J. L. Teicher, "The Christian Interpretation of the Sign X in the Isaiah Scroll," *VT* 5 (1955) 189–98; Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 178–218.

[31] Since the scroll is a witness to the text of the Bible, most of the articles and books on 1QIsᵃ belong to this category. Yet, there is no monograph that analyzes all or most of the readings of the scroll comprehensively. Kutscher's monograph comes closest to this goal as it probably mentions all or most of the differences between MT and the scroll, but describes them mainly on the linguistic level. Less comprehensive with regard to the readings themselves, but more comprehensive regarding their background is A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches, Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981) revised from his Ph.D. diss.: *De oude tekstgetuigen van het boek Jesaja*, Utrecht University, 1978.

[32] M. H. Gottstein, "Die Jesajah-Rolle im Lichte von Peschitta und Targum," *Bib* 35 (1954) 51–71; A. Penna, "La Volgata e il manoscritto 1QIsᵃ," *Bib* 38 (1957) 381–95; J. Ziegler, "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (1QIsᵃ)," *JBL* 78 (1959) 34–59.

[33] See M. H. Gottstein, "Die Jesaiah-Rolle und das Problem der hebräischen Bibelhandschriften," *Bib* 35 (1954) 429–42.

[34] See Kutscher, *Language*, 566–7; Z. Ben-Hayyim, "*mswrt hshwmrwnym wzyqth lmswrt hlshwn shl mgylwt ym hmlh wlshwn hz"l*," *Leshonenu* 22 (1958) 223–45; M. Mansoor, "Some Linguistic Aspects of the Qumran Texts," *JSS* 3 (1958) 46–9.

[35] Kutscher, *Language*, 87–9; J. P. Siegel, "The Severus Scroll and 1QIsᵃ," in *1972 and 1973 Proceedings of the International Organization for Masoretic Studies* (ed. H. M. Orlinsky; SBLMasS 2; 1974) 99–110.

[36] See Martin, *Scribal Character*.

[37] The assumption that a second scribe started his work with col. XXVIII (chapter 33) of 1QIsᵃ at the beginning of a new sheet was accepted by several scholars, while for Martin the two segments of that scroll were written by the same scribe: Martin, *Scribal Character*, 65–73; thus also Kutscher, *Language*, 564–6; J Cook, "Orthographical Peculiarities in the Dead Sea Biblical Scrolls," *RevQ* 14 (1989) 293–305, esp. 303–4. However, the assumption of the bipartition of the scroll seems to be more sound: Thus M. Noth, "Eine Bemerkung zur Jesajarolle vom Toten Meer," *VT* 1 (1951) 224–6; Kuhl, "Schreibereigentümlichkeiten" (see n. 29), esp. 332–3. This assumption is supported by arguments at the paleography level, but

The latter aspect is of particular interest. Already in 1955, Chamberlain recognized messianic interpretations in several readings in the scroll.[39] For example, according to this scholar, the third person forms זרועו (2x) and אליו in 1QIsa[a] 51:5 for זר(ו)עי and אלי in MT refer to the Messiah, and the other words in the context were conceived of as "messianic names": ישעי, תורה, משפטי, צדקי, ישועתי, and צדקתי. In the same year, Rubinstein showed interest in "theological" aspects of some variant readings.[40] The descriptive term "theological," used in the title of this study should, according to Rubinstein, be used in a limited sense, "as denoting certain religious susceptibilities which can reasonably be inferred from the variant readings selected for discussion."[41] All the readings selected by him are undoubtedly of importance for understanding the scribe, but it is often difficult to know whether the change is intentional and therefore carries theological implications. Thus, the following change has undoubtedly been made on the basis of the context:

> Isa 45:7 MT   עשה *שלום* ובורא רע (= V, T)
> I make *prosperity* and I create disaster.
> 1QIsa[a]   עושה *טוב* ובורה רע
> I make *the good* and I create the evil.

We need not go as far as Rubinstein, who sees in this reading "an affirmation of the doctrine of the sectaries of Qumran, who held that

---

also at other levels. The second scribe wrote with a fuller orthography than the first one; note, for example, the preponderance of the shorter form of the second person singular masculine suffix in the first part of the scroll compared with the longer form in the second part, as described in detail by Martin, "The Use" (see n. 28 above). The second scribe corrected more gutturals than scribe A. See R. L. Giese, "Further Evidence for the Bisection of 1QIs[a]," *Textus* 14 (1988) 61–70. See further W. H. Brownlee, "The Literary Significance of the Bisection of Isaiah in the Ancient Scroll of Isaiah from Qumran," *Proceedings of the 25th Congress of Orientalists* (Moscow, 1962–1963) 431–7; K. H. Richards, "A Note on the Bisection of Isaiah," *RevQ* 5 (1965) 257–8; J. Cook, "The Dichotomy of 1QIs[a]," in *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of Józef Tadeusz Milik* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; Qumranica Mogilanensia 6; Kraków: Enigma, 1992) I.7–24.

[38] Y. Maori, "The Tradition of Pisqa'ot in Ancient Hebrew MSS—The Isaiah Texts and Commentaries from Qumran," *Textus* 10 (1982) א–י; O. H. Steck, *Die erste Jesajarolle von Qumran (1QIsa): Schreibweise als Leseanleitung für ein Prophetenbuch* (SBS 173/1; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1998); idem, "Bemerkungen zur Abschnittgliederung in den Jesaja-Handschriften aus der Wüste Juda," in *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel* (ed. U. Dahmen et al.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000) 51–88.

[39] J. V. Chamberlain, "The Functions of God as Messianic Titles in the Complete Qumran Isaiah Scroll," *VT* 5 (1955) 366–72.

[40] A. Rubinstein, "The Theological Aspect of Some Variant Readings in the Isaiah Scroll," *JSS* 6 (1955) 187–200.

[41] Rubinstein, "The Theological Aspect," 187.

both good and evil are created by God and that the morally good or bad in human conduct is predetermined by Him, at least for the duration of the period preceding the ultimate 'visitation.'"[42] Talmon likewise discussed the exegetical aspects of several readings.[43] According to van der Kooij, the readings of this scroll, as of any other biblical text, need to be viewed not as reflecting occasional and unrelated exegesis, but as exponents of a more or less coherent exegetical system within each pericope (cf. e.g. his analysis of 8:4-11),[44] certainly in those places in which the paragraph division in 1QIsa[a] differs from that of MT.[45] A similar approach underlies the text-critical commentary of Barthélemy.[46] A special type of content exegesis in this scroll, as well as in the LXX, is recognized by Koenig, who describes at length the background of small pluses in the scroll.[47] These are not just incidental scribal pluses, but they reflect a refined system of what the author names "herméneutique analogique," and which links certain texts internally, similar to the rabbinic *gezerah shavah*.

When focusing on 1QIsa[a], we note a number of special features that have been alluded to above in the studies written on various aspects of the scroll. Some of these are characteristic of this scroll, while others are not. Thus the orthographic and morphological features of the scroll are characteristic several biblical texts (see below). Characteristic features of this scroll are:

a. The division of the scroll into two segments (Isaiah 1–34 and 35–66), written by two different scribes. Scribe B started with col. XXVIII, at the beginning of a new sheet. Although two or more hands are visible in other Qumran scrolls (1QH[a], 1QpHab, 11QT[a]), in no other source is the

---

[42] Rubinstein, "The Theological Aspect," 194. Besides, it has not yet been established that a Qumran scribe inserted sectarian readings in a biblical scroll. See chapter 10*, n. 55.

[43] S. Talmon, "DSIa as a Witness to Ancient Exegesis of the Book of Isaiah," *ASTI* 1 (1962) 62–72 = idem, *The World of Qumran from Within* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1989) 131–41; idem, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of the Qumran Manuscripts," *Textus* 4 (1964) 95–132.

[44] A. van der Kooij, "*1QIsa[a]* Col. VIII, 4–11 (Isa 8, 11-18): A Contextual Approach of its Variants," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 569–81.

[45] Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen* (see n. 31). See further the previous note. For examples of exegesis underlying different paragraph divisions, see Høgenhaven, "The First Isaiah Scroll," 28–9 (see n. 27 above).

[46] Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, 3.

[47] J. Koenig, *L'Herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe* (VTSup 33; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1982). See my review in *Bib* 65 (1984) 118–21, and that of A. van der Kooij, "Accident or Method: On 'Analogical' Interpretation in the Old Testament Greek of Isaiah and in 1QIs[a]," BibOr 43 (1986) 366–76. The special importance of the pluses in the Isaiah scroll based on other verses was recognized by Skehan, "The Qumran Manuscripts," 150.

text so neatly divided as in 1QIsaᵃ: Scribe A left three lines empty at the end of col. XXVII, at the end of a sheet, the last one written by him. Scribe B started at the beginning of the next sheet with col. XXVIII (Isa 34:1–36:2). It is unlikely that the two scribes worked concurrently, since it would have been difficult for the first scribe to calculate how many columns and sheets he would need for his assignment.[48] Several scholars accepted the assumption of bisection, while others maintained that the two segments of that scroll were written by the same scribe.[49] However, the assumption of the bipartition of the scroll seems to be defensible not only at the paleographical level, but also on other levels. The second scribe adopted a fuller orthography than the first,[50] corrected more gutturals than scribe A (Giese, "Further Evidence"), used specific scribal marks, and left out more sections than the first scribe, to be filled in subsequently by a different hand in small letters between the lines and in the margin: cols. XXXII 14 (Isa 38:21), XXXIII 7 (Isa 40:7) and XXXIII 14 (Isa 40:14)—for more details, see chapter 5*, n. 15.

   b. Unusual marginal signs occurring in various places in the scroll, not all of them understandable,[51] are in three cases almost identical to signs in 1QS.[52] They were probably produced by the same scribe, that is, the person who inserted the corrections in the Isaiah scroll and wrote the text of 1QS (as well as 1QSa, 1QSb, and 4QSamᶜ).[53] Some of these scribal markings are letters in the paleo-Hebrew script, while others are similar to letters in the Cryptic A script.[54] In 1QIsaᵃ, they may refer to the sectarian reading of certain passages,[55] or to matters of sectarian interest.

---

[48] For an analysis of the features of the two scribal hands of Isaiah, see M. Noth, "Eine Bemerkung zur Jesajarolle vom Toten Meer," *VT* 1 (1951) 224–6; Kuhl, "Schreibereigentümlichkeiten" (see n. 29 above) esp. 332–3; Brownlee, "Literary Significance" (see n. 37); Richards, "Note" (see n. 37); Giese, "Further Evidence" (see n. 37); Cook, "Dichotomy" (see n. 37); M. Abegg, "1QIsaᵃ and 1QIsaᵇ: A Rematch" in *The Bible as Book,* 221–8 (statistics of different orthographic systems); P. Pulikottil, *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran—The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll 1QIsaᵃ* (JSOTSup 34; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 18–20; Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 21.

[49] See n. 37.

[50] Note, for example, the preponderance of the shorter form of the second person singular masculine suffix in the first part of the scroll as against the longer form in the second part, as described in detail by M. Martin, "The Use . . .." Furthermore, in the second part of the scroll כי is consistently written *plene* (כיא), but only in twenty percent of the instances in the first part.

[51] Several of the signs, if not most of them, indicate the division of the text into sense units, even though the system is not carried out consistently.

[52] *Scribal Practices*, 361–5.

[53] See E. Ulrich, "4QSamᶜ: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14–15 from the Scribe of the *Serek Hayyaḥad* (1QS)," *BASOR* 235 (1979) 1–25.

[54] *Scribal Practices*, 361–5.

[55] Thus already Burrows, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* XVI.

In any event, since the identification of the so-called Cryptic A script for the use of sectarian texts is solid (chapter 27*, n. 17), it is now clear that at least some of the Qumran texts were either used by the Qumran community or copied by its scribes.

c. The copyist of 1QIsa[a] produced a carelessly and irregularly written copy that was full of errors. Many of these errors were corrected, and, in fact, of all the Qumran texts, this one contains the largest proportion of corrections, viz. an average of one scribal intervention to every four lines of text.[56] All the corrections in this scroll, as in all other scrolls from the Judean Desert, were made on the basis of the scribe's *Vorlage*, his orthographic system, or his insights. In the texts reflecting a system of orthography and morphology different from MT, as in the case of 1QIsa[a], several corrections distance them further from MT. These corrections were presumably not made on the basis of an external source, but rather according to an orthographic framework the scribe had in mind, inconsistent though it may have been. At the same time, 1QIsa[a] also contains several corrections toward a text identical to the proto-Masoretic text. As these corrections agree with MT, while others bring the text into disagreement with MT, the assumption that the corrections were based on an external source is very unlikely. 1QIsa[a] was corrected both by the original scribe and a later hand, probably in accordance with the manuscript from which this scroll was originally copied.

d. The scribe of 1QIsa[a] was more influenced by Aramaic than most other Qumran scribes.[57] A relatively sizeable number of Aramaisms is found in 4QCant[b] that is written in a different orthographic convention.[58]

e. The scribe of 1QIsa[a] changed many details in accord with the context.[59]

f. The numerous phonetic variants in 1QIsa[a] gave rise to speculation that this and other scrolls were not produced by conventional copying from another text, but rather by dictation.[60] It is not impossible that some scribes were dictated to or that mass production (dictating to several scribes simultaneously) took place, but there is no evidence supporting

---

[56] *Scribal Practices*, Appendix 8, col. 10.

[57] See the elaborate description by Kutscher, *Isaiah*.

[58] *DJD* XVI, 205–18.

[59] See *TCHB*, 110–11 as well as two brief articles by A. Rubinstein (see n. 28) that illustrate this point. In his 1954 article, Rubinstein exemplifies the adaptation of small grammatical elements in 1QIsa[a] to the parallel stich, and in his 1953 article he exemplifies the simplification of the tense system.

[60] Thus Burrows, "Orthography, Morphology," 196 (see n. 28 above); Orlinsky, "Studies," 165 (see n. 17 above).

this view. Phonetic variation does not necessarily prove this assumption, since any scribe copying from another document could make phonetic mistakes or change the orthography, consciously or not.[61]

g. The division of 1QIsa[a] into sense units was analyzed in detail by Bardke,[62] Oesch,[63] and Maori.[64] The studies by Oesch and Maori show that in 80 percent of the cases, 1QIsa[a] agrees with the medieval MT (manuscripts A and C).

h. The typological similarity between 1QIsa[a] and the Severus Scroll was described by Kutscher, *Language*, and Siegel, *The Severus Scroll* (see n. 35). Both sources were dubbed "vulgar" by these scholars. According to Kutscher, 1QIsa[a] was a personal copy used for study, home reading, and perhaps in the synagogue, while MT reflected the standard text used in Palestine.[65]

4. *The Text of Isaiah at Qumran*

When trying to locate information concerning the textual transmission of Isaiah as viewed from the Qumran texts, we should lower our level of expectation:

a. There are many gaps in our information regarding the period covered by the Qumran manuscripts (middle of the third century BCE until the middle of the first century CE), both concerning the Qumran text(s) and the texts extant in Palestine as a whole. There could have been widely divergent texts of Isaiah both at Qumran and elsewhere that by chance were not preserved.

b. As far as we know, no patterns of textual transmission developed that were specific to the special contents of any single biblical book. Therefore, it is probably mere coincidence that among the Prophetical Books texts written in the Qumran scribal practice were preserved for Isaiah (1QIsa[a] and 4QIsa[c]) and Jeremiah (2QJer), but not for Ezekiel.

c. When describing the texts of Isaiah, we are confronted with the special circumstance that the MT and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX were close to each other. Even though the LXX translation often differs much from MT, our analysis of the translator's exegesis and his

---

[61] Thus already E. Hammershaimb, "On the Method Applied in the Copying of Manuscripts in Qumran," *VT* 9 (1959) 415–8.

[62] H. Bardke, "Die Parascheneinteilung der Jesajarolle I," in *Festschrift Franz Dornseiff zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Kusch; Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut, 1953) 33–75.

[63] J. M. Oesch, *Petucha und Setuma, Untersuchungen zu einer überlieferten Gliederung im hebräischen Text des Alten Testaments* (OBO 27; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/ Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979) 200–48.

[64] Maori, "Tradition" (see n. 38).

[65] Kutscher, *Language,* 77–89.

translation techniques leads us to believe that the translator often deviated from his parent text, when that was probably very close to MT. The practical result of this situation is that the Qumran texts are compared with the combined evidence of the MT and LXX, although occasionally a Qumran text contains a reading found in the LXX and not in MT, or vice versa.

Comparison of Isaiah in MT and LXX

Any comparative analysis of the Isaiah texts is based on the fact that the amount of variation between the texts is relatively limited. The known textual data for Isaiah point to a picture of textual *unity*, more than in the Torah and much more than in the other two comparable books of the Prophets, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The main textual feature recognizable for the Isaiah texts is the existence of two different scribal traditions, visible in differences in the areas of orthography, morphology, and scribal habits, represented in MT and some Qumran texts.

α. *The MT group*. Most of the Qumran texts of Isaiah reflect the same consonantal framework as the medieval MT. This group of texts is named the "MT group," although it is difficult to determine exactly which texts should be included and which should not. A good example of this group is 1QIsa[b], which presents a relatively extensive text for comparison with MT (from chapter 38 to the end of the book, with some gaps). Its readings were first listed by S. Loewinger,[66] and the differences between 1QIsa[b] and 1QIsa[a] were analyzed by Barthélemy.[67] When comparing 1QIsa[b], dating from the first century BCE, with codex L written one thousand years later, one easily recognizes the close relation between the two texts that are sometimes almost identical. Thus on p. 7 = plate 9 (Isa 50:7–51:10 [13 verses]) of this scroll in the Sukenik edition, one finds only four differences in minor details and two differences in orthography (our reading differs from that of Sukenik), as analyzed elsewhere.[68]

The close relation between 1QIsa[b] and the medieval text can also be expressed in terms of types of differences between the two. When examining all the fragments of 1QIsa[b], which comprises segments of 46

---

[66] S. Loewinger, "The Variants of DSI II," *VT* 4 (1954) 155–63.

[67] Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle,* cii–cviii.

[68] Tov, *TCHB*, 31. Few Qumran texts are closer to the medieval text than 1QIsa[b]. At the same time, 4QGen[b], published in *DJD* XII, is virtually identical to the medieval text.

chapters, we find the following types of features in the scroll that represent differences from codex L, all of which concern minutiae:[69]

Orthography	107
Addition of conjunctive *waw*	16
Lack of conjunctive *waw*	13
Article	4
Differences in letters	10
Missing letters	5
Differences in number	14
Differences in pronouns	6
Different grammatical forms	24
Different prepositions	9
Different words	11
Minuses of words	5
Pluses of words	6
Different sequence	4

Roberts therefore correctly stated in 1959: "The almost complete absence of textual variants is the clearest indication of the close affinity between the two text-forms, for in one instance only can a case be made for a significant variant reading. It is in 53.11."[70] The detailed analysis of Barthélemy[71] shows clearly that 1QIsa[b] is closely aligned with MT, from which 1QIsa[a] deviates, not only in orthography, but also in some content variants. Garbini's claim[72] that this scroll is actually not of a Masoretic character is therefore unfounded.[73] According to Barthélemy, the initial text of 1QIsa[b], as well as that of MurIsa, was corrected several times towards the text that would later become MT.[74]

---

[69] Quoted from M. Cohen, "*h'ydy'h bdbr qdwsht hnwsh l'wtywtyw wbyqwrt htkst*," *Deoth* 47 (1978) 83–101 = *The Bible and Us* (ed. U. Simon; Heb.; Tel Aviv: Devir, 1979) 42–69. See also *TCHB,* 31–3.

[70] B. J. Roberts, "The Second Isaiah Scroll from Qumrân (1QIs[b])," *BJRL* 42 (1959) 132–44. The quotation is from p. 134.

[71] Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle,* cii–cxvi.

[72] G. Garbini, "1QIsa[b] et le texte d'Isaïe," *Hen* 6 (1984) 17–21.

[73] Against the majority view regarding the character of 1QIsa[b], Garbini suggested that this scroll is quite remote from MT. In order to prove this point, Garbini adduced a list of seven differences in single words and the omission of 38:13 as well as of the end/beginning of 60:19/20. In addition, a calculation of the number of lines per column leads the author to believe that some thirty verses of Isaiah were missing in the scroll. However, Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle,* cii–ciii refutes this view as being based on imprecise data and methodologically incorrect suppositions.

[74] Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle,* cxiii. This assumption is unlikely because the level of disagreement between 1QIsa[b] and MurIsa on the one hand and the medieval MT on the other is much higher than the details in which the former had presumably been corrected. It

The close relationship between the medieval representative of MT, L, and 1QIsa[b] is matched by almost all the texts of Isaiah from cave 4. Indeed, in the sections in which 1QIsa[b] overlaps with 4QIsa[b] and 4QIsa[d], all of them are close to codex L. This generalization also pertains to the following texts, which are close to MT and secondarily also to the LXX: 4QIsa[a], 4QIsa[e], 4QIsa[f], 4QIsa[g] (of these, 4QIsa[e,f] probably differed most from the medieval text). It also pertains to the following texts, although they are too short for pronouncing a clear judgment: 4QIsa[h], 4QIsa[i], 4QIsa[j], 4QIsa[k], 4QIsa[l], 4QIsa[m], 4QIsa[n], 4QIsa[o], 4QpapIsa[p], 4QIsa[q], 4QIsa[r].

The Qumran proto-Masoretic group ought to be investigated with regard to possible clusters within this group regarding spelling and content, but because of the paucity of overlapping Qumran texts, this investigation is by nature very limited. A possible clustering of 1QIsa[a,b] and 4QIsa[c,d] (of which 1QIsa[a] and 4QIsa[c] reflect the Qumran orthography), against the medieval text, is visible. Such clusters, if detected, could show how MT developed after the Qumran period. It should thus be possible to pinpoint readings in which the medieval text reflects a later development. Thus, in Isa 53:11, against the medieval MT יראה (מעמל נפשו), two proto-Masoretic Qumran texts, 1QIsa[b] and 4QIsa[d], as well as 1QIsa[a] (Qumran scribal practice) and the LXX (δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς) add אור. Seeligmann suggested that the minority reading of the medieval MT reflects the original text.[75]

β. *The LXX of Isaiah*. Although the LXX translation often deviates greatly from MT because of the LXX's extensive exegesis, there is no reason to believe that its underlying Hebrew text differed much from MT. Therefore, the list of minor agreements between the LXX and 1QIsa[a][76] does not substantially alter this picture.

γ. *Texts Reflecting the Qumran Scribal Practice.* The idiosyncrasies in orthography, morphology, and scribal habits of 1QIsa[a] and 4QIsa[c][77] set them apart from the other Isaiah texts, but not from other Qumran texts.[78] Contextual harmonizations abound in 1QIsa[a], as shown in brief studies by Rubinstein (see notes 28 and 40). This text, as well as 4QIsa[c], was possibly copied from one that differed little from the Isaiah scrolls

---

is more likely that when errors were made, the scribe or a first reader sometimes adapted the text to the *Vorlage* from which the text was copied. See *Scribal Practices*, 223–5.

[75] I. L. Seeligmann, "δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς," *Tarbiz* 27 (1958) 127–41 (Heb.).

[76] See Ziegler, "Die Vorlage" (see n. 32 above); Morrow, *The Text of Isaiah*, 182–4 (see n. 27).

[77] The close connection between these two texts was already recognized by Skehan, "Qumran, Littérature de Qumran," 812.

[78] See chapter 10* and *Scribal Practices*, 261–73.

from cave 4, or from 1QIsa[b], most of which are rather close to MT. One of the special characteristics of 4QIsa[c] is its writing of the Tetragrammaton and other divine names in paleo-Hebrew characters. This feature is shared with another twenty-three Qumran texts, mainly nonbiblical.[79] 4QIsa[c], like 4QLev[g] and 4QpPs[b], also wrote the prefixes to the divine names in paleo-Hebrew characters (Isa 26:4; 44:5); this text stands alone in writing also the suffixes of *'elohim* in paleo-Hebrew characters (Isa 51:15; 52:10; 55:5).

Of special interest is the comparison of 1QIsa[a] and 4QIsa[c] in overlapping passages. These two texts reflect a similar orthographical and linguistic system, but they differ in details.[80] These differences are not surprising since both texts are to some degree internally inconsistent with regard to orthography and language. Thus the second part of 1QIsa[a] is more *plene* than the first part. Accordingly, in the first part of that book, 4QIsa[c] usually is more *plene* than 1QIsa[a], while in the second part (cols. XXVIII ff. of 1QIsa[a]) the two are closer to each other.

The Qumran Scrolls and Literary Criticism
There has been no evidence in any of the scrolls to either prove or disprove the existence of two different segments, Isaiah and Second Isaiah, and in fact the scrolls derive from too late a period in order to contain evidence of this type. The writing of 1QIsa[a] by two scribes (Isaiah 1–34 and 35–66) cannot be taken as evidence in this regard, since it reflects a mere scribal convenience to subdivide the book into two equal parts.

On the basis of the addition in 1QIsa[a] of what constitutes 38:21-22 in MT, it has been suggested by some scholars that these two verses in MT and other witnesses constitute a late editorial addition to the book.[81]

5. *Conclusion*

The Qumran scrolls of Isaiah add textual data to what was known before their discovery, and this information is as a rule of great importance for

---

[79] For a detailed analysis of the writing of the different divine names in paleo-Hebrew, see *Scribal Practices*, 238–46 (with references to earlier literature).

[80] For example, in one column, 1QIsa[a] XVIII–XIX // 4QIsa[c] frgs. 9ii, 11, 12i, 52 (Isa 23:8–24:15), the two scribes agree 20 times against MT in their fuller orthography, and three times in linguistic variations. At the same time, they disagree among each other 14 times in matters of orthography, and twice in linguistic variations.

[81] S. Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook," in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (ed. F. M. Cross and S. Talmon; Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, 1976) 328–32; Y. Zakovitch, "Assimilation in Biblical Narratives," in *Empirical Models*, 175–96; see also the discussion in *TCHB,* 340–42.

our understanding of the textual transmission of the book and its exegesis. As expected, all the sources of Isaiah differ from each other, but their level of differentiation is not very high. The number of proto-Masoretic texts is remarkable (see chapter 10*). If the two texts written in the Qumran scribal practice, 1QIsa[a] and 4QIsa[c], were copied from a text like the proto-Masoretic texts, they ultimately reflect the same textual family. This pertains also to the Hebrew parent text of the LXX. Therefore, the known texts of Isaiah do not differ from each other recensionally.[82]

---

[82] We therefore agree with the 1957 statement of Skehan, "The Qumran Manuscripts," 150: "For Isaias, the complete scroll from cave 1 remains textually the most interesting document, and there is nothing among the 13 manuscripts of cave 4 which is recensionally different from the received consonantal text, or yields improved readings in any significant degree."