



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
New York School

Report on the Dissertation Submitted by A. James Rudin
for the Master of Arts in Hebrew Literature Degree and Ordination

The Transmission of the Isaiah Scroll

It has now become a commonplace in scholarly circles that the text of the complete Isaiah Scroll of the Dead Sea Scrolls is of negligible value to him who would get behind the preserved, so-called Masoretic text. The text of the Isaiah Scroll is an inferior representative of the version of which the Masoretic text is a very good representative.

One of the reasons that the text of the Isaiah Scroll is inferior is the number of patent errors of commission and omission committed by the copyist(s). The purpose of Mr. Rudin's thesis was to try to determine the source of many of these errors. He made a very careful study of the differences between the text of the Scroll and the text of the Masorah in the first six chapters of the Book, and he arrived at the conclusion that one of the major reasons for this difference was that the scribe of the Scroll wrote either from memory or from dictation; he did not have before him a text from which he copied directly. Time and again the errors of commission and omission were due clearly to oral, rather than visual, circumstances.

Mr. Rudin has begun a study which requires very much more detailed and careful work, and of the entire Book of Isaiah, before any conclusions can be regarded as valid. However, what he has done in this paper is a good beginning.

I find this thesis acceptable.

Respectfully submitted,


Dr. Harry M. Orlinsky

April 15, 1960

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE ISAIAH SCROLL

A. JAMES RUDIN

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the Master of Arts in Hebrew Literature Degree and
Ordination.

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion,
New York, N.Y.

1960

Referee, Professor Harry M. Orlinsky

Hebrew Union College
Jewish Institute of Religion
Library

To the Memory of My Grandparents

ROSE N. RUDIN

LOUIS ROSENBLOOM

66291 *

I wish to acknowledge the tremendous help that my Referee, Dr. Harry M. Orlinsky, gave to me. Without his kindness, suggestions, patience, and, above all, his sense of humor, this thesis would never have been written.

I wish to thank Mr. Jacob Behrman of Behrman House for his gracious aid in the final typing of this thesis. Jacob's assistance eased my labors greatly.

A. JAMES RUDIN
1960

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	LETTERS INSERTED IN ISAIAH SCROLL	4
3.	CONJUNCTIVE / IN ISAIAH SCROLL	8
4.	ADDITION OF PRONOMINAL AND PREPOSITIONAL PREFIX IN ISAIAH SCROLL	13
5.	ADDITION OF PRONOMINAL OR ORTHOGRAPHIC SUFFIX IN ISAIAH SCROLL	19
6.	/ IN ISAIAH SCROLL AS A <u>MATER</u> <u>LECTIONIS</u>	27
7.	' IN ISAIAH SCROLL AS A <u>MATER</u> <u>LECTIONIS</u>	35
8.	SINGLE LETTERS APPEARING IN MT, BUT LACKING IN ISAIAH SCROLL	41
9.	SUBSTITUTION OF SINGLE LETTERS IN ISAIAH SCROLL	45
10.	MISCELLANEOUS LETTERS ADDED TO ISAIAH SCROLL (NOT PREFIX, SUFFIX, OR SUBSTITUTION)	54
11.	MISCELLANEOUS	56
	NOTES	60
	BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CONSULTED AND/OR QUOTED	61

CHAPTER ONE

The Scroll of the Book of Isaiah that was discovered near the Dead Sea over a decade ago presents some basic questions to the scholar. The Isaiah Scroll(hereafter abbreviated IS) differs in many places from the Masoretic Text(hereafter abbreviated MT). Many of these differences involve the addition or omission of single letters in IS.

An intensive study of these variations may help us answer one of the basic questions concerning the Scroll: how was it composed? There are four possibilities:

- (a.) The scribe copied from another manuscript.
- (b.) The scribe copied from or at the dictation of one who read from a manuscript.
- (c.) The scribe copied from memory.
- (d.) The scribe copied from or at the dictation of one who quoted from memory.

Thus, there are two fundamental ways of transmission: oral and visual. Only in case (a.) did the scribe rely upon purely visual methods. The other three would involve the principle of oral transmission.

The object of this study is to classify the textual differences into ten categories. Each category involves a major type of deviation from MT. The categories are:

1. LETTER INSERTED IN IS.

- (a.) כ
- (b.) פ
- (c.) ה
- (d.) י
- (e.) ט
- (f.) נ

- (g.) י
- (h.) נ
- (i.) ט

2. CONJUNCTIVE / IN IS

3. ADDITION OF PRONOMINAL AND PREPOSITIONAL PREFIX IN IS

- (a.) פ
- (b.) ק
- (c.) ל
- (d.) מ

4. ADDITION OF PRONOMINAL OR ORTHOGRAPHIC SUFFIX IN IS

- (a.) כ
- (b.) ך
- (c.) ך
- (d.) ך
- (e.) ך
- (f.) ך
- (g.) ך
- (h.) ך

5. / IN IS AS A MATER LECTIONIS

- (a.) Infinitive
- (b.) Present Participle
- (c.) ך
- (d.) ך
- (e.) ך
- (f.) ך
- (g.) ALL OTHER FORMS

6. ' IN IS AS A MATER LECTIONIS

- (a.) ך
- (b.) ך
- (c.) ך
- (d.) Noun & Verbal Forms Except for ך

7. SINGLE LETTERS APPEARING IN MT, BUT LACKING IN IS

- (a.) כ
- (b.) ך
- (c.) ך
- (d.) ך

8. SUBSTITUTION OF SINGLE LETTERS IN IS

- (a.) כ for ך
- (b.) כ for ך

(c.)	lc	for	yolo 5 20 c-5 c-1 c 20 0
(d.)	lc	for	
(e.)	lc	for	
(f.)	lc	for	
(g.)	lc	for	
(h.)	lc	for	
(i.)	lc	for	
(j.)	lc	for	
(k.)	lc	for	
(l.)	lc	for	
(m.)	lc	for	
(n.)	lc	for	
(o.)	lc	for	

9. MISCELLANEOUS LETTERS ADDED TO IS (NOT PREFIX, SUFFIX, OR SUBSTITUTION)

(a.) lc
 (b.) lc
 (c.) N

10. MISCELLANEOUS

(a.) Metathesis of letters in IS and MT
 (b.) Metathesis of words in IS and MT
 (c.) A word present in IS, but lacking in MT
 (d.) A word present in MT, but lacking in IS
 (e.) Letters lacking in IS

CHAPTER TWO

In this chapter we shall survey the occasions when a letter is omitted in IS, and then later inserted into the text. By studying these instances, it may be possible to determine the reasons for the various omissions.

(a.) lc

In IS 1:12b the word זוֹלֵה appears for זֹלֵה in MT. The word is rendered ("this"). The use of the plena / is widespread in IS. The word זֹלֵה appears quite often in the Scroll.

Two possibilities come to mind. First, the scribe unconsciously omitted the lc in copying the word from a Vorlage, a simple mechanical error. The other possibility is that the error took place during oral transmission. The scribe forgot to add the lc , and it was left to another hand to complete the word.

IS 5:29b has the word נִשְׁׁלֵה , while MT has וְיִחַזְקוּ ("and lay hold of"). It is our opinion that the scribe failed to include the lc when he heard the word. It is not likely that he would have omitted the lc if he copied from a manuscript.

(b.) q

IS 8:1b has the word בְּחִרָה , while MT has בְּחִרָה־ ("in script"). The scribe omitted the q , but why? It is possible that the scribe neglected to reproduce the letter when he copied the word from a manuscript. It is also possible that he failed to write in the letter after he heard the word.

The phrase *וכתוב עשיו חרה* does not make sense. There is little doubt that the *ק* is original. Perhaps the scribe heard the / of *עשיו* and the *ק* of *קרה*, and confused them in his mind. Instead of two distinct letters, he included only one, the / . We are not certain as to the reason for the omission of the *ק* .

(c.) *ה*

IS 8:9a has the word *ואעזב'נא*, while MT has *ואעזב'נא* ("and give ear"). It seems most likely that the scribe did not hear the *ה* , and so did not put it into writing.

IS 5:18a has *והט'ו* for MT *והט'ו* ("iniquity"). It would seem that the scribe of IS did not hear the letter *ה* in the context, and therefore did not reproduce it in writing. It is, conversely, most unlikely that the scribe, having a manuscript before him, accidentally omitted the *ה* .

(d.) /

IS 1:24b has *ב'ק'א* for MT *ב'ק'א* ("from/of mine enemies"). The evidence seems to point to an oral error. The / was not sounded, and the scribe did not reproduce it. It is likely that the scribe would have written the / if he had seen the letter before him.

(e.) *ת*

IS 3:25b has *אזקו ר'יך*, while MT has *אזקו ר'יך* ("thy mighty ones"). *אזקו ר'יך* is balanced in this verse by *ת'יך*.

It seems likely that MT contains the more original

word, and that IS is at variance with the original. It is not clear why the / was omitted.

(f.) 17

IS 4:1a has the word יִקְחֵם , while MT has יִקְחֵם ("shall take hold of"). It is possible that the scribe made a simple mechanical error in copying from a manuscript. He could have seen יִקְחֵם and omitted the 17 by accident. Conversely, the scribe could have heard the word pronounced and he could have mistaken the two letters for one sound. It is difficult to reach any definite conclusion on this point.

(g.) '

The omission of the ' in the word פְּסוּלֵי will be fully discussed in another chapter. However, two other words will help shed some light on the problem of textual transmission.

IS 1:3a has הוּאֵי , while MT has הוּאֵי ("his owner"). Apparently the editor who inserted the ' felt the word needed the vocalic letter. It is possible that the scribe made an unthinking error by forgetting to reproduce the ' . Or perhaps he copied from a Vorlage that did not contain the ' .

However, the scribe did include a vocalic ' . We are of the opinion that the ' was omitted during oral transmission. The omission was a simple mistake.

IS 10:13b has וְיִסְרֹם , while MT has וְיִסְרֹם ("in that I have removed"). It is likely that the ' was omitted

during oral transmission. It is most unlikely that the scribe would have omitted the ' if he copied from an extant manuscript that contained the letter.

We believe that the scribe may have simply omitted the ' when he heard or when he remembered the word. His error was later corrected.

(h.) N

IS 1:2b has $\Sigma \Omega N^w 171$, while MT has לָבָן נִיָּז ("I have brought up"). At first blush, it seems possible that the scribe omitted the N because of the confusion of the twin letters. This explanation would point to a written Vorlage. However, it is also possible that the scribe heard the word pronounced with a single N; ruling out the need to reproduce a second N. It seems most likely that the scribe unconsciously forgot to write the N because of visual confusion.

(i) γ

IS 9:7a has $\text{יָבֹב}^{\gamma} \text{יָבֹב}$, and MT has $\text{יָבֹב}^{\gamma} \text{יָבֹב}$ ("into Jacob"). Again, it would appear that the scribe omitted the γ in the process of oral transmission. The γ probably had little or no sound, and the scribe could have failed to reproduce the letter. Conversely, it is not likely that the scribe would omit the γ if he copied from a Vorlage.

In this chapter we have seen that several letters were omitted by the scribe of IS. We are of the opinion that the bulk of these omissions stem from oral transmission.

That is, the scribe had no manuscript in front of him. Thus, in hearing a word, he may have left out certain letters.

The exact letters omitted tend to support the oral theory. The כ , נ , ל , ו , and ס make up the majority of the omissions. None of these is a "strong" letter; rather they are guttural or vocalic. It is understandable and even reasonable that the scribe sometimes overlooked them in composing his text.

CHAPTER THREE

In this chapter we shall study the conjunctive ך . That is, the ך that appears in IS, but is lacking in MT. Generally, this type of variation follows a pattern. In the first six chapters of IS the conjunctive ך appears ten times.

NO.	LOCATION	IS	MT	TRANSLATION
1.	1:3b	ינחל	ינח	"My people"
2.	1:8b	כנפתי	כנפתי	"as a lodge"
3.	1:16a	כשתי	כשתי	"make you clean"
4.	1:16a	כתי	כתי	"put away"
5.	2:4b	כי	כי	"not"
6.	2:11a	כי	כי	"the looks"
7.	2:12b	כתי	כתי	"lifted up"
8.	3:9a	כי	כי	"not"

NO.	LOCATION	IS	MT	TRANSLATION
9.	3:20a	והפאריק	גפאריק	"the headtires"
10.	5:6a	ולאן	לא	"not"

The addition of the conjunctive | must be studied per se in each of these ten passages. We must try to find the reason for the variations.

IS 1:3b has:
 ידע שור קולו ורחוק אקוס קצלין
 ישראעל לא ידע ולא ידע אלא כ

It is our feeling that the | was added to לא in order to balance in construction the word ורחוק; לא conforms more to the prosaic style, as compared to the more poetic לא in MT. It seems likely that the | was added in the process of an oral method of transmission.

In IS 1:8b we find וכנאונה, and in MT it is כנאונה.

Once again, the entire verse must be considered. IS reads:

ונתת קת ציון כסוכה פכרם
 וכנאונה פחקה כעיר לצור

It is our view that the conjunctive | in וכנאונה is part of an oral, prosaic tradition. If כנאונה were original, then one would expect also.. וכעיר.

IS 1:16a has והסירו and והסירו, while MT has הסירו.

The entire verse in IS is:

קח 13 והסירו והסירו (רוח נאצניב נאצניב עירי)
 חפלו הרע

Here again, IS is more prosaic than MT:

ל 13. קח. (רוח נאצניב נאצניב עירי...)

The asyndeton construction כִּדְבַר וְדָבָר וְדָבָר (2:17) is more powerful and poetic than the construction in IS. It seems more likely that the addition of the conjunctive stems from an oral, prosaic tradition.

In 2:4b IS has וְאֵלֶּיךָ, while MT has אֵלַי. IS reads:

... וְאֵלֶּיךָ אֵלֶּיךָ אֵלֶּיךָ אֵלֶּיךָ
וְאֵלֶּיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ

MT has:

... וְאֵלַי וְאֵלַי וְאֵלַי וְאֵלַי
וְאֵלַי וְאֵלַי וְאֵלַי וְאֵלַי

There is no reason for the last strich to begin with the conjunction, certainly not in poetry. MT would seem here to represent the original. IS probably originated in oral transmission. The scribe would probably not have added a /^o written original manuscript.

In 2:11a, IS has: וְעֵינַי. MT has: עֵינַי. The entire verse in IS:

וְעֵינַי לְדַהֵת אֶדְקַת תִּשְׁפֹּט לְךָ
וְשֵׁחַ רֹק אֶנְשֵׁיךָ
וְנִשְׁבַּח יְהוָה לְכָבוֹד קִיּוֹם הַהוּא.

MT has:

עֵינַי לְדַהֵת אֶדְקַת תִּשְׁפֹּט
וְשֵׁחַ רֹק אֶנְשֵׁיךָ
וְנִשְׁבַּח יְהוָה לְכָבוֹד קִיּוֹם הַהוּא.

In this verse we again see evidence for an oral tradition in IS. MT is surely more poetic than IS. It seems that IS stems from an oral, secondary tradition. It is unlikely that the scribe failed to copy correctly. He probably would not have added a / to a Vorlage. Rather, we may say that IS was probably transmitted orally.

In 2:12b, IS has כִּלְכַּל , and MT has כִּלְכַּל . The IS verse is:

$\text{כִּי יוֹקֵחַ הָיָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָרַק וְלִכְלִי וְלִכְלִי$

MT has:

$\text{כִּי יוֹקֵחַ הָיָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָרַק וְלִכְלִי וְלִכְלִי$

We are faced with the addition of the / to כִּלְכַּל in IS. E. Y. Kutscher points out that the LXX and the Targum follow the text of MT.¹ Thus, it would seem that IS stems from a secondary source. It is hardly likely that the scribe would omit כִּלְכַּל if he copied from a manuscript. The conjunctive / in IS may be all that remains of the MT כִּלְכַּל

3:9a in IS reads:

$\text{... וְלִכְלִי כִּי יוֹקֵחַ הָיָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָרַק וְלִכְלִי$

MT has:

$\text{... וְלִכְלִי כִּי יוֹקֵחַ הָיָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָרַק וְלִכְלִי$

We are concerned with וְאִלּוּ in IS, and וְכֵן in MT.

The addition of the conjunctive / in IS seems to indicate a secondary tradition. The / adds little power to the text, in fact it may even detract from it.

It is dubious that the scribe would have added a / if he copied from a manuscript. The conjunctive / may represent a prosaic and/or dialect form of the original MT.

The same arguments can be advanced in the cases of 3:20a and 5:6a. The former in IS is:

וְהִפְאָרְיָם וְהַצְדִּיקוֹת וְהַקְשִׁיָּם
וְהַנְּפִלְשׁ וְהַנְּחִשִׁיָּם.

MT has:

וְהִפְאָרְיָם וְהַצְדִּיקוֹת וְהַקְשִׁיָּם
וְהַנְּפִלְשׁ וְהַנְּחִשִׁיָּם

The conjunctive / at the beginning of the verse in IS seems to be more prosaic than MT. We are of the opinion that IS was transmitted orally, for it is less likely that the scribe would have added a / to a written original reading simply וְהִפְאָרְיָם.

5:6a of IS reads:

וְאִשׁוֹתֵיחַן קָתְהוּ וְאִלּוּ נִזְנְרָה
וְאִלּוּ יַעֲדָר

MT has

וְאִשׁוֹתֵיחַן קָתְהוּ וְאִלּוּ נִזְנְרָה
וְאִלּוּ יַעֲדָר

Again, it seems most likely that the conjunctive / was added in IS during oral transmission. IS is more prosaic than MT, and it is unlikely that the scribe added a

/ to an already existing manuscript reading ל(ה)ל .

In this chapter we have pointed out some examples of the conjunctive / found in IS and lacking in MT. In each case it was our feeling that the conjunctive / points to an oral, prosaic tradition. It is our belief that the scribe added the / in oral transmission.

CHAPTER FOUR

In this chapter we will study the addition of the pronominal or prepositional prefix in IS. There are four such prefixes in our examples. They are:

(a.) ק

(b.) ה

(c.) ל

(d.) ת

In the first seven chapters of IS there are nine instances of addition of prefixes. Just as with the conjunctive /, we will study each of these prefixes individually.

1:20a of IS has:

$\text{ל אק תמאנו ומריתק ק חרק תאכלו}$
 כ'א פ' ה'ה ק'ר

MT has

$\text{ל אק תמאנו ומריתק ק חרק תאכלו}$
 כ'א פ' ה'ה ק'ר

The addition of the ק to חרק in IS is our concern here. MT is translated ("Ye shall be devoured with the sword").

I. W. Slotki in commenting on חרק says: "WITH THE SWORD.

The construction is called by the grammarians 'the accusative instrument', there being no preposition in the Hebrew.²

Kutscher writes:

מלת 'חרק' יתכן והיא משמשת אקוזטיב של
 אמצ"י. נכונתק לא קבינה, תקנה יבחרק!

3.

In our own translation: "The word חרק is possible. It is used as an accusative of instrument. The scribe did not understand this, and emended the word to read חרקק."

It is probable that MT is more poetic and original than IS. The scribe merely reproduced the oral, prosaic tradition that was his. He would probably not have added the ק if he copied from a manuscript reading חרק.

We see this principle at work in 1:2. IS reads:

שמשו של חרק וקוציניו הארץ
 כי אין יקוה קצק...

MT has:

שמשו של חרק וקוציניו הארץ
 כי אין יקוה קצק...

This verse illustrates subsection (b.), the use of the ה as a prefix in IS. Here IS has ה'ארת, while MT reads ארת. There is little doubt that ה'ארת is prosaic when compared to MT. It seems likely that the scribe added the ה during oral transmission, for it is dubious that he would have added a ה if he copied from a Vorlage reading ארת.

3:24 of IS reads:

ויהיו תחת הקטק מק
ותמות הזורה לקבש א...

MT has:

ויהיה תחת קטק מק יהיה
ותחת הזורה לקבש א...

Our concern is with IS הקטק. It seems probable that הקטק stems from an oral prosaic tradition. The definite article ה is not found anywhere else in IS version of the verse. It is our view that the addition of the ה was due to an error in oral transmission.

IS 6:13 has:

ואשוב קה עטיריה וסרה וה"תה
אשר באלה ובאליון אשר משלכת
מזקת קמה) שרע הקודש מזקתה.

MT has:

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל קָרָא עִי' רִיבָה וְשָׁבָה וְהָיָה ה'
 לְקָרָא כְּאִלְפָה וְכְאִלְפָן וְכְשֶׁלֶם כְּשֶׁלֶם
 וְכְשֶׁלֶם (קָרָא) קָרָא קָרָא

It is most likely that וְקָרָא is a product of an oral, prosaic tradition found in IS or in IS's immediate predecessor or ancestor. The addition of the וְ tends to support the belief that the scribe did not copy from a manuscript. If he did copy from such a Vorlage reading קָרָא, he would probably not have added the וְ.

IS 7:2 has:

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל קָרָא עִי' רִיבָה וְשָׁבָה וְהָיָה ה'
 לְקָרָא כְּאִלְפָה וְכְאִלְפָן וְכְשֶׁלֶם כְּשֶׁלֶם
 הַיֵּצֵר מִפְּנֵי הָרוּחַ

MT has:

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל קָרָא עִי' רִיבָה וְשָׁבָה וְהָיָה ה'
 לְקָרָא כְּאִלְפָה וְכְאִלְפָן וְכְשֶׁלֶם כְּשֶׁלֶם
 הַיֵּצֵר מִפְּנֵי הָרוּחַ

IS contains the definite article: הַיֵּצֵר and הָרוּחַ.

MT has יֵצֵר and רוּחַ. It is our view that MT represents a poetic tradition, while the reading in IS represents the prosaic style. It seems likely that the definite articles were added during oral transmission.

Close inspection of the Scroll seems to indicate there is no grounds for scribal visual confusion. Let us assume he copied from a manuscript. In this verse the η of $\gamma\delta\eta$ ⁽¹³⁸⁾ is followed by a ' and also preceded by a ' . The letters ' and η are not similar in appearance in IS. The η of $\eta\theta\lambda$ is followed by a γ and preceded by a ' . Again, paleographic similarities are not likely.

It is most dubious that the scribe would have added a η to an extant manuscript.

We move now to subsection (c.); the use of the ζ as a prefix in IS. IS 1:13a has:

$\zeta\eta\theta\lambda$ $\eta\theta\lambda$ $\zeta\eta\theta\lambda$ $\eta\theta\lambda$

MT has:

$\zeta\eta\theta\lambda$ $\eta\theta\lambda$ $\zeta\eta\theta\lambda$ $\eta\theta\lambda$

The prefix ζ concerns us here. The form $\zeta\eta\theta\lambda$ is, of course, correct. Yet, $\eta\theta\lambda$ is more poetic. The ζ may readily have been introduced when the scribe received the dictation, or when the scribe himself called it to mind. It is less likely that a scribe wrote $\zeta\eta\theta\lambda$ for a reading $\eta\theta\lambda$ in a Vorlage.

IS 2:11 has:

$\eta\theta\lambda$ $\zeta\eta\theta\lambda$ $\eta\theta\lambda$ $\zeta\eta\theta\lambda$

MT has:

$\eta\theta\lambda$ $\zeta\eta\theta\lambda$ $\eta\theta\lambda$ $\zeta\eta\theta\lambda$

added in IS tends to support the oral theory of transmission. The P , D , S , and N are prefix forms that may change a poetic construction into a prosaic one. We may assume that the more poetic form of the text is closer to the original. Thus, the prefix forms could have been added readily during the oral transmission of the text. It is hardly likely that the scribe added a P , D , S , or N if he had before him a manuscript from which he copied.

CHAPTER FIVE

In this chapter we shall study the additions of the pronominal or orthographic suffix endings in IS. There are eight types of these endings. They are:

(a.) IC

(b.) D

(c.) I

(d.) '

(e.) P

(f.) DJ

(g.) PD

(h.) N

A close look at these forms may help to shed some additional light on the transmission question of IS.

(a.) IC

The IC as a suffix is very prevalent in IS. It occurs 18 times in the first six chapters of IS. The word $\text{IC}'\text{D}$ is involved in 16 of these cases.

IS 1:12a has:

כִּי אַתְּ תִּשְׁמַע (לְרֵאיוֹת פְּנֵי)

MT has:

כִּי תִשְׁמַע (לְרֵאיוֹת פְּנֵי)

It seems likely that the suffix was added during oral transmission. The letter is superfluous in a written text. It is not likely that the scribe of IS added the *lc* to a written original. Rather, it is more probable that the *lc* was automatically added by the scribe when he was writing from dictation or memory.

IS 3:1a has:

כִּי אֵל הַיְהוָה הַיּוֹדֵן יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת
מִהַסִּיר יְרוּשָׁלַם וּמִיְהוֹדֵה
מִשָּׁעַן וּמִשָּׁעֶה

MT has:

כִּי (הַיְהוָה הַיּוֹדֵן) יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת
מִהַסִּיר יְרוּשָׁלַם וּמִיְהוֹדֵה
מִשָּׁעַן וּמִשָּׁעֶה

It is our belief that the addition of the *lc* as a suffix is a probable sign of an oral tradition. As in the previous examples, it is our contention that the scribe added the *lc* when he heard or remembered the word *כִּי*. It seems dubious that the scribe would have added the *lc* if he were copying from an original manuscript reading *כִּי*.

Only twice in the first ten chapters of IS do we find *כִּי* followed by an *lc*. The two places are 6:5 and 10:2.

IS 6:5a has:

וְאִמַר אֵלַי כִּי נִצְמַיְתָ כִּי אֵל אֵלֶיךָ מִן הַר צְבָאוֹת

...כִּי אֵל

MT has:

... כִּי יִשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֶת-קוֹל יְהוָה
... כִּי יִשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֶת-קוֹל יְהוָה

IS 10:22a has:

... כִּי יִשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֶת-קוֹל יְהוָה

MT has:

... כִּי יִשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֶת-קוֹל יְהוָה

In these two cases the scribe could have seen כִּי in a manuscript, and confused the כִּי, and added an extra /c. Thus, instead of כִּי, IS shows כִּי.

It should be noted that these are the only two examples of כִּי being followed by an /c in the first 39 chapters of the Scroll.

The other two examples of the /c used as a suffix are found in IS 5:1b and IS 5:2a. IS 5:1b has:

כִּי יִשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֶת-קוֹל יְהוָה
כִּי יִשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֶת-קוֹל יְהוָה

MT has:

כִּי יִשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֶת-קוֹל יְהוָה
כִּי יִשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֶת-קוֹל יְהוָה

It is our feeling that the addition of the suffix /c to כִּי tends to support the oral explanation of transmission. This is a phonetic device that the scribe may have added when he heard the word כִּי, or when he recalled it from memory. It is hardly likely that he would have added the /c to an extant manuscript.

IS 5:2a has:

added the ה to an original manuscript.

IS 1:15b has:

וְקִיכְמָהּ אֶצְעָעוּתִיכֶם (קֶמְחָהּ) אֶצְעָעוּתִיכֶם

MT has:

וְקִיכֶם

The use of קִיכְמָהּ ' in IS is our concern here.

We shall discuss below the additional words of IS in this passage. It would seem that קִיכְמָהּ represents an oral version of קִיכֶם, resulting from the spoken dialect of the scribe, or of the person who may have dictated to him, causing the ה to be added.

IS 6:9a has:

וְאִיכְמָהּ אֶצְעָעוּתִיכֶם

MT has:

וְאִיכֶם אֶצְעָעוּתִיכֶם

The additional ה may be a possible indication of an oral tradition. This theory would be based upon the scribe's hearing and/or memory. The ה may indicate a scribal attempt to spell out the dialect sound he may have heard or remembered. It is less likely that the scribe would have added the ה if he were copying from a Vorlage.

IS 1:23a has:

שִׁירֵי יְהוָה שִׁירֵי יְהוָה שִׁירֵי יְהוָה שִׁירֵי יְהוָה שִׁירֵי יְהוָה

MT has:

שִׁירֵי יְהוָה שִׁירֵי יְהוָה שִׁירֵי יְהוָה שִׁירֵי יְהוָה שִׁירֵי יְהוָה

The words אִיכְמָהּ and אִיכֶם concern us here.

It is our opinion that קָרַבְתָּ לַיהוָה and $\text{וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ לַיהוָה}$ represent the original poetry of the prophet as compared with the prosaic, secondary form: קָרַבְתָּ לַיהוָה and $\text{וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ לַיהוָה}$.

The use of the plural in accord with the first half of the verse is a possible indication of an oral, prose tradition.

(d.) קָרַבְתָּ
Continuing with the same verse we find in IS 1:23a the word קָרַבְתָּ as compared with MT וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ . We are of the opinion that the argument used above is valid here also. That is, קָרַבְתָּ is part of a secondary oral tradition, while וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ represents the original, poetic tradition.

(e.) וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ
IS 2:11a has:

וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ

MT has:

וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ

וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ has been discussed above. We hold to the view that the use of the plural imperfect tends to be more prosaic than the singular perfect as found in MT.

(f.) וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ

IS5:12b has:

$\text{וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ יְהוָה לְעַבְדֶיךָ וְלְעַבְדֵי יְהוָה}$

MT has:

$\text{וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ יְהוָה לְעַבְדֶיךָ וְלְעַבְדֵי יְהוָה}$

The word וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ is an incorrect grammatical form, and MT word וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ is correct. We are concerned here with the addition of the ו . Perhaps the scribe heard a dialect version of וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ , and wrote it as וַיִּקְרַבְתָּ . It is

also possible that he thought the noun פֶּסַח was feminine.

In this verse we lean toward an oral explanation, but no no firm conclusion can be safely stated.

(g.) MISCELLANEOUS

In this subsection we shall discuss several examples the full forms of words as they appear in IS, and the apocopated formations in MT.

IS 3:10a has: כִּי אֵין פְּרִי מֵעֵץ הַיַּדֵּשׁ וְיֵה מִן הַיַּדֵּשׁ

MT has: כִּי אֵין פְּרִי מֵעֵץ הַיַּדֵּשׁ וְיֵה מִן הַיַּדֵּשׁ

The addition of the ה to עֵץ הַיַּדֵּשׁ seems to indicate an oral tradition, reflecting the spoken dialect of the scribe. It is most dubious that he would have added the ה if he were copying from a manuscript.

IS 5:4b has: מִן הַיַּדֵּשׁ וְיֵה מִן הַיַּדֵּשׁ וְיֵה מִן הַיַּדֵּשׁ

MT has: מִן הַיַּדֵּשׁ וְיֵה מִן הַיַּדֵּשׁ וְיֵה מִן הַיַּדֵּשׁ

The word יֵה seems to indicate the dialect of the scribe. The omission of the ם combined with the addition of the ה may have been the scribe's attempt to spell out that which he heard or remembered. It is highly unlikely that the scribe would have omitted the ם and added the ה if he had a written manuscript from which to copy. These signs tend to support an oral transmission explanation.

IS 5:19 has: וְיֵה מִן הַיַּדֵּשׁ וְיֵה מִן הַיַּדֵּשׁ

קָצַבְתָּ שֶׁכֵּן וְיָצַדְתָּ

MT has:

וְיָצַדְתָּ וְיָצַדְתָּ
קָצַבְתָּ וְיָצַדְתָּ

The use of וְיָצַדְתָּ seems quite justified since its companion verb וְיָצַדְתָּ also has the final ה. Yet, וְיָצַדְתָּ is also a correct grammatical form. Several tentative theories may help explain the use of וְיָצַדְתָּ.

וְיָצַדְתָּ is possibly more poetic when used with וְיָצַדְתָּ, the contrast between the verbs adds poetic power to the verse. Conversely, the use of וְיָצַדְתָּ in IS may be said to reflect a more prosaic, oral tradition.

Another point should be mentioned. IS has וְיָצַדְתָּ while MT has וְיָצַדְתָּ!. Here, it would seem IS is more poetic and original than MT. The scribe omitted the ה in וְיָצַדְתָּ but added it in וְיָצַדְתָּ. The possibility of dialect deviations comes to mind. Perhaps the words וְיָצַדְתָּ and וְיָצַדְתָּ represent the spoken dialect of the scribe.

IS 5:25a has:

וְיָצַדְתָּ כְּשֶׁיִּחַדְתָּ...

MT has:

וְיָצַדְתָּ כְּשֶׁיִּחַדְתָּ...

It is our contention that וְיָצַדְתָּ probably represents a spelling characteristic of the scribe's dialect. It is most likely that the additional ה may be a sign of an oral tradition in the transmission of the text.

In all of these examples we have found that MT contains the apocopated form, while IS has the full imperfect with the way consecutive. Thus, MT has וְיָצַדְתָּ; IS has וְיָצַדְתָּ.

MT contains קָוַי , and IS has קָוַי . MT has קָוַי and IS contains קָוַי . We are probably on safe in saying that this is a result of an oral method of textual transmission.

In this chapter we have noted that the following letters were used as suffixes in IS: כ , נ , ' , פ , נ , and נ . In the majority of these cases, it was our conclusion that they were probably added during oral transmission. We found little or no evidence to support a visual theory of transmission.

CHAPTER SIX

In this chapter we shall examine the usage of the plena waw in IS and in relation to MT. For this study there are seven subsections:

- (a.) The plena waw in the infinitive.
 - (b.) The plena waw in the present participle.
 - (c.) The plena waw in the imperfect.
 - (d.) The plena waw in the word כִּי .
 - (e.) The plena waw in the word כִּי .
 - (f.) The plena waw in words with a double waw (וּו).
 - (g.) The plena waw in the other nouns, adjectives, or adverbs).
- (a.) The plena waw in the infinitive.

IS 2:19b has:

$\text{קָוַי} \text{ קָוַי} \text{ וְנִקְרָא}$

MT has:

$\text{קָוַי} \text{ קָוַי} \text{ וְנִקְרָא}$

It is possible that the plena waw was included for vocalic reasons. It seems plausible that the waw was included

in the text by the scribe as a result of oral transmission.

It does not seem likely that the scribe would have added a waw if none was present in the Vorlage. The same word

וְיָרֵם appears in IS two verses later (21b), as against MT וְיָרֵם.

IS 3:7a has: וְיָרֵם

MT has: וְיָרֵם

The plena waw in IS indicates a scribal addition after he either heard or recalled the word for copying. The plena waw was included for vocalic reasons, and points to an oral method of transmission.

IS 1:12b has: וְיָרֵם וְיָרֵם

MT has: וְיָרֵם וְיָרֵם

It is our belief that the plena waw in וְיָרֵם is part of an oral tradition. The form with prefix וְ, as found in IS, is more prosaic than MT. It does not seem reasonable that the scribe would have added a וְ to an existing manuscript; rather it is likely that the וְ was the scribe's attempt to spell out the word he heard or remembered.

(b.) The plena waw in the present participle.

IS 1:7b has: וְיָרֵם וְיָרֵם (וְיָרֵם)

MT has: וְיָרֵם וְיָרֵם וְיָרֵם

The plena waw in IS וְיָרֵם seems to indicate an oral method of transmission; for it is most likely that the scribe added the וְ in his copying of the word from

dictation or from memory. It seems unreasonable to believe that the scribe added a / to the word if he copied from a Vorlage.

IS 1:15a has:

ḡN1ḡ

MT has:

ḡN1ḡ

It is our opinion that IS represents an oral tradition, for the plena waw was probably included as a pronunciation help. ḡN1ḡ was the scribe's way of reproducing the word he either heard or remembered. We find this type of the waw in IS in many places.

IS 5:5a has:

ḡḡ1ḡ

MT has:

ḡḡ1ḡ

The plena waw in IS is part of a pattern. The scribe added the / as a vocalic device to reproduce the sound or pronunciation of the word. Each of the above examples leads us to believe that the scribe did not copy from a Vorlage. Rather, the additions of the / tend to point to an oral method of textual transmission.

(c.) The plena waw in the imperfect.

IS 1:11a has:

ḡN1c/

MT has:

ḡN1c'

As with the infinitive and the present participle forms, so here too in the imperfect, we find the pattern of the plena waw continued. It is probable that the scribe added the / in IS to spell fully the sound he remembered or heard. The / is an aid to pronunciation.

IS 3:7b has:

כ'ל
כ'ל

MT has:

It seems likely that the plena waw in the word
כ'ל represents a dialect as heard or remembered by the
scribe. Its addition by the scribe points to an oral tradition
for it is dubious if the scribe added a / to an already
existing manuscript.

IS 3:4b has:

פ'פ' | ס'ל'נ' | פ' | ס' | ר' | נ' |
פ' | ס' | ר' | נ' | פ' | ס' | ר' | נ' |

MT has:

Again, the plena waw would seem to indicate an oral
tradition. It was included in IS to help in the pronunciation
of the word; for it is a vocalic / . It is probable that
the / was the scribe's attempt to reproduce accurately the
word as he either heard it or remembered it.

In the first five chapters of IS, there are eight
additional examples of this kind of plena writing. Each one
employs the plena waw in a vocalic way, and each one points
to an oral transmission method.

(d.) The plena waw in the word ס'ל .

The word ס'ל appears 21 times in the first five
chapters of IS; in 14 of these cases the scribe wrote ס'ל,
in five places he wrote ס'ל, and in a pair of verses the
word is lacking.

It is likely that the plena waw in ס'ל represents
an oral method of transmission. That is, the / was used
as a pronunciation guide or aid. It is probable that the

plena waw was inserted as a vocalic sign.

IS 1:5b has: ...כאוי כו

MT has: ...כוי כו

IS 2:15 has: (קדז פזמ) כו פז

MT has: (קדז פזמ) כו פז

כז פזמ כו פז!
כז פזמ כו פז!
כז פזמ כו פז!

IS: 5:25b has;

MT has: כא'ס כו

These three examples show the plena waw as a vocalic sign. In the first example כו starts a phrase. In the second example כו follows a word. Finally, in the last example כו is preceded by a preposition. In each case the scribe probably added the / as he heard or pronounced the word.

(e.) The plena waw in the word כא'ס.

In IS, the word כא'ס is found 17 times in the first five chapters. It is our opinion that the plena waw represents a vocalic sign, and denotes an oral method of transmission.

IS 1:6b has: כא'ס כא'ס כא'ס
/כא'ס כא'ס כא'ס

MT has: כא'ס in all 3 instances.

IS 5:4a has: כא'ס כא'ס כא'ס

MT has: כא'ס כא'ס כא'ס

IS 5:12b has: כא'ס כא'ס ...

MT has: כא'ס כא'ס ...

In these examples we may see the vocalic plena waw. It is not likely that the scribe added a / to an existing

manuscript or that $\{k|\}$ represented an older consonantal tradition.

(f.) The plena waw in words with a double waw($\{w|\}$).

There is only one example in the first five chapters of IS where we find a word with a double plena waw. The word is $\{w|\}$, and is found twice.

IS 1:4a has:

וּבְיָמֵינוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל
 $\{w|\}$ אֶת־עַמּוֹתֵינוּ

MT has:

וּבְיָמֵינוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל
 $\{w|\}$ אֶת־עַמּוֹתֵינוּ

IS 5:18a has:

... $\{w|\}$ וְעַתָּה ...

MT has:

... $\{w|\}$ וְעַתָּה ...

In both cases it seems likely that the scribal addition was done during oral transmission. In each example the second $\{w|\}$ seems to aid in pronouncing the word $\{w|\}$. This was the scribe's attempt to spell out the word as he either heard or remembered $\{w|\}$.

(g.) The plena waw in the other nouns, adjectives, or adverbs)

The largest group of plena waw words is the collection of nouns, adjectives, and adverbs in IS containing the $\{w|\}$. There are 39 such instances in the first five chapters of IS. In this group, we see clearly that the plena waw was employed as a pronunciation aid. Of the 39, two are especially notable for the light they shed on the question of transmission.

IS 1:18b has:

רָפָא וְיָרָא פֶּלַע

MT has:

רָפָא וְיָרָא פֶּלַע

The omission of the פֶּ in IS and the addition of the plena waw was perhaps the scribe's attempt to show the dialect of his speech.

IS 2:19a has:

פֶּלַע

MT has:

פֶּלַע

The word root is פֶּלַע. Thus, it seems likely that the פֶ was added as a vocalic sign, an aid to pronouncing the word. It is not likely that the scribe would have added a פֶ if he were copying from a Vorlage.

The complete list of words containing the plena waw as found in the first five chapters of IS; this list contains the nouns, adjectives, and adverbs that were not discussed or covered in the above subsections. The list:

NO.	IS	MT	CHAPTER & VERSE
1.	פֶּלַע	פֶּלַע	1:5b
2.	פֶּלַע	פֶּלַע	1:6a
3.	פֶּלַע	פֶּלַע	1:8a
4.	פֶּלַע	פֶּלַע	1:9b
5.	פֶּלַע	פֶּלַע	1:9b
6.	פֶּלַע	פֶּלַע	1:10a
7.	פֶּלַע	פֶּלַע	1:10b
8.	פֶּלַע	פֶּלַע	1:10b
9.	פֶּלַע	פֶּלַע	1:11a
10.	פֶּלַע	פֶּלַע	1:11a
11.	פֶּלַע	פֶּלַע	1:13b

NO.	IS	MT	CHAPTER & VERSE
12.	חודשי כס	חודשי כס	1:14a
13.	רוח	רוח	1:16a
14.	יצואו	יצואו	1:18b
15.	ועליו	ועליו	1:28b
16.	עליו	עליו	1:31a
17.	איו	איו	2:3a
18.	בארחתו	בארחתו	2:3a
19.	עליו	עליו	2:7a
20.	עליו	עליו	2:7b
21.	איו	איו	2:8b
22.	צירי	צירי	2:19a
23.	הכרות	הכרות	3:9a
24.	כאדק	כאדק	3:9a
25.	אורחותיו	אורחותיו	3:12b
26.	ועליו	ועליו	3:23a
27.	ותחת	ותחת	3:24a
28.	ותחת	ותחת	3:24a
29.	באיו	באיו	5:4b
30.	שירק	שירק	5:2a
31.	עליו	עליו	5:9b
32.	תוק	תוק	5:14a
33.	כאיו	כאיו	5:17a
34.	חושק	חושק	5:20b
35.	אחושק	אחושק	5:20b
36.	עליו	עליו	5:22a
37.	עליו	עליו	1:12b
38.	כאיו	כאיו	5:25b

NO.	IS	MT	CHAPTER & VERSE
39.	ק'ל'ר'	ק'ל'ר'	2:3a

CHAPTER SEVEN

In this chapter we shall deal with special instances of the plena ' in IS. We may divide the usage of the

plena into four distinct groupings. They are:

- (a.) The plena in the word ק'ל'ר'.
- (b.) The doubling of the ' as in ק'ל'ר'.
- (c.) The ' as found in the word ק'ל'.
- (d.) The as found in noun and verbal forms except for ק'ל'.
- (a.) The plena ' in the word ק'ל'ר'.

The Masoretic ק'ל'ר' appears 45 times in the entire IS. In 32 of these instances the spelling is ק'ל'ר'. It is most likely that the scribe added the plena ' in accordance with the pronunciation of the word. We believe that the plena ' in the word ק'ל'ר' represents an oral tradition, for it is not likely that the scribe would have added a ' to an existing manuscript, or that his existing Vorlage read ק'ל'ר'.

The complete list of ק'ל'ר' and/or ק'ל'ר' in IS and MT:

WORD	IS	MT	CHAPTER & VERSE
ק'ל'ר'	*		3:8
			4:4
			5:3
			7:1

WORD

IS

MT

CHAPTER & VERSE

* 8:14
* 10:32
X 22:10
22:21
31:5
33:20
* 36:20
* 37:10
* 37:22
* 40:2
* 40:9
* 51:17
52:1
* 52:2
* 52:9
* 62:1
* 62:6
*y 62:7
* 64:9
* 65:18
* 66:10
* 66:20

פסוקים

*y 1:1
* 2:1
4:3
27:13

WORD	IS	MT	CHAPTER & VERSE
	*		28:14
			30:19
			31:9
	*		65:19
<u>רַב־לִּבְיָדָי</u>	*		10:12
			24:23
	*		66:13
<u>רַב־לִּבְיָדָי</u>	*		10:11
	*		44:26
	*		44:28
<u>רַב־לִּבְיָדָי</u>	*		36:7
	*		41:27
<u>רַב־לִּבְיָדָי</u>	*		2:3
			3:1
	*		10:10
	*		37:32

In the list the following symbols were employed:

- * represents an instance containing the plena ' .
- x represents an instance where a word is lacking in the text.
- y represents an instance containing an inserted plena ' .

(b.) The plena ' doubling as in רַב־לִּבְיָדָי .

The word רַב־לִּבְיָדָי appears only once in the first six chapters of IS. IS 1:21a has: רַב־לִּבְיָדָי

MT has:

רַב־לִּבְיָדָי
 רַב־לִּבְיָדָי

Two explanations are possible for the scribe adding the second ' in םן"ן. The first explanation is that the additional ' was the result of an unthinking error committed by the scribe when he copied from a Vorlage. In this case, the additional ' is an unthinking visual mistake.

The second explanation is that the scribe attempted to reproduce accurately the sound he heard or remembered. Thus, the plena ' in םן"ן may be a vocalic sign of the scribe's dialect.

(c.) The ' as found in the word '17'.

This subsection deals with the word '17' as it appears in IS in counterdistinction to MT '17'. '17' appears twice in IS first five chapters. It appears twice, in one verse.

IS 5:25 has:

... םן"ן 1158 117' 6"1...
 םן"ן 117' 7181

MT has:

... םן"ן 1158 17' 6"1
 םן"ן 17' 7181

It is possible that the scribe made two visual errors by adding the ' to 17'. The ' and / are very similar in appearance.

IS 17' does not agree with םן"ן. The former is plural, and the latter is singular. MT verse is in grammatical agreement. It seems likely that IS 17' is an oral variant

of the more original (and more correct) MT יָרַח .

Despite the above mentioned similarity between the ' and the /, it is unlikely that the scribe would have added the ' to יָרַח if he were copying from a Vorlage.

(d.) The ' as found in noun and verbal forms except for יָרַח .

This subsection is concerned with the plena ' in certain verbal and noun forms. There are four such examples in the first five chapters of IS.

IS 1:17a has:

$\text{וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֶת-קוֹל יִצְחָק$

MT has:

$\text{וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֶת-קוֹל יִצְחָק}$

It is likely that the plena ' in Is represents an oral tradition. The second ' like the first ' is a vocalic sign. וַיִּשְׁמַע is the scribe's attempt to spell correctly the word which he heard or remembered.

It is most likely that the scribe added the second ' during oral transmission; for it is dubious that the scribe would have written the extra ' if he copied from a Vorlage.

IS 1:25a has:

$\text{וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֶת-קוֹל יִצְחָק$

MT has:

$\text{וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֶת-קוֹל יִצְחָק}$

It is our feeling that the plena ' in וַיִּשְׁמַע was added for pronunciation purposes. It seems hardly likely that the scribe added the ' if he were copying from a manuscript. Conversely, it is most likely that the ' represents an oral

tradition, and the scribe added the ' when he heard or when he remembered the word.

IS 2:6b has:

... פ' י' כ' ו' כ' ו' ...

MT has:

פ' י' כ' ו' כ' ו' ...

פ' י' כ' ו' כ' ו' seems to indicate a difference in pronunciation. IS has "-riyyim", while MT has "-ri'im". It is our belief that the plena ' with the /C represents the scribe's attempt to reproduce faithfully the sound of the word as he heard or remembered it.

It is most dubious that the scribe would have added a ' aw /C if he were copying from a manuscript in which the letters were not present.

IS 5:17b has:

... פ' ד' נ' ...

MT has:

פ' ד' נ'

It is most likely that ' represents an oral tradition. The second ' is part of the plural form of the word. However, the plena ' in IS is probably a vocalic device. It may have been added by the scribe when he either heard or remembered the word. By inserting the first ' , the scribe attempted to reproduce accurately the sound he knew.

It is highly unlikely that the scribe would have added the plena ' if he had copied the word from a manuscript in which the ' was lacking.

In this chapter we have seen that many cases involving the plena ' tend to support an oral theory of text transmission.

MT has:

(פ' 7 5) תַּוּבַּתְּ הַנְּחִי (הַנְּחִי ל')

It is probable that the הַ was slurred over in pronunciation, perhaps due to dialectical pronunciation.

It is less likely that the scribe deleted the הַ in a

Vorlage. תַּוּבַּתְּ הַנְּחִי represents the pronunciation

תַּוּבַּתְּ הַנְּחִי

for MT accurately.

(c.) '

This subsection deals with the two instances in the first five chapters of IS where a ' is lacking.

IS 3:11b has:

(יִסְרָאֵל פִּי יָדָיו) יָדָיו (יִסְרָאֵל יָדָיו)

MT has:

(יִסְרָאֵל יָדָיו) יָדָיו (יִסְרָאֵל יָדָיו)

Unlike 5:25 where we felt MT יָדָיו to be more original as against IS יָדָיו; in this verse we believe that MT יָדָיו represents the original textual tradition.

יָדָיו יִסְרָאֵל

("the work of his hands") is better Hebrew than יָדָיו יִסְרָאֵל (the work of his hand"). Furthermore, it is our contention

that the switch from יָדָיו to יָדָיו could have taken place during oral, prosaic tradition's transmission. Perhaps the scribe remembered or heard יָדָיו, but he reproduced

יָדָיו. However, it must be pointed out that it is also

possible that the omission of the ' in IS was a simple mechanical visual error. If the scribe copied from a

manuscript, he could have confused the ' and the / ;

or he could simply have omitted the ' in his copying.

IS 5:7a has: ירלוּע (על ד'ה' ע'י'ע)

MT has: ירלוּע' ...

One explanation for the ' lacking in IS ירלוּע may be found in a visual theory of textual transmission. It is possible that the scribe forgot to include the ' when he reproduced the word from a manuscript.

It should be noted that the noun form of the word is used only in the plural (ירלוּע'). It is likely that if the scribe heard ירלוּע' he would have used the mater lectionis. He probably heard ירלוּע--perhaps it is a dialectical variant.

(d.) ך

This subsection deals with the two places in the first five chapters of IS where a ך is lacking, but present in MT.

IS 5:5b has: רעק ה'ה'י

MT has: רעק' ה'ה'י'

It is our contention that רעק' may represent an original, poetic tradition. IS may be part of an oral tradition. It is possible that the ך was omitted by the scribe when he either heard or remembered the word. Perhaps the dialect of the scribe did not stress the ך, or perhaps the ך had been discarded even before the scribe heard or remembered the word.

It is not likely that the scribe would have consciously omitted the ך if he were copying from a

manuscript.

IS 5:8b has:

(פְּרִי־הַיַּיִן פֶּתַח) פֶּתַח

MT has:

פֶּתַח

There is little doubt that MT פֶּתַח is the correct form for the word "alone". It is possible that the scribe omitted the פ through a mechanical copying error. However, it is our view that the word פֶּתַח represents an oral tradition. Perhaps פֶּתַח is the dialect form for the word פֶּתַח; or פֶּתַח was what the scribe heard. It is most likely that פֶּתַח represents an oral method of textual transmission.

IS 37:16 and 37:20 have the word פֶּתַח, while MT has פֶּתַח. It is interesting to note that the was reproduced by the scribe in these two instances.

CHAPTER NINE

This chapter deals with the substitution of one letter for another in IS. The close study of these substitutions may help achieve a better understanding of the transmission of IS. In the first five chapters of IS we are concerned with 15 different types of such substitution. They are:

- (a.) כ for ם
- (b.) כ for ן
- (c.) כ for ם
- (d.) פ for ם

- (e.) ק for נ
- (f.) ו for כ
- (g.) ו for ה
- (h.) ו for ' (vowel)
- (i.) ו for נ
- (j.) / for ו
- (k.) קו for /
- (l.) ח for כ
- (m.) ו for פ
- (n.) ו for פ
- (o.) ו for ו
- (a.) כ for ו

IS 5:5b has:

אִסִּיר (נִשְׁכַּח)
 קִסִּיר (נִשְׁכַּח)

MT has:

IS has the imperfect form of the hiphil קִסִּיר,

while MT has the infinitive of the hiphil. We are concerned here with two different words, the כ and the ו constituting the difference. For a better understanding the entire verse should be studied. IS has:

וְאֵת הַיְּהוּדִים אֲסִירָא
 אֲסִירָא אֲסִירָא אֲסִירָא
 אֲסִירָא אֲסִירָא אֲסִירָא
 וְיִהְיֶה קִסִּיר כִּי יִבְרָא
 וְיִהְיֶה אֲסִירָא

MT has:

וְאֵת הַיְּהוּדִים אֲסִירָא
 אֲסִירָא אֲסִירָא אֲסִירָא
 אֲסִירָא אֲסִירָא אֲסִירָא
 וְיִהְיֶה קִסִּיר כִּי יִבְרָא
 וְיִהְיֶה אֲסִירָא

נִּסְבְּחוּ יְהוָה
 וְיִקְרְאוּ
 וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ
 וְיִשְׁתַּבְּחוּ

There can be little doubt that וְיִשְׁתַּבְּחוּ is more poetic, and probably more original than וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ. Indeed, it goes perfectly with וְיִקְרְאוּ. It is most unlikely that the scribe confused the ו and ו if he copied from a manuscript. The two letters are not similar in appearance in IS. Thus, it seems probable that וְיִשְׁתַּבְּחוּ was the word the scribe heard or remembered.

(b.) ו for ו

IS 5:24a has: וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ כִּי יִשְׁתַּבְּחוּ
וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ (וְיִשְׁתַּבְּחוּ)

MT has:

As in וְיִשְׁתַּבְּחוּ above, we are concerned here

with more than mere letter substitution; two different words are involved: IS וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ and MT וְיִשְׁתַּבְּחוּ.

It is our belief that IS represents a secondary word, for in the context of the verse וְיִשְׁתַּבְּחוּ seems to be the correct word. The translation of וְיִשְׁתַּבְּחוּ as ("And as the chaff is consumed in the flame") is more sensible than ("And as the fire is consumed in the flame") for וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ.

The scribe may have added וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ because he saw the previous word וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ. The confusion resulted in the word appearing twice in IS. According to this theory, IS

word ל'כ is the result of an unthinking visual error.

Yet, it is possible to call the inclusion of ל'כ in IS an oral error. Perhaps the scribe's dialect sounded the word ל'כ similar to ל'כ . If this happened, the scribe most likely heard (or misheard) ל'כ for ל'כ . This variation would then be the result of an oral tradition. We are undecided in reaching any definite conclusions.

(c.) כ for ך

IS 5:5a has: $(\text{אֵתְּךָ אֲנִי אֲבִיחֶךָ})$

MT has:

אֵתְּךָ

The correct word is אֵתְּךָ ("and now") rather than אֵתְּךָ ("and you"). The substitution of the כ for the ך seems to be an oral error. Upon hearing or remembering the word, the scribe reproduced אֵתְּכָ .

(d.) ך for כ

IS 5:4a has: $(\text{אֵתְּכָ אֲנִי אֲבִיחֶךָ})$

MT has:

אֵתְּכָ

IS אֵתְּכָ is hardly as appropriate as MT אֵתְּךָ , since it is not "in" the vineyard but "to" the vineyard that the action was taken. It is hardly likely that אֵתְּכָ became אֵתְּכָ visually from a Vorlage. It is more likely that IS אֵתְּכָ is an oral variation of original MT אֵתְּכָ . The letters ך and כ are not similar in appearance in IS.

(e.) ק for ח

IS 5:10a has: $\text{כִּי עָלְמָה לְבָרְכָהּ וְלִשְׁמָחָהּ (כִּי עָלְמָה לְבָרְכָהּ וְלִשְׁמָחָהּ)}$

MT has: וְלִשְׁמָחָהּ

IS contains a grammatical error: וְלִשְׁמָחָהּ . This seems to indicate that IS is the result of a secondary source. Perhaps the scribe did not hear clearly וְלִשְׁמָחָהּ and wrote וְלִשְׁמָחָהּ . It is most unlikely that he substituted וְלִשְׁמָחָהּ for וְלִשְׁמָחָהּ if he copied from a manuscript, for the two letters are not similar in appearance.

(f.) ה for ח

IS 1:4a has: חַטָּה (הַי גוֹי)

MT has: חַטָּה

IS חַטָּה seems to be the result of an error in oral transmission. When the scribe heard or remembered the word, he reproduced חַטָּה instead of חַטָּה . We feel that the ה and the ח are too dissimilar in appearance to have derived from visual error.

(g.) ה for ח

IS 3:24a has: $\text{(וְתַחֲתוֹ) חֲזוֹרָה (מְבַשֵּׁת)}$

MT has: $\text{וְתַחֲתוֹ חֲזוֹרָה מְבַשֵּׁת}$

IS word חֲזוֹרָה is clearly secondary, MT חֲזוֹרָה ("a girdle") being the correct word here. The ה and ח are very similar in appearance in IS; whether this was so in his Vorlage is uncertain. It is possible, therefore, that the scribe made a simple visual mechanical error in copying the word.

קונסול, to end up with the conflated קונסול.

(1.) ס for כ

IS 3:8b has: $\text{ס} \text{ (כ' אלו קונסול ומעשה ידיו)}$

MT has: $\text{ס} \text{ ידיו}$

MT ס is clearly superior to IS ס .

"Against the Lord" makes better sense than "On (or, Concerning) the Lord".

Since ס is hardly a visual error of כ , the ס and כ not being similar in appearance, it is more likely that IS ס derives from oral transmission.

(m.) נ for ק

IS 3:16 has: $\text{נ} \text{ וקרבת ידיו}$

MT has:

$\text{נ} \text{ וקרבת ידיו}$

The IS word $\text{נ} \text{ וקרבת ידיו}$ is correct and maybe original. It seems to go perfectly with the feminine words that precede it in the verse: $\text{נ} \text{ וקרבת ידיו}$.

It is not likely that the scribe substituted נ for ק if he copied from a manuscript.

(n.) ס for ק

IS 4:4b has: $\text{ס} \text{ (קרבות משפט וקרוב)}$

MT has:

$\text{ס} \text{ ...}$

We are concerned here with the suffix in and וִיִּשְׂרָאֵל . The substitution of the ס for the ס has been discussed above. The spelling וִיִּיִּשְׂרָאֵל --in IS indicates a variant pronunciation from MT וִיִּשְׂרָאֵל --. It is not likely that the scribe had וִיִּיִּשְׂרָאֵל -- before him in a manuscript and wrote וִיִּיִּשְׂרָאֵל -- instead.

וִיִּיִּשְׂרָאֵל -- is a rare form in the Bible used only in Psalm 116:12.⁶ It is not unlikely that IS reflects a dialect of the Qumran community.

(c.) ו

IS 1:13b has: $\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \left(\text{וְיִיִּשְׂרָאֵל} \text{ וְיִיִּשְׂרָאֵל} \text{ וְיִיִּשְׂרָאֵל} \right)$

MT has:

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל
 וְיִיִּשְׂרָאֵל

The addition of the ו in IS would seem to derive from an oral tradition, an oral method of transmission. It is not unlikely that the scribe would have added the ו if he heard or remembered the word. Conversely, it is unlikely that the scribe would have added the extra letter if he copied from a manuscript, nor is IS original.

Kutscher points out in two places that וְיִיִּשְׂרָאֵל is an Aramaic form that means וְיִיִּשְׂרָאֵל . Even Josephus, Kutscher says, uses וְיִיִּשְׂרָאֵל in his writings.⁷

In this chapter we have seen that the addition of miscellaneous letters in IS tends to support an oral explanation of textual transmission.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

In this chapter we shall study five miscellaneous groupings showing differences between IS and MT. The categories are:

- (a.) Metathesis of letters in IS and MT
- (b.) Metathesis of words in IS and MT
- (c.) A word present in IS, but lacking in MT
- (d.) A word present in MT, but lacking in IS
- (e.) Letters lacking in IS
- (a.) Metathesis of letters in IS and MT

IS 4:1a has: $\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \quad \text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \quad (\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \quad \text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל})$

MT has:

... $\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \dots$

The metathesis of letters in וְיִשְׂרָאֵל and וְיִשְׂרָאֵל can be the result of either visual or oral transmission. That is, the scribe could have remembered or heard the word in a slurred fashion or in dialect. In his attempt to spell the word, the metathesis took place in IS.

It is possible that וְיִשְׂרָאֵל is the result of a simple unthinking visual error that was made when the scribe copied from a manuscript. No definite opinion may ~~stated~~ regarding this word.

- (b.) Metathesis of words in IS and MT

IS 1:30b has: $\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \quad \text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \quad (\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \quad \text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל})$

MT has:

דָּרַשׁ יָדָיו פְּנֵי...
דָּרַשׁ יָדָיו פְּנֵי...

It is not likely that the scribe incorrectly copied the phrase דָּרַשׁ יָדָיו פְּנֵי, from his Vorlage to become דָּרַשׁ פְּנֵי יָדָיו.

Kutscher points out that LXX probably follows the word order of MT, as do the Targum and the Peshitta.⁸

Thus, it is probable that IS reflects oral transmission.

(c.) A word present in IS, but lacking in MT

IS 1:15b has:
יָדָיו מְלֵאִים דָּמָא דְּחַיִּים וְיָדָיו מְלֵאִים דְּחַיִּים

MT has simply:

יָדָיו מְלֵאִים דָּמָא דְּחַיִּים

The additional words יָדָיו מְלֵאִים דְּחַיִּים in IS concern us here. The unnecessary יָדָיו in יָדָיו מְלֵאִים would indicate oral transmission. As to the possibility of IS representing a more original tradition than MT, ("Your hands are full of blood; your fingers with iniquity."), we may say that IS is mere prose. No one's 'fingers' in the Bible are full of blood or iniquity.

It is more likely that יָדָיו מְלֵאִים דְּחַיִּים represents the scribe's attempt to reproduce accurately that which he heard or remembered.

(d.) A word present in MT, but lacking in IS

IS 2:3a has:
וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהֵינוּ
... יָדָיו מְלֵאִים דְּחַיִּים

MT has:

... יָדָיו מְלֵאִים דְּחַיִּים

אֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִשְׁעֵךָ יִשְׁעֵךָ

We are concerned with the absence of the words אֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ in IS. It is likely that MT represents the more original tradition, while IS is part of an oral tradition. It is possible that the scribe did not hear or remember the phrase אֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ. It is dubious to believe that he omitted these words if he copied from a manuscript, unless the eye of the scribe went from אֵל¹ to אֵל². It seems that no definite conclusion may be reached on this verse.

(e.) Letters lacking in IS

There are many places in IS where parts of the Scroll are lacking, thus causing certain letters to be missing. Two examples of this kind will suffice to show this type of instance.

IS 3:21 has: וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע הָאֵל

MT has:

הַטֶּקְעוֹת וְהַנְּשֹׂאִים

The letters missing were probably טֶעַן. We still have the first and last letters of the word extant.

IS 5:14 has: כִּי תִשָּׂא אֶת אֶזְרִיךָ

MT has:

כִּי תִשָּׂא אֶת אֶזְרִיךָ וְיָשִׁיב

Here, too, we can be fairly certain that the two missings were אֶזְרִיךָ. Fortunately, the Scroll is in excellent

condition, and the instances where letters are lacking do not hinder a close study of IS.

In this chapter we have looked at certain differences between IS and MT. We feel an oral explanation of transmission is valid in a majority of the cases.

NOTES

1. Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher. The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll. Jerusalem, The Magnes Press of the Hebrew University, 1959. p. 437.
2. I. W. Slotki, Editor. Isaiah, Hebrew Text & English Translation with an Introduction and Commentary. London & Bournemouth, The Soncino Press, 1949. p. 7.
3. Kutscher, Op. cit., p. 314.
4. Ibid., p. 272.
5. George Buchanan Gray & Arthur S. Peake. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah, Volumes I and II. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912. Vol. I, p. 48.
6. Harry M. Orlinsky. "The Biblical Prepositions", (Hebrew Union College Annual XVII). Cincinnati, 1942-43. pp. 289-291.
7. Kutscher, Op. cit., pp. 19 & 156.
8. Ibid., p. 450.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CONSULTED AND/OR QUOTED

I. Primary Sources

1. Millar Burrows, Editor; with the assistance of John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee. The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Volume I. New Haven, The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950.
2. I. W. Slotki, Editor. Isaiah, Hebrew Text & English Translation with an Introduction and Commentary. London & Bournemouth, The Soncino Press, 1949.

II. Secondary Sources

1. George Buchanan Gray & Arthur S. Peake. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah, Volumes I and II. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.

2.

Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher. The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll. Jerusalem, The Magnes Press of the Hebrew University, 1959.

3. Harry M. Orlinsky. "The Biblical Prepositions", (Hebrew Union College Annual XVII). Cincinnati, 1942-43.

Hebrew Union College
Jewish Institute of Religion
Library