Variants of the Isaiah Scroll Adopted by the Revised Standard Version and the Jerusalem Bible

By Paul W. Peters

[This essay was delivered at a pastoral conference at Wetaskiwin, Alberta, Canada, on September 25-26, 1973. Dr. Paul Peters is professor emeritus of Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary.]

I. Introduction

When the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls[1] became known in 1948, the question naturally arose as to the age of these many manuscripts including their numberless fragments, some larger, some very much smaller. This question also arose in our midst: I remember how Dr. Sasse, who was visiting our Seminary at the time, asked me my opinion concerning this remarkable find. Members of one of our pastoral conferences wanted me to assure them that the newly found Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll (1 QIs[a]),[2] also called the St. Mark's Scroll or the Qumran Scroll, did not prove the inadequacy of our oldest (9th and 10th century A.D.) Masoretic manuscripts. Even as late as October 24, 1972, the *Lutheran Standard* in its "Question Box" in reference to this find contains the question: "Does the Bible need updating?" The answer to this question reads: "They help in establishing a more accurate text of the Old Testament … They have helped in making many small corrections and in clarifying some obscure passages. These are being incorporated into the newest English translations" (p 35). In general this answer to the question in the "Question Box" is correct. Still, as pastors and professors we are in need of a more specific answer. We want to know which variants have been incorporated into the newest versions and for what reason. The purpose of this essay, then, is to examine the variants and the reasons for their incorporation into both the *Revised Standard Version* (RSV) and *The Jerusalem Bible* (TJB).

Before we examine these variants, we want to learn, as far as possible, how to evaluate them. Although the newly-found fragments of all the Old Testament books with the exception of the book of Esther are as much as 1000 years older than the Masoretic manuscripts, still this does not justify the conclusion that the texts of these old manuscripts are more accurate than the Masoretic texts. The age of an Old Testament manuscript, even if it takes one back a thousand years, is no guarantee of the accuracy of such a text or of its variants. This has been proved by the comparison drawn between the Masoretic Text (MT) and the complete Isaiah Scroll (1 QIs[a]). In the beginning "extravagant speculations which gained much publicity" were made. Harold M. Orlinsky, a leading Jewish scholar and archeologist of our day, has this to say: "It is only natural that the amateur and sometimes even the scholar became so excited by the discovery reported in April, 1948, of the Isaiah and other scrolls in the Ain Feshka cave, that they almost automatically began to describe some of the innumerable variations in the Isaiah Scroll from the Masoretic text as 'interesting,' 'remarkable,' and even 'original.' … Since MT no longer has news value, whereas 1 QIs most decidedly rated front-page treatment, the quite new and intriguing readings in the latter pushed the corresponding readings in MT into the background" ("Studies in the St Mark's Isaiah Scroll III," in *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 1951, p 151). Therefore, before we list and look at the variant readings of the 1 QIs that have been incorporated into our newest English versions, we shall do well to learn to evaluate the newly found Isaiah manuscript

A most interesting fact that all readers of the 1 QIs must take into consideration is its twofold basis. Chapters 1–33 are based on one manuscript different from the manuscript on which chapters 34–60 are founded. The manuscript from which chapters 34–60 are copied is inferior to that utilized in the first thirty-three chapters. This can be concluded from the variants of the second copy (chaps. 34–60), which "have been made without any specific purpose compared with those of the first copy" (chaps. 1–33).

---

[1] D. Barthelemy and J.T. Milik, *Discoveries In the Judean Desert*, Vol. I, Qumran Cave I (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1955.)

[2] Millar Burrows, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, Vol. I, The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950).

How can scholars detect the purpose of a variant? When the Old Testament was rendered into Greek in the 2nd century B.C., the translation was done for readers in Alexandria and in the countries surrounding the Mediterranean, who had forgotten most of their Hebrew, especially all idiomatic phrases. Even in Palestine, Hebrew was replaced by Aramaic and the former with the exception of its use in the synagogue was no longer a primary language. Consequently the purpose of a Dead Sea manuscript was to simplify the classical Biblical Hebrew as found in the Masoretic text. This was the primary purpose of the 1 QIs, "an easily understandable text for a particular audience." Not only the Septuagint, but also the Latin Vulgate, the Syriac Peshitta and the Aramaic Targums had the same twofold purpose. They were to make the Hebrew Bible understandable to their readers and at the same time to interpret the Hebrew text "in the light of a different cultural and social milieu." One but has to read the newly found Habakkuk commentary among the Qumran scrolls to acquaint oneself with such a relevant interpretation.

All this has to be kept in mind when comparing the MT with the 1 QIs. Our main purpose when comparing both is to retain the original reading of the MT wherever it is correct and to regain the original reading where it is incorrect; but which variants in the 1 QIs serve this purpose cannot always be established. The supposition from which one must always proceed is that the MT as the traditional text is preferable to the private 1 QIs. Nevertheless there is a remarkable degree of agreement between the MT and the I QIs. Consequently we must not expect many far-reaching variants between the two texts. The *Revised Standard Version* has adopted only thirteen variants from the 1 QIs. *The Jerusalem Bible* has according to my count twenty-nine variants, some of which also are variants adopted by the RSV. Surprisingly, twenty-seven variants are rated by the *Jewish Quarterly Review* as "superior reading" to the MT (July 19, 1950, pp 60f). Most of these variants consist of single words, some of which have an important contextual meaning.

It would be a grave error on our part to take for granted that in the centuries before Christ only one official text was constantly in use. Certainly, in the first beginnings each book of the Law and each prophetic and poetic book were written by the sacred writers themselves or by their amanuenses without an error. But we do not possess these original manuscripts any more. The copied writings were not without errors. How many of these various copies were in general use can be ascertained only within certain limits. With the aid of the DSS it has become evident that the Septuagint had its own copied Hebrew text different from the MT. Likewise, the copy of the Samaritan text was independent of the Septuagint text, perhaps even older. The Targums, although published much later, certainly had their own copies. The Dead Sea Scrolls have also brought different copies to light: the two Isaiah Scrolls, 1 QIs[a] and 1 QIs[b] are also independent of one another. The latter, the Hebrew University Isaiah Scroll, is closer to the MT than the complete Isaiah Dead Sea Scroll.

Even after the MT had been officially adopted, rabbis in the 12th century still had texts with variations. In other words, the MT has an extended history of text study prior to its final stabilization in the 8th or 9th century. There is a difference between the providential or virtual and the official standardization of the Old Testament texts. The Hebrew University Isaiah text shows that this virtual standardization had come about more or less spontaneously centuries before the Masoretes stabilized it in the 7th century, when a system of vowel points was introduced into the Hebrew text. This system did much to stabilize the text. Still differences continued to exist between the *Kethibh* and *Qere* readings of the text. These differences, however, continued to exist because the Masoretes never changed the consonants within the text, but only brought about a change in the margins of their copied manuscripts. Some of the *Qere* readings prove that the copyist or copyists still had various manuscripts with variants at their disposal. The many manuscripts found in Cave 1 and 4 especially, some larger, some smaller, reflect three textual traditions: The Masoretic, the Samaritan, and the Septuagintal. The *Kittel-Kahle Bible* lists the variants of these textual traditions but is severely criticized by Orlinsky for its uncritical method.

From the foregoing it should be apparent that the Masoretic text had a historical development. Simply to repeat and to be conscious of the fact that the Masoretes were very painstaking in their copying from one or more manuscripts at their disposal ignores the other fact that the Masoretes never had a perfect text at their disposal. This is so often forgotten. Although the DSS have shown scholars that the standardization of the Masoretic text is superior to all private texts, that to their surprise this standardization can now be traced back

farther than they had supposed, still one cannot go back farther than to the time of Ezra. At this time the change from the paleo-Hebrew (Canaanite alphabet still retained in the Samaritan Bible) to the so-called square script in writing the Torah had taken place and even then exclusively. Manuscripts written in paleo-Hebrew script were still found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Even a text-critical activity of a sort is already ascribed to Ezra, namely that the text in ten places was suspect. According to a practice common to the Alexandrian Greek grammarians, these ten doubtful passages were marked with dots (…). Their doubtfulness is most likely based on the evidence of other manuscripts. Only in four out of the ten are these dotted passages lacking in the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch (cf. Greenberg, "Text of the Hebrew Bible," *American Oriental Society Journal*, Vol. 76, 1956, p 158).

The סֹפְרִים (bookmen) were active from the time of Ezra to the time of Simon the Just, i.e., from the middle of the 5th to the beginning of the 2nd century B.C. Consequently by Maccabean times (175–164 B.C.) the text had been largely stabilized, so that at the time of Herod (37 B.C. to 4 A.D.), i.e., at the time of Jesus, "Hillel the Elder was using a text verbally stable" (Greenberg, p 160). Josephus at the end of the 1st century could deny any changes having been made at his time. Historically, a stabilization of the Bible text can well be dated before the end of the 1st Christian century. It can be traced back to the renovation of the Temple and to the victory of the Maccabean forces. Rabbinical sources speak of the "Book of the Temple Court," which was a standard scroll for public reading on holidays. Still corrections of this book of the Temple Court were made. According to Greenberg, upon whom your essayist is altogether dependent for the above material, "there seem to have been several authoritative Torah scrolls in the archive," so that "the editorial activity on them was a continuing process" (p 160).

This editing and standardization of the Biblical text is according to Greenberg to be regarded as a phenomenon (p 167). As such we want to deal with it, not only as a traditional but also as a providential one, even as the canonicity of the Biblical books is to be regarded as such. Therefore our textual criticism of the Masoretic text will always be guided by this providential premise, always mindful that our historical knowledge of it is limited. As Luther regarded it as his duty to practice textual criticism, we do not want to fail to follow his example, the more so since the means at our disposal for such an undertaking far exceed those which Luther had (cf. *Quartalschrift*, Vol. 52, 1955, pp 137ff).

II. 1 QIs Variants Adopted by the RSV[3]

The first ancient 1 QIs reading adopted by the RSV is the last line of verse 24 in chapter 3. The KJV reads: "And burning instead of beauty." The 1 QIs has it in reverse: "Instead of beauty shame." Rosenbloom[4] evaluates it as a "fine emendation," because it gives balance in comparison with the rest of the four lines (cf. p 10). The balance consists in the consistent mention of the women's finery preceding the lack of adornment. Only the fifth line in the MT begins with a lack of adornment, namely "burning" followed by "beauty." The 1 QIs, however, holds the balance by beginning with the finery ("beauty") followed by the lack of adornment ("shame"). Yet it does not drop the word כִּי at the beginning of the line, which is regarded by many as a noun, as an abbreviated form of כְוִיָּה, "branding," and which also occurs in the Arabic in this shortened form. If correct, it would only occur here. In all other passages of the MT כִּי is a conjunction and in this context would have its primary meaning of "yea": "Yea, instead of beauty shame," serving as a climax for the five lines. Homiletically, the preacher could make good use of it in his sermon, even if he does not agree with the RSV in adopting the reading of the 1 QIs as a mere simplification.

---

[3] *The Holy Bible*, Revised Standard Version (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1952).
[4] Joseph R. Rosenbloom, *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll: A Literary Analysis* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns, 1970).

The second 1 QIs reading in the RSV is to be found in chapter 14, verse 4. In the KJV we read: "The golden city ceased!" הָבָה דֵבתָה מַשׂאָ Its marginal reading is: "Exactness of gold." The RSV adds in its footnote: "The meaning of the Hebrew word is uncertain." Concerning this uncertain meaning of הַבְהֵדֶמָ even Orlinsky is not unwilling to state, "I do not know" (Rosenbloom, p 23). The variant of the 1 QIs is הבָה רֵמֶ which the RSV renders "insolent fury," TJB "arrogance," and the *Koehler-Baumgartner Lexicon* (K-B) "assault." The Septuagint and the Peshitta have chosen words which stand in parallel meaning with נֹגֵשׂ, "oppressor." The Targum reads: "The might of the wicked" preceded by "the power of our enslavers" (cf. Rosenbloom, pp 22f). If we decide to adhere to the translation of the KJV, "the golden city," we must be conscious of the fact that its translators simply took over the reading of Revelation 18:16 as noted on the margin. If we take over its alternate translation, "exactness of gold," we must know that it is a traditional Jewish translation, which regarded our word in the MT as an Aramization for הַבְהֶזֶמָא Should we follow the 1 QIs reading הַבְהרֶמֶ we must reckon with the possibility that the scribe of our ancient Isaiah manuscript had difficulty with הַבְהֵדֶמָ and therefore selected the variant reading הַבְהרֶמֶ. The ancient versions, according to Orlinsky, simply guessed at the meaning of the MT on the strength of its content. Perhaps at some future time, Orlinsky consoles himself and us, more evidence may be discovered which will enable us to give a more exact answer.

The third ancient variant reading adopted by the RSV is the first person of "slay" in 14:30: "I will slay" instead of the third person of the MT, "he will slay." Rosenbloom calls it "an attractive variation," which "not only seems to make better sense but also to be in a parallel position with the rest of the verse" (p 25). In this connection Orlinsky passes a devastating judgment on the 1 Qis, concluding, "that the MS. [1 QIs] is a vulgar text, largely if not wholly orally contrived and worthless in any study of the MT" (p 25). This judgment ignores that of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, not to mention other journals, which rates twenty-seven variants of the 1 QIs as "superior readings" to those of the MT (July 19, 1950, pp 60f).

The place name of the MT in chapter 15:9 reads דִימוֹן while the 1 QIs has דִיבוֹן. A study of the two names results in the observation that דִיבוֹן is a much more common Moabite place name than דִימוֹן. The reader of the whole chapter may recall that verse 2 already has דִיבוֹן which one could also expect in verse 9. This is the reading of the Vulgate. Still the more ancient Septuagint version, to which the K-K Bible does not at all refer, has the reading דִימוֹן of the MT. Orlinsky, of course, calls special attention to this fact. The "topographical Concordance" of the *Stuttgarter Biblishes Nachschlagewerk*, however, does not list the name דִימוֹן at all. K-B Lexicon places it under דִיבוֹן and refers to דִימוֹן as a development from דִיבוֹן.

An interesting variant of the 1 QIs is הָרֹאֶה for אַרְיֵה of the MT in chapter 21, verse 8. The RSV, which accepts this variant, translates: "Then he who saw cried." Compared with the translation of the MT reading: "And he cried, A lion," your essayist prefers the variant, which one understands in its context The MT reading, on the other hand, has its difficulties. The only question is whether הָרֹאֶה of the ancient manuscript is not an "explanatory substitute for the more poetic (or perhaps corrupt) form of the MT" (Rosenbloom, pp 31ff), which the *New American Standard Bible* (NASB) amends: "Then the sentry called *like* a lion."

In chapter 23:2 of the MT we find מִלְאוּךְ which is a *Piel* plural verb with a collective noun, "isle." The whole verse is translated in the KJV: "Be still, ye inhabitants of the isle; thou whom the merchants of Zidon, that pass over the sea, *have replenished*." The 1 QIs reads מַלְאָכַיךְ "thy messengers," i.e., the isle's messengers,

"that pass over the sea." Rosenbloom (p 33), however, claims that this "substitute for the difficult מַלְאָוּך … makes no sense." Nevertheless, Harper already amended the text: "Whose messengers traverse many waters" (p 60). He is followed by K-B's Lexicon. The NASB, without telling one where it gets its reading from, has that of the 1 QIs; "Your messengers crossed the sea And were on many waters." Why this "makes no sense" as a substitute reading one has every reason to ask Rosenbloom.

Chapter 33:8 describes the destruction of Zion wreaked by the destroyer: "The highways lie waste, the wayfaring man ceaseth: he hath broken the covenant, he hath despised the cities, he regardeth no man" (KJV). Instead of the Masoretic "cities" the 1 QIs reads עדים "witnesses." This emendation has long ago been suggested by scholars, ר and ד often being confused. The ancient versions do not suggest this change. Therefore it is surprising that the 1 QIs does have אֵדִים "witnesses," which Rosenbloom calls "a fine substitute reading," because of its relation to בְּרִית "covenant," and the general context of the verse (p 42). One but has to read the last three lines together to become convinced: "Covenants are broken, witnesses are despised, there is no regard for man" (RSV).

Again in 45:2 the question arises whether the MT with its reading הד ורים has not mistaken a ר for a ד. The literal meaning of הֲדוּרִים is "swellings" and occurs only here. The KJV rendered it with "crooked places" or with "rugged places." The 1 QIs has as its reading, which the RSV adopted: "I will go before you and level the mountains." K-B does not recognize הֲדוּרִים as an Old Testament word at all, but changes it into הַדְּרָכִים "the ways." This is done by inserting the consonant כ, and thus ending up with the plural form of דֶרֶך "way." Since the plural form of הַר "mountain," is הָרִים and in the MT never הָרוּרִים it is advisable to stay with the MT form רימוּהֲד and simply to understand its literal meaning "swellings" with Eduard Koenig as "a towered up obstacle," which can readily be applied to mountains. Pieper renders it with *Buckel, Hoehen,* "figuratively for hindrances" (p 211).

Our Introit for the Fourth Sunday in Advent, taken from both the Septuagint and the Vulgate, reads "Drop down, ye heavens, from above: and let the skies pour down righteousness. Let the earth open: and bring forth salvation" (*The Lutheran Hymnal*, p 55). In the fourth line of this quadruplet the MT, Isaiah 45:8, has a plural predicate: "Let them bring forth salvation," which would have to refer to both "heavens" and "earth." Harper already in his critical apparatus changes the plural into the singular, which the 1 QIs does by inserting the words: "Who says to the earth, let salvation blossom forth." In other words, the ancient manuscript wants to certify the singular form of the predicate as the original reading of the text, which is in accord with the reading of our Introit. It also replaces פָרָה of the MT with פָרַח "blossom forth." Pieper in his Commentary (p 223) is correct in emphasizing that פָרָה never means *erbluehen*, "blossom, sprout forth." פָרַח however, has this meaning and it is not surprising that both the RSV and TJB employ this reading.

In verse 24 of chapter 49 God asks the question: "Shall the prey be taken from the mighty, or the lawful captive delivered?" (KJV). It is to be expected that in both questions and answers the same or similar expressions shall occur, (cf. Pieper's *Jesaias II*, p 341). This does happen in the first question and answer: "Shall the prey be taken from the mighty?" "Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away." However, in the second question and answer there is a marked difference. The question reads: "Or the lawful captive delivered?" Corresponding to "lawful captive," the answer reads: "And the prey of the terrible shall be delivered." The term "lawful captive" has always been under suspicion. Consequently, "lawful" has been regarded by many commentators as an erroneous reading for אָרִיץ "tyrant." The second question should read: "Or the captive of the tyrant delivered?" The answer is: "And the prey of the tyrant shall be delivered." Many,

however, do not regard צַדִּיק as an erroneous reading, only they do not regard it as an adjective but as a noun, "victorious one." Now we have a perfect parallelism in question and answer of the MT: "Or the captive of the victorious one be delivered?" "And the prey of the terrible shall be delivered." Rosenbloom has this to say: "While the MS [1 QIs] may have read אָרִיץ for צַדִּיק in 49:24 under the influence of אָרִיץ in 49:25, the MT form makes excellent sense and is used throughout Second Isaiah with the meaning found here" (p 59), i.e., "victorious one." The only question is whether the comparatively new interpretation of צַדִּיק is acceptable. Pieper's *Jesaias II* regards it very much as such (p 341).

The second couplet of Isaiah 51:19 is a case where four ancient versions (GSTV) support the reading of the 1 QIs with its third person of the predicate מֵינַחֵךְ. The MT has the first person מְנַחֶעךְ. The third person *Piel* of נָחַם has this in its favor that it is in parallelism with יָנוד of the former couplet. Both couplets then read: "These two things have befallen you—who will condole with you—devastation and destruction, famine and sword; who will comfort you?" Although both forms, the first and third person are possible, and the MT with its first person even "makes excellent sense in that God is speaking Himself here in contrast to others in 19a, " still the RSV and Rosenbloom draw the conclusion from the 1 QIs supported by the four ancient versions that "the MT is incorrect as it might seem" (p 61). Pieper's *Jesaias II* also accepts the 3d person: *Wer war dein Troester*? (p 373.)

In chapter 56:12 the first couplet of the MT and that of the 1 QIs differ as to the singular and plural form of the verb. In the MT one reads: "I will fetch wine" (KJV), in the 1 QIs "let us get wine" (RSV). The first line of the couplet begins with a plural verb, "come ye." In the KJV as also in the RSV it is followed by another plural verb, "say they," which however has been inserted by the editors of both translations and is therefore in italics in our KJV. This insertion is in place in the RSV, since it is followed by the plural verb, "Let us get wine" in accord with the reading of the 1 QIs. This first line of the couplet is followed by the second line, in both the MT and the 1 Qis with the predicate verb in the plural. Both lines therefore in 1 QIs are in complete parallelism: "Come, they say, let us get wine, let us fill ourselves with strong drink." This variant induces one to favor the reading of the 1 QIs. Surprisingly Rosenbloom omits the variant altogether. The NASB, however, also has adopted the reading of the 1 QIs: "Come, *they say*, let us get wine."

Whenever the 1 QIs adds a word to a line, as it does in 60:19, one may be in doubt whether the additional word is original and therefore omitted by our MT, or whether it is only to serve an explanatory purpose. The addition of בַּלַּיְלָה "in the night," is according to Rosenbloom "not essential for an understanding of the verse" and could therefore be "an unnecessary explanatory padding." Still Rosenbloom remarks that it "is more acceptable than the others in this chapter" (p 65). It corresponds fully to "by day," of the foregoing line, so that both lines read: "The sun shall be no more your light by day, nor for brightness shall the moon give light to you by night." Both lines close with the corresponding expression "by day" and "by night." This is undoubtedly the reason why the RSV accepted the addition of the 1 QIs and why Rosenbloom says it "is more acceptable than the other variants in this chapter" (cf. p 65). This reading is also attested to by the Greek, Old Latin, and Aramaic versions.

These are the thirteen variants adopted by the RSV. Whether all or many or few or none are acceptable will always remain a question. Professor Pieper states in his Commentary in one place that a variant may have 99 percent in its favor. The remaining 1 percent prevents us from adopting it with certainty. Still we can now ascertain how *The Jerusalem Bible* (TJB)[5], whose use of the 1 QIs variants are always listed, has evaluated these thirteen variants adopted by the RSV. Six of these 1 QIs variants (14:4; 14:30; 15:9; 33:8; 49:24 and 51:19) have also been adopted by TJB. Four of them (3:24; 45:2; 56:12 and 60:19) have not been adopted. Instead, the MT reading has been retained. Three of the variants (45:8 and 45:21) have been replaced by corrections of the MT without any reference to the 1 QIs, although one of them (45:8) is according to the 1 QIs.

---

[5] *The Jerusalem Bible* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1966).

Apart from the above listed six adopted variants by both the RSV and the TJB, the latter still has the 23 following 1 QIs variants, which have not been adopted by the RSV.

III. The 1 QIs Variants of TJB Not Adopted by the RSV

The first of the variants adopted by TJB which is not adopted by the RSV is that of Isaiah 9:16 (17). Instead of "have no joy" מַחְשִׂי־עֹל of the MT, the 1 QIs reads "will not spare" לֹא־יַחְמֹל. Rosenbloom says of this variant that it "is a very attractive one, making a fine parallel with 'neither have mercy' of the next line." At the same time, however, he advises, "Caution must be used when the usual practice of simplifying on the part of the MS [1 QIs] is considered." Rosenbloom adds, "The style of the MT or its prototype need not have been that of later scribes and editors." Here he apparently means to say that "later scribes and editors" can readily have departed from the original MT reading, in this case from מַחְשִׂי־עֹל "have no joy," to לֹא־יַחְמֹל "will not spare." Still the latter reading remains attractive and may have been the original.

TJB adopts the 1 QIs reading of בַלְעִי "he devours," for "they devour" of the MT in chapter 9, verse 19, i.e., the singular of the word for "devour" with a *waw* connective instead of the plural of the MT, "they shall eat" (KJV). Consequently the 1 QIs connects וַיֹּאכַל with verse 20 and reads: "Manasseh devours Ephraim, Ephraim Manasseh" and omits without further ado the predicate of the foregoing line: "They shall eat every man the flesh of his own arm." Rosenbloom is certainly justified in saying that "the MS [1 QIs] reading … makes little sense. The *waw* connective is out of place here, even if connected with the next verse." Every reader of TJB must of course be aware of the omission of a predicate and of a change of the verb from a plural וכֹלְעִי to a singular יֹאכַל. The NASB, however, does well in inserting "*devours*" in italics in verse 21, even if it then has the reading of the 1 QIs: "Manasseh *devours* Ephraim, and Ephraim Manasseh."

The RSV and TJB agree in adopting the variants of the 1 QIs in chapters 14:4; 14:30; and 33:8. They disagree in regard to the variant of 1 QIs in 34:16. The MT reads: "For my mouth, it hath commanded" (KJV). Five other Hebrew manuscripts have: "For the mouth of the Lord has commanded it." This latter reading is more in accord with the context, which is a quote from "the book of the Lord" (Is 14:16), than the MT reading "my mouth," which can only be interpreted as the mouth of the prophet speaking for the Lord. The RSV has therefore adopted the reading of the five manuscripts. TJB, however, prefers the reading of the 1 QIs, which reads, "his mouth has ordained it" (p 1196). Rosenbloom does not agree with TJB, but regards the reading of the 1 QIs פִיהוּ "his mouth" as a dittograph for פִי "my mouth," and of the following הוּ "it." Apparently the five manuscripts referred to above, inserting יְהוָה, "LORD," have retained the original reading.

For the first time the 1 QIs has a significant change of one line in the couplet 37:28 compared with that of the MT. The latter reads: "But I know thy abode and thy going out and thy coming in" (KJV). The former, the 1 QIs, reads: "I know whenever you rise and whenever you sit, your going out, your coming in" (TJB). The 1 Qis, "achieves a better parallel reading" than that of the MT, although it is not found in the parallel passage of 2 Kings 19:27.

Long before the 1 QIs had been discovered, Harper in his critical study of Isaiah 38:15 only had the variant of the Targum at his disposal. Nevertheless, his critical note on the strength of the Targum reads: "Better, what can I speak and say to him (with Targum) since he himself…?" Along came the 1 QIs, dated six centuries before the publication of the Jonathan ben Uzziel *Targum of the Prophets* with the same reading: "What can I say? Of what can I speak to him? It is he who is at work." TJB has adopted this reading (p 1201). The RSV has adhered to the MT reading: "But what can I say? For he has spoken to me, and himself has done it" Only the intrinsic value of one or the other reading can decide. Your essayist prefers the reading of the MT because of its strong emphasis on God's *work*, on what God has *done*.

Our *Authorized Version* in 41:2 does not only depart from the MT by changing the noun צֶדֶק "righteousness" (all modern versions translate "victory") into an adjective and adding "man" to it, "righteous man." In addition it also divides the couplet in such a manner that צֶדֶק, contrary to the MT, is added to the first line: "Who raised up the righteous man from the east, called him to his foot." The 1 QIs also divides the couplet, as does the KJV, by separating the second half of the couplet from the first by means of a *waw*, "and," so that both lines are to be rendered: "Who stirred up victory from the east, *and* called him to his foot." Although TJB in its footnote translates the reading of the 1 QIs "Who has aroused victory (Vulg: The Just One) from the East and has hailed it," still it does not use this translation in the chapter itself, but renders it according to the MT even as the RSV has done: "Who roused from the east him that victory hails at every step?"

Two questions remain to be answered: 1) Is there any reason to depart from the Masoretic pointing which has צֶדֶק "righteousness," in 2b? 2) Is there any reason to substitute "victory" for "righteousness," even if the passage refers to Cyrus and not to Abraham as Kissane in his Commentary *The Book of Isaiah* (1943) claims? As to the first question Kissane argues that there is "no valid ground for departing from the Masoretic pointing" (p 30). צֶדֶק "righteousness," as "the accusative of respect" to be compared with 42:6 and 45:13 is very much in place. And the meaning of לְרַגְלוֹ "to his feet" as "behind him" and not "at every step," is well supported by Genesis 33:14, 1 Samuel 25:42, and Habakkuk 3:5. Consequently Kissane's translation is to be preferred: "Who raised up one from the east, in righteousness called him to follow," (cf. NASB). "Righteousness" is meaningful in that "in the present context it suggests a victory associated with the restoration of the world order willed by God" (TJB, p 1205, footnote b.). This order is willed by God, in accord with His covenant faithfulness (cf. Pieper, pp 79 & 92).

"A variation in 43:19 has evoked much comment," Rosenbloom tells us. The comments are especially those of Burrows and Orlinsky. They culminate in the 1 QIs reading נְתִיבִים although it is the feminine plural form נְתִיבוֹת which always occurs in the MT. As such Burrows had read the form originally, but finally agreed with Orlinsky in the reading of the masculine form נְתִיבִים. Still Rosenbloom closes his discussion of the reading as follows: "Study of the photoscript of the MS [1 QIs] indicates some difficulty in reading because of a blurring, perhaps caused by an erasure. However, it still seems to read נְתִיבוֹת and is apparently another instance of the MS [1 QIs] substituting a simple reading for one which he found to be difficult" (p 53). The difficulty of the 1 QIs editor undoubtedly consisted in the lack of a parallelism in 19b of the MT, while 20b has a parallelism. Couplet 19b speaks of "a way in the wilderness" and "rivers in the desert," instead of "paths in the wild" (TJB): בִּישִׁמֹן נְתִיבוֹת.

In 48:14 the 1 QIs has two different readings from the MT. The two imperatives of the MT, "assemble" and "hear" are at variance with the futures of the 1 QIs, "you will assemble" and "you will hear." But both the RSV and TJB do not adopt this reading. However, the third person suffix in "loved him" הֲבוֹע and "his pleasure" חֶפְצוֹ has been changed by the 1 QIs to the first person (חֶפְצִי and אֲהֵבִי). This change has been adopted by TJB, (although not by the RSV), and is translated: "My beloved will perform my pleasure." This undoubtedly is again a means of simplifying the text according to the tendency of the 1 QIs for the sake of its readers.

Surprisingly all reviewed translations with the exception of the KJV put the active of "despise" (49:7) into the passive. While the KJV reads: "To him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth," Harper already states in a footnote: "Translate, *to him who is heartily despised, abhorred by the nations*, cf. 53:3, " where "despised" is used twice in the passive. TJB refers one to the 1 QIs and translates: "To him whose life is despised." It does not put the next verb of the line into the passive, as Harper did and as Kittel-Kahle and

the RSV do: "Abhorred by the nations." Since the 1 QIs has the passive of these in both cases, its reading seems to have the better forms. Why TJB in its translation does not put "abhor" into the passive your essayist cannot say, although the footnote states: "line corr., cf. DSI a."

In the well-known context of Isaiah 49:17, where verse 16 reads: "Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands; thy walls are continually before me," the 1 QIs continues: "Your builders outstrip your destroyers, and those who laid you waste go forth from you" (RSV).[6] Rosenbloom calls it an "attractive reading." Instead of the MT בָּנָיִךְ "thy children," the 1 QIs varies little with its בֹּנַיִךְ "thy builders," supported by one Greek manuscript, by the Targum and the Arabic. Added to this the connective *waw* actually divides the line into two equal parts, contrary to the Masoretic pointing and the KJV. Nevertheless, Orlinsky finds that the other Greek manuscripts agree with the MT, that "both traditions are found in Targumim," and "that the Arabic is a secondary source." Decisive, however, are verses 20 and 21, to which Slotki in his *Isaiah* (The Soncino Press) refers, which have "children" preceded in verse 19 by "destroyers," יְאַלְּמָבַךְ "that swallowed thee up" (KJV). Therefore the first half of the line in verse 17 of the MT must read: "Your children shall outstrip your destroyers."

In 51:19b the question again arises whether the first person (MT) or the third person (1 QIs) is the original. One but has to read Rosenbloom's critical remarks, who states that "both forms are possible," to realize how difficult the decision is. The 1 QIs has this in its favor that its third person is supported by the GSTV ancient versions and that it is in parallelism with 19a. The MT with its first person "makes excellent sense in that God is speaking of Himself here in contrast to others in 19a" (Rosenbloom, p 61). Most modern versions follow the 1 QIs, including most commentaries. Here we should let the majority rule: "These two calamities have befallen you—who is there to mourn for you? Devastation and ruin, famine and sword—who is there to console you?" (TJB; cf. Pieper, pp 373 and 376).

When both lines of a couplet begin with the same conjunction as in 52:6 with "therefore," we have no reason to question such a twofold reading. Harper in his critical remarks does not do it, the RSV likewise. TJB, however, drops the second "therefore" with the 1 QIs, the LXX, and the Vulgate, and reads: "My people will therefore know my name; *that day* they will understand that it is I who say, I am here" (p 61). Still the 1 QIs by omitting the second "therefore" places emphasis on "that day" which is lost by the repetition of "therefore." The preacher will make use of this emphasis in his sermon, even if he does not change the reading of the MT.

It is surprising that the RSV did not adopt the reading of the 1 QIs in 53:9, which has בֹּומָתֹו "his tomb" (TJB) instead of בָּמֹתָיו literally "in his deaths" (cf. KJV, RSV). One only has to note the parallelism to favor the 1 QIs reading: "They gave him a grave with the wicked, a tomb with the rich."[7] TJB has the additional footnote: "Early Christian preaching seems to have had the text in mind when recording the burial of Jesus in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathaea, a rich man, MT 27:57–60" (p 1229, footnote g.).

The last word in the first line of 53:10 reads literally: הֶחֱלִי "He made sick," without any connecting *waw* with the foregoing words. The 1 QIs evaded the difficult MT reading by taking over the word for "wounded" (rather "pierced through") from 53:5: "But he was wounded for our transgressions." In 53:10 the 1 QIs connects the word for "wounded" with the foregoing words by means of a *waw*: "And he has pierced him." But there is little similarity between הֶחֱלִי and יחַלְּלֵהוּ. One can readily retain the consonants of the MT by

---

[6] This translation of the RSV has the 1 QIs as its source, although there is no reference to it in a footnote. TJB has the footnote: "'Your re-builders' following versions and 1 QIsᵃ; 'your sons' Hebr." It, however, does not divide the verse as the 1 QIs and the RSV do and therefore its translation has not been quoted.

[7] *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (*Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Alten Testament*, herausgegeben von G. Johannes Botterweck und Helmer Ringgren. Verlag W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart/Berlin/Koeln/Mainz, 1972) on pages 662 and 663 under בָּמָה gives Isaiah 53:9 according to the 1 QIs the reading of בֹומָתֹו with the meaning of *Grabhuegel* (mound, tomb).

reading them with the preposition בְּ as a noun form, בְּחַלִי "to crush him *with suffering*." Pieper translates it thus although he rejects the Hebrew equivalent (pp 413f).

The verb "he shall see" הָעְרִי in 53:11 of the MT has no direct object. In the 1 QIs it has the object אוֹר "light," and reads according to TJB: "His soul's anguish over he shall see the light and be content." An interesting factor is that this reading is to be found in both Dead Sea Scrolls of Isaiah (1 QIsa and 1 QIsb) as well as in the Septuagint. Since the 1 QIsb is independent of the 1 QIsa, the use of אוֹר "light," is attested to by two different scrolls and is therefore hardly to be regarded as a mere simplification of an obscure text.

The 1 QIs does not only testify to insertions but also to deletions or omissions. In 55:1 there is a deletion of three words: "And eat, yea, come, buy." Without these three words the text simply reads: "Come ye, buy without money," and concludes: "Without price, wine and milk." Rosenbloom is in favor of the omission or deletion by stating: "The MT reading is difficult and the verse makes sense as the MS [1 QIs] has it" (p 62).

The omission by the 1 QIs of the word הרו "conceiving" in the last line of verse 59:13 really robs the line of an important contextual concept. This becomes evident if we acquaint ourselves with the free translation of *The New English Bible*, which retains the word: "We have conceived lies in our hearts and repeated them in slanderous and treacherous words." The RSV also retains the word "conceiving" together with "uttering." Only TJB adopts the reading of the 1 QIs: "Talking treachery and revolt, *murmuring* lies in our heart" This reading might create the impression as if the 1 QIs has the Hebrew preposition for "in" instead of for "from" our heart. It also has "from" and therefore our well known expression of "uttering from the heart words of falsehood" (KJV). Its omission of הרו "conceiving," however, disregards that the "uttering" is "from the heart."

As to Isaiah 59:20 there are no less than four prepositions in use. The MT has the preposition לְ "to," governed by the verb for "come" (בוֹא) and having "Zion" as its object, and "Redeemer" (גֹּאֵל) as its subject, translated by the KJV: "The Redeemer shall come to Zion." TJB renders the passage: "But for Zion comes the Redeemer" referring one to 1 QIs, which has the preposition אֶל - "shall come *towards* Zion," thereby only stating the direction. The preposition of the Septuagint is ἕνεκεν, "for the sake of Zion," thereby supporting TJB, "for Zion." The fourth proposition ἐκ, "out of" is found in the New Testament, Romans 11:26: "As it is written, There shall come out of Zion (ἐκ Σιών) the Deliverer." The apostle did not quote on the basis of a "faulty memory." The preposition "out of" is vital for the first advent meaning of his text and is used in many Messianic prophecies, as in Psalms 14:7; 53:6; 110:2 and Isaiah 2:3 (cf. Lenski, *Romans*, pp 734 and 736). The MT is undoubtedly the original reading in 59:20, while אֶל of the 1 QIs is a clarification for לְ

In the second couplet of chapter 60, verse 21, the question arises whether the *Kethibh* or the *Qere* reading of the MT for "planting" is the original. The *Qere* of the MT for "planting" is the original. The *Qere* of the MT is supported by the ancient versions TSV and is to be translated: "The branch of my plantation, the work of my hands." The *Kethibh* reading is to be rendered: "The branch of his plantation, the work of my hands." It is quite evident that the *Kethibh* reading is not original. However the 1 QIs seems to come to its support by inserting the name of God and by changing the noun for plantation into a verb and reading: "The shoot that *YAHWEH* has planted," and then continues with the first person suffix: "My handiwork." Kittel-Kahle suggests this as a probable reading and TJB has adopted it. This time, however, the *Qere* reading of the MT is the simplest and therefore the most preferable: "The branch of my planting, the work of my hands" (KJV; cf. also RSV).

The couplet in chapter 62, verse 1b, according to the MT has only one predicate although it has two subjects, one a masculine, the other a feminine: "Until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth" (KJV). Grammatically this is possible. Still the 1 QIs has changed the

masculine form ראבי into a feminine form תִּבְעַר with "salvation" as subject. This creates a perfect parallelism: "Until her integrity shines out like the dawn and her salvation flames like a torch" (TJB). *The Modern Language Bible* also adopts the 1 QIs reading and renders it "Until her righteousness shines forth brightly and her salvation radiates as a lamp." As captivating as this reading is, still it is in a forced order, since in Hebrew "radiates" does not follow "salvation" but "torch" or "lamp" forming a relative clause: "A lamp that burneth."

By replacing the noun מְמָהֹשת "dismal desolation," with the participial for שֵׁמְמָה "abandoned," "non-wedded" (cf. 54:1 in contrast to וְלָהאב "wedded"), the 1 QIs retains a uniformity of meaning throughout verse 4 of chapter 62, which speaks of un-wedded Zion as the "married" one. Therefore "abandoned" is to be preferred to "desolate," since the former is more closely related to an un-wedded state than the latter. It is also in close agreement with "forsaken" in 62:4a. One but has to read the first two couplets of 62:4 to prefer the vocalization of the 1 QIs: "No longer are you to be named Forsaken, nor your land Abandoned, but you shall be called My Delight and your land The Wedded." Even if the preacher does not drop the reading of the MT "Desolate," he cannot but interpret it as "Abandoned."

Instead of "the people" or rather "the peoples," of whom there was not one with Him, who trod the winepress alone (63:3), the 1 QIs apparently has a simplified reading: "Of my people there was not one with me, who trod the winepress alone." Kissane is not to be criticized for saying "the thought of a helper *from among* the nations is somewhat strange" (p 26). Still *The New English Bible* does not avoid but rather stresses the strangeness by translating "no man, no nation was with me" (p 898). There is a justification for such a stress, since the plural pronoun "them" in the following line refers to Edom and Bozrah (63:1), from where he already came with crimson garments, on whose earth (v 6) He poured out His lifeblood. Nevertheless, "house of Israel" (v 7) was His people (cf. v 8) and "He was their Savior" (v 8). Because of His bloodstained garments the passage is applied to the "suffering Messiah" (TJB, footnote b, p 1243).

While the Masoretic text in 63:11b reads "brought them out," the 1 QIs simply has "brought out" without a suffix. Consequently the object of the 1 QIs verb is "the shepherd of his flock," while the object of the MT verb undoubtedly is "his people." TJB together with the RSV and TNBV adopts the 1 QIs reading: "Where is he who brought out of the sea the shepherd of his flock?" The NASB and NEB read with KJV according to the MT: "Where is he that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherd of his flock?" or "from the Nile with the shepherd of his flock?" (cf. NEB).

Since the Masoretic texts, exceptionally in this instance, do not agree with one another, many difficulties as to the translation of the whole verse beset the translator and make it difficult for him to decide whether the MT or the 1 QIs has the original reading.

The first difficulty is a matter of interpretation as to the subject of כֹּרֵזִיו Our KJV has "God" as subject and its translation reads: "Then he remembered the days of old, Moses, and his people." The RSV and *The New Berkeley Version* support this reading: "But He recalled the days of old, Moses and His people." However, the NASB (then his people), NEB (then men), TJB (they) and the Jewish translation deem "Israel" to be the subject. Likewise K-K (וַיִּזְכְּרוּ) takes the plural pronoun "they" as subject, which according to the context is more natural (cf. Kissane).

The second text difficulty is the MT reading: "Moses His people," which Kissane declares to be "certainly wrong." Since some Masoretic manuscripts and the Peshitta have אַבְדֹו "Moses His servant," and since Moses is also mentioned in the following verse, this reading seems to be the most probable.

In the following line, 11b, as already noted, according to the 1 QIs and a few Masoretic manuscripts together with the Septuagint, Lucian, and Symmachus read "brought up" without the plural suffix "them." The object of this verb is according to many Masoretic manuscripts together with the Septuagint, Lucian, and Targum the singular רֹעֶה "shepherd," and not the plural רֹעֵי "shepherds." Thus it is evident that Moses is again

spoken of: "Where is He who brought up from the sea the shepherd of His flock" (TNBV). Line 11c also refers to Moses: "Where is He who put His Holy Spirit within him" (KJV), and not with the RSV "within them." In short, the penitent confession of God's people after they had grieved His Holy Spirit (v 10) reads: "They remembered the days of old, of Moses his servant, Where is he who brought out of the sea (Nile!) the shepherd of his flock? Where is he who endowed him with his holy spirit?" (TJB). In this confession Israel remembers how God rescued Moses from the Nile (Ex 2:1–10), here called the "sea" as in Nahum 3:8. This confession continues in verse 12, which also speaks of Moses accompanied by the power of God's "glorious arm," so that He divided the waters of the Red Sea and won for Himself everlasting renown. Then this confession is followed by a pleading prayer of God's people addressing Him as their "Father" and "Redeemer" (vv 15–19). It is Israel as God's own people who remembers (כרזיו) and confesses all this.

IV. Conclusion

The purpose of this essay was to summarize the variants of the 1 QIs adopted by the RSV and TJB and to gain an impression of their reliability. Do they help in establishing a more accurate text of Isaiah, in making many small corrections and in clarifying some obscure passages? There is no doubt that such is the case. We can at least agree on the following general results: 1) A study of the variants leads us to difficult readings in the MT. Such a reading, for instance, is chapter 14, verse 4, where the meaning of the word כְּהַדֵמָה is unknown and where the KJV consequently gives us two renderings, "golden city" or "exactness of gold." Again in chapter 21, verse 8, the MT reading הערי "lion," has its great contextual difficulties. 2) The 1 QIs can aid one at times in correcting such difficult readings as for instance that of 53:9, where the 1 QIs has בּוֹמָתוֹ "his tomb," instead of the MT reading בְּמֹתָיו, "in his deaths." 3) Variants, it need hardly be said, also serve the interpreter. The 1 QIs reading in 63:11 with its stress on Moses, "the shepherd of his flock," as object of the predicate "brought out" gives the sentence an altogether different and much more consistent meaning.