



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The old Greek of Isaiah : an analysis of its pluses and minuses

Vorm-Croughs, M. van der

Citation

Vorm-Croughs, M. van der. (2010, November 10). *The old Greek of Isaiah : an analysis of its pluses and minuses*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16135>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16135>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Chapter 12.

PLUSES AND MINUSES CAUSED BY A DIFFERENT *VORLAGE*

12.1 Introduction

Everyone engaged in the study of ancient Bible translations knows how complicated this research is made by the everlasting uncertainty surrounding the origin of variant readings. Have they been caused by the translator himself or by an underlying Hebrew text that was different from the MT? This complication also affects the Greek translation of Isaiah. Even if there is some consensus on the idea that the majority of its numerous variants are the achievement of the translator, the possibility of a different *Vorlage* should not too easily be dismissed.

In order to identify pluses, minuses and variant readings in LXX Isaiah as the outcome of a different *Vorlage*, two criteria may be of help. These are, in the first place, the lack of a translation tendency or pattern that can explain the plus or minus, and secondly, the attestation of a similar variant in one of the Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah. If a plus or minus is supported by a Qumran document, and cannot be clarified by one of the translation tendencies LXX Isaiah displays, one may reasonably suspect this plus or minus to be due to a Hebrew text deviating from the MT. Obviously, these criteria can still not save us from speculation, and if one were able to take a glimpse into the translator's Hebrew manuscript, one would, without doubt, be confronted with some unexpected findings. Nonetheless, these two principles may be a first step in the direction of determining in which places the LXX Isaiah *Vorlage* has deviated from the MT.

There is a third situation in which LXX variants are occasionally ascribed to a different Hebrew text, namely when the MT seems to contain a textual error that can be demonstrated to have developed from the retroverted Greek variant.¹ Yet, this criterion is not reliable as it concerns the LXX of Isaiah, because its translator betrays an inclination to “improve” Hebrew texts that were difficult or ambiguous to him. One example to illustrate this is the following:

48:14 יהוה אהבו יעשה חפצו בבבל ἀγαπῶν σε ἐποίησα τὸ θέλημα σου ἐπὶ Βαβυλῶνα
זרעו כשדים τοῦ ἄραι σπέρμα Χαλδαίων.

The Hebrew text is peculiar: “He shall perform his purpose on Babylon, *and his arm* the Chaldeans.” It could be conjectured, as is done by e.g. Duhm, Fohrer, and Hermisson,² that one has to read זרעו for זרעו, and interpret זרע as “seed” rather than as “arm”: “and (*on*) the seed of the Chaldeans.” This also appears to have been the reading of the LXX. Still, the Isaiah translator may have had a Hebrew text in front of him which was similar to the MT, and which he “corrected” himself, just as he regularly did in complex textual situations.³ The latter

¹ Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 82.

² Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja* (3rd enl. ed.; HKAT 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914), 336; Fohrer, *Jesaja*, 3:115; Karl Elliger and Hans-Jürgen Hermisson, *Deuterocesaja* (2 vols.; BKAT 11; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978–2003), 2:256. *BHS* proposes זרעו. Marti proposes to read a verb form זרעו prior to זרעו: “dass er seinen Willen ausrichte an Babel Und seinen Arm offenbare an den Chaldäern”; see Karl Marti, *Das Buch Jesaja* (KHC 10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1900), 324.

³ For more examples, see section 10.2.

assumption is supported by 1QIsa^a, which offers זרועו, and hence—in accordance with the MT—does display a suffix in the noun.

In the continuation of this chapter the two criteria proposed for establishing pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah to derive from a different *Vorlage* will be discussed in more detail. Additionally, some examples will be offered of cases which meet with either of both.

12.2 A plus or minus can not be explained by one of the translation tendencies LXX Isaiah displays

With respect to the addition or omission of elements in the translation, the main tendencies that LXX Isaiah appears to exhibit, as discussed in the previous chapters, are: double translation; condensation; explicitation; implicitation; free translation of Hebrew grammatical and idiomatic features; contextual harmonisation; the borrowing of elements from other Biblical texts (both from within and beyond the book of Isaiah); the creation or improvement of rhetorical figures; and the addition or omission of certain particles. Besides these, there are some pluses and minuses that may have their origin in the translator's solution of ambiguous or complex Hebrew formulations, as well as some that might derive from translational mistakes. Finally, a number of cases of plus and minus in LXX Isaiah are bound to a rearrangement of the Hebrew text. Pluses and minuses which may be considered not to be assignable to one of these categories, are, for instance, the following:

1:4 עזבו את־יהוה ἐγκατελίπατε τὸν κύριον
נאצו את־קדוש ישראל נזרו אחור καὶ παρωργίσατε τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Ἰσραηλ.

According to e.g. Duhm, Ziegler, and Watts the Isaiah translator may not have read נזרו אחור in his Hebrew manuscript,⁴ as “the two words appear to exceed the metric form and the compact composition and probably should be judged a gloss.”⁵ In Ziegler's view the words may have entered the MT version from Isa 42:17 (נסגו אחור).⁶ The Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah agree with the MT, however. Hence, it seems more likely to me that the translator omitted the clause in order to shorten the text, because in content נזרו אחור is close to the two preceding lines.

4:1 והחזיקו שבע נשים באיש אחד καὶ ἐπιλήμψονται ἑπτὰ γυναῖκες ἀνθρώπου ἑνὸς
ביום ההוא לאמר λέγουσαι

ביום ההוא may be a secondary addition in the MT, which is often the case with this formula.⁷ Perhaps it was inserted in the parent text of the MT in analogy to ביום ההוא in v.2. Nevertheless, 1QIsa^a offers the phrase as well.

⁴ Duhm, *Jesaja*, 3; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 53; John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 1–33* (WBC 24; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1985), 14. According to Marti all three lines are later additions (Marti, *Jesaja*, 4–5); Gray thinks that “one at least of the last three lines of v.4 is probably not original” (Gray, *Isaiah*, 1:10). Wildberger, by contrast, assumes that נזרו אחור is original, and that an equivalent of it is missing in the LXX because of the difficulty of the text (Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 1:18).

⁵ Watts, *Isaiah 1–33*, 14.

⁶ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 53.

⁷ Thus Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 1:146. For the lack of representation of ביום ההוא in LXX Isaiah, cf. 20:6 and 24:21.

8:2 ואעידה לי עדים נאמנים ואת אוריה הכהן ואת זכריהו בן יברכיהו καὶ μάρτυράς μοι ποιήσον πιστοὺς ἀνθρώπους, τὸν Οὐριαν καὶ τὸν Ζαχαριαν υἱὸν Βαραχίου.

Also in 2 Kgs 16:10ff. the name אוריה is accompanied by the profession הכהן (LXX: Ουριανς ὁ ἱερεύς). Maybe הכהן was inserted in the manuscript tradition of MT Isa 8:2 in assimilation to that passage.⁸ 1QIsa^a supports the MT, however.

14:2 ולקחום עמים והביאום אל־מקומם והתנחלום בית־ישראל על אדמת יהוה לעבדים ולשפחות καὶ λήμψονται αὐτοὺς ἔθνη καὶ εἰσάξουσιν εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν, καὶ κατακληρονομήσουσι καὶ πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας·

A Hebrew scribe subsequent to the LXX might have supplied בית־ישראל so as to identify the subject of והתנחלום as the “house of Israel” (contrary to the LXX, where the ones who will inherit seem to be the foreign people). However, 1QIsa^a gives בית־ישראל too.⁹

20:2 בעת ההיא דבר יהוה ביד ישעיהו בן־אמוץ τότε ἐλάλησε κύριος πρὸς Ησαϊαν λέγων

Besides in 20:2, the name of Isaiah is followed by the patronym בן־אמוץ / υἱὸς Αμωσ in 1:1; 2:1; 13:1; 37:2,21; and 38:1. Without this specification it is found in Isa 7:3; 20:3; 37:5,6; 38:4,21; and 39:3,5,8. The absence of the patronym in the LXX of Isa 20:2 may reflect a deviation in the Hebrew parent text of LXX Isaiah, even though it is equally conceivable that the translator left it out intentionally, because elsewhere in Isaiah בן־אמוץ only appears in redactional sections and in headings, but not in dialogues. 1QIsa^a accords with the MT.

48:1 שמעו־זאת בית־יעקב הנקראים בשם ישראל וממי יהודה יצאו Ἀκούσατε ταῦτα, οἶκος Ιακωβ οἱ κεκλημένοι τῷ ὀνόματι Ισραηλ καὶ οἱ ἐξ Ιουδα ἐξεληθόντες

The content of the clause וממי יהודה יצאו—“they have gone out from the waters of Judah”—seems somewhat curious on the surface, as it hard to imagine what is meant by “the waters of Judah.”¹⁰ Perhaps וממי has to be perceived as a secondary reading, having entered the manuscript tradition of the MT by way of dittography of the *mem*, the original reading being a mere preposition (מ). Such an explanation would be favoured by the LXX, in which a word in the sense of “waters” is missing. Yet, it is opposed by 1QIsa^a, which agrees with the MT. Therefore, it is more plausible that the Isaiah translator did read וממי in his Hebrew text, but because of the same embarrassment with the text as we ourselves experience—or perhaps accidentally, on account of haplography—left “the waters” out of his translation.

64:4(5) פגעת את־שש ועשה צדק συναντήσεται γὰρ τοῖς ποιούσι τὸ δίκαιον

⁸ Thus Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 53.

⁹ For a further discussion, see section 8.3.1.

¹⁰ Marti (*Jesaja*, 321), Duhm (*Jesaja*, 332), Fohrer (*Jesaja*, 3:110), Westermann (Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. A Commentary* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969], 194), BHS, Beuken (W. A. M. Beuken, *Jesaja* [4 vols.; POuT; Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1989], 2^a:282), and others propose to read וממעי—“from the inside of.” Koole thinks it possible to maintain the MT, and to perceive Judah’s “waters” as the catastrophe of Judah’s and Jerusalem’s destruction; cf. J. L. Koole, *Jesaja 2* (2 vols.; COuT; Kampen: Kok, 1985–1990), 1:418.

The Masoretic ψ ועשה has regularly been labelled as a corrupt reading. The original version would have read עשי instead, in line with the LXX.¹¹ Yet, the Isaiah texts from Qumran reflect the MT. Maybe the rendering of the LXX is an “elusive abbreviation to escape a syntactical difficulty.”¹²

Large minuses in LXX Isaiah

Among the minuses in LXX Isaiah which cannot easily be ascribed to a translation tendency, one finds relatively many *large* ones, that is, missing elements embracing an entire sentence or an even larger textual unit. As a whole, the Greek Isaiah does not contain many of such extensive minuses, the preponderance of the units which are not represented in the translation numbering not more than three words. Some examples of large minuses in LXX Isaiah that might have their roots in a different *Vorlage* are the following:¹³

2:22 חדלו לכם מן־האדם אשר נשמה באפו כי־במה נחשב הוא

According to e.g. Duhm, Marti, Gray, Wildberger, and Ulrich this text is a late addition to the MT which as yet did not form part of the Hebrew manuscript of LXX Isaiah.¹⁴ An argument against this, however, is the fact that the sentence is attested by 1QIsa^a. Van der Kooij therefore assumes that it was left out by the LXX translator himself. He would have done this for rhetorical reasons:

The plus of “and now” in v. 10, which means that the Lord is going to act, right now, against every one that is high and arrogant, makes the call of v. 22, not to rely on man (understood as the

¹¹ Thus e.g. Marti (*Jesaja*, 398), Duhm (*Jesaia*, 441), Fohrer (*Jesaja*, 3:253), and BHS. Ziegler (*Untersuchungen*, 53) thinks that ψ derives from dittography of (ה)עש. Koole (J. L. Koole, *Jesaja 3* [COuT; Kampen: Kok, 1995], 366–367) and Beuken (*Jesaja*, 3^b:34) follow the MT.

¹² Jan de Waard, *A Handbook on Isaiah* (TCT 1; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 218; cf. Dominique Barthélemy, ed., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament 2. Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations* (OBO 50.2; Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 447–448.

¹³ Larger minuses can further relatively often be found in places where the Hebrew offers two parallel or nearly identical clauses which the translator seems to have reduced to one in order to condense his text (see e.g. 25:9; 26:9; 34:3–4; 37:8–9,33–34; 42:15; 44:13,14; 59:18; 60:13; 61:7; 62:4; and cf. section 3.2.1c), and in places where *parablepsis*, haplography or a related translation mistake might have occurred (see 6:13; 14:24; 22:14–15; 25:9; 36:10–11; 38:15; 40:7–8; 41:13–14; 42:19; 44:8–9,13; 51:9–10; 59:18,21; 62:4,7; 65:18; and 66:3; and cf. chapter 11). Sometimes a minus can be explained by both of these two possibilities. It is remarkable that quite some large minuses are found in the chapters on Hezekiah (Isa 36–39): see 36:7; 37:8–9,14,33–34; and 38:15,17. On the relative scarcity of large minuses in LXX Isaiah, see also Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 47; Johan Lust, “Exegesis and Theology in the Septuagint of Ezekiel. The Longer ‘Pluses’ and Ezek 43:1–9,” in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SCS 23; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987), 203–204; and Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 15 n.18. Lust offers a scheme, based upon the aligned Hebrew-Greek computer-readable text of Tov and Kraft, in which the pluses and minuses in the LXX of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel are compared. This scheme distinguishes between “long” pluses or minuses—stretching out over at least four Hebrew words—and “short” ones, numbering less than four words. This model attributes to LXX Isaiah 994 short minuses, as compared to 50 long ones, and 1011 long pluses, as compared to only 19 long ones.

¹⁴ Duhm, *Jesaia*, 21; Marti, *Jesaja*, 33; Gray, *Isaiah*, 1:57; Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 1:95; Eugene Ulrich, “The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah. Light from 1QIsa^a on Additions in the MT,” *DSD* 8 (2001): 292–293.

powerful and the arrogant), superfluous. The wording of v. 10 (cf. v. 5) actually implies that the house of Jacob put their trust in the Lord, and no longer in those who did them wrong ...¹⁵

6:13	ועוד בה עשריה ושבה והיתה לבער כאלה וכאלון אשר בשלכת מצבת במ זרע קדש מצבתה	καὶ ἔτι ἐπ’ αὐτῆς ἔστι τὸ ἐπιδέκατον, καὶ πάλιν ἔσται εἰς προνομήν ὡς τερέβινθος καὶ ὡς βάλανος ὅταν ἐκπέση ἀπὸ τῆς θήκης αὐτῆς.
------	--	---

The LXX reading ὅταν ἐκπέση ἀπὸ τῆς θήκης αὐτῆς has often been thought to render the penultimate line of this difficult Hebrew verse, i.e. אשר בשלכת מצבת במ. The final line in the MT—זרע קדש מצבתה—was then regarded as a minus in the LXX. An explanation for this minus coming from Brownlee held that the LXX was based on a Hebrew text in which these final words were missing.¹⁶ However, as rightly advanced by e.g. Budde and Emerton, ἀπὸ τῆς θήκης αὐτῆς probably represents מצבתה rather than מצבת במ, since αὐτῆς reflects the suffix in מצבתה, and not במ. The words in between אשר בשלכת and מצבתה—i.e. זרע במ מצבתה—have in all likelihood been omitted by the LXX translator due to *parablepsis*.¹⁷

36:7	וכי־תאמר אלי אל־יהוה אלהינו בטחנו הלוא־הוא אשר הסיר חזקיהו את־במתיו ואת־מזבחתי ויאמר ליהודה ולירושלם לפני המזבח הזה תשתחוּ	εἰ δὲ λέγετε Ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν πεποιθήσαμεν
------	---	---

Also this minus is taken by some to be a later expansion of the MT.¹⁸ Catastini, for instance, believes the shorter form to be the more original one because he thinks it implausible that the statement on the centralisation of the cult would have been removed by a later post-exilic editor at a time in which this very issue had become so significant.¹⁹ Van der Kooij, on the contrary, perceives the longer version to be original. He comes to this conclusion because in his view the shorter version makes less sense in the context. One misses in it a continuation in which Rabshakeh addresses the issue of trust in the Lord. The concluding lines of 36:7 have, in van der Kooij’s opinion, been elided by the LXX translator, who would have done this because they claim Jerusalem to be the only place for an altar of the Lord. Such an idea would be in disfavour with the group of Jews to whom van der Kooij thinks the translator belonged, who had their own temple in Leontopolis, built by the priest Onias (see LXX Isa 19:19).²⁰

37:14	ויקח חזקיהו את־הספרים מיד המלאכים ויקראהו ויעל בית יהוה ויפרשהו חזקיהו לפני יהוה	καὶ ἔλαβεν Εζεκιας τὸ βιβλίον παρὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων καὶ ἤνοιξεν αὐτὸ ἐναντίον κυρίου
-------	--	---

¹⁵ van der Kooij, “Isa 2:22 and 36:7,” 382.

¹⁶ William H. Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumrân Scrolls for the Bible. With Special Attention to the Book of Isaiah* (The James W. Richard Lectures; New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 237.

¹⁷ Budde, “Über die Schranken,” 167; Emerton, “Isaiah vi.13,” 88–89; de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 30. 1QIsa^a offers אשר בשלכת מצבת במה זרע הקודש מצבתה; for a detailed discussion of this Qumran reading, see Emerton, “Isaiah vi.13,” 100–103.

¹⁸ E.g. Marti, *Jesaja*, 250; Duhm, *Jesaja*, 235; Ulrich, “Developmental Composition,” 296.

¹⁹ Catastini, *Isaia ed Ezechia*, 268.

²⁰ van der Kooij, “Isa 2:22 and 36:7,” 382–384. See also van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 60–61. 1QIsa^a accords with the MT.

Rather than that these words were absent in his Hebrew parent text, the translator may have accidentally skipped them due to the similarity of the verbs ויקראהו and ויפרשהו.²¹

38:14–15 ערבני מה־אדבר ואמר־לי והוא עשה אדדה καὶ ἀφείλατό μου
בל־שנותי על־מר נפשי τὴν ὀδύνην τῆς ψυχῆς.

38:17 הנה לשלום מר־לי מר הנה לשלום מר־לי מר
ואתה חשקת נפשי משחת בלי εἴλου γάρ μου τὴν ψυχὴν, ἵνα μὴ ἀπόληται

These two large minuses in Isa 38:15 and 17 might, on the one hand, be additions to the Hebrew text which were later than the LXX. This is what e.g. Duhm posits.²² Nonetheless, the Greek rendering of the prayer of Hezekiah (Isa 38:10–20) as a whole is quite divergent from the MT, so these minuses may well form part of the translator's entire rearrangement of the Hebrew text.²³

40:7–8 יבש חציר נבל ציץ כי רוח יהוה נשבה ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος, καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσε,
בו אכן חציר העם יבש חציר נבל ציץ τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

1QIsa^a has אלוהינו יקום (ודבר) כי רוח נשבה בוא הכן חציר העם יבש חציר נבל ציץ ודבר אלוהינו לועולם, with the same section that is missing in the LXX plus the words ודבר־אלוהינו added in superscript. In the original version of the Scroll these words (except for אלוהינו) may have got lost through *parablepsis*. They have been supplied supralinearly by a second hand, making the text to accord with the MT. The corrector has erroneously doubled אלוהינו.

The Isaiah translator probably fell prey to the same error of *parablepsis* as the original scribe of 1QIsa^a had made. This is not surprising from the perspective that the text of Isa 40:7–8, because of all of its repetitions, is confusing. Still, many exegetes think that the fact that text is missing in both 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah may indicate that the shorter text is the older one, and that it was later on supplemented with a gloss.²⁴

56:12 אתיו אקחה־יין ונסבאה שכר והיה כזה יום מחר גדול יתר מאד

It is hard to find an explanation for this large minus. According to Ziegler the translator did not read the text in his *Vorlage*.²⁵ Nevertheless, we do find these words in both 1QIsa^a and 1QIsa^b.

One difficulty in attributing a plus or a minus to a translation tendency of LXX Isaiah is that often the same plus or minus could equally be clarified by a converse process having occurred in the reading tradition of the MT. When, for instance, a plus in the Greek is ascribed to double

²¹ 1QIsa^a reflects the MT.

²² Duhm, *Jesaia*, 254–255. Marti (*Jesaja*, 264) considers only the minus in 38:17 to be a later addition; Wildberger (*Jesaja*, 3:1445) thinks that sentence to be original except for the first מר.

²³ In Isa 38:15 1QIsa^a is similar to the MT; in 38:17 the Scroll offers מר ליא מאודה הן לשלום מר ליא מאודה. The minus in 38:15 could be the result of an error of homoeoarkton on account of מה and מר (cf. *HUB Isa*, 169 and section 11.2).

²⁴ See e.g. Fohrer, *Jesaja*, 3:20; Beuken, *Jesaja*, 2^a:25. Koole (*Jesaja* 2,1:33–35), in contrast, thinks the longer reading of the MT to be original, and suspects an *aberratio oculi* in LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa^a; for a discussion of this case, cf. also Ulrich, “Developmental Composition,” 299–301.

²⁵ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 47. Duhm, however, thinks that the sentence fits well within the context (Duhm, *Jesaia*, 395).

translation by the translator, theoretically seen the same plus could likewise be regarded as a product of condensation applied to the *Vorlage* of the MT. In a similar way, when one thinks a minus may be caused by haplography on the part of the translator, its actual cause might have been dittography from the side of the MT scribe. The same pertains to the techniques of explicitation and implicitation. Also, if one supposes the translator to have solved a difficulty of the Hebrew text, it may well be that this difficulty actually never existed at all in his *Vorlage* but was only extant in the MT tradition, or the text repair may perhaps already have been carried out in the Hebrew parent text of the translator. These complications make it very complex—if not impossible—ever to be completely certain about the nature of pluses and minuses in an ancient translation, and they demand a high degree of modesty in the interpretation of them.

Despite these reservations, we will have to make do with the rule of thumb that when a certain phenomenon occurs fairly frequently in LXX Isaiah and seems to point in the direction of a translation tendency, there is a greater chance that a plus or minus fitting into its pattern is the outcome of this translation tendency rather than of a different *Vorlage*.

12.3 The plus or minus has a parallel in one of the Qumran manuscripts

When a plus or a minus has a parallel in another ancient version, particularly in one of the Isaianic Qumran manuscripts, this could be an argument for establishing that the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah deviated from the MT. However, corresponding variants of the Greek Isaiah and the Qumran documents may also be the result of certain practices that the scribes of the scrolls and the Isaiah translator had in common. To offer one example, the technique of contextual harmonisation—which has been applied abundantly in the Greek translation of Isaiah—is also frequently displayed in the Great Isaiah Scroll.²⁶ Another tactic that these two documents seem to share is condensation. Just as in LXX Isaiah, so also in the Scroll many minuses are related to an inclination to reduce identical or synonymous text elements. Hence, in the continuation of this paragraph, which lists the pluses and minuses of LXX Isaiah that find support in Qumran manuscripts, each case needs to be examined to find out whether this correspondence may actually indicate a similar *Vorlage* for both LXX Isaiah and the Qumran document under consideration, or whether the plus or minus should rather be explained by a commonly applied technique.

12.3.1 Pluses and minuses which LXX Isaiah shares with 1QIsa^a

The most important Qumran manuscript attesting the Isaianic text is the Great Isaiah Scroll, abbreviated as 1QIsa^a. This document, which originates from the late second century B.C.E., comprehends the entire text of Isaiah. On the whole, the Scroll reflects a free approach towards its supposed *Vorlage*.²⁷

²⁶ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 545.

²⁷ Arie van der Kooij, “The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts of Isaiah. Some General Comments,” in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings. Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (Manchester, 1990) (ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; SCS 33; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1992), 195–197.

The following two paragraphs contain cases of plus and minus in LXX Isaiah which are supported by 1QIsa^a.²⁸

12.3.1.1 Pluses which LXX Isaiah shares with 1QIsa^a

1:31	MT Isa	והיה החסן לנערת ופעלו לניצון
	1QIsa ^a	והיה החסנכּם לנעורת ופעלכם לניצוצ
	LXX Isa	καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἰσχὺς αὐτῶν ὡς καλάμη στιππύου καὶ αἱ ἐργασίαι αὐτῶν ὡς σπινθηρες πυρός

The Isaiah translator may have had a Hebrew manuscript in front of him that had a pronoun suffix joined to החסן, in accordance with the Scroll. Yet, it is more plausible that both the translator and the scribe added this pronoun in parallelism to ופעלכם/ופעלו in the succeeding line. This presumption is advocated by the fact that 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah differ in the possessive pronouns they use, and additionally by the fact that the presence of the article in החסן makes the supposed original attachment of a suffix to this form ungrammatical. The fact that 1QIsa^a has kept the definite article in החסנכּם shows the secondary character of the suffix.²⁹

7:4	MT Isa	בחר־יאף
	1QIsa ^a	כּי בחורי אפ
	LXX Isa	ὅταν γάρ ὀργή τοῦ θυμοῦ μου γένηται, πάλιν ἰάσομαι.

The reading γάρ of the LXX may be based on a Hebrew parent text differing from the MT and agreeing with 1QIsa^a.

9:13(14)	MT Isa	ויכרת יהוה מישראל ראש זונב כפה ואגמון יום אחד
	1QIsa ^a	ויכרת יהוה מישראל ראש זונב כפה ואגמן ביום אחד
	LXX Isa	καὶ ἀφείλεν κύριος ἀπὸ Ἰσραηλ κεφαλὴν καὶ οὐράν, μέγαν καὶ μικρὸν ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ

The correspondence between 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah cannot give any clue about the *Vorlage* of the latter, since the LXX translator could just as well have read יום אחד, which he naturally corrected by adding a preposition.

11:15	MT Isa	והדריך בנעלים
	1QIsa ^a	והדריכּוּ בנעלים
	LXX Isa	ὥστε διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν ὑποδήμασι·

Both the Greek translator and the scribe of the Scroll may have supplied an object because they considered their Hebrew *Vorlage*, as reflected by the MT, elliptic.

12:2	MT Isa	הנה אל ישועתי אבטח
------	--------	--------------------

²⁸ Pluses or minuses consisting of the conjunctions καί/ו as well as of articles are excluded. Text from 1QIsa^a has been cited from Donald W. Parry and Elisha Qimron, eds., *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa). A New Edition* (STDJ 32; Leiden: Brill, 1999). For a further discussion on pluses and minuses shared by 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah, see Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 536–554, and Ziegler, “Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta,” 38–45.

²⁹ Cf. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament*, 2:11–12; de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 11.

1QIsa^a הנה **אל** אל ישועתי אבטח
 LXX Isa ἰδοὺ ὁ θεὸς μου σωτήρ μου κύριος, πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι **ἐπ’ αὐτῷ**

Here too the agreement between the pluses of LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa^a does not necessarily imply that the Greek translation had a parent text similar to the Scroll. The two documents rather offer alternative solutions to a seemingly elliptic Hebrew text: LXX Isaiah by adding a prepositional object ἐπ’ αὐτῷ to πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι / אבטח (“God is my salvation, I will trust *in him*”), and 1QIsa^a—apparently interpreting אבטח אל ישועתי אבטח as “(In) the God of my salvation I will trust” instead of as “God is my salvation, I will trust”—by placing the preposition **אל** before “God.”³⁰

12:2 MT Isa כִּי־עֲזִי זֹמַרְתָּ יְהוָה
 1QIsa^a כִּי־אֲעֲזִי זֹמַרְתָּ יְהוָה
 LXX Isa διότι ἡ δόξα μου καὶ ἡ **αἴνεσις μου** κύριος

The form זֹמַרְתָּ in the MT is awkward; one would rather expect זֹמַרְתִּי, parallel to עֲזִי. That the form may still be original is suggested by the fact that similar phraseology appears in Exod 15:2 and Ps 118:14. The obscurity of the Hebrew could have encouraged both the scribe of 1QIsa^a (who was corrected by a later hand, suspending the ה) and the LXX translator to attach to זֹמַרְתָּ the yod of the following יְהוָה as a possessive pronoun.³¹

13:22 MT Isa ... וענה אִיִּם בִּאלְמִנּוֹתָיו וְתַנִּים בְּהִיכְלֵי עֲנֹג וְקָרוֹב ...
 1QIsa^a ... וענה אִם בִּאלְמִנּוֹתוֹ וְתַנִּים בְּהִיכְלֵן עֲנוֹגוֹ וְקָרוֹב ...
 LXX Isa καὶ ὄνοκένταυροι ἐκεῖ κατοικήσουσι, καὶ νοσοσποιοῦσους ἐχῖνοι ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις **αὐτῶν**: ταχὺ ἔρχεται ...

Syntactically seen, the reading καὶ νοσοσποιοῦσους ἐχῖνοι ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις αὐτῶν of LXX Isaiah is closer to that of the Scroll (presenting עֲנוֹגוֹ וְתַנִּים בְּהִיכְלֵן עֲנוֹגוֹ—“and jackals will be daintily bred in his palace”) than to that of the MT. The former two have in common that they echo or display a verb עֲנוֹג(ו) instead of a noun עֲנֹג, most likely because they regarded the *waw* which in the MT is the first letter of the succeeding word וְקָרוֹב, to be the final letter of the preceding form עֲנֹג. Besides, they both have a possessive pronoun joined to הִיכְלֵ (even if LXX Isaiah implies a reading with בְּהִיכְלֵיהֶם, whereas 1QIsa^a gives בְּהִיכְלֵן). Perhaps these two deviations from the MT have their origin in the Hebrew manuscript tradition underlying 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah. Yet, the possessive pronoun to הִיכְלֵ could also have been added by both composers of these documents in parallelism to בִּאלְמִנּוֹתוֹ/בִּאלְמִנּוֹתָיו in the previous line (although that phrase is rendered by ἐκεῖ in the LXX).

18:7 MT Isa בעת ההיא יובל־שי ליהוה צבאות עם ממשך ומרט ומעם נורא
 1QIsa^a בעתה ההיא יובל שי ליהוה צבאות **מעם** ממשך ומרט ומעם נורא
 LXX Isa ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἀνεχθήσεται δῶρα κυρίῳ σαβαωθ **ἐκ λαοῦ**

³⁰ Another possibility, though, is that 1QIsa^a reflects the original reading, the MT reading having come into existence by haplography.

³¹ Also Barthélemy (*Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 2:87–90) and de Waard (*Handbook on Isaiah*, 58) think that a reading with זֹמַרְתָּ is original, because “scribes were accustomed to omitting a last character when the first character of the next word was the same,” and because “the reduplication of the divine name is also found elsewhere in Isa (26.4 and 38.11) and it can therefore be considered as a literary characteristic of the book” (de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 58).

τεθλιμμένου καὶ τετιλμένου καὶ ἀπὸ λαοῦ μεγάλου

1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah might reflect a comparable interpretation or exegetical change: the gift that in Isa 18:7 is offered to the Lord will not embody the nation itself, but will come *from* that nation. Maybe this seemed a more suitable picture in the eyes of the copyist and translator.³² Barthélemy and de Waard, by contrast, give some arguments in favour of 1QIsa^a presenting the more original reading, stating that only the 1QIsa^a reading respects the parallelism between this verse and verse 2, and that the MT reading can be explained as a graphical error in view of the following וּמַעַם.³³

29:9 MT Isa שכרו ולא ייין נעו ולא שכר
 1QIsa^a שכרון ולא מִיין נעו ושכר
 LXX Isa καὶ κραιπαλήσατε οὐκ ἀπὸ σικερα οὐδὲ ἀπὸ οἴνου·

Cases in which the LXX and 1QIsa^a may both have supplied an (in their eyes) necessary preposition which is missing in the MT, can additionally be found in 9:14(13) (see above), and in 31:1; 37:38; 43:23; 45:18; 55:9; 57:15; and 62:5 below. Cf. also 18:7 and 49:4.

31:1 MT Isa הוי הירדים מצרים לעזרה
 1QIsa^a הוי הירדים למצרים לעזרה
 LXX Isa Οὐαὶ οἱ καταβαίνοντες εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐπὶ βοήθειαν

See the comment at 29:9.

37:9 MT Isa וישמע וישלח מלאכים אל-חזקיהו לאמר
 1QIsa^a וישמע ישב וישלח מלאכים אל יחזקיה לאמר
 LXX Isa καὶ ἀκούσας ἀπέστρεψε καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸς Εζεκίαν λέγων

The agreement between 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah possibly indicates a common *Vorlage* at variance with the MT. This *Vorlage* may have contained a conflated reading, which combined the MT wording וישמע וישלח מלאכים אל with that of the parallel in MT 2 Kgs 19:9 וישב וישלח מלאכים.³⁴

37:38 MT Isa ויהי הוא משתחוה בית נסרך אלהיו
 1QIsa^a ויהי הוא משתחוה בבית נסרך אלוהיו
 LXX Isa καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν προσκυνεῖν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Νασαραχ τὸν παταχρον αὐτοῦ

The preposition ב might have been dropped from the MT through haplography, whereas the text lying in front of the LXX translator had preserved the original preposition, just as 1QIsa^a. Alternatively, the translator and scribe may have read a text identical to the MT, which they “corrected” by adding a preposition. Cf. the comment at 29:9.

³² Cf. Ziegler, “Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta,” 42.

³³ Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament*, 2:135–137; de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 83.

³⁴ See Shemaryahu Talmon, “Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts,” *Textus* 4 (1960): 107–108. Cf. also Ziegler, “Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta,” 56; according to Ziegler 2 Kgs 19:9—where וישמע is missing—gives the original form of the text, since וישמע can already be found at the beginning of v.9, and in Ziegler’s opinion it is improbable that this would be said twice in the same verse.

38:8	MT Isa	במעלות אחז
	1QIsa ^a	במעלות <u>עלית</u> אחז
	LXX Isa	τούς δέκα ἀναβαθμούς <u>τοῦ οἴκου</u> τοῦ πατρός σου

The Isaiah translation and the Scroll offer a plus in the same place but with a different meaning: where 1QIsa^a has עלית—a construct state of עליה (“upper room”)—LXX Isaiah offers τοῦ οἴκου —“ of the house” (the two versions also differ in that the former continues with “Achaz” and the latter with “of your father”). Clearly, both inserted a specification of מעלות independently from each other with the purpose of making their texts more explicit.

38:18	MT Isa	כי לא שאול תודך מות יהללך לא־ישברו יורדי־בור אל־אמתך
	1QIsa ^a	כיא לוא שאול תודכה <u>לוא</u> מות יהללכה ולוא ישברו יורדי בור אל אמתכה
	LXX Isa	οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἐν ἄδου αἰνέσουσί σε, <u>οὐδέ</u> οἱ ἀποθανόντες εὐλογήσουσί σε, οὐδέ ἐλπιοῦσιν οἱ ἐν ἄδου τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην σου·

In all probability it was the scribe and the translator themselves who supplied a negation at the beginning of the second clause, thus harmonising this line to the preceding and subsequent one. Yet, it is also conceivable that this negation was already present in their Hebrew parent texts. Compare 58:13.

39:6	MT Isa	ונשא כל־אשר בביתך ואשר אצרו אבתך עד־היום הזה בבל
	1QIsa ^a	ונשאו כול אשר בביתכה ואשר אצרו אבותיכה עד היום הזה בבל <u>יבואו</u>
	LXX Isa	καὶ λήμψονται πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου, καὶ ὅσα συηγάγον οἱ πατέρες σου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης, εἰς Βαβυλῶνα <u>ἦξει</u>

Whereas the MT incorporates just one sentence including a twofold object, the texts of 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah consist of two clauses each with its own object. The second one of these two lines is governed by the verbs יבואו / ἦξει, which are pluses in comparison to the MT. This congruity between 1QIsa^a and the Greek Isaiah could point to an underlying Hebrew text departing from the MT, which has in its favour the fact that the two versions also agree in presenting at the beginning of the sentence a *plural* verb ונשאו / καὶ λήμψονται as against the singular ונשא of the MT. Notwithstanding this, the pluses may equally well be the result of an addition by the Qumran scribe and the translator because they thought the Hebrew text to be composed of two clauses of which the second one was elliptic on account of a missing verb.

41:11	MT Isa	ויאבדו אנשי ריבך
	1QIsa ^a	יובדו <u>כול</u> אנשי ריבכה
	LXX Isa	καὶ ἀπολοῦνται <u>πάντες</u> οἱ ἀντίδικοί σου.

In the Qumran Scroll and the Greek translation a word for “all” may have been interpolated in parallelism to כול / πάντες in the previous line. For the frequent addition of πᾶς in LXX Isaiah, see section 4.3.

42:14	MT Isa	החשיתי מעולם אחריש אתאפק
	1QIsa ^a	אחשיתי <u>אך</u> מעולם אחריש אתאפק
	LXX Isa	ἐσιώπησα, <u>μη</u> <u>και</u> ἀεὶ σιωπήσομαι καὶ ἀνέξομαι;

The translator presumably read **אך** in his Hebrew manuscript, in accordance with 1QIsa^a. Two other verses in which he has represented **אך** by means of a question are 36:5 (μή) and 63:8 (ούχ).

43:23f.	MT Isa	לא־הביאת לי שה עלתך וזבחך לא כבדתני לא העבדתך במנחה ולא הוגעתך בלבונה לא־קנית לי בכסף קנה וחלב זבחך לא הרויתני אך העבדתני כחטאותיך הוגעתני בעונתיך
	1QIsa ^a	לוא הביאותה לי שה לעולה ובזבחיכה לוא כבדתני ולוא עשיתה ליא מנחה ולוא הוגעתיכה בלבונה לוא קניתה ליא בכסף קנה וחלב זבחיכה לוא הרויתני אך העבדתבתי כחטאותיכה והוגעתני בעונכה
	LXX Isa	οὐκ ἔμοι πρόβρατα τῆς ὀλοκαρπώσεώς σου, οὐδὲ ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις σου ἐδόξασάς με, οὐδὲ ἔγκοπον ἐποίησά σε ἐν λιβάνω, οὐδὲ ἐκτίσω μοι ἀργυρίου θυμίαμα, οὐδὲ τὸ στέαρ τῶν θυσιῶν σου ἐπεθύμησα, ἀλλὰ ἐν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις σου προέστην σου.

The composers of 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah probably placed a preposition before **זבחך** so as to assimilate this clause to the ensuing lines, most of which contain a prepositional object starting with **ב** as well, and also in view of the fact that the absence of a preposition in **זבחך** seems grammatically incorrect. Compare **לעולה** in the first line of 1QIsa^a, where the scribe appears to have prefixed a preposition too. That the MT provides the more original reading is further suggested by the fact that in the sixth line of this series—**וחלב זבחך לא הרויתני**—the object **חלב זבחך** does not start with **ב** either, even if one were to expect it there (“and *with* the fat of your sacrifices you have not satisfied me”). Cf. the comment at 29:9.

44:13	MT Isa	חרש עצים נטה קו
	1QIsa ^a	ח ⁽¹⁾ רש עצים נטהו קו
	LXX Isa	ἐκλεξάμενος τέκτων ξύλον ἔστησεν <u>αὐτὸ</u> ἐν μέτρῳ

The translator and scribe may have encountered a pronominal suffix joined to **נטה** in their Hebrew manuscripts, but could as easily have added the object themselves, in order to approximate the clause to the succeeding ones; there an object pronoun follows the verb too (**יתאדו בשרד יעשו במקצעות ובמחוגה יתאדו**).

44:28	MT Isa	והיכל תוסד
	1QIsa ^a	והיכל' תיסדד
	LXX Isa	καὶ τὸν οἶκον τὸν ἅγιόν μου θεμελιώσω.

It is unclear whether the suspended *yod* in 1QIsa^a belongs to either **תיסדד** or **והיכל**. In the latter case, the reading of the Scroll (with correction) would be mirrored by **καὶ τὸν οἶκον τὸν ἅγιόν μου** in the LXX. In both versions the possessive pronoun may have been added for explication.

45:18	MT Isa	לא־תהו בראה
	1QIsa ^a	לוא לתהו בראה
	LXX Isa	οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἐποίησεν αὐτήν

The **ל** might have got lost in the MT due to haplography. See, however, the comment at 29:9.

48:8	MT Isa	כי ידעתי בגוד תבגוד
	1QIsa ^a	כיא ידעתי כיא בגוד תבגוד
	LXX Isa	ἐγνων γὰρ ὅτι ἀθετῶν ἀθετήσεις

The presence of ὅτι in LXX Isaiah does not necessarily mean that its *Vorlage* read **כיא** (א) in this place together with 1QIsa^a. The word may just as well have been added by the translator because he saw himself obliged to provide a conjunction in order not to produce improper Greek. Also the scribe of the Scroll may have inserted **כיא** for grammatical considerations.

48:17	MT Isa	מלמדך להועיל מדריךך בדרך תלך
	1QIsa ^a	מלמדכה להועיל הדריכה בדרך אשר תלך בה
	LXX Isa	δέδειχά σοι τοῦ εὐρεῖν σε τὴν ὁδόν , ἐν ἣ πορεύσῃ ἐν αὐτῇ .

It is indeed possible that the Isaiah translator had a Hebrew manuscript in front of him that offered **בה** תלך (**אשר**) in accordance with 1QIsa^a, so presenting a retrospective pronoun in the relative clause (ἐν αὐτῇ = **בה**). This can be deduced from the fact that in places in MT Isaiah where the relative clause contains a retrospective pronoun, the LXX usually does not give a rendering of it.³⁵ This makes it improbable that if the Hebrew had *not* provided such a pronoun, the LXX would still have added one.

49:4	MT Isa	לריק יגעתי לתהו והבל כחי כליתי
	1QIsa ^a	לריק יגעתי לתוה ולהבל כוחי כליתי
	LXX Isa	Κενῶς ἐκοπίασα καὶ εἰς μάταιον καὶ εἰς οὐδέν ἔδωκα τὴν ἰσχύν μου·

The insertion of a preposition before **הבל** may have been realised in harmonisation to the two preceding phrases. Cf. also the comment at 29:9.

49:7	MT Isa	כה אמר־יהוה גאל ישראל קדושו
	1QIsa ^a	כוה אמר אדוני יהוה גואלכה ישראל קדושו
	LXX Isa	Οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ ῥυσάμενός σε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ Ἁγιάσατε ...

The attestation in 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah of a second person singular object to the verb “to save,” which is absent in the MT, could hint at a common reading of the former two versions, differing from the latter. Another possibility is that in both texts this object was added in assimilation to related verses in Isaiah which designate “the holy God of Israel” as the one “who saves you”: see 48:17; 49:26; and 54:5,8, and compare also 44:6 and 47:4.

49:9	MT Isa	על־דרכים ירעו ובכל־שפיים מרעיתם
	1QIsa ^a	על בול הרים ירעו ובכול שפאים מרעיתם
	LXX Isa	καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν βοσκηθήσονται, καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς τρίβοις ἢ νομῆ αὐτῶν·

The extra **כול** in 1QIsa^a and **πάσαις** in LXX Isaiah are presumably additions for the sake of parallelism. Cf. 41:11 above.

51:23	MT Isa	ושמתיה ביד־מוגיך
-------	--------	------------------

³⁵ In only a few places does LXX Isaiah translate the retrospective pronoun: see Isa 8:20; 37:10,29; and 62:2; cf. section 9.4.

1QIsa ^a	ושמתיהו ביד מוגיך ומענייך
LXX Isa	καὶ ἐμβάλῳ αὐτὸ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἀδικησάντων σε καὶ τῶν <u>ταπεινωσάντων σε</u>

The plus shared by LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa^a could well evidence a similar Hebrew text at variance with the MT. In the MT מוגיך may have been eliminated by homoeoteleuton.³⁶ Another—less plausible—option would be that the composers of the two versions have complemented מוגיך with the synonymous form מענייך / τῶν ταπεινωσάντων σε both on their own initiative, under the influence of Isa 60:14.³⁷

53:10–11	MT Isa	וחפץ יהוה בידו יצלח מעמל נפשו יראה
	1QIsa ^a ≈1QIsa ^b ≈4QIsa ^d	וחפצ יהוה בידו יצלח מעמל נפשו יראה <u>אור</u>
	LXX Isa	καὶ βούλεται κύριος ἀφελεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ πόνου τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, δεῖξαι αὐτῷ <u>φῶς</u>

Seeligmann posits that φῶς is a later insertion by the LXX translator, who would have had a theological preoccupation with the notion of light as knowledge (compare the plus in 26:9 and in some manuscripts in 51:5, and the motif of light in e.g. 50:10,11).³⁸ However, an equivalent plus is attested by three Qumran scrolls, namely 1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b and 4QIsa^d, which exhibit אור in this place. This has given rise to the assumption that אור belonged to a pre-Masoretic text tradition of Isaiah.³⁹ According to van der Kooij, the plus may however still be secondary. This he contends because the expression “to see light” would not really suit within the content of the Hebrew text, since the verb ראה has not been used there to refer to the gaining of knowledge—which would be the connotation of “to see light”—but must be understood in the perspective of the preceding verse (v.10), which reads, “he will see offspring, prolong his days.”⁴⁰

53:12	MT Isa	ולפשעים יפגיע
	1QIsa ^a	ולפשעיהמה יפגיע
	1QIsa ^b ≈4QIsa ^d	ולפשעיהם יפגיע
	LXX Isa	καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη.

καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν in LXX Isaiah echoes (ה)ולפשעיהמה, which is the reading of 1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b, and 4QIsa^d. The translator seems to have interpreted the form as deriving from פשע—“crime”—rather than as a participle form of פשע, in the sense of “rebellious ones,” such as the MT offers. In this way the phrase has become parallel in meaning to חטא (“sin”) in the preceding clause והוא חטא־רבים נשא. Hence, one could argue that the translator

³⁶ Thus Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 2:377, and de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 190.

³⁷ See section 2.3b. According to Talmon (“Aspects of the Textual Transmission,” 108) מוגיך in 1QIsa^a may be an interpretative gloss of the *hapaxlegomenon* מוגיך.

³⁸ Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 108.

³⁹ This is the opinion of e.g. Jan de Waard, “Old Greek Translation Techniques and the Modern Translator,” *The Bible Translator* 41/3 (1990): 312. See also Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 2:403–407; van der Kooij, “The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts,” 199; de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 196–197. Barthélemy and de Waard suggest that the MT has been subject to an error or to a correction of theological nature.

⁴⁰ Arie van der Kooij, “The Text of Isaiah and its Early Witnesses in Hebrew,” in *Sôfer Mahîr. Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker. Offered by Editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (ed. Yohanan A. P. Goldman, Arie van der Kooij, and Richard D. Weis; VTSup 110; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 150–151.

has added a genitive attribute to פשע in order to ameliorate the parallelism with הטאָרביים in the preceding line. However, this is opposed by the fact mentioned that three Qumran documents likewise evidence a possessive pronoun to פשע. It is not so credible that the composers of all four documents have added such a pronoun independently from each other. A possible solution is given by van der Kooij, who holds that the original form was spelled defectively, as פשעם. This would elucidate both interpretations: “sinners” (פשעם) as well as “their sins” (פשעם).⁴¹ Something which argues against this, however, is the fact that פשעם is a singular noun, whereas the Qumran manuscripts and the LXX reflect a plural noun. Barthélemy and de Waard think it more likely that the Qumran texts are original. The MT reading could, in their eyes, be either due to an assimilation to פשעים in the preceding line or to a correction of a theological nature.⁴²

54:9	MT Isa	אשר נשבעתי מעבר מי־נח עוד על־הארץ כן נשבעתי מקצף עליך
	1QIsa ^a	אשר נשבעתי מעבור מי נוח עוד על הארצ כן נשבעתי מקצופ עליך עוד
	LXX Isa	καθότι ὠμοσα αὐτῶ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ ἐκείνῳ τῆ γῆ μὴ θυμωθῆσεσθαι ἐπὶ σοὶ ἔτι

עוד and ἔτι have perhaps been added in harmonisation to the first part of the comparison where the same adverb appears (even if this first part is absent in the LXX).

55:9	MT Isa	כי־גבהו שמים מארץ כן גבהו דרכי מדרכיכם
	1QIsa ^a	כיא בגובה שמים מארצ כן גבהו דרכי מדרכיכמה
	LXX Isa	ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπέχει ὁ οὐρανὸς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς οὕτως ἀπέχει ἡ ὁδὸς μου ἀπὸ τῶν ὁδῶν ὑμῶν

The LXX translator and Qumran scribe may both have read a כ prefixed to גובה/גבהו in their Hebrew manuscript. Alternatively, a particle of comparison was supplemented by both, as it is presupposed by the Hebrew text. For a similar case, see 62:5 below.

56:7	MT Isa	עולתיהם זבחייהם לרצון על־מזבחי
	1QIsa ^a	עולותיהם זבחייהמה יעלו לרצון על מזבחי
	LXX Isa	τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα αὐτῶν καὶ αἱ θυσίαι αὐτῶν ἔσονται δεκταὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου μου

Most likely, the copyist and translator both in their own way filled in the ellipsis of the MT.⁴³ For the addition of forms of “to be” in LXX Isaiah, cf. section 4.6.1a.

57:15	MT Isa	מרום וקדוש אשכון
	1QIsa ^a	במרום ובקדוש ישכון
	LXX Isa	κύριος ὑψιστος ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαύομενος

The surmise that the Isaiah translator read בקודש in his *Vorlage*—in conformity with 1QIsa^a and as against the Masoretic קדוש—is favoured by the fact that elsewhere in the Septuagint ἁγία regularly also renders קודש (cf. e.g. Exod 15:11; 29:30; 30:29). Although in this aspect

⁴¹ van der Kooij, “The Text of Isaiah and its Early Witnesses,” 152.

⁴² Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 2:403–407; de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 197.

⁴³ Ziegler, on the other contrary, thinks that the translator has read יעלו in his *Vorlage*, in accordance with 1QIsa^a (Ziegler, “Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta,” 43).

the ancestor text of LXX Isaiah may have agreed with 1QIsa^a, it has differed from the latter in that the translator seems not to have read the first word of the clause as במרום, as the Scroll offers, but as מרום, in accordance with the MT, since LXX Isaiah displays the adjective ὑψιστος here. Another option is that LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa^a in fact both had a text in front of them that was identical to the MT, but made changes to it to make it easier to understand. Cf. the comment at 29:9.

58:13 MT Isa אמ־תשיב משבת רגלך עשות חפצִיך ביום קדשי
 1QIsa^a אמ תשיב משבת רגלכה מעשות חפציכה ביום קודשי
 LXX Isa ἐὰν ἀποστρέψῃς τὸν πόδα σου ἀπὸ τῶν σαββάτων τοῦ μη ποιεῖν τὰ θελήματά σου ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἀγία

With מעשות = τοῦ μη ποιεῖν 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah may have preserved the original form of the text. Alternatively, the two versions have aligned the apparently defective form to מעשות and ממצוא in the ensuing sentence וכבדתו מעשות דרכיך ממצוא חפצך.

60:19 MT Isa לֹא־יִהְיֶה־לְךָ עוֹד הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ לְאוֹר יוֹמָם וּלְנֶגַה הַיָּרֵחַ לְאִי־אִיר לְךָ
 1QIsa^a לוא יהיה לך השמש לאור יוממ ולנ'גה הירח בלילה לוא יאיר לך
 LXX Isa καὶ οὐκ ἔσται σοι ὁ ἥλιος εἰς φῶς ἡμέρας, οὐδὲ ἀνατολὴ σελήνης φωτιεῖ σοι τῆν νύκτα

A word for “night” may already have been extant in the Hebrew manuscripts underlying LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa^a, or was added in each of these versions so as to enhance the parallelism.⁴⁴

62:5 MT Isa כִּי־יִבְעַל בַּחֹר בַּתּוֹלָה יִבְעֹלֹךְ בַּנֵּיךְ
 1QIsa^a כִּיא בבעול בַּחֹר בַּתּוֹלָה יִבְעֹלֹכִי בַנֵּיךְ
 LXX Isa καὶ ὥς συνουῶν νεανίσκος παρθένω, οὕτως κατοικήσουσιν οἱ υἱοί σου μετὰ σοῦ·

Compare 55:9 above. Possibly כ has disappeared from the MT on account of haplography.

62:9 MT Isa כִּי מֵאֲסַפְיֹו יֵאכְלֶהוּ
 1QIsa^a כִּיא אמ מֵאֲסַפּוּהִי יֵאכּוּלוּהִי
 LXX Isa ἀλλ' ἢ οἱ συνάγοντες φάγονται αὐτὰ

The LXX translator may have read כִּיא אמ with 1QIsa^a.

64:1(2) MT Isa מִים תִּבְעֶה־אֵשׁ לְהוֹדִיעַ שְׁמֶךָ לְצַרִּיךְ
 1QIsa^a מִים תִּבְעֶה אֵשׁ לְצַרִּיכָה לְהוֹדִיעַ שְׁמֶכָה לְצַרִּיכָה
 LXX Isa καὶ κατακαύσει πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους, καὶ φανερόν ἐσται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ἐν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις·

Talmon holds the theory that the version of 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah with twice the form לצריך has been caused by the conflation of two different readings: להודיע שמך לצריך and לצריך שמך להודיע.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Barthélemy and de Waard consider the MT as the original reading, because the frequency and naturalness of the combination of “sun” and “moon” makes the omission of the words “during the night” less likely than their addition. Moreover, the addition is redundant since נגה expresses already a nocturnal light of either moon or stars (Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 2:420–421; de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 205).

64:9(10) MT Isa	ציון מדבר היתה
1QIsa ^a	ציון במדבר הייתה
LXX Isa	Σιωπῶν ὡς ἔρημος ἐγενήθη

For the Isaiah translator's inclination to turn metaphors into similes by adding a particle of comparison, see section 6.2.2.

65:1 MT Isa	נדרשתי ללוא שאלו נמצאתי ללא בקשני
1QIsa ^a	נדרשתי ללא שאלוני נמציתי ללוא בקשוני
LXX Isa	Ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, εὐρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν·

1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah will have complemented שאלו with an object in parallelism to בקשוני.

65:3 MT Isa	זבחים בגנות
1QIsa ^a	המה זובחים בגנות
LXX Isa	αὐτοὶ θυσιάζουσιν ἐν τοῖς κήποις

Possibly LXX Isaiah read המה in his Hebrew manuscript in conformity with 1QIsa^a.

66:3 MT Isa	שוחט השור מכה־איש זובח השא ערף כלב
1QIsa ^a	שוחט ⁷ שור במכה איש זובח השא עורף כלב
LXX Isa	ὁ δὲ ἄνομος ὁ θύων μοι μόσχον ὡς ὁ ἀποκτένων κύνα

Compare 64:9(10) above.

66:21 MT Isa	וגם־מהם אקח לכהנים ללויים
1QIsa ^a	וגם מהמה אקח לכהנים ללויים
LXX Isa	καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν λήμψομαι ἐμοὶ ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευίτας

Perhaps the plus ἐμοί in LXX Isaiah stems from a Hebrew manuscript attesting (א)לי, just as 1QIsa^a does. But in both versions the prepositional phrase could equally be an addition in harmonisation to Num 8:14–16.⁴⁶

12.3.1.2 Minuses which LXX Isaiah shares with 1QIsa^a

The following elements are lacking in both LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa^a as opposed to the MT:⁴⁷

3:24 MT Isa	והיה תחת בשם מק יהיה
1QIsa ^a	(-) ויהיו תחת הבשם מק
LXX Isa	καὶ ἔσται ἀντὶ ὀσμῆς ἡδέϊας κονιορτός (-)

The Qumran scribe has substituted the consecutive perfect והיה with an imperfect + *waw* (conjunctive) ויהיו. He has regularly removed consecutive forms, which can be explained by the fact that in the period in which he lived these forms were not in common use anymore.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Talmon, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission," 115.

⁴⁶ See section 8.4.1.2b.

⁴⁷ For a discussion of minuses shared by LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa^a, see also Ziegler, "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta," 43–45, and Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 547–555.

⁴⁸ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 350–352, 354–355, 357–358.

Because in the verse under consideration he has also changed the function of the initial verb (from an introductory “and it will happen that” into the main verb of the clause—“and they will be”), יהיה at the end of the sentence became redundant and was omitted. Something comparable has happened in LXX Isaiah, where the translator in the place of והיה installed the main verb of the clause: καὶ ἔσται—“and there will be.”⁴⁹

5:27 MT Isa ואי־כושל בו
 1QIsa^a (-) כושל
 LXX Isa οὐδὲ κοπιήσουσιν (-)

The lack of representation of בו in the Greek Isaiah is probably just an element of the variant translation of ואי־כושל בו (“and none among them [?] will stumble”) by οὐδὲ κοπιήσουσιν (“they will not get tired”) rather than resulting from a *Vorlage* in which the preposition was lacking. In the Scroll בו may have been deleted because it is somewhat difficult to comprehend (“over him” does not make sense in the context), and because it has no parallel in the preceding line (אי־עי).

7:23 MT Isa והיה ביום ההוא יהיה כל־מקום אשר יהיה־שם אלף גפן באלף כסף לשמיר ולשית יהיה
 1QIsa^a והיה ביום ההוא (-) כול המקום אשר יהיה שמ אלף גפן באלף כסף לשמיר ולשית יהיה
 LXX Isa καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ (-) πᾶς τόπος, οὗ ἔαν ὥσι χίλια ἄμπελοι χιλίων σίκλων, εἰς χέρσον ἔσονται καὶ εἰς ἄκανθαν.

The composers of LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa^a most likely deleted יהיה because they considered it an ungrammatical repetition. Compare 3:24 above.

11:15 MT Isa ... והניף ידו על־הנהר בעים רוחו והכהו ...
 1QIsa^a ... והניף ידיו על הנהר בעיים רוח (-) והכהו ...
 LXX Isa καὶ ἐπιβαλεῖ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν πνεύματι (-) βιαίῳ καὶ πατάξει ...

In (the manuscript tradition of) 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah the suffix in רוחו possibly got lost on account of haplography. Or, conversely, in the MT the *waw* has been doubled due to dittography. But it is imaginable as well that the possessive pronoun was left out by the LXX translator and Qumran scribe on purpose, on the grounds that they preferred to interpret רוח as “wind” rather than as God’s “spirit,” and because “his wind” would produce a somewhat curious text in their eyes. In their interpretation of רוח as “wind” they may have been influenced by Exod 14:21 כִּלְהִלֵּלָהּ עֹזָה בְרוּחַ קְדִים יהוה ויולך יהוה את־ידו על־הים ויולך יהוה את־הים ויולך יהוה את־הים ויולך יהוה את־הים (LXX: ... ἐν ἀνέμῳ νότῳ βιαίῳ ...).

13:9 MT Isa וחטאיה ישמיד ממנה
 1QIsa^a וחטאים (-) ישמיד ממנה
 LXX Isa καὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς (-) ἀπολέσαι ἐξ αὐτῆς.

The lack of (representation of) a suffix in וחטאים and τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς may be the consequence of a ה/ם interchange in the Hebrew manuscript tradition, unless the scribe of the

⁴⁹ Cf. 7:23, and see section 3.3.2.

Scroll and the translator discarded the suffix intentionally, considering its reference to “the world” as pleonastic.⁵⁰ Compare Ps 104:35 **יתמו חטאים מן-הארץ**.

14:18	MT Isa	כל-מלכי גוים כלם שכבו בכבוד
	1QIsa ^a	כול מלכי גואים (-) שכבו בכבוד
	LXX Isa	πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἔθνῶν (-) ἐκοιμήθησαν ἐν τιμῇ

The absence of **כלם** in 1QIsa^a and of its equivalent in the Greek translation might indicate a divergence in the Hebrew *Vorlage*,⁵¹ but could also be caused by the application of condensation in both versions.

14:19	MT Isa	יורדי אל- אבני-בור
	1QIsa ^a	יורדו [אל] אבני בור
	LXX Isa	καταβαινόντων εἰς (-) ἄδου.

LXX Isaiah reflects the reading of 1QIsa^a before the correction. It may well be that **אבני** was lacking in the parent text of both.

21:14	MT Isa	בלחמן קדמו נדד
	1QIsa ^a	בלחם (-) קדמו נודד
	LXX Isa	ἄρτοις (-) συναντᾶτε τοῖς φεύγουσι

The MT form **בלחמן** might be corrupt, 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah bearing witness to the more original reading **בלחם**. Yet, the latter two may also have omitted the suffix deliberately, on account of its obscurity, and perhaps also in parallelism to **מים** in the preceding line **לקראת מים צמא התיו מים**.

21:16	MT Isa	וכלה בל-כבוד קדר
	1QIsa ^a	יכלה (-) כבוד קדר
	LXX Isa	ἐκλείψει (-) ἡ δόξα τῶν υἱῶν Κηδαρ

Here again we come across a case where a word for “all” is absent in both LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa^a (cf. 14:18 above). This word is regularly missing in each of the two versions (in 1QIsa^a, see 2:12; 11:9; 14:18; 21:16; 23:17; 56:6; and 66:20;⁵² as regards LXX Isaiah, see section 5.4).

23:8	MT Isa	אשר סחריה שרים כנעניה נכבדי-ארץ
	1QIsa ^a	אשר סחריה שרים כנעניה נכבדי (ה) ארץ
	LXX Isa	οἱ ἔμποροι αὐτῆς ἔνδοξοι, (-) ἄρχοντες τῆς γῆς.

Similar to 1QIsa^a 23:8 before the correction, and contrary to the MT, LXX Isaiah presents only one phrase in the sense of “her merchants”. It is doubtful, however, whether the minus in the Greek consists of **סחריה**, as in 1QIsa^a, or of **כנעניה**. The latter option is more probable, as in the equivalent place of **סחריה** the phrase **οἱ ἔμποροι αὐτῆς** appears. Both versions will have omitted either of the two synonyms for the sake of condensation.

⁵⁰ Cf. section 9.5.

⁵¹ It is conceivable that the MT version is the result of conflation between two readings: **כל-מלכי גוים שכבו בכבוד** (=1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah) and **כלם שכבו בכבוד**.

⁵² Cf. Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 554.

24:4	MT Isa	אמללו מרום עַם־הארץ
	1QIsa ^a	אמלל מרום עַם הארץ
	LXX Isa	ἐπένηθησαν οἱ ὑψηλοὶ (-) τῆς γῆς.

The agreement of the LXX with the reading of 1QIsa^a (before its correction) may be due to a common *Vorlage* of the two documents,⁵³ or to the omission of עַם in parallelism to the preceding lines (נבלה הארץ אמללה נבלה תבל). Barthélemy and de Waard suggest that the LXX translator and the copyist of 1QIsa^a deliberately omitted עַם in order to avoid the pejorative connotation “people not educated in the Torah” which the phrase עַם־הארץ could evoke in post-exilic times.⁵⁴

26:3–4	MT Isa	כי בך בטוח בטחו ביהוה
	1QIsa ^a	כי בכה (-) בטחו ביהוה
	LXX Isa	ὄτι ἐπὶ σοὶ (-) ἤλπισαν, κύριε

The LXX translator regarded בטחו as a finite form rather than as an imperative, while probably interpreting the preceding בטוח as a paranomastically used infinitive absolute instead of as a passive participle. This would elucidate the lack of representation of בטוח in the Greek, given that the translator frequently avoided rendering the infinitive absolute.⁵⁵ The absence of בטוח in 1QIsa^a can be explained in a similar way: since the infinitive absolute was no longer utilised in the time of the scribe, he has often refrained from using this construction, generally by substituting another verb form for it,⁵⁶ but in this case by simply leaving out the form which he probably thought of as an infinitive absolute.⁵⁷

26:6	MT Isa	תרמסנה רגל רגלי עני פעמי דלים
	1QIsa ^a	תרמסנה (-) רגלי עניים פעמי דלים
	LXX Isa	καὶ πατήσουσιν αὐτούς (-) πόδες πρᾶέων καὶ ταπεινῶν.

The missing of (an equivalent to) רגל may be accounted for by a deliberate abbreviation of the text on the part of the scribe and the translator, because it was too repetitious in their eyes. In LXX Isaiah פעמי also is omitted for that same reason. Talmon, however, thinks that רגל in the MT is a variant of רגלי, which was inserted into the text base.⁵⁸

26:8	MT Isa	אף ארח משפטיך יהוה קוינוך לשמך ולזכרך תאות־נפש
	1QIsa ^a	אפ אורח משפטיך יהוה קוינו (-) לשמך ולתורתך תאית נפש
	LXX Isa	ἡ γὰρ ὁδὸς κυρίου κρίσις· ἤλπισαμεν (-) ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ μείᾳ

⁵³ According to Talmon (“Aspects of the Textual Transmission,” 118) “(הארץ) עַם may be conceived of as a parallel of (הארץ) מרום which in Is-a was collated between the lines from a not anymore extant text-type. At a subsequent copying for which a MS of the Is-a type served as *Vorlage*, the superscribed variant was misconstrued as a corrected omission, and was reinstated in the text proper. This resulted in a doublet, as exhibited by the present MT.”

⁵⁴ Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 2:172–174; de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 104.

⁵⁵ See section 9.6.

⁵⁶ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 346–348.

⁵⁷ Another possible explanation is that either of the two verb forms is a variant reading which was circulating in the manuscript tradition, and was added to the original reading in the MT. This seems less possible to me, however, since both forms have their own object and are integrated into a separate clause.

⁵⁸ Talmon, “Aspects of the Textual Transmission,” 121.

1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah may both have sought to “improve” the Hebrew text by not representing the object suffix in קוֹה, as this suffix seems superfluous. The object of קוֹה is already incorporated in אַרְחַ מִשְׁפָּטִיךָ, or—as perceived by the composers of the two versions themselves (1QIsa^a displaying an extra spacing after מִשְׁפָּטִיךָ)—in לְשִׁמְךָ וּלְזִכְרֶךָ.⁵⁹

28:16	MT Isa	לְכֵן כִּה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה
	1QIsa ^a	לְכֵן כִּה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה
	LXX Isa	διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως λέγει κύριος (–)

The absence of אֲדֹנָי preceding יְהוִה can in 1QIsa^a additionally be observed in 3:15;⁶⁰ 28:22; 30:15; 49:22; 52:4; 61:1; and 65:13,⁶¹ each time—except in 28:22 and 61:1—in places where the Hebrew offers the messenger formulae יְהוִה אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה or נֹאֲמֵס־אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה. In all of these places the Greek translation likewise gives one divine name only.⁶² This agreement between LXX Isaiah and (the first hand of) 1QIsa^a does not signify, however, that the LXX translator had a Hebrew text in front of him in which אֲדֹנָי was also missing here, since LXX Isaiah in nearly all instances where the Hebrew presents the combinations יְהוִה אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה, אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה, or יְהוִה יְהוִה, translates this with only one divine name.⁶³ Hence, in the Greek Isaiah the shortening of the name of God seems to be an overall tendency. Besides, in most of its instances the absence of אֲדֹנָי in 1QIsa^a can be explained in the light of similar formulae in the near context where אֲדֹנָי is also missing (in the MT too), and to which the scribe may have wanted to assimilate the expression (see 30:15; 49:22; 52:4; and 65:13). Also as regards the verse under consideration—Isa 28:16—harmonisation may be at stake, namely to שְׁמַעוּ דְבַר־יְהוִה in v.14, where God is designated by a mere יְהוִה as well.

28:22	MT Isa	כִּי־כֹלָה וְנִחְרָצָה שְׁמַעְתִּי מֵאֵת אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה צְבָאוֹת עַל־כֹּל־הָאָרֶץ
	1QIsa ^a	כִּי כֹלָה וְנִחְרָצָה שְׁמַעְתִּי מֵאֵת (-) יְהוִה צְבָאוֹת עַל כֹּל הָאָרֶץ
	LXX Isa	διότι συντετελεσμένα καὶ συντετημημένα πράγματα ἤκουσα παρὰ (–) κυρίου σαβαωθ, ἃ ποιήσει ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν.

See the discussion above.

30:15	MT Isa	כִּי כֹה־אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל
	1QIsa ^a	כִּי כֹה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל
	LXX Isa	οὕτως λέγει (–) κύριος ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Ἰσραηλ

Cf. 28:16 above. אֲדֹנָי may have been left out in conformity with the messenger formulae in 30:1 and 12, where this title does not appear either.

37:14	MT Isa	וַיִּפְרָשׁוּ חֻזְקִיהוּ לִפְנֵי יְהוִה
	1QIsa ^a	וַיִּפְרוּשׁ חֻזְקִיָּה לִפְנֵי יְהוִה
	LXX Isa	καὶ ἤξουσεν αὐτὸ (–) ἐναντίον κυρίου

⁵⁹ Cf. section 10.2.

⁶⁰ 1QIsa^a gives in 3:15 יְהוִה צְבָאוֹת אֲדֹנָי נֹאֲמֵס with אֲדֹנָי suspended.

⁶¹ Also compare 38:11, cited below.

⁶² In the LXX of Isa 3:15–16 the two consecutive formulae יְהוִה וַיִּאֲמַר יְהוִה צְבָאוֹת אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה are represented by only one: Τάδε λέγει κύριος.

⁶³ In only three of the nearly thirty occurrences of יְהוִה אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה, אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה, or יְהוִה יְהוִה does the Greek translate these as ὁ δεσπότης κύριος; see section 5.2.3a.

The name of Hezekiah has perhaps been deleted in LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa^a (before the correction) in order to avoid repetitious language, as it also appears in a previous and subsequent sentence.

38:11	MT Isa	לֹא־אֵרָאָה יְהוָה בְּאֶרֶץ הַחַיִּים
	1QIsa ^a	לֹא אֵרָאָה יְהוָה (-) בְּאֶרֶץ חַיִּים
	LXX Isa	Οὐκέτι μὴ ἴδω τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ (-) ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

It might be assumed that haplography or dittography has occurred here. It is also possible that the scribe of 1QIsa^a as well as the Greek translator have erroneously read יהוה instead of יה יה. But they may also have left out יה intentionally, so as to remove the repetition; for a similar deletion of the figure of geminatio, compare 62:10 below.⁶⁴

40:7–8	MT Isa	יִבֶשׁ חֲצִיר נָבֵל צִיץ כִּי רוּחַ יְהוָה נִשְׁבָּה בּוֹ אֲכַן חֲצִיר הָעֵם יִבֶשׁ חֲצִיר נָבֵל צִיץ וְדַבְר־אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִקּוּם לְעוֹלָם
	1QIsa ^a	יִבֶשׁ חֲצִיר נָבֵל צִיץ (וְדַבְר) כִּי רוּחַ נִשְׁבָּה בּוֹ הֵן חֲצִיר הָעֵם יִבֶשׁ חֲצִיר נָבֵל צִיץ וְדַבְר אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִקּוּם לְעוֹלָם
	LXX Isa	ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος, καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσε, (-) τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

The words in superscript were added to the Qumran text by a later hand. The original scribe may have accidentally skipped them (except for אֱלֹהֵינוּ) due to *parablepsis*. A similar mistake appears to have been made in LXX Isaiah. For more comments, see 12.2.

42:3	MT Isa	קָנָה רְצוּץ לֹא יִשְׁבוּר וּפְשֵׁתָה כְּהָה לֹא יִכְבְּנָה
	1QIsa ^a	קָנָה רְצוּץ לֹא יִשְׁבוּר וּפְשֵׁתָה כְּהָה לֹא יִכְבְּנָה (-)
	LXX Isa	κάλαμον τεθλασμένον οὐ συντρίψει καὶ λίνον καπνιζόμενον οὐ σβέσει (-)

The seemingly redundant object pronoun in יִכְבְּנָה may have been left out in parallelism to יִשְׁבוּר in the preceding line.

44:20	MT Isa	וְלֹא יֵאמֵר הַלּוֹא שֶׁקַר בִּימִינִי
	1QIsa ^a	וְלֹא יֵאמֵר (-) שֶׁקַר בִּימִינִי
	LXX Isa	ἴδετε, οὐκ ἐρεῖτε ὅτι (-) Ψεῦδος ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ μου;

In the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah הַלּוֹא might have been absent, in accordance with 1QIsa^a.⁶⁵

46:6	MT Isa	יִשְׁכְּרוּ צוּרָף וַיַּעֲשֶׂהוּ אֵל
	1QIsa ^a	יִשְׁכְּרוּ צוּרָף וַיַּעֲשֶׂה (-) אֵל
	LXX Isa	καὶ μισθωσάμενοι χρυσοχόον ἐποίησαν (-) χειροποίητα

Although 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah concur in not representing the suffix in וַיַּעֲשֶׂהוּ, the grammatical number of the verb differs in both documents, being singular in the Scroll and plural in the translation. This makes one suspect that they both created their own variant out of the more original MT reading: whereas in 1QIsa^a וַיַּעֲשֶׂהוּ was altered into וַיַּעֲשֶׂה, in the LXX it

⁶⁴ Cf. also section 7.7.

⁶⁵ Ottley suggests that the translator has read הַלּוֹא as if it were יֵרָאוּ, which would be reflected in ἴδετε (Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*, 2:317).

was turned into ויעשו. LXX Isaiah has thus harmonised this clause to the surrounding ones, in which the subject is a third person plural as well.

48:15	MT Isa	אני אני דברתי אף־קראתי
	1QIsa ^a	אני אני דברתי אפ קראתי (-)
	LXX Isa	ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, ἐγὼ ἐκάλεσα (-)

The object of the verb “to call” may have been left out in 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah to make the clause “I have called (him)” more parallel to the preceding one “I have spoken.”

49:22	MT Isa	כה־אמר אדני יהוה
	1QIsa ^a	כה אמר (-) יהוה
	LXX Isa	Οὕτως λέγει (-) κύριος

Possibly the Qumran scribe did not represent אדני because he wished to align this formula to the ones in vv. 7,8, and 25, reading אמר יהוה (כי) / Οὕτως λέγει κύριος. Cf. 28:16.

52:4	MT Isa	כי כה אמר אדני יהוה
	1QIsa ^a	כיא כה אמר (-) יהוה
	LXX Isa	οὕτως λέγει (-) κύριος

אדני has perhaps been deleted in assimilation to אמר יהוה כי כה in v.3 and to נאם־יהוה in v.5, where אדני is absent too. Cf. the discussion at 28:16 above.

52:6	MT Isa	לכן ידע עמי שמי לכן ביום ההוא
	1QIsa ^a	לכן ידע עמיא שמי (-) ביום ההוא
	LXX Isa	διὰ τοῦτο γινώσεται ὁ λαός μου τὸ ὄνομά μου (-) ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ

The second לכן gives the impression of being a somewhat peculiar and unnecessary reiteration. This may have encouraged the 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah composers to omit the word.

55:1	MT Isa	ואשר אין־לו כסף לכו שברו ואכלו ולכו שברו בלוא־כסף ובלוא מחיר יין וחלב
	1QIsa ^a	ואשר אין לו כסף לכו שבורו (-) בלוא כסף ובלוא מחיר יין וחלב
	LXX Isa	καὶ ὅσοι μὴ ἔχετε ἀργύριον, βαδίσαντες ἀγοράσατε καὶ πίνετε(-) ἄνευ ἀργυρίου καὶ τιμῆς οἴνου καὶ στέαρ.

Whereas in 1QIsa^a the minus encompasses שברו ולכו שברו, in LXX Isaiah it concerns only the words שברו ואכלו (ולכו שברו being represented by πίνετε). In both documents the words may have been omitted so as to avoid repetition, although in the Scroll *homoeoteleuton* might also have taken place.

60:20	MT Isa	לא־יבוא עוד שמשך
	1QIsa ^a	לוא יבוא (-) שמשך
	LXX Isa	οὐ γὰρ δύσεται (-) ὁ ἥλιός σοι

The absence of עוד in 1QIsa^a and of its counterpart ἔτι in LXX Isaiah could point to a Hebrew *Vorlage* without this adverb, or may be an adjustment to balance this line to the succeeding parallel one וירחך לא יאסף.

61:1	MT Isa	רוח אדני יהוה עלי
------	--------	-------------------

1QIsa^a רוח (-) יהוה עלי
 LXX Isa Πνεῦμα (-) κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ

Cf. the discussion at 28:16 above.

62:10 MT Isa עברו עברו בשערים
 1QIsa^a עבורו (-) שערים
 LXX Isa πορεύεσθε (-) διὰ τῶν πυλῶν μου

For a similar case of the elimination of geminatio, see 38:11 above.

63:11 MT Isa איה המעלם מים את רעי צאנו
 1QIsa^a איה המעלה (-) מים את רועי צ'א(ו)נו
 LXX Isa ὁ ἀναβιβάσας (-) ἐκ τῆς γῆς τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων·

The object suffix in המעלם might have been considered redundant, the object of עלה already being expressed in רעי צאנו. Alternatively, a ה/ם interchange may have occurred in the Hebrew manuscript tradition.

65:13 MT Isa לכן כה־אמר אדני יהוה
 1QIsa^a לכן כוה אמר אדני יהוה
 LXX Isa Διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει (-) κύριος

See 28:16 above. The scribe and translator perhaps wanted to approximate the formula to יהוה(כה־)אמר יהוה in vv. 7,8, and 25.

12.3.1.3 Conclusion to 12.3.1

A survey of the cases discussed above leads us to conclude that most of the pluses and minuses which 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah have in common, rather than stemming from a corresponding *Vorlage* that differed from the MT, could equally well derive from certain techniques that both the scribe of the Scroll and the Isaiah translator have applied to their texts, and in particular the following:

- *Condensation/implication*: According to Kutscher, 1QIsa^a offers fourteen examples of the removal of one out of two identical expressions.⁶⁶ LXX Isaiah includes an abundance of such cases, as well as of the reduction of synonyms.⁶⁷ Also when expressions may have seemed superfluous because the information they give has already been provided by other elements in the text, they have often been omitted in both documents.⁶⁸ For shared instances of condensation or implication, see 1QIsa^a and LXX Isa 3:24; 7:23; 13:9; 14:18; 23:8; 26:6,8; 37:14; 38:11; 42:3; 52:6; 55:1; 62:10; and 63:11 above.
- *Contextual harmonisation or the "improvement" of parallelism*: In both 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah words have frequently been deleted or inserted in order to make a clause more parallel to a previous or subsequent one, or to harmonise expressions to related ones nearby. Kutscher gives circa forty examples of pluses in the Scroll resulting from this tendency. Of these circa twelve likewise occur in LXX Isaiah: see the pluses in 1:31; 38:18; 41:11; 43:23;

⁶⁶ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 554.

⁶⁷ See chapter 3 Condensation.

⁶⁸ For more examples of implication in LXX Isaiah, cf. chapter 5.

44:13; 49:7,9; 54:9; 58:13; 60:19; and 65:1. Minuses common to both texts and related to this pattern can be detected in 5:27; 21:14; 24:4; 42:3; 48:15; and 60:20. To these can be added several cases in which an equivalent to אֲדֹנָי is missing in the combination אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה appearing in messenger formulae, perhaps in harmonisation to similar formulae nearby where אֲדֹנָי is absent too: see 28:16; 30:15; 49:22; 52:4; and 65:13.

- *Explicitation or deletion of a difficult or elliptic Hebrew text*: Both the LXX translation and the Isaiah Scroll regularly seem to have “corrected” what they regarded as an unclear or ungrammatical Hebrew text, or have made an (elliptic) expression more explicit. The two versions are congruent in this as it concerns the pluses in Isa 9:13(14); 11:15; 12:2; 31:1; 37:38; 38:8,18; 39:6; 43:23; 44:28; 45:18; 48:8; 55:9; 56:7; 57:15; 58:13; and 62:5(?), and the minuses in 5:27; 7:23; 21:14; 26:8; and 52:6. Relatively many pluses entail the supply by the scribe and the translator of an—in their eyes—necessary, yet missing preposition in the Hebrew: see 9:13(14); 18:7; 29:9; 31:1; 37:38; 43:23; 45:18; 55:9; 57:15; and 62:5. In 26:3 the scribe as well as the translator did not represent a form which they presumably considered as an infinitive absolute, possibly because it may have sounded unnatural in the ears of speakers of later Hebrew or when literally translated into Greek.

The inclination of the Qumran scribe to simplify difficult texts has received an extensive treatment by Kutscher. Kutscher remarks that the scribe was apt to emend texts which he found complex, and to replace rare words by more common ones. In order to “correct” the text he also made additions.⁶⁹ Despite the fact that such a tendency for ameliorating obscurities in the Hebrew seems to characterise both documents, of course the possibility remains that some of the pluses and minuses shared by LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa^a which in this chapter are attributed to that trend, may in fact have been a corruption in the *Vorlage* of the MT that had never entered the ancestor texts of the Scroll and the translation.

- *A word in the sense of “all”* is often missing in both versions. In 1QIsa^a this happens seven times (see 2:12; 11:9; 14:9[?]; 21:16; 23:17; 56:6; and 66:20),⁷⁰ in LXX Isaiah around thirty times.⁷¹ Corresponding minuses in this realm can be found in 14:18 and 21:16. Both documents have a word in the sense of “all” *extra* in 41:11 and 49:9.⁷² The addition or omission of “all” is regularly related to the wish to ameliorate a parallelism.
- *In the divine title יהוה אֲדֹנָי* the first name—אֲדֹנָי—often has no counterpart in the Scroll and the Greek translation. In LXX Isaiah this happens in the overwhelming majority of the approximately thirty Masoretic occurrences of this combination. In 1QIsa^a it can be found about eight times (mostly in formulae introducing divine speech): see Isa 3:15; 28:16,22; 30:15; 49:22; 52:4; 61:1; and 65:13. In all of these cases an equivalent to אֲדֹנָי is missing in LXX Isaiah as well. The correspondence between the two documents in this regard does not necessarily imply that they had a common *Vorlage* displaying only one divine name in the places mentioned, for, as noted, the omission of אֲדֹנָי seems a more general tendency of the Isaiah translator.⁷³

⁶⁹ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 30–39, 546.

⁷⁰ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 554.

⁷¹ See section 5.4.

⁷² In 1QIsa^a כֹּל appears four times as a plus: besides in 41:11 and 49:9, also in 39:2 and 60:14. In LXX Isa πᾶς is a plus more than twenty times; see section 4.3.

⁷³ Ziegler, on the contrary, thinks that in these places LXX Isaiah had a *Vorlage* with only one divine name (Ziegler, “Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta,” 57–58).

- *Intertextuality*: In a few places, i.e. in Isa 11:15; 49:7; and 66:21, the Scroll and the Isaiah translation possibly reveal a similar influence of texts elsewhere in Scripture, either from within Isaiah, or from beyond. In 1QIsa^a Kutscher distinguishes approximately twenty cases of the former and ten of the latter phenomenon.⁷⁴ The abundant instances of anaphoric translation in LXX Isaiah have been listed in chapter 8.
- A shared plus betraying an *exegetical change* might be present in 1QIsa^a and LXX Isa 18:7.

A comparable reading mistake, such as *parablepsis* or haplography, may account for the minuses in 1QIsa^a and LXX Isa 11:15; 18:7(?); 38:11; 40:7–8; and 55:1.

That 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah had a similar Hebrew text in front of them that deviated from the MT may be the most likely situation with regard to the pluses in 7:4; 13:22(?); 18:7; 37:9; 42:14; 48:17; 51:23; 53:11,12; 57:15; 62:5(?),9; 64:1(2); 65:3; and 66:21, and the minuses in 13:9(?); 14:19; and 44:20.⁷⁵

All in all, this short study confirms the hypothesis of van der Kooij, that the affinities between the Isaiah Scroll and the Greek translation are often the result of a similar kind of free approach towards their Hebrew texts by the composers of these two documents.⁷⁶ Several techniques, such as condensation, explicitation, contextual harmonisation, and intertextuality were applied to their text by both of them, though by the LXX translator mostly to a greater degree.

12.3.2 Pluses and minuses which LXX Isaiah shares with Isaianic Qumran manuscripts other than 1QIsa^a

In addition to the Great Isaiah Scroll, some other manuscripts which also witness the text of Isaiah were discovered in Qumran. These are, however, all fragmentary, containing only parts of the Isaianic text. The majority of them were found in Cave 4, and are accordingly numbered as 4QIsa^{a-o}.⁷⁷ Their text seems to be closer to the MT than to 1QIsa^a. In addition, a more extensive fragment, encompassing a fifth of the book, was detected in Cave 1. This manuscript, named 1QIsa^b, displays a conservative attitude towards its supposed *Vorlage*, and is for that reason believed to reflect an archaic or “pre-Masoretic” version of the Isaianic text.⁷⁸ This could be of importance for the comparison with the Greek Isaiah, as it would enhance the possibility that pluses or minuses which this manuscript has in common with the LXX translation evidence a more original Hebrew text. Yet, with the exception of several cases involving the conjunction ׀ (which are not dealt with in this study), only a handful of pluses and minuses can be found in 1QIsa^b that agree with those attested in the Greek Isaiah. In the

⁷⁴ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 545.

⁷⁵ According to Ziegler, 1QIsa^a and LXX Isaiah have preserved the original reading where it concerns the shared pluses in 49:9; 51:23; 53:11; and 60:19, and the minus in 40:7–8 (he has not involved in his discussion all of the instances that are treated in the present chapter, however). Also in the places where the MT offers אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה, whereas in the two other versions (a representation of) אֲדֹנָי is absent, he thinks that the latter two attest to the more original form of the text (Ziegler, “Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta,” 43, 45, 58).

⁷⁶ van der Kooij, “The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts,” 208. See also van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 112–113.

⁷⁷ One tiny fragment is found in Cave 5 and is named 5QIsa (cf. van der Kooij, “The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts,” 195).

⁷⁸ See van der Kooij, “The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts,” 197; idem, “The Text of Isaiah and its Early Witnesses,” 152.

Isaianic Qumran manuscripts from Cave 4 we also encounter only few quantitative differences from the MT concurring with the LXX. These various cases are listed below.⁷⁹

12.3.2.1 Pluses which LXX Isaiah shares with Isaianic Qumran manuscripts other than 1QIsa^a

49:5	MT Isa	ועתה אמר יהוה
	1QIsa ^b	ועתה כה אמר יהוה
	LXX Isa	καὶ νῦν οὕτως λέγει κύριος

1QIsa^b and LXX Isaiah may both have applied contextual harmonisation: compare **כה אמר יהוה** (אדני) in vv.7, 8, and 22.

53:11	MT Isa	מעמל נפשו יראה
	1QIsa ^b	מעמל נפשו יראה אור
	4QIsa ^d	מעמל נפשו יראה אור]
	LXX Isa	δειξαὶ αὐτῷ φῶς

אור is also attested in 1QIsa^a; see section 12.3.1.1 above.

53:12	MT Isa	ולפשעים יפגיע
	1QIsa ^b	ולפשעיהם יפגיע
	4QIsa ^d	ולפשעיה]ם יפגיע
	LXX Isa	καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη.

1QIsa^a reads **ולפשעיהמה**; see 12.3.1.1 above.

12.3.2.2 Minuses which LXX Isaiah shares with Isaianic Qumran manuscripts other than 1QIsa^a

3:14	MT Isa	יהוה במשפט יבוא עם־זקני עמו
	4QIsa ^b	(-) יבא עם זקני עם
	LXX Isa	αὐτὸς κύριος εἰς κρίσιον ἤξει μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ (-)
8:11	MT Isa	כי כה אמר יהוה אלי
	4QIsa ^f	(-) כה אמר יהוה
	LXX Isa	(-) Οὕτως λέγει κύριος

In MT Isaiah the formula **כה אמר יהוה** appears almost fifty times, including only fourteen cases in which the expression starts with **כי**. In eight of those fourteen instances the LXX does not represent the conjunction (8:11; 30:15; 36:16; 45:18; 49:25; 52:4; 56:4; and 57:15). Perhaps in those places the translator sought to adjust the formula to its most common appearance or to harmonise it to a similar formula close by that did not open with **כי**.⁸⁰ A comparable motivation may have prompted the omission of **כי** in 4QIsa^f, although it is also possible that the particle was absent in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of 4QIsa^f and LXX Isaiah.

49:12	MT Isa	הנה־אלה מרחוק יבאו והנה־אלה מצפון
-------	--------	-----------------------------------

⁷⁹ Text from 1QIsa^b and the Isaiah scrolls found in Cave 4 has been quoted from Eugene Ulrich, ed., *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls. Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VTSup134; Leiden: Brill, 2010).

⁸⁰ See section 6.3.1.

4QIsa^d אֱלֹהֵינוּ (–) מִצַּפּוֹן
 LXX Isa ἰδοὺ οὗτοι πόρρωθεν ἔρχονται, (–) οὗτοι ἀπὸ βορρᾶ

The second הנה may have been elided for the purpose of condensation.

12.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I have proposed two criteria that may help to establish whether pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah are caused by a Hebrew *Vorlage* deviating from the MT. The first is, that a plus or minus cannot simply be explained by one of the translation tendencies that LXX Isaiah displays, and the second that the plus or minus is also attested in one of the Isaianic Qumran manuscripts. Considering the cases which meet with the first criterion, three aspects stand out. In the first place, I could find only a small number of these. Secondly, all of the instances listed consist of *minuses*, and thirdly, compared to other minuses in LXX Isaiah many of them are relatively *large*: more than fifty per cent consist of an entire clause (or an even larger unit), whereas the overwhelming majority of minuses in the Isaiah translation are formed of only one or two words. Perhaps this affirms the supposition that the translator was not apt to leave out extensive parts of the Hebrew text *on purpose*, as this would clash with his reverential approach towards Scripture.⁸¹

As regards the comparison of the LXX translation with the Isaiah manuscripts from Qumran, the main role is played by the Great Isaiah Scroll. It has been shown that the pluses and minuses which LXX Isaiah shares with this document, should not too easily be assigned to a similar *Vorlage* at variance with the MT, as most of them can likewise be attributed to certain *practices* that the Qumran scribe and LXX translator seem to have had in common. These include, for instance, an inclination towards condensation, contextual harmonisation, “improvement” of parallelism, the solution of difficult Hebrew texts, and the addition or omission of words in the sense of “all.” Nevertheless, in a limited number of cases there is sufficient reason to suspect that a different underlying Hebrew manuscript is the cause of a plus or minus exhibited by both LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa^a.

⁸¹ Cf. Aejmelaeus, “What Can We Know,” 68: “Now, knowing that the translators considered the text they translated to be authoritative Scripture and, on the other hand, that most of them, after all, were fairly literal, it would seem to be a good rule of thumb to start with the assumption that larger divergences from the MT mainly come from the *Vorlage*, and only exceptionally and with imperative reasons to attribute them to the translator.” Whereas Aejmelaeus takes as a *starting-point* that larger minuses are mostly caused by a different *Vorlage*, in my study I found out that many large minuses in LXX Isaiah may indeed have a different *Vorlage* as their background, although another part of them may be caused by condensation or parablepsis.