Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint


This volume in two parts completes the DJD series, which now contains forty volumes. It therefore is appropriate that Part 1 is dedicated to Emanuel Tov “for his wise and gracious leadership of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series.” Although previous editions of both Isaiah scrolls from Cave 1 appeared, first of all in the 1950s, the present one offers the first critical edition of the two scrolls, including “the clearest photographs available of the first two biblical manuscripts discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947” (1.1). It reminds one of the saying, “the first will be the last,” although in this case being the last has the advantage of containing new features, such as the presentation of the plates and their transcriptions on facing pages. Moreover, the new volume is most important as it provides scholarship “a fresh transcription of their texts, introductions describing salient features, notes on paleographically difficult readings and problems in the manuscripts, and a comprehensive list of the textual variants with other known Hebrew texts” (1; unless otherwise stated, page numbers refer to Part 2).

Part 1 presents the transcriptions and plates of the two scrolls, the former of which has also been published in Eugene Ulrich, The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants (VTSup 134; Brill: Leiden, 2010). For a discussion of the transcriptions and a detailed comparison with those of the volume edited by Donald W. Parry and Elisha Qimron (The Great Isaiah Scroll [1QIsa\textsuperscript{2}]: A New Edition [STDJ 32; Brill: Leiden, 1999]), I would like to refer to the extensive review by Eibert Tigchelaar in RBL 12/2011. Just to add a note myself: the edition of Ulrich and Flint read משוש in Isa 8:6 (1QIsa\textsuperscript{2} 7:26), whereas Parry and Qimron have משיש (cf. Tigchelaar). As is well-known, it is often not that
easy to interpret a letter as \textit{waw} or \textit{yod}, but in this case I prefer the reading with \textit{yod} (ptc. Hiphil).

Part 2 consists of three sections: “Introduction” (1–55), “The Great Isaiah Scroll: 1QIsaa” (57–193), and “The Hebrew University Isaiah Scroll: 1QIsab” (195–253), followed by two indices: one of biblical passages (255–57), and one of the contents of the Isaiah manuscripts (including the Cave 4 fragments) (259–60). Besides information about the discovery of the two scrolls, and about the photographs, the introduction includes a very useful contribution by Martin Abegg on “the linguistic profile” of the Isaiah scrolls from Cave 1 (25–41). The focus is on important linguistic characteristics of 1QIsaa whereas the other scroll, 1QIsab, is used for the sake of comparison. In line with the important work of E.Y. Kutscher (\textit{The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll} [1QIsaa] [STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974; first published in Hebrew in 1959]), it is clear that 1QIsaa represents a manuscript exhibiting in many respects a linguistic profile which, in comparison to 1QIsab and other manuscripts of Qumran, is rather unique. Instead of labelling the language “Qumranic” the editors are of the opinion, in line with Kutscher, that it reflects “the Hebrew and Aramaic currently spoken in Palestine” at the time (88). It is to be noted, however, that Kutscher is a bit more nuanced because he considers the language of the Great Isaiah Scroll to represent an “Aramaic-Hebrew dialect of the end of the Second Temple Period” (\textit{Language}, 95; italics mine), which is to be distinguished from the standard Hebrew of the time.

Regarding the features presented by Abegg two questions may be raised. First, in the paragraph on the \textit{yod} as \textit{mater lectionis} it is stated that the \textit{yod} also “occurs occasionally with the singular of lamed-yod roots in 1QIsaa” (26). So, for example, \textit{ועשיה} in Isa 45:18 (1QIsaa 38:26; MT \textit{ועשה}). It is arguable however that this form as well as other references to God, such as \textit{יצריו} in Isa 45:9 (1QIsaa 38:15; MT \textit{יצרו}), are to be regarded as plural with a meaning in the singular. Second, a similar question concerns the spelling of \textit{yod-waw} which in some cases should be taken as the suffix “his” in the singular (34). The well-known phrase “his outstretched hand” (ידי נטויה) is said to be a “compelling” example because of the form \textit{נטויה}. I am not sure whether the \textit{yod-waw} spelling in this and other cases should be read as sg. suffix. There are similar cases in MT (e.g., Deut 21:7; 1 Sam 4:15; Isa 59:12) where a fem. sg. is used in the collective sense (see \textit{GCK} §145k). Furthermore, a reading like \textit{גואליו} in Isa 44:6 (1QIsaa 37:12), which is considered another compelling example of a sg. suffix spelled as \textit{יו}, may also represent a plural form (with a meaning in the sg.), just like \textit{בעלו} in Isa 1:3 (MT; 1QIsaa 1:4). It strikes one that the scroll contains a large number of readings in the plural relating to God (see my \textit{Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches. Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments} [OBO 35;