

# **The Great Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (1QIsaa): Orthographic and Scribal Features, Analysis, and Translation — Column 1**

Željko Stanojević

Independent Researcher in Hebrew Linguistics and Biblical Philology

ORCID: 0009-0009-0717-6184

## **Abstract**

This paper presents fundamental data on the Great Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (1QIsaa), the largest and most prominent manuscript among the Dead Sea Scrolls, together with a detailed philological analysis and English translation of its first column. The study examines orthographic, scribal, and editorial features of the Qumran text (K.) in comparison with the Masoretic Text (M.), with particular attention to scribal practices such as the use of *matres lectionis*, interlinear corrections, spacing (*spatia*), lacunae, omissions, and repetitions, as well as to the possible influence of Aramaic orthography.

The analysis demonstrates that the differences between the two textual traditions are predominantly orthographic and scribal in nature and do not reflect a substantially different textual base. On the contrary, they confirm a high degree of textual stability in the transmission of the Book of Isaiah.

This article constitutes the first part of a broader series devoted to the systematic philological analysis and translation of all columns of the Great Isaiah Scroll.

## **Keywords**

Great Isaiah Scroll; 1QIsaa; Dead Sea Scrolls; Qumran; Biblical Hebrew; Hebrew linguistics; textual criticism; Masoretic Text; Qumran Hebrew; scribal practices; orthography; *matres lectionis*; Second Temple Hebrew; Isaiah Scroll; Isaiah 1; philology; manuscript studies; textual transmission; Hebrew manuscript tradition; Bible translation

## **Abbreviations**

M. = Masoretic Text

K. = Qumran Text

perf. = perfect

imperf. = imperfect

pers. = person

sg. = singular

pl. = plural

m. = masculine  
f. = feminine

## **Position of this Study within Current Scholarship**

The study of the Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaa) has a long and well-established history within the broader field of Dead Sea Scrolls research, with significant contributions from leading scholars such as Millar Burrows, Emanuel Tov, Eugene Ulrich, Peter W. Flint, Frank Moore Cross, Elisha Qimron, Donald W. Parry, as well as more recent scholars including Mladen Popović, Armin Lange, Sidnie White Crawford, George J. Brooke, Eibert Tigchelaar, John J. Collins, Hugh G. M. Williamson, and Andrew Perrin.<sup>1</sup>

The foundational work of Millar Burrows provided one of the earliest scholarly editions and general observations on the Isaiah Scroll shortly after its discovery, establishing the basis for subsequent research.<sup>2</sup> Emanuel Tov and Eugene Ulrich significantly advanced the field through the development of modern textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, offering methodological frameworks for evaluating textual variants and transmission history.<sup>3</sup> Frank Moore Cross contributed essential paleographic analysis, while Elisha Qimron and Donald W. Parry produced critical editions and transcriptions that made the text more accessible for detailed study.<sup>4</sup> Scholars such as Peter W. Flint and Hugh G. M. Williamson have focused extensively on the book of Isaiah within the Qumran corpus, while more recent research by Mladen Popović and others has introduced new methodological approaches, including digital and computational analysis of scribal practices.<sup>5</sup>

Despite these substantial contributions, the existing scholarship has largely remained either thematic, methodological, or focused on selected textual features, rather than providing a fully systematic, sequential, and exhaustive analysis of the entire manuscript.

The present study seeks to address this gap by introducing a comprehensive, column-by-column analysis of the Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaa), combining orthographic examination, scribal feature analysis, and direct translation within a unified and continuous framework. Unlike previous approaches, which tend to isolate specific phenomena or passages, this research adopts a linear, integrative methodology, examining the manuscript in its entirety as a coherent textual and scribal unit.

The primary objective of this project is to achieve a detailed, micro-level analysis of the text—effectively a “letter-by-letter” (grapheme-level) examination—while simultaneously situating these observations within broader linguistic, philological, and textual-critical contexts. In doing so, the study aims not only to document variation but also to identify underlying patterns in scribal behavior, orthographic consistency, and textual transmission.

Accordingly, the contribution of the present work lies in its methodological synthesis and scope: it does not replace earlier scholarship but builds upon it by extending analysis into a systematic, serial format covering the entire scroll. This approach aspires to provide a new level of analytical resolution and continuity, thereby offering a complementary perspective to existing studies and

contributing to a more complete understanding of the Great Isaiah Scroll within the field of Dead Sea Scrolls research.

---

## Footnotes

1. For general overviews of the field, see Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012); Eugene Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2010); John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).
2. Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery* (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951).
3. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*; Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).
4. Donald W. Parry and Elisha Qimron, *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaa): A New Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1999).
5. Mladen Popović et al., "Patterns of Scribal Variation in the Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaa)," *PLOS ONE* 16, no. 4 (2021);
6. Armin Lange, *Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
7. Frank Moore Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995).
8. Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999).
9. Sidnie White Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019).
10. George J. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005).
11. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "Assessing the Textual Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
12. Hugh G. M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
13. Andrew B. Perrin, *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015).

## 1. The Isaiah Scroll from Qumran

The Isaiah Scroll is the largest and most well-known scroll discovered in Qumran. It has always served for demonstrating the authenticity of the Bible, above all the Old Testament. In the book by Željko Stanojević, *Kumranski spisi – dokaz autentičnosti Biblije* (Metaphysica, 2009), a part of the Isaiah Scroll was used as evidence that what we have in the present-day Holy Scriptures is

identical or almost identical to the text found in the Isaiah Scroll discovered in Qumran, which is dated to 100 BCE (this is the year in which it was copied, or, in modern terms, “printed,” although it was written much earlier).

The pages of the scroll treated in this book are photocopies. Some are scanned in black and white, while others are in grayscale. When it was first photographed, the original scroll was somewhat orange, with certain darkened areas. Therefore, here you will be able to read the scroll, but it is a facsimile of a photocopy and does not display the real colors of the scroll.

As already stated, this book presents an overview of the pages of the magnificent Isaiah Scroll of the Qumran community, which dates from 100 BCE. The dating is supported by internal evidence within the scroll, which will be addressed where relevant. In the following text, the magnificent Isaiah Scroll will be referred to as **K.**, and the derived Greek text as the Masoretic Text, or **M.**

My comments on the scroll on each page are intended to help you become familiar with the scroll and with the technical differences between it and the derived Greek text. They do not represent commentary on the Book of Isaiah.

If you know how to read Hebrew, this will be of great help in studying the scroll, but knowledge of Hebrew is not necessary in order to perceive its characteristics and its significance. Although there are certain differences between the scroll and the Masoretic Text, they are usually based on writing, such as cases where a vowel, article, or conjunction has been added, or where a change in gender or number has occurred.

In some places, words or entire verses are omitted. Added words in **K.** can also be observed, for the sake of clarification or easier reading. In addition to editorial marks, empty spaces in paragraphs or verses—called **spatia**—can also be observed.

The critical comments are intended for students at beginner and intermediate levels. Advanced students will also find things of interest on these pages.

Have we thereby said everything that should be said about this text and identified all differences between it and the Masoretic Text? Certainly not, although we have attempted to note them all in one way or another. If you are interested in what the Isaiah Scroll is really like, and if you wish to know more about it, as well as about the technical means of embellishing the scroll and the differences between it and the derived Greek text, this is the right place to begin your study.

---

## 2. General Observations

Two frequent differences will not be mentioned in this overview.

The addition of **wāw** and **yôd** to certain words, in order to emphasize vowels, is very frequent and corresponds to the emphasis of these vowels as introduced later by Masoretic scholars.

The addition of **’ālep** in a similar manner is less frequent and will be specifically noted.

Another difference is the interchange between **wāw** and **yôd**. This is a common practice. When one expects **yôd**, **wāw** may appear, and vice versa. This will not be emphasized, but due to its frequency, it is important for general reading.

When we list all differences, take them into account, and understand the reasons for their existence (omissions, writing errors, simple human copying mistakes, dialectal differences, Aramaic environment, etc.), it becomes easier to say with certainty that the text of **K.** is practically identical to the derived Greek text of the Book of Isaiah that we read today in the Bible.

---

### 3. Introduction – Let Us Try Ourselves

In the book by Željko Stanojević, *Kumranski spisi – dokaz verodostojnosti Biblije* (Metaphysica, 2009), one can easily find and learn the 22 letters of the Hebrew alphabet, both in their modern form (p. 37) and in the form used in the Qumran manuscripts (p. 35).

Certainly, the text in the image that follows will appear strange and may remind you of hieroglyphs, but in reality it is very simple—only 22 letters. When you place the tables from the mentioned book in front of you and begin to read the photograph below, you will easily practice identifying deviations in the Qumran (K.) text from the Masoretic (M.) text.

סוף השנה...  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

As a starting point, let us find the name “Immanuel,” written as a single word (unlike in the derived Greek text), in the position of the last word in lines 1 and 3.

Let us also pay attention to the horizontal stroke on the right side in lines 1 and 3, which separates the lines as an important paragraph. There is also indentation, which represents a paragraph marker and indicates that the previous line has been filled with text.

More often, however, the empty space at the end of the third line, where no text is present, marks the end of a paragraph.

We also observe that the editor has written **hē** above the fourth word in line 2, thus transforming:

**wə-’azîṇû → wə-ha’āzîṇû**

Next, in the penultimate word in line 3, we observe that an **’ālep̄** has been added to the conjunction *kî* (“because” or “that”).

Qumran scribes often added **’ālep̄** to prepositional forms and conjunctions ending in **yôd**. However, we see that in the first word of the fourth line, **’ālep̄** is not added.

Next, we observe the spacing (*spatium*) in the middle of the last line, which represents a verse marker. In most cases, a *spatium* would indicate the presence of versification, but this is not the case here.

The Masoretic Text begins with verse thirteen, with three words ending in -’et. Two words at the end of the second line are omitted, and there are at least two additional differences concerning the addition or omission of the article.

---

## 4. The First Column of the Scroll

What you see is a photocopy of a photograph from the Albright Institute of the Great Isaiah Scroll, specifically its first page, that is, the first column.

The scroll photographed by the Albright Institute contains the entire Book of Isaiah, from the first to the last letter, beginning with the first word visible in the upper right corner when read in Hebrew:

**ḥāzôn yəša’ yāhû ben ’āmôš ’āšer ḥāzâ ’al yəhûdâ wîrûšālayim bîmê ’uzzîyāhû**

This is the same as in the Masoretic Text, as is the rest of the manuscript, with rare and negligible exceptions.

This literally means:

“Vision of Isaiah, son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah...”

Several important differences between the Qumran and Masoretic texts arose due to scribal errors in most cases, and not because they were copied from a different text.

Many other differences arose from the custom of Qumran scribes to apply a system of adding semi-vowels in order to emphasize vowels in certain words. This applies to most differences between **K.** and **M.**, since such vowel indicators do not exist in the Masoretic Text.

In order to emphasize vowels and open syllables, and thus assist pronunciation and meaning, Qumran scribes often added **wāw**, **yôd**, or **hē**, and more rarely **’āleḫ**.

---

## 5. Preservation

According to a letter received from the deputy curator of the Israel Museum at the University of Jerusalem (the Shrine of the Book), the scroll will never again be in the condition it was in when it was first photographed by members of the Albright Institute. The reason for this is the oxidation of the leather on which it was written, despite excellent care and climate control. As a result, it is now very dark and difficult to read.

Therefore, the facsimile of this copy is better for reading than the original itself.

---

## 6. Scribal Features

This first page shows several characteristics that occur frequently throughout the scroll.

Some letters omitted by the original scribes are written above the words. For example, the letter **’ayin** omitted from the name Isaiah is later inserted.

It cannot be determined whether this was done by the original scribe or by a later editor, though the latter is more likely. There is evidence of multiple editors with different handwriting styles.

The same applies to the addition of **yôd** at the end of *Jerusalem* and **wāw** in *bîmê*.

One may also notice that the original scribe omitted the initial **yôd** in the name Hezekiah. Additionally, what appears to be a correction of **lāmed** in the word “kings” represents a scribal peculiarity—the writing of a very large **lāmed** in **malḳê**.

---



## 7. Detailed Points

- (1) Some additions may represent corrections, others vowel indicators (**wāw**, **yôd**).
- (2) Entire omitted words may be added above the line.
- (3) 'Āleḫ is frequently added and may reflect Aramaic influence.
- (4) Gaps (**lacunae**) can be reconstructed from the Masoretic Text.
- (5) Rare additions of one or two words do not change meaning.
- (6) Entire verses may be omitted, marked by editors.
- (7) Scribal repetition occurs.
- (8) A second scroll (**Kb**) was likely copied from this one.
- (9) None of these differences indicate a different textual tradition.

## 8. Photograph and Copy of the First Column of the Book of Isaiah Found at Qumran



## 9. Physical Characteristics of the Qumran Text

The column contains 29 lines of relatively well-preserved text. In the lower left corner, there is a larger area of damage affecting the ends of lines 23–29. As a result, the final words of the text in these lines are lost, except in line 23, which is shorter.

In lines 1, 2, 4, 21, and 22, stains are visible, which also hinder the identification of certain letters or entire words.

It is also possible to observe several smaller abraded areas and similar types of damage, which likewise interfere with the reading of the text, primarily at the level of individual letters (at the beginning of line 21, and at the ends of lines 9 and 12).

---

## 10. Major Characteristics of the Qumran Text and Differences between the Qumran and Masoretic Texts

### Line 2:

Last word:

K. = the article **xe** is present, which is also found in M.

---

### Line 3:

Sixth word:

K. = the word is partially erased, but it contains a **mem**, as in M. (*weromamtiy*), and therefore it most likely does not represent a difference.

Seventh word:

K. = *hemah* (“they”),

M. = *hem*.

Ninth word:

K. = *biy* (“in me”), which in this instance fully corresponds to M., although this word in K. will often take an **alef** as a suffix.

---

### Line 4:

Ninth word:

K. = *hitbonen*, which remains unclear due to the presence of a stain.

---

**Line 6:**

Seventh word:

K. = the letter **dalet** is unclear in the word *od* (“still, yet”).

---

**Line 7:**

Third word:

K. = *dawah*,

M. = *daway* (“feeble, weak, sick, painful...”).

The difference is orthographic and does not affect meaning.

Ninth word:

K. = *biy* (“in me”),

M. = *bo* (“in him”).

Here, however, the meaning changes, and according to the context, this is most likely an error in K.

---

**Line 9:**

Seventh word:

M. = *šemamah* (“desolation, emptiness, wasteland”),

K. = *šemamo*, *šamemu* (“he devastated it,” “they devastated it”).

Here a change in meaning occurs; according to the sense of the sentence, this is most likely an error in K.

Eighth word:

K. = *aleyah* (“upon her,” “on it,” “over it”).

This word is most likely inserted, as it does not appear in M. The insertion is logical in relation to the verb used in K. Based on this insertion, it may be concluded that the preceding verb was likely used in the third person plural (“they devastated, they laid waste”).

Penultimate word:

K. = omission of **he** in the word *ke-mapekat* (“like an overthrow,” “like a destruction”), whereas M. correctly preserves the form *ke-mahpekat*.

Since the sound **he** does not significantly affect pronunciation, the error in K. is understandable; nevertheless, the missing letter was later added above the word.

Last word:

The letter **resh** is missing in the word *zariyim* (“foreigners”) due to physical damage.

---

#### Line 10:

Eighth word:

K. = *necura* (“besieged, occupied”).

Isaiah uses this term only in this instance in order to convey the meaning “besieged, occupied,” possibly with the intention of foreshadowing (prophesying) Nazareth, the Messiah, and related themes.

---

#### Line 12:

First two words:

These are damaged and difficult to read. According to M., they correspond to *šim ‘u devar* (“hear the word,” “hear the speech”).

Sixth word:

K. = *we aziynu* (“and listen”); however, the verb cannot be classified within a standard grammatical category and is therefore most likely erroneous.

M. = *ha aziynu* (“listen”), an imperative form in the Hifil stem, plural.

Last two words:

According to M., these should read *lamah liu* (“why,” “why to me,” “what is it to me”); however, only the letters **mem** and **he** are visible in the word *lama*.

---

#### Line 14:

Last word:

K. = *zot* (“this,” feminine; often rendered as “this/that” in Serbian, since Hebrew lacks a neuter gender).

In K., the pronoun is incorrectly written without the letter **alef**, which was later added above the word.

The absence of **alef** does not affect pronunciation; therefore, the error is orthographic and understandable.

---

**Line 15:**

Second and fifth words:

K. = in both instances, the preposition **lamed** is added, which is absent in M.

---

**Line 16:**

Seventh word:

K. = *wa acaratah* (“and her assembly,” with a third person feminine singular suffix),

M. = *waacarah* (“assembly,” without the suffix).

According to the sense, the difference does not necessarily indicate an error in either K. or M.

---

**Lines 18–19:**

Last word of line 18 and first word of line 19:

K. adds two additional words at the end of verse 15:

- *ecba oteykem* (Aramaic form: “your fingers,” written as one word)
- *be'awon* (“in iniquity”)

Both words exist in the Masoretic Text, which raises a textual issue given that the scroll dates to approximately 100 BCE. The issue may lie in the Vorlage used by the scribe.

---

**Line 19:**

Third and fourth words:

K. adds the conjunction **vav** to both words, which is absent in M.

This difference is stylistic in nature and should not be considered a true error.

---

**Line 20:**

Seventh word:

K. employs a different orthographic form compared to M. in the word *ya'tom* (“orphan”).

---

**Line 21:**

Third word from the end of the line:

K. = *kešeniy* (“like scarlet,” masculine singular),

M. = *kešeniyim* (“like scarlets,” masculine plural).

---

**Line 22:**

Second word:

K. = employs a different orthography by adding the letter **alef**.

---

**Line 23:**

Fourth word:

K. adds the preposition **be** (“in, with”) to the word *herev* (“sword”), thereby using the instrumental case, unlike M.

---

**Line 25:**

Third word:

K. = *kayu* (“they were”),

M. = *hayah* (“he was”).

---

**Line 26:**

Second word:

K. = *kulam* (“all of them”),

M. = *kulo* (“all of him”).

Third word:

K. = *ohevey* (“those who love, those who seek, those who follow”),

M. = *ohev* (“he who loves, he who desires, he who follows”).

Fifth word:

K. = plural form,

M. = singular form.

Seventh word:

K. = includes **alef**, as in previous cases.

---

**Line 28:**

Fourth word:

K. = *we'anaqem* (“and I will avenge myself”),

M. = *we'anaqamah* (cohortative form: “I will surely avenge myself,” with intensified meaning).

It is possible that the cohortative form was introduced in M.

## Introductory Remarks on the Translation

The Essenes of Qumran, who copied this scroll around 100 BCE, should not be regarded as preservers of a precise text identical to the Tanakh, which is deeply respected by rabbinic tradition. Rather, they stood at a considerable distance from that tradition, and it is evident that the Qumran text of Isaiah represents a kind of “dialect” of Hebrew.

This is not a translation; rather, it is characterized by modifications in the writing of words and pronouns, made in order to adapt the text to the Aramaic dialect spoken by the Essenes. In our context, this would be comparable to altering an archaic form such as “*vostani*” into “*ustani*.” Therefore, their motivation in using manuscripts was certainly not based on preserving an identical derived text according to a strict letter-by-letter principle.

The Qumran texts that I have translated (1QIsaa and 1QpHab) represent dialectal forms of the Hebrew language, rather than the Hebrew of the Tanakh. The preservation of the original Hebrew text was part of the role carried out by the most prominent priestly authorities in Jerusalem and in Babylon (Sura, Nehardea, and Pumbedita), who maintained a specialized class known as “scribes.” These scribes carefully copied manuscripts, subsequently destroyed them, and preserved only the newly produced copies. The Essenes neither were nor claimed to be copyists of that type.

Taking this into account—that the Qumran scribes modified the text according to their own judgment in order to adapt it to their dialect—we may say that the degree of correspondence between the Isaiah Scroll from Qumran and the Masoretic text of Isaiah is all the more remarkable.

In the translation that follows, I have altered only the order of words within individual lines, but not across lines. For example, the Hebrew word order in line 6 (p. 44) would be “land dry,” whereas I translated it as “dry land.” In Serbian, the adjective typically precedes the noun, whereas in Hebrew the adjective follows the noun it modifies.

In sentences where the Hebrew word order would sound particularly unusual in Serbian, I have translated them literally, preserving the Hebrew structure, and I trust that they will be understandable. I have endeavored to translate word-for-word, preserving verbal person and number, as well as the number and gender of nouns, exactly as they appear in the Qumran text.

If the person, number, or gender of nouns, pronouns, or verbs differs from the Masoretic text, you may be certain that this reflects the Qumran text.

There are idioms that are difficult to translate strictly “word-for-word.” For example, “he healed us” (p. 44, verse 5, line 11) represents only one possible rendering of the original idea. Most translators have opted for “by his stripes we are (or were) healed.” A strictly literal rendering would be:

“in his wounds, we are healed for ourselves” (Hebrew: *u-va-ḥăvurātāyw nirpā’ lānû*).



Words that are implied but not present in the original text are written in *italics*. I am confident that the interpretation you will encounter is precise; however, since it is human to err, I would appreciate it if any mistakes were identified and brought to my attention.

With regard to verbal tenses—whether past or present—it should be noted that Hebrew verbs are not inherently marked for tense. Temporal reference can only be determined from context (past, present, or future). Therefore, it is entirely legitimate for the reader to determine the appropriate tense for each verb.

For example, for line 8 (p. 44), it would be equally correct to translate:  
“He is despised and we do not esteem him; he has surely borne our griefs,”  
as well as:  
“He was despised and we did not esteem him; he surely bears our griefs.”

Idioms have not been stylistically adjusted, but translated in their original form. For example, in line 14 (p. 44), at the end of verse 8, I translated literally: “a wound was to him,” rather than smoothing it into “he had a wound” or “he was wounded.”

Paragraphs that are part of the Qumran text are marked by adding (PP) at the end of the paragraph and by leaving a blank line between numbered lines.

In the translation of the Isaiah Scroll from Qumran that follows, the numbering of columns and lines corresponds exactly to the columns and lines in the scroll itself. All corresponding words appear consistently in the same numbered lines as in the scroll.

Numbers in square brackets indicate verses. Chapter divisions are marked within the text, and if spacing indicating chapter division appears, it is likewise marked.

The presence or absence of articles is also indicated. Where a conjunction was required in English for clarity, it has either been placed in *italics* or omitted, in accordance with the principle of word-for-word translation.

This approach has resulted in a translation that may appear somewhat “unclear,” precisely because of the effort to preserve every word. The translation is therefore not stylistically polished, but it is highly precise, enabling those studying Hebrew to easily identify the equivalent of each word.

Paragraphs marked in the Qumran text correspond in the translation to blank space, even if this is not always identical in the original.

---

## **Symbols Used in the Translation**

- (1) Verses are indicated in square brackets.
- (PP) Paragraphs are marked with (PP).

[+...+] Words added in the Qumran text that are absent in the Masoretic Text.  
 {} Words present in M. but differing from K.  
 [m.....] and [m+...+] Words present in M. but absent in K. (not all are marked).  
*Italicized words* = added for clarity in translation.  
 [{ }] Words assumed to be present in lacunae.  
 [...] Text omitted in the Masoretic Text but present in Qumran.  
 {&...&} Text written above the line.  
 [...text...] Text marked by the scribe/editor as incorrect.  
 (text) Words crossed out by the original scribe.  
 [s-...-s] Alternative spelling.  
 [\*] Marginal note by the scribe.

## English Translation of Column 1 of the Isaiah Scroll (Isaiah 1:1–26)

1. (1) The vision of Isaiah, son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah
2. Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, kings of Judah. Hear, O heavens, and listen, O earth,
3. for YHWH speaks: I raised and brought up sons, and they rebelled against me. The ox knows its owner
4. and the donkey the manger of its master; Israel does not know, my people does not understand. Ah, sinful nation,
5. a people burdened with iniquity, seed of evildoers, corrupt sons—they have forsaken YHWH, they have despised
6. the Holy One of Israel, they have turned backward. Why are you still struck down? You continue in rebellion; the whole head is sick
7. and every heart is faint. From the sole of the foot even to the head, there is no soundness in it—only wounds and bruises and fresh sores;
8. they have not been pressed out, nor bound up, nor softened with oil. Your land is desolate, your cities burned
9. with fire; your land—strangers devour it in your presence, and its desolation is upon it, like the overthrow of strangers.
10. (8) And the daughter of Zion is left like a booth in a vineyard, like a hut in a cucumber field, like a city of Nazarenes.

**11. (9)** If YHWH of hosts had not left us a very small remnant, we would have been like Sodom, we would have resembled Gomorrah. (PP)

---

**12. (10)** Hear the word of YHWH, princes of Sodom; give ear to the Torah of our God, people of Gomorrah.

**13. (11)** What are your many sacrifices to me? says YHWH. I am sated with burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts; and in the blood

**14.** of bulls and lambs and goats I take no pleasure.

**15. (12)** When you come to appear before me, who has required this from your hand, trampling my courts?

**16. (13)** Do not continue bringing vain offerings; incense is an abomination

**17.** to me. New moons and Sabbaths, the calling of assemblies—I cannot endure even a sacred gathering.

**18. (14)** Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hates; they are a burden to me; I am weary of bearing them.

**19. (15)** And when you spread out your hands, I will hide my eyes

**20.** from you; even when you multiply prayers, I will not listen; your hands are full of blood [+and your fingers+] [Aramaic]

**21.** [+of iniquity+].

**22. (16)** Wash yourselves, make yourselves clean; remove the evil of your deeds from before my eyes; cease to do evil.

**23. (17)** Learn to do good; seek justice; bless the oppressed; judge the orphan; plead for the widow. (PP)

---

**24.** Come now, let us reason together, says YHWH: though your sins are like scarlet, they shall be white as snow;

**25.** though they are red like crimson, they shall become like wool.

**26. (19)** If you are willing and obedient, you shall eat the good of the land [{you shall eat}].

- 27. (20)** But if you refuse and rebel, you shall be devoured by the sword, for the mouth of YHWH has spoken.
- 28. (21)** How the faithful city has become a harlot! It was full of justice; righteousness lodged in it [{but now}]
- 29.** murderers.
- 30. (22)** Your silver has become dross, your drink diluted with water.
- 31. (23)** Your princes [{are rebels}] and companions of thieves; all of them love bribes and pursue gifts;
- 32.** they [{do not give justice}] to the orphan, and the widow's cause does not come before them.
- 33. (24)** Therefore says the Lord, YHWH of hosts [{the Mighty One of Israel}]:
- 34.** I will rid myself of my adversaries and avenge myself on my enemies.
- 35. (25)** And I will turn my hand against you, and I [{will smelt away}] your dross
- 36.** and remove all your alloy.
- 37. (26)** And I will restore your judges as at the first, and [{your counselors}]

## Bibliography

Even-Shoshan, Avraham. *Ha-Milon He-Hadash (The New Dictionary of the Hebrew Language)*. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1966–1970.

Even-Shoshan, Avraham. *A New Concordance of the Bible: Thesaurus of the Language of the Bible, Hebrew and Aramaic*. Jerusalem, 1977.

Brown, Francis; Driver, S. R.; Briggs, Charles A. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.

Kutscher, Edward Yechezkel. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaa)*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.

Tov, Emanuel. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Flint, Peter W. "The Book of Isaiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. London: British Library, 2002.

VanderKam, James C.; Flint, Peter W. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: HarperCollins, 2002.

Ulrich, Eugene. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Burrows, Millar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Viking Press, 1965.

Fassberg, Steven E.; Bar-Asher, Moshe; Clements, Ruth A. (eds.). *Hebrew in the Second Temple Period*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Joüon, Paul; Muraoka, Takamitsu. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2006.

Gesenius, Wilhelm; Kautzsch, Emil; Cowley, A. E. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.

Würthwein, Ernst. *The Text of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Cross, Frank Moore. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Schiffman, Lawrence H.; VanderKam, James C. (eds.). *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Barr, James. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Sáenz-Badillos, Angel. *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

## **Works by the Author**

Stanojević, Željko. *Hebrejsko-srpski rečnik*. Beograd: Rad; Alfa i Omega, 2001.

Stanojević, Željko. *Kumranski spisi – dokaz autentičnosti Biblije*. Beograd: Metafizika, 2009.

Stanojević, Željko. *Sveto pismo ili Biblija – savremeni prevod sa hebrejskog*. Beograd: Metafizika, 2010.