**Variants due to Graphic Similarity Evidencing a Bisection of 1QIsaa**

**1 Introduction**

1QIsaa was one of the first scrolls discovered at Qumran. For this reason, and also because of its relative antiquity and the fact that it includes an almost-complete biblical book, 1QIsaa is one of the most-studied Dead Sea scrolls. One of the key questions that have been studied and which is also the focus of this article is the question of the scroll’s bisection; in other words: can we distinguish clearly between its two parts: columns 1–27 (chapters 1–33) and columns 28–54 (chapters 33–66)? Most scholars who have studied the scroll distinguished between the two sections, first and foremost in light of a three-line gap at the end of column 27 – a unique feature which may be intended to demarcate two distinct sections of the scroll. As evidence supporting the scroll’s bisection, Martin Abegg pointed to the width of the leather sheets at the end of each of the two sections of the scroll. These sheets are narrower than the other parchments in the scroll – each one contains two columns only (columns 26–27 appear on one, and 53–54 on the second), as opposed to the rest of the scroll’s sheets which each have three or four columns. Moreover, columns 27 and 28 are narrower than the other columns in the scroll, which could indicate that the scribe made a deliberate effort to conclude the first section of the scroll at the end of column 27.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Drew Longacre offered additional material evidence for the bisection of 1QIsaa.[[2]](#footnote-2) He explored such textual phenomena as spacing irregularities, literary and textual difficulties, and secondary supplementations in the second half of the scroll. Longacre convincingly showed that these textual phenomena occur at frequent intervals, and concluded that they are due to a damaged exemplar. Since he was unable to find evidence for a similar damage pattern in the first half of the scroll, he concluded that the second half of the scroll was copied from a different exemplar.

The scroll’s text also points to its bisection: first, there is an orthographic shift between the scroll’s two sections. Although the shift is gradual, and does not appear drastically in column 28, an in-depth look at the scroll reveals a growing tendency to use plene spelling in its second half. Malachi Martin, for instance, has pointed out that plene spelling for the word כל is used only 90% of the time in the first half of the scroll, versus the word’s appearances in the scroll’s second half, which are all in plene spelling. In the case of the word כי this tendency becomes more obvious: plene spelling is used in only 20% of the appearances of the word in the first half of the scroll, versus 100% of the appearances in the second half.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Ronald Giese offered additional evidence of the bisection suggestion by looking at the frequency of omissions of basic letters from words in the scroll (basic letters are letters that function as a necessary part of the lexical form of the word: letters that are part of the root of a verb or part of the lexical form of a noun), as well as the frequency of corrected omissions of gutturals and haplographies. His findings indicate that the relative frequency of these corrections is greater in the first half of the scroll than in the second. He therefore concluded that the scribe copied from two different sources, one of which included chapters 1–33, and the other chapters 33–66. The first source was apparently less clear or precise, and as a result, some of the corruptions in the first half of the scroll were either inadvertently transferred from the source or resulted from the source’s lack of clarity.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Some scholars have opposed the bisection of the scroll. First, the fact that there is no change in script between the two sections led many to question the assumption that they were written by different scribes. A detailed paleographic discussion of Eugene Ulrich and Peter Flint in the critical edition in *DJD* 32 establishes with virtual certainty that a single scribe copied the two sections.[[5]](#footnote-5) Martin also examined the scroll’s script and determined that it is uniform, except for some minor inconsistencies between specific columns. These inconsistencies are a natural occurrence when copying such a long scroll, which is a lengthy process that is influenced by the scribe’s condition and by the writing tools available to him.[[6]](#footnote-6) In addition, Edward Kutscher and Paulson Pulikottil reject the theory of the scroll’s bisection itself, and not just the claim that it was written by two different scribes. They attributed the orthographic differences to an inconsistency on the part of the scribe, who adopted plene spelling during the period in which he was copying the scroll.[[7]](#footnote-7)

In this article, I intend to support the bisection of the scroll by examining the relative frequency of variants due to graphic similarity in each section. I will show that the relative frequency of these variants is considerably greater in the first part of the scroll, compared to their frequency in the second part, in a way that is consistent with Giese’s findings, which were surveyed above.

**2 Variants Due to Graphic Similarity**

Interchanges of letters due to graphic similarity have been known since the beginning of biblical textual criticism. These interchanges were committed unintentionally by the biblical scribes, who copied the books as part of the transmission process. Occasionally, they misidentified a letter and interchanged it with a different letter that was graphically similar. The interchange of letters due to graphic similarity can occur under various circumstances: sometimes the shape of the letters is so similar that they are virtually indistinguishable, which in some cases even requires the scribe to consider the context when deciding between the letters. Other times, letters share one or more elements, so that any change or minor damage to the scroll can result in their interchange.[[8]](#footnote-8)

The transmission process of the biblical texts began in antiquity and included transmission in two scripts: Paleo-Hebrew script and square script. Therefore, the list of variants due to graphic similarity between the Masoretic Text of Isaiah and 1QIsaa that will serve here to assess the scroll’s bisection includes interchange of letters bearing graphic similarity in Paleo-Hebrew script (e.g. *mêm*-*nûn*), in square script (e.g. *wāw-yôd*) and in the both scripts (*dālet-rêsh*).

Moreover, among the letters that are interchanged due to graphic similarity, between the Masoretic text (MT) and 1QIsaa, one should mention the pairs of letters *wāw-yôd*, *bêt-mêm*, and *mêm*-*nûn*, which share another similarity in addition to the graphical one: in the case of *bêt-mêm* and *mêm*-*nûn* there is a phonetic similarity between the consonants they represent, and/or a semantic similarity between the prefixes (in the case of *bêt* and *mêm*) or suffixes (in the case of *mêm* and *nûn*) that they represent. Interchanges of the letters *wāw* and *yôd* could even result from an interchange in their roles as *matres lectionis*. In cases in which these letters are interchanged, it is hard – sometimes impossible – to determine the specific cause. Nonetheless, these cases are included in the corpus of variants due to graphic similarity to be discussed, because I claim that the graphical similarity between the letters had an effect on their interchange, along with the other causes. Based on a similar theory advanced by Emanuel Tov in reference to the Septuagint, I would like to make the claim that each of the secondary variants in these cases emerged first and foremost due to the difficulty in identifying letters that are graphically similar to one another.[[9]](#footnote-9) Under these circumstances, the copyist would require paleographic exegesis to identify the letter, and would have to take contextual considerations into account in order to do so. In these cases, the copyist needs to make an intuitive decision, subjective by nature, on the basis of the recognizable phonetic or semantic background. Thus, although the phonetic similarity between the consonants or the semantic similarity between the prefixes or suffixes that the letters represent can serve as a basis for generating new readings, the primary source of the variants is the graphical similarity between the letters, which initially generates an uncertain identification on the part of the scribe.

I will demonstrate this general claim through one interchange of the letters *wāw* and *yôd* in the book of Isaiah, in the name “Ariel” in the MT. In each of the five appearances of the name (all of them in chapter 29), the MT reads אריאל whereas 1QIsaa reads ארואל.[[10]](#footnote-10) Dewey Beegle and Kutscher offered a linguistic explanation for the variant, proposing that it is the result of separate orthographic traditions that reflect different linguistic traditions – in the Masoretic tradition the vowel *ī* served as a vowel connected to personal names, while in 1QIsaa the scribe preserved the tradition in which the vowel *ū* served in this capacity.[[11]](#footnote-11)By the way, a similar orthographic difference between variants of the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) has also been documented, where the SP seems to reflect the same tradition as the scroll: In Genesis 32:31, the MT reads פניאל whereas the SP reads פנואל; similarly, in Numbers 26:31 the MT reads אשריאל whereas the SP reads אשרואל. All of these names are theophoric, including within them the component *el*, together with the connecting vowel *ī* in the MT and *ū* in 1QIsaa as well as the SP. Indeed, it may be that the variants are due to an interchange of the connecting vowel. At the same time, the interchange between the letters *wāw* and *yôd* in this case may also be due to the graphic similarity between them. These letters are graphically similar in square script since the Hasmonean period, and they become more and more similar to the point where they are virtually indistinguishable in some Qumran scrolls.

An examination of Herodian scrolls reveals how easy it can be to interchange the letters. We see this, for instance, in the words בוגדים and בגויים, in 1QpHab and 11QPsa, respectively, in which the letters appear adjacently (fig. 1). In 1QpHab, the *wāw*’s “leg” is just marginally longer than the *yôd*’s leg and the difference between them is hardly noticeable. In the word בגויים in 11QPsa, the letters are identical so that there is no graphical difference between the *wāw* and the two *yôd*s alongside it.[[12]](#footnote-12)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| 1QpHab 5:8[[13]](#footnote-13) | 11QPsa IV 11[[14]](#footnote-14) |

F I G U R E 1 Graphic similarity between *wāw* and *yôd* in Herodian script

The shape of these letters is nearly identical for a long period of time, up until the first century CE, when they grew different from one another once again, distinguished by the length of their leg – the *wāw* with a long leg and the *yôd* with a shorter one.

Without rejecting the suggestions presented above, I wish to make the claim that the graphic element is connected to these variants, and that it is interwoven with the morphological one: the scribe was uncertain with regard to the letter before him and could not determine whether it was a *wāw* or a *yôd*, which led him to decide according to the orthographic tradition known to him. In these cases, even though there was no simple graphical interchange, the graphical element likely plays a decisive influence in its development.

**3 Variants Due to Graphic Similarity in 1QIsaa**

We shall now examine the number of instances in which there are variants due to graphic similarity throughout the scroll. We will see that these variants point to another difference between the two parts of the scroll. In the tables below (tab. 1; tab. 2), we can see the distribution of the variants due to graphic similarity between the book of Isaiah in the MT and 1QIsaa, by column:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Column Number  in 1QIsaa | Number of Variants Due to Graphic Similarity |
| 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 |
| 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 2 |
| 6 | 1 |
| 7 | 0 |
| 8 | 2 |
| 9 | 3 |
| 10 | 4 |
| 11 | 3 |
| 12 | 4 |
| 13 | 6 |
| 14 | 7 |
| 15 | 3 |
| 16 | 2 |
| 17 | 6 |
| 18 | 6 |
| 19 | 1 |
| 20 | 7 |
| 21 | 1 |
| 22 | 7 |
| 23 | 12 |
| 24 | 3 |
| 25 | 1 |
| 26 | 4 |
| 27 | 4 |

T A B L E 1 Variants due to graphic similarity by columns in the first half of the scroll (MT-1QIsaa)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Column Number  in 1QIsaa | Number of Variants Due to Graphic Similarity |
| 28 | 2 |
| 29 | 1 |
| 30 | 1 |
| 31 | 0 |
| 32 | 5 |
| 33 | 2 |
| 34 | 1 |
| 35 | 2 |
| 36 | 1 |
| 37 | 1 |
| 38 | 3 |
| 39 | 3 |
| 40 | 5 |
| 41 | 2 |
| 42 | 1 |
| 43 | 1 |
| 44 | 1 |
| 45 | 1 |
| 46 | 0 |
| 47 | 1 |
| 48 | 1 |
| 49 | 2 |
| 50 | 2 |
| 51 | 0 |
| 52 | 3 |
| 53 | 2 |
| 54 | 1 |

T A B L E 2 Variants due to graphic similarity by columns in the second half of the scroll (MT-1QIsaa)

Altogether, there are 140 variants due to graphic similarity when comparing Isaiah in the MT and 1QIsaa. In the first half of the scroll there are 95 such variants, and only 45 in the second half. On average, there are 3.5 variants per column in the first half, and only 1.6 per column on average in the second half. Hence, we are talking about a significant difference in the frequency of variants due to graphic similarity between the two parts of the scroll.

Now let us examine the data before us, in relation to the data compiled by Giese on the high frequency of omissions of basic letters, gutturals and haplographies in the first half of the scroll, compared to its second half. Does the disparity in the number of interchanges of letters due to graphic similarity between the two parts of the scroll support Giese’s hypothesis that the scroll was in fact copied from two different sources, the first of which was less reliable and precise than the second, which was of better quality?

To show the connections between the findings above and Giese’s findings, we must assume that, when it comes to variants due to graphic similarity, all readings of the MT are superior, whereas all of the readings of the scroll are secondary. Indeed, Millar Burrows made the sweeping claim that the MT is superior to 1QIsaa in all instances of variants due to graphic similarity between letters.[[15]](#footnote-15) However, Burrows made a similar claim regarding most of the other variants between the MT and 1QIsaa, and he seems to have been influenced by the diminished textual value associated with the scroll in the first years after its discovery. Indeed, the assumption that the variants in 1QIsaa were the result of scribal errors was dominant in the first years in which it was studied. This approach attributed imprecision and ineptitude to the scribe who copied 1QIsaa or to the source from which it was copied. In addition to Burrows, this was also the opinion of William Brownlee and Harry Orlinsky. In a series of publications dating from 1950 onwards, Orlinsky refuted attempts to reconstruct the original text of the book of Isaiah with variants from the scroll. He argued that any deviation from the MT were due to imprecision on the part of the scribe of the scroll.[[16]](#footnote-16) Although later scholars recognized the possibility of interpretive changes, they still attributed many variants in the scroll to unintentional scribal errors.[[17]](#footnote-17) The prevailing view of the scroll’s inferiority became less pervasive the more it was studied. Shemaryahu Talmon, for instance, criticized the extreme skepticism expressed by some scholars towards the scroll and called for it to be reevaluated on several occasions.[[18]](#footnote-18) Nonetheless, the low evaluation of the scroll’s reliability and the skeptical attitude towards its textual value are still prevalent among scholars today.[[19]](#footnote-19)

In order to examine the connection between the findings I presented above and Giese’s findings, the variants due to graphic similarity between the MT and 1QIsaa must be evaluated in a balanced manner, and to deal with the question of the original reading in each case. I have therefore divided the variants into four categories:

1. Cases in which the MT’s variant is primary and the scroll’s secondary (A): Included in this category are clear-cut cases in which the scroll’s reading is etymologically unacceptable, such as in Isaiah 33:21: “where no galley with oars can go (MT: תלך; 1QIsaa: תלב)”; Isaiah 63:1: “announcing vindication (MT: בצדקה; 1QIsaa: בעדקה)”.[[20]](#footnote-20) Included in this category are also cases in which the scroll’s reading is secondary due to Aramaic influence or the graphical similarity between the letters *mêm* and *nûn*: Isa 13:7: “Therefore all **hands** (MT: ידים; 1QIsaa: ידין) will be feeble”; Isa 23:17: “At the end of seventy (MT: שבעים; 1QIsaa: שבעין) years”; Isa 48:6: “hidden things that you have not known (MT: ידעתם; 1QIsaa: ידעתן)”.
2. Variants in which the scroll’s version is primary and MT’s is secondary (B): the most unambiguous case in this category appears in Isaiah 14:4: “you will take up this taunt against the king of Babylon: How the oppressor has ceased! How his insolence (MT: מדהבה; 1QIsaa: מרהבה) has ceased!”.[[21]](#footnote-21) The word מרהבה that appears in the scroll derives from the root רה"ב, which can mean to attack, and therefore the meaning of מרהבה in this case is to attack.[[22]](#footnote-22) The etymology of the word that appears in the MT, in comparison, is unknown. There are additional cases in which the scroll’s reading is preferable, although there is no consensus among scholars in those cases.
3. Variants in which both the scroll’s reading and the MT’s reading are etymologically and contextually challenging, so that it is impossible to determine which is preferable (C): For example, in Isaiah 10:31: “Madmenah (MT: מַדְמֵנָה; 1QIsaa: מרמנה) is in flight, the inhabitants of Gebim flee for safety”. מדמנה/מרמנה is the name of a place near Jerusalem whose inhabitants will leave for fear of the approaching Assyrian army. מדמנה as the name of a place is not documented anywhere else in the MT, nor is מרמנה.[[23]](#footnote-23) Thus, it is impossible to determine the name’s original form.
4. Variants in which both versions are linguistically and contextually conceivable, so that it is impossible to determine which is primary (D): This category includes variants that could be related to the interchange of the letters *yôd* and *wāw*, and/or uses of perfect and imperfect forms of verbs that do not affect a word’s meaning at all such as ושאג/ישאג (5:29) or ובושו/יבושו (19:9), and uses of different patterns such as אסיר/אסור (10:4), סיגים/סוגים (1:22).

In the table number 3, we can see how the corpus of variants due to graphic similarity between the MT and 1QIsaa is distributed across the four categories:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Number of Variants in the First Half of the Scroll | Number of Variants in the Second Half of the Scroll | Total |
| A | 54 | 31 | 85 |
| B | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| C | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| D | 28 | 8 | 36 |

T A B L E 3 Distribution of variants due to graphic similarity to the four categories

Although the numbers are somewhat fluid, because the determination which variant is primary and which is secondary is subjective by nature, the general picture revealed by our findings is clear. In most of the variants in which it possible to decide, the MT is preferable to the scroll. In these cases, the secondary reading in the scroll is the result of a letter being interchanged for a graphically similar one, either by the scribe who copied the scroll, or in the source that he used.

This data points to a direct correlation between Giese’s findings and my own. We can now make the general claim that the number of scribal errors in the first half of the scroll is greater than in its second half – regardless of whether these errors are the result of interchanging graphically similar letters, omitting basic letters or gutturals, or haplographies.

**4 The Cause of the Bifurcation of the Scroll: Two Sources or Two Scribes?**

Noth and Tov were of the opinion that 1QIsaa was copied by two scribes: one copied columns 1–27, and the other copied columns 28–54.[[24]](#footnote-24) If their claim is correct, one can distinguish between their skill levels. The first scribe copied his source in a relatively imprecise fashion, as a result of which his work displays a large number of scribal errors: omissions of basic letters or gutturals, haplographies, and the interchanging of letters due to graphic similarity. In contrast to this, the second scribe copied his source with relative precision, so that the frequency of those textual phenomena was more limited in the second half of the scroll.

Nevertheless, although there is a possibility that the scroll was written by two scribes, that is unlikely given the absence of paleographic evidence pointing to a different manuscript in each of the two parts. In light of that, many scholars who have noted the bisection of the scroll have argued that it stems from two different sources from which the scroll was copied. This contention has been proffered, inter alia, by Ulrich and Flint, Brownlee, Williamson, Longacre and Martin.[[25]](#footnote-25) Giese too came to a similar conclusion from the data he presented in his study.[[26]](#footnote-26) In this view, the relative plethora of secondary readings in the first half of the scroll would indicate that it was copied from a manuscript of low textual quality, but the second half was copied from a manuscript of higher quality. Furthermore, on the basis of the increased tendency to use plene spellings in the second half of the scroll, one may infer that the manuscript employed for copying the first half of the scroll was earlier than the one used for copying the second half. This assumption may explain the frequency of textual variants in the first half of the scroll: since its source had undergone a longer process of transmission, the likelihood of scribal errors was increased.

**5 Conclusion**

The findings that I have enumerated above offer an additional criterion for the bisection of 1QIsaa, and they are congruent with the research done by Giese, which also indicates a relative abundance of scribal errors in the first half of the scroll. In the absence of paleographic evidence for the scroll being the work of two scribes, the differences between the two parts of the scroll should be ascribed to two sources from which the scroll was copied, one being the source for columns 1–27 and the other being the source for columns 28–54. Those two sources varied in the degree of their textual accuracy: the first source contained a greater measure of secondary readings stemming from scribal error than did the second.
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**Appendix – Variants Due to Graphic Similarity between The Masoretic Text of Isaiah and 1QIsaa**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **MT** | **1QIsaa** | **Letter in MT** | **Letter in 1QIsaa** | **Column Number** | **Category** |
| 1 | Isa 1:22 | לְסִיגִים | לסוגים | י | ו | 1 | D |
| 2 | Isa 1:25 | סִיגָיִךְ | סוגיך | י | ו | 1 | D |
| 3 | Isa 3:16 | נטוות (K) | נטיות (Q) | ו | י | 3 | D |
| 4 | Isa 4:4 | בָּעֵר | סער | ב | ס | 4 | D |
| 5 | Isa 5:11 | מְאַחֲרֵי | מאחזי | ר | ז | 4 | A |
| 6 | Isa 5:13 | וּכְבוֹדוֹ | וכבודי | ו | י | 4 | A |
| 7 | Isa 5:18 | הַשָּׁוְא | השי | ו | י | 5 | A |
| 8 | Isa 5:29 | ושאג (K) | ישאג Q)) | ו | י | 5 | D |
| 9 | Isa 6:13 | בְּשַׁלֶּכֶת | משלכת | ב | מ | 6 | A |
| 10 | Isa 9:3 | מִדְיָן | מדים | ן | ם | 8 | A |
| 11 | Isa 9:8 | וְיָדְעוּ | וירעו | ד | ר | 8 | D |
| 12 | Isa 9:18 | בְּעֶבְרַת | מעברת | ב | מ | 9 | D |
| 13 | Isa 10:4 | אַסִּיר | אסור | י | ו | 9 | D |
| 14 | Isa 10:6 | ולשימו K)) | ולשום | י | ו | 9 | D |
| 15 | Isa 10:24 | בַּשֵּׁבֶט | משבט | ב | מ | 10 | D |
| 16 | Isa 10:25 | תַּבְלִיתָם | תבלותם | י | ו | 10 | A |
| 17 | Isa 10:31 | מַדְמֵנָה | מרמנה | ד | ר | 10 | C |
| 18 | Isa 11:4 | לְעַנְוֵי־אָרֶץ | לעניי ארץ | ו | י | 10 | D |
| 19 | Isa 12:5 | מידעת K)) | מודעת (Q) | י | ו | 11 | D |
| 20 | Isa 13:7 | יָדַיִם | ידין | ם | ן | 11 | A |
| 21 | Isa 13:9 | וְחַטָּאֶיהָ | וחטאים | ה | ם | 11 | D |
| 22 | Isa 14:4 | מַדְהֵבָה | מרהבה | ד | ר | 12 | B |
| 23 | Isa 14:11 | הֶמְיַת | המות | י | ו | 12 | A |
| 24 | Isa 14:23 | לְמוֹרַשׁ | למירש[] | ו | י | 12 | D |
| 25 | Isa 14:23 | קִפֹּד | קפז | ד | ז | 12 | C |
| 26 | Isa 14:31 | בּוֹדֵד | מודד | ב | מ | 13 | C |
| 27 | Isa 15:5 | בְּרִיחֶהָ | ברחוה | י | ו | 13 | A |
| 28 | Isa 15:9 | דִימוֹן | דיבון | מ | ב | 13 | D |
| 29 | Isa 15:9 | דִימוֹן | דיבון | מ | ב | 13 | D |
| 30 | Isa 15:9 | אַרְיֵה | ארוה | י | ו | 13 | A |
| 31 | Isa 16:9 | אֲרַיָּוֶךְ | ארזיך | ו | ז | 13 | C |
| 32 | Isa 16:14 | כַבִּיר | כבוד | י | ו | 14 | A |
| 33 | Isa 16:15 | כַבִּיר | כבוד | ר | ד | 14 | A |
| 34 | Isa 17:5 | יִקְצוֹר | וקציר | י | ו | 14 | D |
| 35 | Isa 17:5 | יִקְצוֹר | וקציר | ו | י | 14 | D |
| 36 | Isa 17:6 | גַּרְגְּרִים | גדגרים | ר | ד | 14 | A |
| 37 | Isa 17:12 | כַּבִּירִים | כבדים | ר | ד | 14 | A |
| 38 | Isa 18:2 | בָּזְאוּ | בזאי | ו | י | 14 | A |
| 39 | Isa 18:7 | בָּזְאוּ | בזאי | ו | י | 15 | A |
| 40 | Isa 19:9 | וּבֹשׁוּ | יבושו | ו | י | 15 | D |
| 41 | Isa 19:9 | חוֹרָי | חורו | י | ו | 15 | B |
| 42 | Isa 21:2 | צוּרִי | צירי | ו | י | 16 | A |
| 43 | Isa 21:10 | גָּרְנִי | גדרי | ר | ד | 16 | C |
| 44 | Isa 22:1 | חִזָּיוֹן | חזוון | י | ו | 17 | A |
| 45 | Isa 22:5 | קִר וְשׁוֹעַ | קדשו | ר | ד | 17 | C |
| 46 | Isa 22:6 | וְקִיר | וקור | י | ו | 17 | A |
| 47 | Isa 22:18 | צָנוֹף יִצְנָפְךָ | צניף וצנפכה | ו | י | 17 | A |
| 48 | Isa 22:18 | צָנוֹף יִצְנָפְךָ | צניף וצנפכה | י | ו | 17 | A |
| 49 | Isa 22:24 | כְּבוֹד | כביד | ו | י | 17 | A |
| 50 | Isa 23:7 | עַלִּיזָה | העלוזה | י | ו | 18 | A |
| 51 | Isa 23:7 | יֹבִלוּהָ | ובליה | י | ו | 18 | A |
| 52 | Isa 23:7 | יֹבִלוּהָ | ובליה | ו | י | 18 | A |
| 53 | Isa 23:10 | עִבְרִי | עבדי | ר | ד | 18 | B |
| 54 | Isa 23:13 | לְצִיִּים | לציין | ם | ן | 18 | A |
| 55 | Isa 23:17 | שִׁבְעִים | שבעין | ם | ן | 18 | A |
| 56 | Isa 25:1 | עֵצוֹת | אצית | ו | י | 19 | A |
| 57 | Isa 25:7 | פְּנֵי | פנו | י | ו | 20 | C |
| 58 | Isa 26:5 | הֵשַׁח | השת | ח | ת | 20 | A |
| 59 | Isa 26:7 | תְּפַלֵּס | תפלט | ס | ט | 20 | A |
| 60 | Isa 26:8 | תַּאֲוַת | תאית | ו | י | 20 | A |
| 61 | Isa 26:10 | יְעַוֵּל | יעיל | ו | י | 20 | A |
| 62 | Isa 26:14 | וַתְּאַבֵּד | ותאסר | ב | ס | 20 | A |
| 63 | Isa 26:14 | וַתְּאַבֵּד | ותאסר | ד | ר | 20 | A |
| 64 | Isa 26:20 | חֲבִי | חבו | י | ו | 21 | D |
| 65 | Isa 28:10 | צַו לָצָו צַו לָצָו | צי לצי צי לצי | ו | י | 22 | A |
| 66 | Isa 28:13 | צַו לָצָו צַו לָצָו | צי לצי צי לצי | ו | י | 22 | A |
| 67 | Isa 28:15 | שִׁיט | שוט | י | ו | 22 | B |
| 68 | Isa 28:15 | מַחְסֵנוּ | מחסני | ו | י | 22 | A |
| 69 | Isa 28:20 | כְּהִתְכַּנֵּס | בהתכנס | כ | ב | 22 | B |
| 70 | Isa 28:21 | כְהַר | בהר | כ | ב | 22 | D |
| 71 | Isa 28:21 | כְּעֵמֶק | בעמק | כ | ב | 22 | D |
| 72 | Isa 29:1 | אֲרִיאֵל | ארואל | י | ו | 23 | A |
| 73 | Isa 29:1 | אֲרִיאֵל | ארואל | י | ו | 23 | A |
| 74 | Isa 29:1 | סְפוּ | ספי | ו | י | 23 | A |
| 75 | Isa 29:2 | לַאֲרִיאֵל | לארואל | י | ו | 23 | A |
| 76 | Isa 29:2 | כַּאֲרִיאֵל | כארואל | י | ו | 23 | A |
| 77 | Isa 29:3 | מְצֻרֹת | מצודות | ר | ד | 23 | D |
| 78 | Isa 29:5 | זָרָיִךְ | זדיך | ר | ד | 23 | B |
| 79 | Isa 29:7 | אֲרִיאֵל | ארואל | י | ו | 23 | A |
| 80 | Isa 29:7 | וּמְצֹדָתָהּ | ומצרתה | ד | ר | 23 | D |
| 81 | Isa 29:7 | וְהַמְּצִיקִים | והמצוקים | י | ו | 23 | A |
| 82 | Isa 29:8 | שׁוֹקֵקָה | שקיקה | ו | י | 23 | A |
| 83 | Isa 29:19 | עֲנָוִים | עניים | ו | י | 23 | D |
| 84 | Isa 30:11 | מִנֵּי | מנו | י | ו | 24 | A |
| 85 | Isa 30:15 | בְּשׁוּבָה | בשיבה | ו | י | 24 | C |
| 86 | Isa 30:18 | יָרוּם | ירים | ו | י | 24 | D |
| 87 | Isa 30:23 | יִרְעֶה | זרעה | י | ז | 25 | A |
| 88 | Isa 32:2 | בְּצָיוֹן | בציין | ו | י | 26 | A |
| 89 | Isa 32:2 | כְּצֵל | בצל | כ | ב | 26 | A |
| 90 | Isa 32:7 | ענוים (K) | עניים (Q) | ו | י | 26 | D |
| 91 | Isa 32:11 | וְעֹרָה | יערו | ו | י | 26 | C |
| 92 | Isa 33:3 | מֵרוֹמְמֻתֶךָ | מדממתך | ר | ד | 27 | D |
| 93 | Isa 33:7 | יִבְכָּיוּן | יבכוון | י | ו | 27 | D |
| 94 | Isa 33:8 | עָרִים | עדים | ר | ד | 27 | B |
| 95 | Isa 33:21 | תֵּלֶךְ | תלב | ך | ב | 27 | A |
| 96 | Isa 34:15 | קִפּוֹז | קופד | ז | ד | 28 | D |
| 97 | Isa 34:15 | דַיּוֹת | דוות | י | ו | 28 | A |
| 98 | Isa 36:19 | סְפַרְוָיִם | ספריים | ו | י | 29 | A |
| 99 | Isa 37:13 | סְפַרְוָיִם | וספריים | ו | י | 30 | A |
| 100 | Isa 38:16 | יִחְיוּ | וחיו | י | ו | 32 | D |
| 101 | Isa 38:16 | בָּהֶן | בהמה | ן | מ | 32 | D |
| 102 | Isa 38:16 | חַיֵּי | חיו | י | ו | 32 | A |
| 103 | Isa 38:16 | רוּחִי | רוחו | י | ו | 32 | A |
| 104 | Isa 38:17 | בְּלִי | כלי | ב | כ | 32 | D |
| 105 | Isa 40:19 | נָסַךְ | מסך | נ | מ | 33 | A |
| 106 | Isa 40:20 | יְבַקֶּשׁ־לוֹ | ובשקלו | י | ו | 33 | A |
| 107 | Isa 41:19 | תִּדְהָר | תרהר | ד | ר | 34 | A |
| 108 | Isa 42:7 | אַסִּיר | אסור | י | ו | 35 | D |
| 109 | Isa 42:13 | יָרִיעַ | יודיע | ר | ד | 35 | A |
| 110 | Isa 43:20 | בִּישִׁימֹן | בישומון | י | ו | 36 | A |
| 111 | Isa 44:4 | בְּבֵין | כבין | ב | כ | 37 | B |
| 112 | Isa 45:2 | וַהֲדוּרִים | והררים | ד | ר | 38 | B |
| 113 | Isa 45:10 | תְּחִילִין | ת]חולין | י | ו | 38 | A |
| 114 | Isa 45:16 | צִירִים | צורים | י | ו | 38 | A |
| 115 | Isa 46:6 | מִכִּיס | בכיס | מ | ב | 39 | D |
| 116 | Isa 46:10 | אַחֲרִית | אחרות | י | ו | 39 | A |
| 117 | Isa 47:10 | בְרָעָתֵךְ | בדעתך | ר | ד | 39 | A |
| 118 | Isa 47:13 | בְּרֹב | כרוב | ב | כ | 40 | A |
| 119 | Isa 47:13 | לֶחֳדָשִׁים | לחרדים | ד | ר | 40 | A |
| 120 | Isa 48:6 | יְדַעְתָּם | ידעתן | ם | ן | 40 | A |
| 121 | Isa 48:7 | יְדַעְתִּין | ידעתים | ן | ם | 40 | A |
| 122 | Isa 48:16 | מֵעֵת | בעת | מ | ב | 40 | A |
| 123 | Isa 49:10 | שָׁרָב | שוב | ר | ו | 41 | A |
| 124 | Isa 49:12 | סִינִים | סוניים | י | ו | 41 | A |
| 125 | Isa 51:9 | תַּנִּין | תנים | ן | ם | 42 | A |
| 126 | Isa 51:19 | הֵנָּה | המה | נ | מ | 43 | D |
| 127 | Isa 54:2 | יַטּוּ | יטי | ו | י | 44 | A |
| 128 | Isa 54:15 | אֶפֶס | אכס | פ | כ | 45 | A |
| 129 | Isa 57:19 | נוב (K) | ניב (Q) | ו | י | 47 | B |
| 130 | Isa 58:7 | וַעֲנִיִּים | וענויים | י | ו | 48 | D |
| 131 | Isa 60:6 | מִדְיָן | מדים | ן | ם | 49 | A |
| 132 | Isa 60:13 | תִּדְהָר | תהרהר | ד | ר | 49 | A |
| 133 | Isa 61:10 | שׂוֹשׂ | שיש | ו | י | 50 | A |
| 134 | Isa 63:1 | בִּצְדָקָה | בעקדה | צ | ע | 50 | A |
| 135 | Isa 65:4 | וּבַנְּצוּרִים | ובנצירים | ו | י | 52 | A |
| 136 | Isa 65:5 | תִּגַּשׁ | תגע | ש | ע | 52 | A |
| 137 | Isa 65:14 | מִטּוּב | בטוב | מ | ב | 52 | D |
| 138 | Isa 66:6 | מֵעִיר | בעיר | מ | ב | 53 | D |
| 139 | Isa 66:11 | מִזִּיז | ממזוז | י | ו | 53 | A |
| 140 | Isa 66:15 | וְכַסּוּפָה | ובסופה | כ | ב | 54 | B |
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