The possible meanings of the bisection of the scroll were also discussed: whether the scroll was copied from two different exemplars or by two different scribes. The purpose of this article is to support the bisection of the scroll by examining the frequency of variants that are due to graphic similarity between the Masoretic Text and 1QIsaa in each part of the scroll. In addition, this article adopts the accepted assumption that the bisection of the scroll is the result of its copying from two exemplars. On the basis of this assumption, it assesses the textual value of these exemplars by evaluating the variants due to graphic similarity in each part of the scroll.

Malachi Martin, for instance, has pointed out that in the first half of the scroll only 20% of the appearances of the word כיא are written in plene spelling, versus 100% of its appearances in the second half. In the case of the word כה this tendency becomes more obvious: defective spelling is used consistently in the first half of the scroll, versus the word’s appearances in the scroll’s second half, which are all written in plene spelling. Moreover, Cook assessed in detail the use of the letter *aleph* as *mater lectionis* in various positions, and agreed that there is an orthographic difference between the two parts of the scroll

Pulikottil attributed the orthographic differences to inconsistency on the part of the scribe, who changed from one system of spelling to the other.

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

However, these letters exchanges are not limited to prefixes and appear also in a middle position. From a linguistic perspective, it is likely that the interchanges of *mêm* and *nûn* at the end of words stemmed from the well-known tendency to alter plural masc. endings *-im* to *-in*. For the distribution of the phenomenon see Kutscher. See also in relation to Mishnaic Hebrew, Epstein. For the phonetic similarity between *mêm* and *nûn*, see Macuch, *Grammatik*.

Therefore, I wish to make the claim that the graphic element is interwoven with the morphological one in the interchanges of *wāw* and *yôd*. In these cases, the scribe was uncertain with regard to the letter before him and could not determine whether it was a *wāw* or a *yôd*. The uncertainty led him to decide according to the orthographic tradition known to him. Thus, the graphical element likely plays a decisive influence in the development of these variants, although they are no simple graphic interchange.

On the basis of the definition of variants due to graphic similarity presented above, I collected these differences between MT and 1QIsaa (Appendix). The distribution of these variants further proves the bisection of the scroll.

The bisection of the scroll assume that it can be divided into two equal parts, each of them of 27 columns. Nevertheless, we can see that in the first half of the scroll there are 95 variants due to graphic similarity, and only 45 in the second half.

Two possible conclusions can be drawn from the bisection of the scroll:the scroll was copied by two scribes or it was copied from two different exemplars.

Brook claims that the scroll’s bisection is a further evidence for the transmission of Isaiah in two parts during the late Second Temple period.

Indeed, the assumption that 1QIsaa was copied from two different *Vorlagen* is preferable, since the assumption that it was written by different scribes do not seem to be defensible at the paleographical aspect.

Moreover, this article supports the assumption that the difference between the two parts of the scroll stems from two different exemplars from which the scroll was copied. Through textual evaluation of the variants due to graphic similarity, along with further data available in the research of 1QIsaa, the article offers textual characterization of these exemplars.
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