One would think that after sixty years of studying the scrolls, scholars would have reached a consensus concerning the nature of the language of these texts. But such is not the case—the picture is no different for Qumran Hebrew (QH) than it is for identifying the sect of the Qumran community, for understanding the origins of the scroll depository in the caves, or for the classification of the archaeological remains at Qumran. At first glance, this is a bit difficult to comprehend, since in theory, at least, linguistic research should be the most objective form of scholarly inquiry, and the facts should speak for themselves—in contrast to, let’s say, the interpretation of texts, where subjectivity may be considered necessary at all times. But as we shall see, even though the data themselves are derived from purely empirical observation, the interpretation of the linguistic picture that emerges from the study of Qumran Hebrew has no less a range of options than the other subjects canvassed during this symposium.

Before entering into such discussion, however, let us begin with the presentation of some basic facts. Of the 930 assorted documents from Qumran, 790, or about 85% of them are written in Hebrew (120 or about 13% are written in Aramaic, and 20 or about 2% are written in Greek). Of these 930, about 230 are biblical manuscripts, which

* It was my pleasure to present this paper on three occasions during calendar year 2008: first and most importantly at the symposium entitled “The Dead Sea Scrolls at 60: The Scholarly Contributions of NYU Faculty and Alumni” (March 6), next at the “Semitic Philology Workshop” of Harvard University (November 20), and finally at the panel on “New Directions in Dead Sea Scrolls Scholarship” at the annual meeting of the Association of Jewish Studies held in Washington, D.C. (December 23). My thanks to the organizers of all three events, respectively, Lawrence Schiffman, John Huehnergard, and Alex Jassen, and to the participants at each who provided valuable feedback. To a large extent I have retained the oral nature of my three presentations in this written version of the paper. Note the following abbreviations: EBH = Early Biblical Hebrew; SBH = Standard Biblical Hebrew; LBH = Late Biblical Hebrew; SH = Samaritan Hebrew; QH = Qumran Hebrew; GQH = General Qumran Hebrew; MH = Mishnaic Hebrew; DSS = Dead Sea Scrolls; MMT = Miqsat Ma’ase ha-Torah (4Q394–399); MT = Masoretic Text.
naturally are in Hebrew,\(^1\) so in actuality the percentage of Hebrew
texts is 80%. On the other hand, our Hebrew texts are the longest ones,
such as the *Temple Scroll*, the *Community Rule*, the *War Scroll*, and
the *Hodayot*—with only the *Genesis Apocryphon* as a lengthy Aramaic
scroll. This might, of course, be the accident of preservation—that is
to say, the Aramaic documents are much more fragmentary than the
Hebrew ones—but in general we may state that the language of choice
for the Qumran community was Hebrew and that the percentage of
Hebrew material among the Dead Sea Scrolls is actually higher than
the aforementioned 80%, perhaps even approaching 90\(\%\).\(^2\)

An immediate question that arises is to what extent does this distri-
bution reflect the actual daily use of the three languages at Qumran. By
even asking such a question, of course, I adhere to the majority view
that the scrolls discovered in the caves were produced by the commu-
nity that lived at the archaeological site of Qumran—a point which I
now consider proven, based on the work of Hanan Eshel, Jodi Mag-
ness, et al.\(^3\)—as opposed to alternative reconstructions, which suggest,
for example, that the scrolls were brought to these caves from Jerusa-
lem or elsewhere. Accordingly, I return to the question: to what extent
does the fact that 80\% of our documents are composed in Hebrew
reflect the linguistic reality of the Qumran community? Or to put it in
simpler terms: did they speak Hebrew?—as opposed to Aramaic, for
example, or to Greek. There seems to be no other approach possible
than to say: yes, the individuals at Qumran spoke Hebrew. Of course,
it is possible for certain speech communities to write in one language
and to speak another—an example from the ancient Near East is the
site of Nuzi, whose texts are in Akkadian but almost undoubtedly the
residents of the city spoke Hurrian on a daily basis—but in such cases

---

\(^1\) Or at least the vast majority thereof, since we have a few Aramaic texts from
Ezra and Daniel included among the biblical manuscripts. See conveniently David
Studies 2; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 81, 136–38.

\(^2\) I am well aware, of course, that I have levelled all the data for “the Qumran com-
munity,” since I include in my calculations both sectarian and non-sectarian composi-
tions.

\(^3\) See, for example, Hanan Eshel, “A History of Discoveries at Qumran,” in *A Day
at Qumran: The Dead Sea Sect and Its Scrolls* (ed. Adolfo Roitman; Jerusalem: Israel
Museum, 1997), 11–17 (along with the other essays in this volume); idem, “Qumran
Studies in Light of Archaeological Excavations Between 1967 and 1997,” *Journal of
and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).
the linguistic interference from the daily patois to the language of the written texts is almost always self-evident, especially within the lexicon (and again, Nuzi is a good case-in-point, given the high percentage of Hurrian words appearing within these Akkadian texts). As we shall see, this is not the case at Qumran, where only rarely does one encounter an Aramaic word within the Hebrew documents—and this is even more true of any Greek incursions. So while it remains possible that the Qumran sect—and yes, I am now conscious of my use of this specific term—spoke Aramaic, the overall picture clearly points to Hebrew as the common language of the community, both in writing and in everyday speech. In fact, as we shall see, one of the views concerning Qumran Hebrew proposes that the peculiar linguistic structure of the written texts reflects the spoken language of the Qumran community—but we jump ahead of ourselves here.

Let us begin our survey of the various understandings of QH by returning to the 1950s, when the first studies of the language were produced, mainly by scholars from the Hebrew University, including Hanoch Yalon, Chaim Rabin, E. Y. Kutscher, Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, and Ze’ev Ben-Hayyim. While I would not group all of these individuals under the same rubric necessarily, we nevertheless may suggest a general agreement in the first decade or two of Qumran studies, which concluded that QH represented a continuum of Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH). This finding was emphasized most of all by Kutscher in his monumental and magisterial book on 1QIṣa (Hebrew edition, 1959; English version, 1974), in which he demonstrated that this text reflects an updated version of the biblical book, with its Hebrew “reflecting the linguistic situation prevailing in Palestine during the

---

4 For a recent work on the subject, albeit with a focus on one particular aspect thereof, see Scobie P. Smith, “Hurrian Orthographic Interference in Nuzi Akkadian: A Computational Comparative Graphemic Analysis,” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2007).

5 E. Y. Kutscher, Ha-Lashon ve-ha-Reqa’ ha-Leshoni shel Megillat Yesha’yahu ha-Shelema mi-Megillot Yam ha-Melah (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1959); and E. Y. Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIṣa) (STDJ 6; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974). In the footnotes below, I cite pages from the Hebrew original (hereinafter Megillat Yesha’yahu) only. For a convenient summary of the results of this major research project, see E. Y. Kutscher, A History of the Hebrew Language (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1982), 93–106 (with occasional references to other DSS as well). Another valuable survey of QH is Angel Sáenz-Badillos, A History of the Hebrew Language (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 130–46.
last centuries before the Common Era." Thus, for example, one finds the following contrasts between the Masoretic Text (MT) of Isaiah, which clearly reflects an older version of the book, and 1QIsaa (shortened to Q below), with its linguistic updatings of the biblical book:

- MT דָּמָשׁק
  ~ Q דָּרָמָשׁק
- MT חזֵיָהוּ, יהוּדָּה, etc.
  ~ Q חזֵי, יהוּד, etc.

In the first of these items, MT דָּמָשׁק ‘Damascus’ has been replaced by the LBH (and Aramaic) form דָּרָמָשׁק (cf. 1 Chr 18:5, 18:6, 2 Chr 24:23; 28:5, 28:23). In the second of these items, the older theophoric element יהוּ ‘-yahu’ has been replaced by the LBH form יה ‘-yah’.

One also notes the replacement of archaic forms by standard forms, as seen, for example, in the following passage:

- MT כֹּל חַיְיֹת כּוֹל־חַיְיֹת כׁל־לֶאֱאֵתָיוּ (Isa 56:9)
  ~ Q בִּיער חַיְיֹת וּכּוֹל לֶאֱאֵתָיוּ שָׂדוֹת

in which the archaic forms חַיְיֹת and שָׂדוֹת of the MT have been replaced by the standard forms חַיְיֹת (using a plural noun now) and שָׂדוֹת.

On the syntactic level, 1QIsaa reflects a decrease in the use of wayyiqtol and waqatal forms, another feature well known from LBH, as the following passages (one for each form) illustrate:

- MT וַיִּהְיֶֽה כָּל־יָֽאדֶּֽתָּה יִֽדְּךָ (Isa 66:2)
  ~ Q וַיִּהְיֶֽה כָּל־יָֽאדֶּֽתָּה יִֽדְּךָ
- MT נִבְרֵא הָיוֹת עַל כָּל־מְרֵאָתִים (Isa 4:5)
  ~ Q נִבְרֵא הָיוֹת עַל בִּלְכָּנָמָה הָרִים

---

In the first passage, MT ויהיו, a wayyiqtol form, has been replaced by והיו, a simple suffix-conjugation form indicating past tense preceded by conjunctive waw, in 1QIsa. While in the second passage, MT וברא, a waqatal form, has been replaced by ויברא, a simple prefix-conjugation form indicating future tense preceded by conjunctive waw, in the Isaiah scroll.

As one final illustration from the realm of syntax, we observe how asyndetic relatives are eliminated by the inclusion of the relative pronoun אשר, for example:12

- MT בָּרָדָךְ (Isa 48:17)
  ~ Q אשר בָּרָדָך

These examples allow us to see a parallel between MT Isaiah and 1QIsa, on the one hand, and Samuel/Kings and Chronicles, on the other. In both cases, the latter text presents a linguistically updated version of the former, allowing latter-day readers to comprehend more easily an ancient text—a point emphasized by Kutscher time and again in his many publications.

In addition to the above examples, which link 1QIsa to LBH, we may note several linguistic features that link up with other varieties of Hebrew from the general period. Thus, for example, in the great Isaiah scroll from Qumran one finds a weakening of the pharyngeals and laryngeals, a feature known from Samaritan Hebrew (SH)13 and to some extent from Mishnaic Hebrew (MH).14 The following comparisons illustrate the point well:15

- MT נִרְחָֽב ~ Q נרהב (Isa 30:23)
- MT יְחַיֶּה ~ Q יהיה (Isa 7:21)
- MT הִנֵּה ~ Q אנה (Isa 8:18)
- MT יַֽﬠֲבֹר ~ Q בור (Isa 28:15)

In the last instance, note that the pharyngeal consonant is omitted altogether.

---

15 Kutscher, Megillat Yesha’yahu, 42; and Kutscher, History of the Hebrew Language, 96.
As final illustrations of the modernization process manifested in 1QIsaa, we offer two lexical items, with older words updated with newer equivalents:

- Isa 47:2

The hapax legomenon נְהָרֹֺֽת 'hem, skirt', apparently no longer understood several centuries after this text was composed, was replaced by the 1QIsaa scribe with the more familiar word שליך 'your skirts'—a term that appears 11× in the Bible and commonly in the Mishna as well.16

- Isa 9:16

In this passage the usual meaning of the verb שׂחַמ 'rejoice' makes no sense, especially when the parallel verb is רָחַם 'have pity'. As Jonas Greenfield recognized, the former verb means here—and only here in the Tanakh—'have compassion', based on its Arabic cognate šmh (even if we expect Arabic šmh, in light of the Hebrew šin).17 But clearly this sense of the verb was long forgotten, or at least not widely recognized, by the time the Qumran scribe put pen to parchment, and therefore the word was changed in 1QIsaa to יחָמַל (with waw hanging), a better known verb, which serves as the parallel to רָחַם in two other biblical texts (Jer 13:14, 21:7).

All of the above information, I repeat, derives from Kutscher’s detailed study of a single scroll, 1QIsaa. When the other Dead Sea Scrolls, especially the sectarian ones, are brought into the picture, we see many of the same features, pointing to the same connections between LBH and QH. In what follows, I will derive the vast majority of my examples from the major documents, such as 1QS, 1QM, 1QH, and 11QT,18 with a special emphasis on 1QS. In fact, as the title of this article adumbrates, this essay could be designated “a linguist reads

---

16 Kutscher, Megillat Yeshaʿyahu, 218; and Sáenz-Badillos, A History of the Hebrew Language, 135.
17 See Jonas C. Greenfield, “Lexicographical Notes II,” HUCA 30 (1959): 141–42. The issue is treated briefly by Kutscher, Megillat Yeshaʿyahu, 179 (with n. 38).
18 I realize, of course, that many scholars consider the Temple Scroll to be a pre-Qumran document (see, for example, Joseph L. Angel, “The Historical and Exegetical Roots of Eschatological Priesthood at Qumran,” in this volume, following Lawrence Schiffman, inter alia), so that caution is advised when referring to 11QT as a sectarian document. For our present purposes, however, this question is less germane: the fact remains that the Temple Scroll was found at Qumran.
1QS in order to provide a ‘snapshot’ or ‘trial cut’ of QH.”\(^{19}\) I present the evidence in no particular order, though by the end of this section (and see also towards the end of the paper) I trust that the reader will have gained a good sense of the nexuses between LBH and QH.

A stellar example of a LBH feature that appears in the DSS is the \(\text{לא לקטול} \) form to express the prohibitive. This feature occurs only \(3 \times\) in the Bible, two of which are in Chronicles (1 Chr 5:1, 1 Chr 15:2),\(^{20}\) \(3 \times\) in Biblical Aramaic; and about \(12 \times\) in the DSS.\(^{21}\) The two Chronicles passages are:

- 1 Chr 5:1
- 1 Chr 15:2

The Biblical Aramaic examples are:

- Ezra 6:8
- Dan 6:9
- Dan 6:16

A sample Qumran passage is 1QS 1:13–15, which contains four instances of this usage, including the well-known proscription against adjusting the dates of the festivals:

13

14

15

True, the SBH usage \(\text{קטול לא} \) is still to be found in 1QS, e.g.:

- 1QS 3:6
- 1QS 10:11

But very clearly the \(\text{לא לקטול} \) usage has become more common and has become part and parcel of QH.

---

\(^{19}\) I will not delve into the question of the language of two specific documents, namely, MMT and the \textit{Copper Scroll}, since scholars agree that the language of these two texts differs from General Qumran Hebrew (GQH). Though on one occasion (regarding the personal pronouns), I will present the evidence of MMT, if only to round out the picture more fully.

\(^{20}\) The sole other passage is Amos 6:10, where we may suspect an IH feature with an isogloss with Aramaic. The expression \(\text{לא להתרש לא להתריש} \) in Judg 1:19 represents a different (and equally unusual) syntagma, since the words refer to the past tense and not to a prohibitive.

As another example linking QH and LBH, I present another syntagma relating to the expression of the negative, the use of לאין followed by an infinitive or an abstract noun to express the notion of 'without'. This usage is found 8x in the Bible, with the following distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ezra 9:14</td>
<td>לאין שרתה והליסה</td>
<td>2 Chr 14:12</td>
<td>לאין חמה והליסה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh 8:10</td>
<td>לאין נון ולו</td>
<td>2 Chr 20:25</td>
<td>לאין מושא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 22:4</td>
<td>לאין מספר</td>
<td>2 Chr 21:18</td>
<td>לאין מורה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chr 14:10</td>
<td>לאין היה ולו</td>
<td>2 Chr 36:16</td>
<td>לאין מורה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And then about 40 times in QH,\(^{22}\) including the following four examples in 1QS:

- 1QS 2:7 לאין רחמים
- 1QS 2:14–15 לאין סלחוה
- 1QS 4:14 לאין שרתה
- 1QS 5:13 לאין שרתה

As an additional example of a DSS feature that links with LBH, I present an important finding by Gidon Haneman, who studied the syntactic use of the word 'בין 'between' in BH, QH, and in MH as well.\(^{23}\) The norm in BH is the expression Y-ובין X-, as can be seen in the following phrase:

- Gen 1:4 בין החוש ובין אור

The alternative form -ל...בין is used when the two elements are the same, that is X-ל... tussen, as is in the following phrase (and in several other specific syntagmas):

- Gen 1:5 בין משה לימי

In two places, however, we encounter Y-ל X בין, and they appear in two of the latest biblical books:

- Dan 11:45 בין ימים להר אביריך בין
- Neh 3:32 בין עלית המשנה לישר וחפץ

---

\(^{22}\) Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 77, 79.

This usage, in turn, becomes more common in MH:\textsuperscript{24}

- Berakhot 1:5 בִּין הַשְּׁלָלַת לַאֲבָל
- Berakhot 2:2 בִּין בְּרָכָה רָאוֹשִׁית לְעֹנֵיִית
- Pe'ah 1:1 בִּין אָדָם לִבְּהַר
- Pesaḥim 9:3 בִּין הָרָאוֹשׁ לְשַׁנָּה

Thus, it is not surprising to find this late usage in QH as well:

- 1QS 4:14 בִּין רְבָּע לְמוּעָה
- 1QS 5:21 בִּין אֶשׁ לְעַדְּתָה

We next turn our attention to the two words for ‘I’ in ancient Hebrew: אָני and אֵנִי. Among the distinctions between the two forms, one can state uncatégorically that the former occurs in EBH and SBH, but greatly recedes in LBH, until only the latter form occurs. As illustration thereof, note the data from the following contrastive biblical books:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Samuel/Kings</th>
<th>Chronicles/Ezra-Nehemiah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אָני</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֵנִי</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the earlier corpus, the ratio is 1:1.6; while in the latter corpus, the ratio is 1:23.5—the only two instances of אֵנִי are Neh 1:6, 1 Chr 17:1.

When we turn to the Scrolls, we note that אֵנִי is normal, occurring 57 times in all types of literature, whereas אָני is used only in the Temple Scroll, no doubt due to that text’s imitation of Deuteronomy (along with one [or perhaps several] instance[s] in 1Q22 [2:4 for sure]).\textsuperscript{25} As examples of the use of אֵי in QH, we note the following passages from the concluding section of 1QS, where the author turns to speaking in the first person:

- 1QS 11:2 בִּין אֵי לָא לְמַשְׁפֵּיט
- 1QS 11:9 בִּין אֵי לָא לַרְשָׁעָה
- 1QS 11:11–12 בִּין אֵי לָא אַמְּתָה


\textsuperscript{25} Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 57.
As a final feature that links QH with LBH, I present one noted earlier, in conjunction with the data forthcoming from the Isaiah scroll. We noted the decreased use of the *wqatal* form, with the illustration from Isa 66:2—and here we note a similar instance, the citation of Deut 29:18 in 1QS 2:12–13:

- Deut 29:18
- 1QS 2:12–13

In the biblical passage, the form וַיַּהֲרָךְ occurs, while in the Qumran version the simple prefix-conjugation form יִהְבָּרֶךְ occurs to mark the future.

Of course, the *wqatal* form וַיִּהְבָּרֶךְ appears in the Qumran reworking of the Deuteronomy passage, but I would suggest that this is more a “frozen” sentence introducer than a naturally productive usage. On the other hand, note that at times even this word is omitted, as in the following example from the *War Scroll*:

- Deut 20:2
- 1QM 10:2

And while one must admit that two other *wqatal* forms have been retained in this sentence (וַיִּהְבָּרֶךְ and וַיַּהֲרָךְ), the main point stands nonetheless.

I do not, however, wish to relay the impression that *wqatal* forms and the corresponding *wayyiqtol* forms decrease to the point of non-use. Clearly this is not the case, as the passage just cited reveals. Indeed, as Mark Smith demonstrated (see the following chart for a convenient digest of the data), there are plenty of *wqatal* forms in QH, along with a good number of *wayyiqtol* forms,\(^\text{26}\) though naturally the lack of historical texts among the DSS means far fewer of the latter in comparison to BH prose.

Nevertheless, there is an undeniable decrease in the use of such forms in QH, which thereby continues the trend noticeable in LBH. Smith summed up the point nicely, “The usage of converted tenses in QL more closely resembles that in a late BH book such as Esther rather than Mishnaic Hebrew.”27 The question remains whether the use of waqatal and wayyiqtol forms is a natural feature of QH, stemming from a period several centuries after the last biblical books (save Daniel) were written,28 or whether these forms are used in imitation of BH, which was Kutscher’s contention.29 As we shall see, this question can be asked over and over again when referring to the linguistic data present in the DSS.

While we have the passage from 1QM 10:2 before us, let us note two other linguistic changes here: a) the replacement of הָלַךְ with הָלַךְ, at least in the first instance, which reflects the situation in LBH, most likely due to Aramaic influence, since the longer prepositional form הָלַךְ does not occur in that language; and b) the replacement of יָשֵׁב with יָשֵׁב, which reflects the radically reduced use of the former and the dramatically increased use of the latter in LBH.

As an inexact indication thereof, note the following statistics:

27 Ibid., 60.
28 This is largely Smith’s position, as I understand it.
In addition, one notes that the root עמד occurs 5× in Qohelet, 12× in Esther, 12× in Zechariah, and an amazing 46× in Daniel.³⁰ In contrast to these cumulative 75 attestations, the root נפש never occurs in these four books. I need to state, however, that the verb נפש appears 42 times in the DSS corpus, so clearly it remains a productive verb. A more detailed study of this root—with an eye towards a) identifying its specific semantic nuances and then b) determining if the pattern from Chronicles/Ezra-Nehemiah and the other late books is continued in any way—remains a desideratum. Regardless, once more we need to raise the question: given the radically reduced use of נפש in LBH, are we to conclude that the presence of this verbal root in the DSS is in some fashion imitative of biblical style?

Now, if the picture were as simple as I have presented it until this juncture, this essay could be concluded with a simple repetition of the basic finding thus far—QH shares much in common with LBH and thus should be considered a natural continuation thereof. The picture, however, is much more complicated—and it is to those complications that we now turn. The most striking feature of QH, which I have not mentioned until now, although it is very well recognized, is the use of longer forms of the independent personal pronouns, that is, forms ending in -āh. The specific data are as follows:³¹

³⁰ In addition to these statistics, note that in BH overall the root עמד is the 23rd most frequent verbal root, while in QH it is the 17th most frequent verbal root. While a full study of verbal frequency (for all frequently attested verbs) in the two corpora remains a desideratum, this datum suggests, at least at first glance, that עמד is more common in QH than in BH, thereby continuing the trend that emerges in LBH. I have culled these rankings, for BH and QH respectively, from Francis I. Andersen and A. Dean Forbes, The Vocabulary of the Old Testament (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1992), 451–67 (the section entitled “Part IV: Verb Formations”); and The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library (ed. Emanuel Tov; Brigham Young University; Leiden: Brill, 2006), using the Search function, which includes a ranking of all attested lexical forms by frequency.

³¹ These figures are derived from Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 57–58.
In this particular case, since the information is so readily available, I also provide the data from MMT, in which the longer pronoun forms are used less frequently.

**MMT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>MMT Frequency</th>
<th>QH Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הוא</td>
<td>5×</td>
<td>65×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>היא</td>
<td>4×</td>
<td>45×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הם</td>
<td>4×</td>
<td>21×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>她们</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ןות</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ןתת</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>אנתה 5×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ןתת</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>אנתה 19×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ןתת</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>אתנה 17×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ןתת</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>אתנה 2×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ןתת</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>אתנה 2×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ןתת</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>אתנה 17×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And just to keep in mind the biblical data, I include a chart of the attestations of the BH pronouns, though naturally there is no need to include the 3rd person singular forms, since only the shorter forms הוא and היא are attested.32

**Bible:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אתה</td>
<td>278×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אתנה</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אתנה</td>
<td>237×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אתנה</td>
<td>30×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How to analyze the QH data? The evidence for the 3rd person masculine plural forms is only mildly surprising. In BH the two forms occur as free variants (apparently),34 while in QH the longer form is used less frequently.

---

32 When I use the word “Bible” in the following chart and in other presentations of linguistic data appearing below, I mean specifically the MT.

33 These figures reflect the total number of occurrences, even though in some instances הם and הה are used as common dual forms and/or as feminine plural forms. See the examples listed in Gary A. Rendsburg, “Dual Personal Pronouns and Dual Verbs in Hebrew,” *JQR* 73 (1982): 39–40 (for the former); and idem, *Diglossia in Ancient Hebrew* (AOS 72; New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1990), 44 (for the latter). These few instances, however, do not effect the statistical distribution of these forms.

34 Note the following expressions in consecutive verses: **}`לָכֶֽם** (Lev 11:27) and **}`לָכֶֽה** (Lev 11:28), used for the sake of variation, a literary device that
the more dominant one, though there still are ample occurrences of the shorter form. For the corresponding feminine forms, the picture is totally consistent with the biblical data, since in both BH and QH only דָּהֲנָה is attested (and not דָּהֲן)—even if we are dealing with comparatively few attestations, 30× and 2×, respectively.

More surprising, of course, is the five-fold use of אָתָהּ in QH for the 2nd person masculine plural form, since this form is not attested in the Bible—though naturally it could be modeled after הנָהָה אָ, which occurs 4× in the Bible, against just one example of נָהָה. Nonetheless, the ratio of three shorter forms to five longer ones within the DSS corpus is noteworthy.

But most striking of all is the presence of the longer forms of the 3rd masculine singular pronouns: הואָהוּ and היאָהוּ. And while the shorter forms הואָהוּ and היאָהוּ are more common, the ratio between the two sets is relatively close to 1:1—indicating that for the authors of the DSS, the two forms are most likely free variants. The question immediately arises: whence these longer forms?—especially since no other layer or stratum or dialect of Hebrew in all its manifestations throughout the ages attests to these forms, הואָהוּ and היאָהוּ.

As is well known, the reconstructed proto-Semitic forms for the 3rd singular pronouns are exactly what one encounters in QH: הָוָא and הִיָא. Through a shift of the glottal stop to the corresponding off-glide, the Arabic and Ugaritic forms هوָוָה and היֵיָה developed. Is it possible that the Qumran forms hark back to proto-Semitic times, or at least to proto-Hebrew? Is it possible that הואָהוּ and היאָהוּ were used in some dialect of Hebrew throughout the millennium-long biblical period, from the earliest texts such as Exodus 15 until the latest texts in the book of Daniel, without even a single attestation in the very large canon which is the Bible, not to mention the many Hebrew inscriptions from throughout this period—only to surface in a group of texts from the 1st century B.C.E.? Such is the opinion of an important scholar such as Takamitsu Muraoka, though to my mind the scenario that these longer forms are derived directly from proto-Semitic or from proto-Hebrew is highly unlikely.

I continue to explore in lectures (most recently at Tel-Aviv University, December 25, 2007) and which one day I plan to present in published form.

35 The Ugaritic spellings are hw and hy.
Before presenting a proper answer to the issue of these forms, we need to expand the discussion now to include the 2nd and 3rd person pronominal suffixes, which are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2mpl</td>
<td>עם—26×</td>
<td>בירה—31× (28x in 11QT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fpl</td>
<td>[not attested]</td>
<td>[not attested]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3mpl</td>
<td>עם(ה)—650×</td>
<td>בירה(ה)—250×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fpl</td>
<td>של(ה)—14×</td>
<td>[not attested]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the 2nd masculine plural ending of the suffix-conjugation verb is relevant here, for alongside the standard ending נ- occurs the longer form הביר-, with the following distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2mpl</td>
<td>עם—30×</td>
<td>בירה—31× (19× in 11QT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon the discovery of the DSS it was immediately noticed by scholars, with H. L. Ginsberg and Ze’ev Ben-Hayyim leading the way,38 that these forms correspond to the oral reading tradition among the Samaritans, even when the final he is not indicated in the orthography. Ben-Hayyim went so far to advocate the position that QH and SH are variants of the same late Second Temple period Hebrew dialect, sharing not only this key feature, but other isoglosses as well.39 Ben-Hayyim’s position has not found many advocates, and I also would reject the main part of it—but for the moment, let us set this issue aside, to return to it later.

What we can state positively at this juncture is that QH shows a clear proclivity for the pronominal forms, both independent and suffixed, with final -āḥ—and that this feature most of all demands explanation. Since the most regular forms among these pronoun forms, that is, regular in BH, are the 3rd person plural independent forms והנה, we should consider them first. The Qumran scribes no

37 Though cf., e.g., 1QIsa יושביהנה = MT וְיוֹשְׁבֵיהֶ (Isa 37:27), on which see Kutscher, Megillat Yesha’yahu, 352.
38 H. L. Ginsberg, “The Hebrew University Scrolls from the Sectarian Cache,” BASOR 112 (1948): 19–23, esp. 20, n. 3. For Ben-Hayyim, see the next footnote, though naturally he would have noticed the parallel between the QH and SH pronunciation traditions during the decade between the discovery of the scrolls and his 1958 article.
doubt strove to retain these forms, believing them to be in some way archaic and authentic, or at least more archaic and authentic than the shorter forms—and as we have implied above, they were correct in their assumption. Given the very strict adherence by the DSS sect to legal, cultic, and social mores, which were more conservative than those held by other contemporary Jewish groups, one is warranted to conclude that the Qumran community extended this conservativism to their Hebrew language as well. This position was enunciated first by Chaim Rabin in an important article in 1958, 40 who suggested that various phrases within the DSS themselves refer to the dialect of their opponent(s) in pejorative ways, for example:

- הֲלֹהַ 잣 1QH 2:19, 4:16
- הָרָעִיל יִשָּׁה 1QH 2:7, 2:18–19
- הָלְוָל יִשָּׁה 1QH 12:16
- הָלְשָׁן הָרָעִיל 1QS 4:11, CD 5:11–12

This position has found a latter-day adherent and proponent in William Schniedewind, who introduced the term “anti-language” into the scholarly literature—or at least borrowed that term from the realm of sociolinguistics and brought it to the attention of Hebraists. 41 When I first encountered Schniedewind’s position, expressed in two articles published in 1999 and 2000, I admit that I was skeptical. Now, however, after reading the breadth of the scholarly literature during the past year, in preparation for my presentation to the NYU conference, I have come to embrace his position. In my own attempts to come to grips with the peculiarities of QH, of the various interpretative routes before us, all of them proposed by leading scholars, I now accede to Schniedewind’s view as the one that explains best the nature of QH.

We will return to this point in a moment, but here I also must note—as I continue to survey the various scholarly opinions concerning QH—the view of Elisha Qimron and Shelomo Morag, that QH

---


represents the spoken dialect of the DSS sect. The authority of both these scholars provides this view with a major voice. Qimron, after all, knows more about the Hebrew of the DSS than any scholar alive (his grammar, of course, is the standard work on the subject); while Morag focused the bulk of his scholarly work on the various pronunciation traditions of Hebrew throughout the ages.

Could QH indeed represent the spoken Hebrew of the DSS sect? I highly doubt it. True, it is possible that all the long pronominal forms developed from the force of analogy, which is indeed a major force in the natural development of all languages—that is to say, from הוה and הנה, for example, developed all the other forms, including והוה and והוה. But it is hard to imagine that some of the very conservative features of QH—and we will see some more in a moment—are elements of a spoken, living language, especially when one recalls all the evidence presented above which links QH and LBH so closely. It is more likely, to my mind, that a text such as MMT, which diverges from core QH, reflects the actual spoken Hebrew of the Qumran community. I could go on at length, with all due respect, to refute the view of Qimron and Morag that QH as reflected in our texts represents a living spoken Hebrew—but I am absolved of the necessity to do so because Joshua Blau already has addressed the issue in his concise and informative article. As Blau noted, with italics to emphasize, “even dead languages, only used in literature, change,” at which point he presented the evidence from Middle Arabic (his term, both in this

---

42 Of the many studies of the former scholar which one may cite, see Elisha Qimron, “The Nature of DSS Hebrew and Its Relation to BH and MH,” in Muraoka and Elwolde, Diggers at the Well, 232–44. The seminal article of the latter scholar is Shelomo Morag, “Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations,” VT 48 (1988): 148–64. I do not mean to imply that the views expressed by Morag and Qimron are identical, though there is clear overlap between them. I add here this fond remembrance: during the period January–June 1987 I had the distinct privilege of being Professor Morag’s neighbor in Nayot (a neighborhood in Jerusalem). As we walked together to and from synagogue on Friday evenings, he shared with me his views on QH, then in germination stage, which eventually appeared in his classic 1988 article. As I tell my own students, the experience of shared walks with Professor Morag during those six months was the equivalent of a graduate seminar at the feet of a master.

43 That is to say, Hebrew at Qumran was diglossic. For the subject in general, see Rendsburg, Diglossia in Ancient Hebrew.


and many other publications), which is based in the main on classical Arabic, but with deviations due to a “rather free alternation of (post-)classical, vulgar (Neo-Arabic) and pseudo-correct elements,” and with features derived from “various traditions, genres, fashions, scribal schools, and personal inclinations.” The analogy with QH is clear—and here I would add another parallel as well, that of medieval Latin, based on classical Latin to be sure, but with admixtures of all sorts and stripes. Thus, with all due respect to the authoritative voices of both Morag and Qimron, I cannot accede to their notion that the distinctive traits of QH reflect the spoken language of the sect.

And so we return to the view expressed early on by Rabin and more recently endorsed by Schniedewind that the distinguishing elements of QH are the result of an intentional and ideologically motivated shift away from the varieties of Hebrew that characterized the writings of their opponents. Of course, caution is advised here, because in truth we lack the writings of the other Jewish communities at this time. The closest text chronologically is Ben Sira, but since that text is in poetry and is in many ways derivative of the book of Proverbs and other wisdom texts from the Bible, the language of Ben Sira is not as helpful as one might hope—and in any case, as a text that belonged to common Judaism, without any overriding theological or ideological stance, one would not expect the DSS sectarianists to be composing literature in any major way in response to the language or content of Ben Sira. In the other direction, we have the writings of the rabbis, with views diametrically opposed to the Qumran sect, but the problem here, of course, is the distance between the documents found at Qumran and the later Tannaitic corpus (Mishna, Tosefta, Mekhilta, Sifra, Sifre BeMidbar, Sifre Devarim, etc.). And while I adhere to the view that much of the content of the rabbinic corpus harks back to earlier centuries, I do not believe that we can assume that 2nd and 1st century B.C.E. Pharisees and others were composing texts in MH per se. Nonetheless, even with this caveat, as I indicated above, I have come to embrace the “anti-language” view, as the one which best explains the (pseudo-archaizing) QH pronominal forms and much more.

46 Ibid., 21.
47 Ibid.
48 While the main point about Ben Sira still holds, see now Jonathan Klawans, "Josephus on Fate, Free Will, and Ancient Jewish Types of Compatibilism," Numen 56 (2009): 44–90.
In short, I believe that the long pronominal forms are invented, in order to give a patina of antiquity to the writings of the Qumran sect. They were created on the analogy of the הוה forms, no doubt, but not in a living spoken language, pace Morag and Qimron, but rather in the hands of thoughtful scribes with purposeful intention. In an attempt to distinguish their language in a particular fashion, with an eye towards some kind of antiquity, whether real or faux, the scribes opted as much as possible for forms such as the independent pronouns ווא, ווא, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, הוה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה, והאה,谴 and the suffix-conjugation forms כַּסְלַתָּמה and כַּסְלַתָּנה—even if not all of these specific forms are attested in the corpus.49

And here I would return to Ben-Hayyim’s view concerning certain isoglosses between QH and SH, the long pronominal forms prime among them. Quite possibly, the Samaritans likewise set out to distinguish themselves from the (other) Jews in their oral reading tradition of the sacred text in the sacred language. In this way, there may be some contact between the DSS sect and the Samaritans, or at least a strong parallel between them—with each in its own way advocating the position of the “true Israel”—but I would not go so far as to claim that SH and QH derive from the same dialect of Hebrew in the Second Temple period.

Are there other linguistic facts that support the view that QH intentionally diverges from the Hebrew language of contemporary Jewish communities? Again, one cannot claim this unequivocally, given the lack of real data for other varieties of Hebrew contemporary with the DSS community—and even the non-sectarian texts found in Qumran do not allow us this comparison, since they have been copied and manipulated by the Qumran scribes, in much the same way that 1QIsa reflects QH, as noted at the outset. But in so far as we are able to identify several features that are extremely archaic and/or

49 For a parallel to the effect that linguistic ideology can have on pronoun usage, see Michael Silverstein, “Language and the Culture of Gender: At the Intersection of Structure, Usage, and Ideology,” in Semiotic Mediation: Sociocultural and Psychological Perspectives (ed. Elizabeth Mertz and Richard J. Parmentier; New York: Academic Press, 1985), 219–59, esp. 242–51, with particular reference to the development of English ‘you’ as the sole 2nd person pronoun used by the general population in the 17th century C.E., as a reaction to the Quaker insistence on ‘thou’. My thanks to my colleague Laura M. Ahearn (Department of Anthropology) for this reference and for our ongoing dialogue on linguistic ideology and other related matters.
very atypical of all other varieties of ancient Hebrew, we may suggest that these features likewise serve as evidence for the “anti-language” hypothesis, including the following two identified by Schniedewind.

First, there is the presence of suffixed -āh in a variety of adverbials, most famously מַּאֲדָה / מַּאֲדָה / מַּאֲדוֹד / מַּאֲדוֹד, which occurs c. 30×, vs. only 9 attestations of מַּאֲד / מַּאֲדו. Note other forms as well, including the following:

- 4Q177 (4QCatena A) 1–4:13
- 4Q365a (4QTemple?) 2:ii:9
- 4Q365a (4QTemple?) 3:4
- 4Q405 (4QShirShabb‘) 15:ii:6

The adverbial ending -āh is known from BH, of course, but in the Bible it is used very consistently, in forms such as צְפָּנָה, יִמָּה, אִרְצָה, הַשְּׁמִית, קְדִמָה, and many others—with its force understood throughout. In post-biblical times, the force of this morpheme was lost, and it became a linguistic fossil apparently, to be used or not to be used, perhaps by personal predilection. The Qumran scribes, accordingly, seized upon this feature and used it regularly in the creation of their prose, suffixing it to a host of forms—once more, as per the present argument, to provide a patina of antiquity and archaism and by extension authenticity to the force of their words.

A ready English analogy comes to mind: as the word “whence” has become archaic and no longer standard in our language, people occasionally employ the word, to show an air of sophistication perhaps, though typically they do so by adding “from” before the word, to create the neologism “from whence,” when in fact the word “whence” by itself means “from where.” In short, if you hear someone say “from whence,” he or she presumably is trying to add some authority to his or her language, but in truth this two-word phrase produces a cringe in many learned ears. In similar fashion, we latter-day readers of QH may recoil upon encountering forms such as מַּאֲדוֹד, but presumably this word produced a more positive ring in the ears of the sectarians.

We also should note that the use of this ending may have been influenced by the use of the same suffix -āh on the personal pronouns, discussed above—since the two are functionally one and the same, even though their origins are distinct. But the main point, again, is to

---
50 One must admit, however, that the phrase has an excellent pedigree, as both Shakespeare and Dryden already used it!
note how the authors of these documents, by their inclusion of this feature, evoke something old and different—and which, if they succeeded in their effort, gave added force to their rhetoric.

Schniedewind has paid particular attention to the use of שָׁם and שַׁמֶּה in the Temple Scroll, especially in comparison to the base text of Deuteronomy.51 I refrain from presenting his statistical analysis—the following two examples should suffice to demonstrate the point:

Deut 21:4
אֶל תּוּלַת עָשָׁר לَا-יָשָׁב בַּ-יָּמִין תּוּלַת עָשָׁב יִזְרָעֵאל
11QT 63:2
אַל נָתָנָה לַא לָא תִתְנָא לָא יִצְרַע אַל-תּוֹעָרְפּוּ-יָהוּ
Deut 18:7
בָּכַל אֶת-הָעֶגְלָה אֲכָלּוּ וּלְא-יָזַרִּו וַאֲל-וֹאֲכָלְוּ
11QT 60:13–14
בָּכַל אֲחָיו אֵיתָ֔ן אֲל-נַ֣חַל לָהֵמָּ֔ה

The one additional example from Schniedewind’s work that I will present here is the use of אֲבָיו, which appears 24× in the DSS, as opposed to only three instances of אָבָיו.52 Both forms are attested in the Bible, but the ratio between them is quite the opposite:

DSS (see below for texts)
- אֲבָיו—3×
- אָבָיו—24×

Bible
- אָבָיו—217×
- אֲבָיו—7× (Judg 14:10, 14:19, 16:31, 1 Kgs 5:5, Zech 13:3, 1 Chr 26:10, 2 Chr 3:1)

The attestations in the Dead Sea Scrolls are as follows:

אֲבָיו—3×:
- 4Q225 (4QpsJub) 2:ii:4
- 4Q416 (4QInstr) 2:iv:1
- 11QT 64:2—quoting Deut 21:18 (the law of the wayward son)

אָבָיו—24×, e.g.:
- 1Q19 (1QNoah) 3:4
- 4Q221 (4QJub) 4:1–2 (2×)
- 4Q418 (4QInstr) 9–9c:17
- 11QT—11× (15:16, 25:16, etc.), including quotations/rewritings of Deuteronomy and other biblical texts, e.g., the laws of incest from Leviticus 18 and 20, along with the next line in the law of the wayward son (11QT 64:3)

52 Schniedewind, “Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage,” 237, 245.
To the material adduced by Schniedewind, I would add several additional characteristic features, the first being the exceedingly frequent use of יָהּ for ‘God’ in the DSS, especially in 1QS—with 694 occurrences in the corpus, 56 of which appear in the composition under consideration here.\(^{53}\) Note the following phrases, for example, just from Column 1:

- 1:2 יָהּ הָדוּרָשׁ
- 1:7 יָהּ חֹק
- 1:8 נֶעֲצָת יָהּ
- 1:10 נֶעֲצָת יָהּ
- 1:11 נַקְמָת יָהּ
- 1:12 נַדְדֵה יָהּ

One notes the same dominance of יָהּ in other key texts. For example, one finds the following attestations in the Damascus Document (citing examples from the first two columns only):

- 1:10 יָהּ
- 2:7 יָהּ
- 2:1 יָהּ
- 2:15 יָהּ
- 2:3 יָהּ
- 2:18 יָהּ

And similarly in the War Scroll (citing examples from Column 1 only):

- 1:5 יָהּ
- 1:8 יָהּ
- 1:9 יָהּ
- 1:11 יָהּ
- 1:12 יָהּ

In the Hodayot scroll, we note the following occurrences, to the exclusion of the longer form אלהים, including three instances of יָהּ written in paleo-Hebrew script (one of them actually אלָי).

- 7:25 יָהּ
- 9:26 יָהּ
- 9:37 (restored from 4Q432 1–2) יָהּ
- 10:34 יָהּ
- 11:34 יָהּ
- 12:12 יָהּ
- 12:31 יָהּ
- 12:31 יָהּ

etc.

In light of this evidence, with four major scrolls preferring יָהּ to אלהים, typically to the exclusion of the latter, I would suggest that the

\(^{53}\) Data according to the Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library program.
Qumran sect’s preference for הָלֶכֶת derives once more from its desire to present a variety of Hebrew that is ancient and archaic—in contrast to the use of אלהים, which is the dominant form in the Bible (especially in the later books) and which presumably was the form used by common Judaism at the time of the composition of the DSS.

I should note, however, that the Temple Scroll does not participate in this pattern, though in this case one must recall that the Temple Scroll is evoking the language of Deuteronomy throughout, and thus not surprisingly one finds the typical Deuteronomic phrase in the Temple Scroll, e.g.:

- 43:8, 54:13–14

I do not want to leave the impression that אלהים is not used by the Qumran scribes (the form occurs 414×). Nonetheless, the use of הָלֶכֶת in the major texts is a distinct feature of the DSS, and this lexical trait should be understood as another manifestation of QH as an anti-language.

As a second additional feature that one does not expect to find in literature deriving from the late Second Temple period, I call attention to the word לָמָּה ‘to them’ (occasionally ‘to him’), which occurs 22× in the DSS, including most of the major texts: CD, 1QS, 1QM, 1QH, and 1QpHab.54 In the Bible, the form לָמָּה occurs 57×, all in poetry,

54 Since this last-cited document has been subjected to a thorough linguistic analysis by Ian Young (Ian Young, “Late Biblical Hebrew and the Qumran Pesher Habakkuk,” JHS 8 [2008] 38 pp.; available online at http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/JHS/Articles/article_102.pdf), with specific reference to the use of לָמָּה in 1QpHab 5:6 on p. 32 (along with other data presented herein noted by Young on p. 36), an additional word about the linguistic profile of Pesher Habakkuk is in order here. Young argues that 1QpHab reflects EBH (his term = what I prefer to call SBH) more than it does LBH; and he then uses this finding to demonstrate that well into post-biblical times authors could still write EBH/SBH, leading to the conclusion that “the current chronological approach to BH has to be abandoned” (p. 38). While this is not the time for a full rebuttal to this statement, I simply would note that to some extent Young proves what I am arguing for in this article—namely, that the Qumran scribes’ linguistic ideology led to a register of Hebrew in imitation of EBH/SBH in order to give their prose a patina of antiquity. All the while, however, they were unable to swim totally against the stream of LBH. I believe that Young would agree with the greater part of my statement here vis-à-vis Pesher Habakkuk specifically and QH generally. I would not, however, accede to his statement that this finding calls into question the entire
mainly in Job, Psalms, and Isaiah, though also 2× each in the archaic poems of Deuteronomy 32 and Deuteronomy 33. Accordingly, only in the Hodayot scroll is the form \( \text{l\,m\,m} \) expected, especially since this poetic text evokes biblical poetic language so often. It is truly striking, therefore, to find this archaic BH feature used in standard QH prose, as in 1QS, for example:

- 1QS 4:14 \( \text{l\,m\,m\,p\,f\,l\,t\,h\,s\,h} \)
- 1QS 9:22 \( \text{l\,u\,v\,b\,l\,m\,m\,h\,n\,h} \)

Once more, it appears, the Qumran writers sought an archaic form and revived it, as it were, to be part of their “natural” literary language.

As a third instance of the Qumran scribes electing an older grammatical form, especially when a newer one was very much on the rise, I present the evidence for the byforms \( \text{ב\,מ} \) and \( \text{ב\,ה\,מ} \). The BH data (including occurrences in selected late books) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>בָּמ</th>
<th>בָּהַמ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BH overall</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qohelet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally speaking the frequency of these alternative forms is about the same in the Bible. But a marked decrease in the shorter form occurs in post-exilic texts, with the longer form on the rise, no doubt due to Aramaic influence. It is therefore remarkable to witness the QH data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>בָּמ</th>
<th>בָּהַמ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QH overall</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Running against the trend of LBH is the more frequent use of \( \text{ב\,מ} \), especially in 1QS, where the shorter, older form occurs 9× to the exclusion of \( \text{ב\,ה\,מ} \). Once more, apparently, the Qumran scribes made a conscious choice to use an older Hebrew form.

And for one final point relevant to QH as anti-language, I would suggest that the desire to evoke antiquity and thus authority serves as
a ready explanation for the remarkable paucity of Greek, Aramaic, and Persian loanwords, a point that every student of the Dead Sea Scrolls has noticed. Normally, native speakers of a language do not retain active knowledge of native words versus lexemes borrowed from other languages. But individuals who spend their lives with texts, who pay attention to such matters, and who contemplate the ideology behind word choice and lexical usage can—and indeed do—keep track of the distinction. In the Middle Ages, witness Thomas Aquinas and William of Tyre, both of whose Latin prose is well known for its avoidance of vulgargisms and colloquialisms that characterized the Medieval Latin stemming from the pen of their contemporaries. It is very possible, therefore, that the Qumran scribes, who copied biblical texts and who evoked biblical language in their own compositions—in the Temple Scroll, in the Reworked Bible texts, and with constant allusions to biblical passages throughout—could have recognized the difference between core Hebrew usages and incursions from outside. Naturally, they could not do this without the occasional slip, and thus, for example, the word רָז (derived from Persian rāz ‘secret, mystery’) became an important part of the DSS vocabulary, occurring 119× (plus 19× in Aramaic texts)—but by and large the Qumran scribes succeeded.

Try as they might, however, these learned individuals could not produce the pure anti-language that they so desired—such is the mighty force of diachronic language change. Time and again, accordingly, one encounters the LBH features with which I began this essay and to which we now return. I limit myself to a random sampling of such items in 1QS, presented here in brief fashion.

---

55 See, for example, Kutscher, History of the Hebrew Language, 100.
56 For an example closer to our own time, witness J. R. R. Tolkien, who spent his scholarly career reading and teaching Beowulf and other Old English texts, and who decried the incursion of French words into our language from the Middle English period onward, and thus preferred to have Bilbo Baggins reside at Bag End instead of cul-de-sac.
57 Again (see n. 18 above), for my present argument it matters not whether texts such as the Temple Scroll were actually composed at Qumran or were merely copied and collected by the Qumran scribes. The main point remains, regardless.
58 As John Huehnergard pointed out to me, the foreign nature of the word רָז may not have been recognized, since it passes quite easily as a Hebrew form (cf. נָשָׁה, מַז, מַזָּה, מַזַּהְוַה, מַזָּהְוַה בּוֹ, בּוֹ, בּוֹ, בּוֹ, etc.).
59 As further evidence thereof—especially in light of the previous footnote, with reference to Hebrew nouns of the same structure—it is striking that a word such as דָּטָה (also derived from Persian, namely, dāta) is wanting in the Hebrew texts and is attested only once in an Aramaic text (1QapGen ar 6:8).
In the Bible, the root **ץרפ** occurs typically in the Qal form. Only in Mal 3:2, 3:3, in the last of the prophetic books, do we encounter the Pi’el form. The use of the Pi’el in 1QS 1:17, accordingly, links QH to LBH.

As indicated above, the DSS are remarkably free of foreign loanwords, though now and then they do occur. More frequently, one encounters Aramaisms of a grammatical nature. In this passage we see one of each kind of foreign language interference. The noun ‘purity’ derives from the Aramaic root **דכה**, as opposed to the Hebrew equivalent **יהכה**; while the *Hiphil* prefix-conjugational verbal form **יהכין** retains the distinctive letter *he*, as in the Aramaic equivalent, in contrast to the standard Hebrew form **יכין**, reflecting elision of the *he*.

Here one notes the Aramaic pronominal suffix **והי**-, as opposed to Hebrew **הם**- or perhaps **המה**- as in QH). This form never occurs in BH, though clearly the Aramaic feature has influenced the Qumran scribe here.

In these four instances the author or scribe of 1QS employs the Aramaic 3rd masculine singular pronominal suffix **והי**- attached to plural and dual nouns. This form occurs once in the Bible, at Ps 116:12, in the word **תגמולוהי**, though there the explanation is regional dialectal, since this psalm includes a host of Israelian Hebrew features. In 1QS, the pressure of Aramaic is felt once more, and thus four examples of this morpheme occur in our text.

We now turn to several lexical items:

> **‘knowledge’**
> - 1QS 6:9
> - 1QS 7:3
> - 1QS 7:5
> - 1QS 7:13
> - 1QS 5:11
> - 1QS 6:26

---

---

---
The noun **.chk** ‘knowledge’ is a clear Aramaism and a clear marker of LBH, with the following six attestations:

- Qoh 10:20
- Dan 1:4
- Dan 1:17
- 2 Chr 1:10
- 2 Chr 1:11
- 2 Chr 1:12

The word occurs eight times altogether in the DSS, including the three above passages in 1QS.

**מדרש** ‘study, investigation’

- 1QS 6:24
- 1QS 8:15
- 1QS 8:26

The word **מדרש** occurs only twice in the Bible, both times in Chronicles:

- 2 Chr 13:22
- 2 Chr 24:27

In these two instances the word **מדרש** appears in the name of a book, from which the reader of Chronicles can learn additional information about a particular subject (kings Abijah and Joash, respectively). Its use in the DSS is different, with the word serving a range of meanings, including “study, investigation, etc.” Nonetheless, scholars who approach the Hebrew language from a diachronic perspective will see the immediate connection between this LBH feature and its presence in the DSS.61 It occurs three times in 1QS, and another 9× in the remainder of the Qumran corpus.

**וקף** ‘stand, arise’

- 1QS 7:11

The text is difficult at this point, though regardless the root **וקף** ‘arise’ may be recognized here. This verb is another identifiable feature of

---

LBH. It is common in Aramaic and is attested in the Bible in two late Psalms only (the two passages have very similar wording).62

- Ps 145:14
- Ps 146:8

The root occurs three other times in the DSS, and is another clear nexus between LBH and QH.

גֹּפֶר (vs. עולם) ‘forever, eternity’

This is an exceedingly common feature in our text; I limit myself here to examples from the first three columns only:

- 1QS 2:3
- 1QS 2:17
- 1QS 2:4
- 1QS 2:23
- 1QS 2:8
- 1QS 2:25
- 1QS 2:15
- 1QS 3:12

One of the characteristics of LBH identified by Avi Hurvitz is the use of עולם in a variety of contexts, especially as the second element in a construct phrase, where previously the singular form עולם was utilized.63 Clear LBH examples include the following:

- Isa 45:17
- Isa 51:9
- Ps 145:13
- Dan 9:24

In QH this trend continues, as is visible from the eight examples in the first three columns of 1QS.

The present article provides a reading of 1QS through a linguistic lens, with special attention to the historical development of the Hebrew language. Two counter trends are visible in this document, which (as I hope to have demonstrated) may serve as a “trial cut” or sample text from among the many DSS compositions. The first trend, following Rabin and more recently Schniedewind, is the purposeful development and employment of an anti-language, in order to create an internal idiom for the members of the sect. This brand of Hebrew attempts as much as possible to utilize archaic features, in order to provide an air of authenticity and authority to the new documents

---

62 Hurvitz, Ben Lashon le-Lashon, 93–95.
63 Ibid., 100–104.
under formation in the hands of the sect’s leaders. At the same time, though, a second trend is noticeable throughout: try as they might, the Qumran authors could not swim upstream against the billowing surge of LBH incursions into their prose. The result is a most unusual Hebrew dialect, which may be visualized in the following manner (adapting the chart developed by Shelomo Morag to depict his understanding of QH):64

(a) non-LBH features, especially those of a (pseudo-)archaic nature used to create an anti-language

(b) LBH features

(c) variant stress patterns

(d) features due to Aramaic influence

GQH

Note: Item (c) refers to stress patterns that diverge from Tiberian Hebrew, a feature which unites QH and MH. We have not discussed this issue above, though the interested reader may find information on this topic in Morag’s article and elsewhere.65

I repeat here Morag’s words to explain his version of the chart: “In this diagram components (c) and (d) are represented by broken lines, to indicate their synchronic nature (representing factors that were operating during the Qumran period); the full lines, on the other hand, indicate diachronic relationship (that is, a relationship that has to be viewed in historical terms).” Although I have not acceded to Morag’s main position concerning QH, I find his chart extremely helpful in

---

64 Morag, “Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations,” 162.
65 Ibid., 155. See also Kutscher, Megillat Yesha yahu, 255–61. For a different approach, see Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 40–42, 50–52.
envisioning the historical development of the language of the DSS—with the one change from his “(a) non-LBH features, possibly Old Hebrew isoglosses” to my “(a) non-LBH features, especially those of a (pseudo-)archaic nature used to create an anti-language.”