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1.0. One of the major accomplishments of Hebraists in the 20th century was the establishment of a reliable methodology for the diachronic study of Biblical Hebrew.¹ Based on the foundations laid by S. R. Driver and others,² the two scholars who stand out in this field are E. Y. Kutscher and Avi Hurvitz, mentor and disciple, respectively.³ The results of their investigations led to a scholarly consensus regarding the periodization of Biblical Hebrew, with recognition of three chronological strata: Archaic Biblical Hebrew (ca. 1150–1000 BCE), Standard Biblical Hebrew (ca. 1000–550 BCE), and Late Biblical Hebrew (ca. 550–200 BCE).

Just as this consensus emerged, however, a challenge arose, mainly from the pens of Ian Young, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensvärd.⁴ These scholars aver that the differences between Standard Biblical Hebrew (SBH) and Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH) result not from matters of diachrony, but rather from matters of style.⁵ Hence, according to this view, both registers were in use during the post-Exilic period, with the former a more conservative style, used by certain scribes who continued to write in an older form of the language, and with the latter a more liberal style, used by other scribes who wrote in a more contemporary fashion. To demonstrate the manner in which the former style still could be employed deep into the Second Temple Period, Young, Rezetko,

---

⁵ In addition to the abbreviations included in this sentence, note also: QH = Qumran Hebrew; MH = Mishnaic Hebrew.
and Ehrensvärd present the case of Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab). To their mind, this composition evinces relatively few LBH features, to such an extent, in fact, that it may be compared with other SBH texts such as portions of Samuel and Kings.

2.0. The LBH features identified by Young in 1QpHab are the following:

2.1. — with two separate items inherent in this phrase:
   a) The noun פשר "solution, interpretation" (cf. Qoh 8:1; פשרה Sir 38:14 MS B).
   b) אשר introducing complement clause (much more common in Qohelet, Esther, Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles, than in SBH).

2.2. preference for Hiphil over Qal:
   a) 4:2 "mock" (cf. Ps 22:9, Job 21:3, Neh 2:19, 3:33, 2 Chr 30:10; elsewhere 12x as Qal)
   b) 9:11 "acted wickedly" (cf. 1 Sam 14:47, Ps 106:6, Job 34:12, Dan 9:5, 11:32, 12:10, Neh 9:33, 2 Chr 20:35, 23:3; elsewhere 9x as Qal)

6 Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd, Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts, 1:255–62, 271–76. In light of the more detailed article written by Young alone ("Late Biblical Hebrew and the Qumran Pesher Habakkuk," JHS 8 [2008], 1–38, art. 25), one assumes that he is the main contributor to this particular subject. Henceforth, accordingly, I shall refer to the view of Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd as simply "Young."


8 The outlier here is 1 Sam 14:47, since it appears in a clearly SBH composition. But as Noam Mizrahi pointed out to me during the oral presentation of this paper in Leuven, the passage is textually difficult and suspect, especially in light of LXX ἐσῴζετο "he was being kept safe" (thus the NETS rendering), the last word in the verse. Note that Greek σῴζω frequently renders Hebrew יושע יושע or יושע Hiphil) or יושע (Niphal) "he would save, he would be victorious," which eventually served as the LXX Vorlage. One could imagine, for example, an "original" text which read יושע יושע Hiphil) or יושע (Niphal) "he would save, he would be victorious," which eventually served as the LXX Vorlage (the latter option is suggested by the passive voice in the Greek), but which was changed (purposefully?) by a later scribe to יושע "he would transgress" during the Persian period, during which time the Hiphil served to express this semantic notion, as opposed to the Qal. See S. R. Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel (Oxford: Clarendon, 1890), 91–92. Alas, the last word that can be read in 4QSam* 6 2 is יָשָׁﬠ— and how often does this happen in Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship!
2.3. Eighteen verbal object suffixes vs. zero instances of חָּלַל plus suffix;\(^9\) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:7</td>
<td>יָכַפּוּם</td>
<td>“they overtake them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:7</td>
<td>הָלָמְשָׁם</td>
<td>“to capture them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:8</td>
<td>אַרְכָּס</td>
<td>“and they destroy them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:11</td>
<td>לְאָלָחְו</td>
<td>“and they did not help them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:2</td>
<td>לְאָהָדוּ</td>
<td>“he did not make known to him”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:4</td>
<td>הָדוֹרֵי</td>
<td>“he made known to him”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:2</td>
<td>צָילָל</td>
<td>“he will rescue them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10</td>
<td>נָגָה</td>
<td>“he gave him”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:4</td>
<td>יָבְלוּ</td>
<td>“he will bring him up”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:5</td>
<td>יָרְשָׁהּ</td>
<td>“he will condemn him”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:5</td>
<td>יָשָׁפָנָה</td>
<td>“he will judge him”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:7</td>
<td>לְבַלְשָׁמ</td>
<td>“to swallow them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:8</td>
<td>לְבַלְשְׁלָמ</td>
<td>“and to cause them to stumble”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>לְבֵלוֹנֶג</td>
<td>“it will swallow him”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:5</td>
<td>יָשָׁפָנָה</td>
<td>“he will judge him”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:13</td>
<td>יָרְשָׁה</td>
<td>“they made them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:13</td>
<td>לְעָוַבָם</td>
<td>“to worship them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:14</td>
<td>לָהָו לֻּלְעָו</td>
<td>“they will not save them”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4. Preference for לע (40x vs. 2x לְ, even if this count includes 20 instances of the characteristic phrase לע -ם; 참조) one notes especially the following passages:

- a) 1:4 [וכל לע] (even though the lemma Hab 1:2 reads על עַל
  (even though the lemma Hab 1:2 reads על עַל
- b) 4:2 [רֵעָה לע הרֹים] (cf. Neh 3:33; elsewhere in BH typically with לְ, sometimes with בְ)
  (cf. Neh 3:33; elsewhere in BH typically with לְ, sometimes with בְ)
- c) 4:2 [רַבּוֹת לע מבצרי] (cf. Neh 2:19; elsewhere in BH with לְ)
  (cf. Neh 2:19; elsewhere in BH with לְ)
- d) 12:3 [גָּלְעָל לע ألכיזים] (cf. Joel 4:4, Ps 13:6, 103:10, 116:7, 119:17, 142:8, 2 Chr 20:11; elsewhere with direct object or with לְ)
  (cf. Joel 4:4, Ps 13:6, 103:10, 116:7, 119:17, 142:8, 2 Chr 20:11; elsewhere with direct object or with לְ)
- e) 7:12 [חסְמֵשׁ לעהוֹלָם עַשֶּׁם רַפָּה] (cf. Neh 9:30; elsewhere in BH with לְ)
  (cf. Neh 9:30; elsewhere in BH with לְ)

2.5. Double plurals:
   a) 6:4 **לחם**ם **כלי** (cf. BH **מִלְחָמָה** **כְּלֵי** 11x)
   b) 8:12–13 **חובש**ו (cf. BH **רֹדֶר** [**חֲבֹשׁוֹת**]
   c) 12:8 **נעשו**ו (cf. BH **מעשׁו**ו)

2.6. כ"ה secret, mystery," appearing as the construct plural כ"ה 3x in col. 7 (7:5, 7:8, 7:14).10

2.7. To quantify these data, and to place them within the context of other ancient Hebrew compositions, Young invokes sample 500-word texts from the literary corpus. The 6 above-listed LBH traits all appear within the 500 words that span 1QpHab 5:3–12:13,11 a datum which places this portion of **Pesher Habakkuk** on par with SBH texts such as 1 Sam 13:1–14:9; 2 Sam 6:1–20a, 7:1–12; 1 Kgs 2:1–29—i.e., other 500-word extracts which include 6 LBH features. These stand in contrast to selected 500-word excerpts from core LBH books such as Ezra, Daniel, Chronicles, Nehemiah, and Esther, which have 25, 24, 22, 20, and 17 LBH traits, respectively, within the same span of material. Which is to say: a writer in the 1st century BCE, the presumed date of **Pesher Habakkuk**, still was capable of writing SBH, notwithstanding the development of LBH in the preceding centuries spanning the Persian and Hellenistic periods. This is thus far Young’s position, though, as we shall see, he neglected to include in the mix a host of other LBH features present in 1QpHab.

3.0. Prime among these LBH traits are matters of style and syntax identified by Frank Polak in his extensive researches into the different registers of the biblical Hebrew literary corpus.

3.1. One of the most crucial discoveries made by Polak is the increased use of hypotaxis (subordination) in LBH prose, in contrast to the more typical parataxis that dominates in SBH.12 Moreover, the hypotaxis of LBH at times works downward through several levels, with subordination upon subordination. **Pesher Habakkuk** reveals a number of such instances:13

---

10 See further below, §8.7.
11 “Biblical quotes are excluded from the sample,” according to Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd, Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts, 1:274 n. 42.
13 Since Polak treats mainly narrative prose in his research, I have limited my selections from 1QpHab to those passages which relate past events. These are not quite narrative prose, of course, but they are the closest approximation thereto in our document. The translations (which are mine) are included in order to help the reader apprehend the hypotaxis, especially since the subordinating particles are indicated by italics. The Hebrew originals are taken from The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library Program (ed. Emanuel Tov; Brigham
1QpHab 2:6–10

6. They are the oppressors of the covenant who will not believe

7. when they hear all that is to come upon the latter generation from

8. the Priest whom God has placed in [his heart the understanding] to

9. interpret all

10. the words of his servants the prophets, through [whom] God has

11. foretold

12. all that is to come upon his people and [his] community.

1QpHab 5:9–12

9. Its interpretation is about the house of Absalom

10. and the men of their council, who kept quiet upon the rebuking of the

11. Teacher of Righteousness,

12. and they did not help him against the Man of the Lie, [vacat] who has

13. rejected

14. the Torah in the midst of their entire congregation.

Young University; Leiden: Brill, 2006) (henceforth DDSSEL), though I have kept an eye on
other editions as well, e.g., Maurya P. Horgan, "Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab)," in The Dead
Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, vol. 6B: Pesharim,
Other Commentaries, and Related Documents (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; PTSDSSP; Tübingen:
Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 157–85; and Elisha Qimron, Megillot Midbar Yehuda: ha-Hibburim

Qimron, Megillot Midbar Yehuda, 1:246 restores instead of at the lacuna, though
for our purposes this matters not.
1QpHab 7:7–8

7. Its interpretation, that the end time will be long, more so than all
8. that the prophets had said, because the mysteries of God are wondrous.

1QpHab 7:10–14

10. Its interpretation is about the men of truth,
11. observers of the Torah, whose hands do not slacken from the worship of
12. truth, even when the end time is drawn out upon them, because
13. all the fixed–times of God will come about in their due course, as he ordained
14. for them through the mysteries of his discernment.

1QpHab 8:1–3

1. Its interpretation is about all the observers of the Torah in the house of Judah whom
2. God will rescue from the house of judgment, on account of their labour and their loyalty
3. to the Teacher of Righteousness.

1QpHab 9:4–7
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4. Its interpretation is about later priests of Jerusalem,
5. who will gather wealth and spoil from the plunder of the peoples,
6. but in the end of days their wealth and their plunder will be given into
the hand of
7. the army of the Kittim, [vacat] because they are “the rest of the
peoples”.

*iQpHab 9:9–12*

9. Its interpretation is about the [W]icked Priest, because of the crime
against the Teacher of
10. Righteousness and the men of his council, God gave him into the hand
of his enemies, to humiliate him
11. with a consuming affliction, with bitterness of soul, on account that he
had done wrong
12. to his chosen-ones.

*iQpHab 10:9–13*

9. Its interpretation is about the Spreader of Lies, who deceived many,
10. by building a worthless city by bloodshed and by founding a congrega-
tion by lies,
11. on account of its glory, by making many weary with worthless work,
and by teaching them
12. about false d[ee]ds. Their labour will be for naught, on account of
which they will enter

---

15 I have adopted the reading לכהל (with kaf) in line 11, following Horgan, “Habakkuk Pesher (*iQpHab)*,” 176, especially upon checking the photograph; though the reading with bet (as per *DSSEL* and Qimron, *Megillot Midbar Yehuda*, 1:253) is possible and would fit the context as well.
13. into judgments of fire, because they blasphemed and reviled the chosen ones of God.

\textit{1QpHab 11:12–14}

because they blasphemed and reviled the chosen ones of God.

11. Its interpretation is about the priest whose disgrace became greater than his honour,

12. because he had not circumcised the foreskin of his heart, and he followed the paths of

13. indulgence, in order to bring to sweep away the thirsty.

\textit{1QpHab 12:2–6}

The interpretation of this matter is about the Wicked Priest, to recom pense him

2. his due for what he did to the poor, because “Lebanon” refers to

3. the council of the Yahad, and “the beasts” refers to the simple ones of Judah who obey

4. the Torah, because God will judge him for destruction, \textit{[vacat]}

5. just as he had planned to destroy the poor.

3.2. A second important LBH feature identified by Polak is the much more nominal, and hence less verbal, style. Which is to say, writers in the Persian period were wont to use many more nouns in their prose (and indeed poetry as well), so that the Noun-Verb ratio in later texts is markedly higher.\textsuperscript{16} While I do not engage in the specific statistical analysis regularly presented by Polak, the highlighting of the nouns and verbs in the following passages will demonstrate the point. I indicate the nouns with the bold Hebrew font (and note how

many of these are noun groups, on which see below, §3.3); whereas verbs are

designated via the light Hebrew font.17

\[\text{iQpHab 5:9–12}\]

\[\text{משריע על בית.Abstract}

\[\text{ואכתי תענום איש ונודר בחרבת אופריה תעמך}

\[\text{ולא תענהו על איש бесומ ואר מטא ואט}

\[\text{התוריןハウ כוֹל תְּלַעֲפָה}

\[\text{iQpHab 7:4–5}\]

\[\text{משריע על מחרה תWrapped אופריה ורידי אל אט}

\[\text{כמל רוי דפי עפֶרָי הנהבומ}

\[\text{iQpHab 9:9–12}\]

\[\text{משריע על הכותך חراعש איש בְּני מחרה}

\[\text{שמע ואכתי תענה נגנ אל ביד ]אֵרִבי לַנְגָּנָה}

\[\text{בצניע לְכלָה בְּמוֹרָיו פֶשֶׁב בַעֹור אופריה ורדי}

\[\text{על בְּמִיהֵר}

\[\text{iQpHab 11:4–8}\]

\[\text{משריע על הכותך ורדי איש}

\[\text{רדף אחר מחרה החרמס לכלני ב_cם}

\[\text{המכה אופי דלי בוכק מועד הבותח}

\[\text{ויי המחזרו חוכף אלהים לכלני}

\[\text{לחסילא דיש דאם שבט מנהות}

\[\text{על בְּמִיהֵר}

3.3. Not surprisingly, given the greater nominal style inherent in LBH, the

number of “noun groups” increases in Persian-period literature.18 Such is to be

seen in Pesher Habakkuk as well, as witnessed by the following lists.

3.3.1. The first type of noun group is comprised by the collocation of two (or

more) individual nouns (A+B). In six instances, as indicated below, the Pesher

comment expands upon a single noun present in the interpreted lemma, thereby

further highlighting this practice.

---

17 Once more these selections are taken from those sections of Pesher Habakkuk which nar-
rate past events and hence most closely approximate BH narrative prose storytelling.

18 See n. 12; and see also Frank Polak, “Parallelism and Noun Groups in Prophetic Poetry
from the Persian Era,” in A Palimpsest: Rhetoric, Ideology, Stylistics, and Language Relating
to Persian Israel (ed. E. Ben Zvi, D. V. Edelman, and F. Polak; Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias,
2009), 199–235.
3.3.2. The second type of noun group is comprised of construct phrases (A–B). On four occasions, Pesher Habakkuk expands a single noun in the lemma to a construct phrase in the interpretative comment. Moreover, fifteen of the following items include a complex construct phrase, that is, with three or more nouns in construct, or two constructs back-to-back with the second standing in apposition to the first, and so on.

1:11 תורת אל (lemma Hab 1:4)
1:13, etc. מורה הצדק (lemma Hab 1:4)
2:1–2, 5:11 איש הבוב
2:2–3ставлен אל
2:4 בור אל
2:6urrection הר[ת]י
2:7 קול הבה[ת]ו
2:7–8مفهوم הכומת
2:8–9бол דבריו עבורי הנביאים (complex)
2:10 קול הבהוא
2:13 ממשלת המתחים
2:15 תקיע [ז]ל
3:4–5бол הנוסא
3:6 כל העמים
4:5 ממשל עכווסים
4:6 (lemma Hab 1:10)
4:10 ממשל עכווסים
5:5 (complex)
5:7–8 בקן להשלות
5:10 (complex)
7:2 נגời חק
7:5 בול ו🍫 עבדי הנבואה (complex)
7:8 וי אל
7:10–11 אנשי האמה עשירים והרודים (complex)
7:11–12 אנשי האמה
7:13 בול וgetInstance (complex)
7:14 וי לעמה
8:1 בול וgetInstance (complex)
8:2-bin testimony
8:3-4 יש האמה
8:9-13 בוחנות של
8:9-10 חכתות על
8:11-12 (complex)
8:12 חכתות של
8:12-13 (complex)
8:12-13 Derech ha[ Ми
8:13 (complex)
8:14 בוחנות של
9:2-12 בוחנות של
9:5-6 attravers die
9:7-8 הולך החזאים
10:12 [ זה שקר
10:13-14 משפטים אשמים
10:13-14 בוחנים את
11:1–2 (sic)
11:5–6 בכתובים
11:6 בכתוב
11:6-7 בכתובים מנשה ים הבופים (complex)
11:8-9 בכתובים מנשה ים הבופים (complex)
11:14–15 בכתובים (complex) (cf. Isa 51:17)
12:4-13 השוואת
12:4-13 השוואת (complex)
12:8-9 השוואת
The most revealing of these passages is 11:6–8, which includes a five-word construct string “at the time of the festival of the repose of the Day of Atonement” (11:6–7), followed by a four-word construct string “on the day of the fast of the Sabbath of their repose” (11:8). Such complex constructs are very rare in the Bible; the following represents more or less a complete list:19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen 47:9</td>
<td>וְיָוהֵֽי הַהַרְדָּם ... וְיָוהֵֽי הַאָמֶֽוֶת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 10:12</td>
<td>מֶלֶךְ־אַשּׁוּר לְבַ‍ﬠַל־פְ‍רִי־גֹ֙דֶל אֶפְקֹ֗ד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 21:17</td>
<td>יִמְﬠָ֑טוּ בְגֵ‍י־קֵדָ֖ר גִּבּוֹרֵ֥י מִסְפַּר־קֶ֛שֶׁת וּשְׁאָ֧ר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 12:24</td>
<td>יִמְﬠָ֑טוּ בְגֵ‍י־קֵדָ֖ר גִּבּוֹרֵ֥י מִסְפַּר־קֶ֛שֶׁת וּשְׁאָ֧ר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0. We now turn to other grammatical items classified as LBH (that is, beyond the items investigated by Polak), though these too were not included by Young in his study of Pesher Habakkuk. The first of these is the non-repetition of the preposition in a noun series.

The difference between SBH and LBH may be seen by comparing the following passages:20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBH</th>
<th>LBH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הבכִּין בְּהַרְדָּם (Gen 31:27);</td>
<td>הבכִּין בְּהַרְדָּם (Exod 15:20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הבכִּין בְּהַרְדָּם (Exod 15:20);</td>
<td>הבכִּין בְּהַרְדָּם (Ps 149:3);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הבכִּין בְּהַרְדָּם (Ps 150:4);</td>
<td>הבכִּין בְּהַרְדָּם (Ps 150:4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The latter system continues in post-Biblical texts, as seen in the following passages from a Judean desert document:21


21 Uri Mor, “Diqduq ʿIvrit šel Teʿudot Midbar Yehuda ben ha-Mered ha-Gadol le-Mered Bar-Kokhva” (Ph.D. diss., Ben-Gurion University, 2009), 241.
In light of this picture, one is not surprised to find five examples of this usage in *Pesher Habakkuk*:

5.0. Among the noun groups of the construct phrase type surveyed above (§3.3.2), two collocations deserve special notice.

5.1. The first of these places the word אמת “truth” in the *nomen rectum* position, with a variety of nouns serving in the *nomen regens* slot. Five such phrases occur in the Bible, with only one from a pre-exilic text, one from an exilic text, and three from post-exilic texts—thus pointing to the late usage inherent here:\footnote{Note that the first of these occurs in the mouth of Jethro, whose speech is replete with atypical usages. See further Mordecai Mishor, “On the Language and Text of Exodus 18,” in *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Environment: Typological and Historical Perspectives* (ed. S. E. Fassberg and A. Hurvitz; Jerusalem: Magnes, 2006), 225–29.}

\begin{itemize}
  \item אֱמֶת אַנְשֵׁי (Exod 18:21)
  \item אֱמֶתמִשְׁפַּט (Ezek 18:8, Zech 7:9)
  \item אֱמֶת אִישׁ (Neh 7:2)
  \item אֱמֶת וְתוֹרוֹת (Neh 9:13)
\end{itemize}

This pattern continues throughout Qumran Hebrew, as the following representative examples demonstrate:\footnote{I do not include the specific references here, which may be located via a search in any of the DSS concordances; the same holds for the list in §5.2 below.}

\begin{itemize}
  \item יד אמת
  \item מעשׁי אמת
  \item דִּי אמת
  \item נחלת אמת
  \item חוכֵי אמת
\end{itemize}
Three examples of this phraseology occur in *Pesher Habakkuk*:

1. אַנְשֵׁי הָאָםָה
2. עִבְּרוֹת הָאָםָה
3. שֶׁ הָאָםָה

5.2. The second relevant phrase places the word יִמְעַשֶּׂה “deeds of” in the *nomen regens* position, with a panoply of terms in the *nomen rectum* slot. To be sure, such construct phrases occur in *SBH*, but they are limited to prescribed usages.

The first such usage places יִמְעַשֶּׂה before a specific artisan term, as in the following exemplary phrases:

- יִמְעַשֶּׂה חָרָשׁ
- יִמְעַשֶּׂה חֹשֵׁב
- יִמְעַשֶּׂה רֹקֵם
- יִמְעַשֶּׂה אֹרֵג
- יִמְעַשֶּׂה אֹפֶה

The second typical usage occurs with a specific product or material in the *nomen rectum* locus, as illustrated by the following expressions:

- יִמְעַשֶּׂה עִזִּים
- יִמְעַשֶּׂה עֲבֹת
- יִמְעַשֶּׂה שׁוּשַׁן

The third standard usage is the well-known expression with יִד “hand” (singular or plural) serving as *nomen rectum*, hence, for example:

- יִמְעַשֶּׂה יָד
- יִמְעַשֶּׂה יָדְיָה

Finally, we may point to the two parallel usages in Lev 18:3:

- יִמְעַשֶּׂה אֲרִיָּמְשִׁים
- יִמְעַשֶּׂה אֲרֵיָּמְשִׁים

The picture in *LBH* is totally different, since here one finds authors utilizing a host of different words following יִמְעַשֶּׂה “deeds of.” The impression one gains is that late authors no longer felt constrained by the traditional phraseology.
summarized above. Rather, they began to express their literary and linguistic freedom through the use of expressions such as these:

מַﬠֲשֵׂ֥ה הַצָּדִּי קִ֑ים (Isa 32:17)
מַﬠֲשֵׂ֥ה הָרָﬠָ֖ה (Qoh 8:11)
מַﬠֲשֵׂ֥ה הָעוֹמ֑דִים (Qoh 8:14)
מַﬠֲשֵׂ֥ה הָרְשָׁﬠִ֔ים (Qoh 8:14)
מַﬠֲשֵׂ֥ה יִשְׂרָאֵֽל (2 Chr 17:4)
מַﬠֲשֵׂ֥ה כל בֵּשַׁךְ (Sir 39:19 MS B)

This LBH trend continues, indeed increases to a remarkable extent, in Qumran Hebrew, as witnessed by the following examples:

מעָשֶׂמֶת רִחְיֹת
מעָשֶׂת אַפִּיעַ
מעָשֶׂת יִשְׁפֶּט
מעָשֶׂת הָוְדָר
מעָשֶׂת נוֹעַב
מעָשֶׂת בַּבָּד
מעָשֶׂת הָוָדָר
מעָשֶׂת נַדָּה

Two such expressions occur in 1QpHab:

10:12 מעָשֶׂת שְּקָר
12:8 מעָשֶׂת נוֹעַבָּה

6.0. In this section we present a series of other late usages, of various types and in no particular order, found in Pesher Habakkuk.

6.1. The expression "one after another" occurs in our text in the following passage:

[on]e after another they shall come to destroy the la[nd] (1QpHab 4:12–13)

A second instance of this syntagma in QH appears in 1QS 2:19–20 "the priests shall pass first in order, according to their spirits, one after another." The closest BH parallel occurs in Qoh 7:14 "indeed this-one and that-one God has done.” Most strikingly, the expression "one after another" occurs 38x in Tannaitic Hebrew (Mishnah 7x; Tosefta 27x; Midreshe Halakah 4x).
6.2. The prepositional phrase אֶבִּית "in the house" (in place of standard Hebrew בֵּית) occurs in Pesher Habakkuk in the expression:

אֶבִּית גֶּלוֹתָה in the house of his exile (1QpHab 11:6)

A second attestation within the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus (albeit in an Aramaic composition) occurs in the book of Tobit:

אֶבִּית תַּרְעֹאֵל in the house of [Reuel] (4Q197 [4QTob ar] 4 i 16)

For another occurrence in a Hebrew text of several centuries later, note the following from a Wadi Muraba‘at document:

אֶבִּית מפור in Bet-Mašiko (Mur 42:4)

Finally, the form אֶבִּית “in the house” occurs 9x in MH, especially within specific locutions, such as אֶבִּית הָדְשֶן “at the ash-heap” and אֶבִּית הָפַרְיַן “in the pharynx.” The evidence points to this unusual usage as a feature of Hebrew (and Aramaic) within the prescribed period of ca. 200 BCE (or whenever we may date the book of Tobit, or at least the relevant Qumran manuscript thereof) through ca. 300 CE. Its presence in 1QpHab surely must be accorded status as an LBH trait.

6.3. The noun גְּמֶר “fulfillment” occurs in 1QpHab 7:2 גְּמֶר הַקָּצָה “fulfillment of the end,” and in two other DSS texts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4Q249p</td>
<td>10 כֹּלָה וַחֲזָן (מִן עֲבוֹדָה)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q381</td>
<td>24a+b כֹּלָה (מִן עֲבוֹדָה)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The word is used more regularly in MH (28x in Tannaitic texts), especially in the phrase גְּמֶר מְלָאכָה “completion of the work.”

---

24 For this specific reference and for general discussion of the phenomenon treated here, see Mor, “Diqduq ʿIvrit,” 109–10.
25 Data according to Maʿagarim (database of the Academy of the Hebrew Language, Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language project).
26 See already E. Qimron, The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 99, where גְּמֶר is included in the list of “Words Mainly Attested in the DSS and in the Tannaitic and Amoraitic (MH1) Literature.”
6.4. The noun עמל “engagement” occurs in Pesher Habakkuk as follows:

בשובר עמל ואומנות מומורים היצדק

On account of their engagement and their faith in the Teacher of Righteousness (1QpHab 8:2–3)

This usage is not attested in BH, where instead the noun עמל means “toil, labour” and by extension “trouble, distress.” But the QH usage is continued in MH, especially with the collocation of the verbal root ל-מ-ע “be engaged” and the key noun תורה “Torah,” e.g.:27

Mekilta Devarim 12:1

6.5. The same passage in Pesher Habakkuk attests to the noun אמנה “faith, support”:

בשובר עמל ואומנות מומורים היצדק

On account of their engagement and their faith in the Teacher of Righteousness (1QpHab 8:2–3)

While in theory this word could be read as ʾĕmūnā (= Masoretic אֱמוּנָה), in light of the fact that in MT 48 out of 49 attestations of this noun are written plene (the exception is Ps 143:1)—not to mention the greater propensity for plene orthography in the Qumran scribal tradition when compared to MT—almost without a doubt the relevant word above should be read as wa-ʾāmānātām (= Masoretic וַאֲמָנָתָם), with the base word אֲמָנָה ʾāmānā as in Neh 10:1, 11:23 (with the meanings “pact” and “agreement,” respectively).28

A second postbiblical attestation of this word may occur in the Damascus Document:29

בברית { } the covenant { } and (the) pact (CD 20:12)

Notwithstanding the uncertainty of the reading here, most likely, especially with the preceding word ברית, we are to understand the second word in this

27 Again, see Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 102, where עמל occurs in the same list of lexical items noted in the previous footnote.
28 Once more, see Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 88, where אמנה is included amongst “Words Mainly Attested in the DSS and in the Late Biblical Books.”
29 DCH, 1:318.
phrase as the noun אמנה meaning “pact” (though in theory it could be functioning as an adjective here).

6.6. The next term to be considered is לזרב “in abundance,” occurring in Pesher Habakkuk as follows:

כמי יהים לזרב

like the waters of the sea, in abundance (1QpHab 11:1–2)

While this adverbial occurs in SBH (e.g., 15x in Genesis, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings), it develops into a more salient feature of LBH. The single attestations of לזרב in both Zechariah and Nehemiah do not disclose this, but the 36 occurrences in the book of Chronicles demonstrate the point clearly, especially when one considers the difference between parallel passages such as these:30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kings 10:2</th>
<th>בשמן ותחב רכיבאיה</th>
<th>מאה וששים</th>
<th>כבר יתב ובשאם רכיביה</th>
<th>מאד</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Chronicles 9:1</td>
<td>בשמן ותחב לזרב</td>
<td>מאה וששים</td>
<td>כבר יתב ובשאם לזרב</td>
<td>מאד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings 10:10</td>
<td>מ 횩 ומשים</td>
<td>מ획 ומשים מזרב</td>
<td>מאד</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chronicles 9:9</td>
<td>מ 횩 ומשים</td>
<td>מ획 ומשים מזרב</td>
<td>מאד</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Kings passages use adverbials such as רב מי (the latter is particularly common in SBH), while the Chronicler updates the text linguistically by using לזרב in both cases (once with מזרב following).

The pattern discernible here continues in other Qumran texts, as witnessed by the attestation of לזרב in 1QS 4:12; 1QHª 2014, 23:14; 4Q381 (4QNon-Canonical Psalms B) 46a+b 4; 4Q285 (4QSefer ha-Milḥamah) 8 7 // 11Q14 (11QSefer ha-Milḥamah) 1 ii 10.31 We exemplify the usage with the last passage: הנראת והיהו ויהי לזרב “grain, wine, and oil in abundance.”

6.7. Yet another late usage occurring in Pesher Habakkuk is the adverb יותר “more than, very much”:

פשה אורב יאראק חקמה והארון יתור על כל אswire וזרב הנביס

Its interpretation, that the last end time will be longer than anything about which the prophets spoke. (1QpHab 7:7[–8])

30 Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, 535; and Polzin, Late Biblical Hebrew, 140.
31 See Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 95, for the inclusion of this item in his list of “Words Mainly Attested in the DSS and in the Late Biblical Books.”
This term is a true marker of LBH, as indicated by the following passages:\footnote{For extended discussion, see A. Schoors, *The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words: A Study of the Language of Qoheleth, Part I: Grammar* (OLA 41; Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 114–15, and Schoors, *The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words: A Study of the Language of Qoheleth, Part II: Vocabulary* (OLA 143; Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 215–18.}

\begin{tabular}{l}
Qoh 2:15 & יִתְרָה יַפְּנֵה אֲנִי אֵלָה יִתְרָה \\
Qoh 7:16 & יָיִרֵ֥י נַעֲרֵ֑י קְדֹשָּׁה יִתְרָה קְדֹשָּׁ֥ה יִתְרָה \\
Qoh 12:9 & יִתְרָה שָׁקַ֣ר קְלַלָּ֑ה יִתְרָה קְלַלָּה יִתְרָה \\
Qoh 12:12 & יִתְרָה מְקַמֵּ֣ה בָּאָֽה יִתְרָה מְקַמֵּ֣ה בָּאָֽה \\
Esth 6:6 & לָֽלַמְּלַ֣ךְ יִתְרָה לָֽלַמְּלַ֣ךְ יִתְרָה
\end{tabular}

This usage continues in the book of Ben Sira:\footnote{Several of these perhaps should be read as יָתְרָה (as opposed to יִתְרָה), but the picture remains the same essentially.}

\begin{tabular}{l}
Sir 8:13 (MS A) & יָתְרָה יָתְרָה מְקַמְּלִי \\
Sir 10:31 (MS A) & תַּכֵּ֥בָה בְּדַלּוֹת בְּדַלּוֹת מְקַמְּלִי \\
Sir 10:31 (MS A) & מְקַמְּלִי בְּדַלּוֹת בְּדַלּוֹת יִתְרָה יִתְרָה
\end{tabular}

Other Qumran texts also reflect the usage of יִתְרָה “more than, very much”:

\begin{tabular}{l}
1Q30 1 5 & יָתְרָה יָתְרָה אֶארֶבֶּעַת \text{ and more than four} \\
4Q274 3 ii 4 & לֶטֶהְרוּ יִתְרָה \text{ for one more pure}
\end{tabular}

Finally, one notes that this feature occurs in Tannaitic texts, indeed one might even consider it a distinguishing characteristic of MH.\footnote{The restoration is rather obvious, but in any case is confirmed by the reading of Ben Sira MS B, which is not damaged at this point.}

6.8. The noun הבאות “the coming things” is a common feature of *Pesher Habakkuk*:

\begin{tabular}{l}
1QpHab 1:3 & הבֹּא[ה] דֹּאָת עִלְיָּמָה \text{ the coming things} \\
1QpHab 2:7 & Kol bèa גּוֹל הַבָּא [ה] דֹּאָת הַאָהָרָה \text{ for the coming Holy} \\
1QpHab 2:10 & Kol bèa גּוֹל הַבָּא [ה] דֹּאָת \text{ the coming Holy} \\
1QpHab 7:1–2 & לִלְתֹּהוּ גּוֹלָה גּוֹלָה חֹדֶר הַהָאָרָה \text{ the coming Holy就有 the Holy Holy}
\end{tabular}

\footnote{Moshe Zvi Segal, *Diqduq Lešon ha-Mišna* (Tel-Aviv: Devir, 1936), 193; and Miguel Pérez Fernández, *An Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 81. According to *Ma’agarim*, the counts for יִתְרָה in Tannaitic texts are as follows: 18x Mishnah, 43x Tosefta, 60x Midreshe Halakah.}
This usage developed in BH only during the exilic period, as evidenced by the following two texts:

Isa 41:22  
נְדַעֵת אַחֲרִיתָן אֵלֶּה שָׁמַעְתָּן  
Ezek 16:16  
לֹא בָּאוֹתָן אֱלֹהִים

Notwithstanding the fact that these phrases represented the totality of this usage in ancient Hebrew (which is to say, the term בבאות “the coming things” does not occur in the intervening material from the Persian period or in Ben Sira, nor does it occur in rabbinic texts, as far as I am able to determine), one still may see in this usage a feature linking LBH (albeit from the transitional period during the 6th century BCE) and QH.

6.9. The noun נכבדים “honoured ones” occurs in Pesher Habakkuk in the following passage:

ילענו על ריבם וגו על נכבדים במלכים ושרים ומעשנה וכסות בעם רב  
They mock the great ones, and they deride the honoured ones; at kings and princes they jeer, and they scoff a throng of people. (4:2–3).

The source for this usage may be found in the following biblical passages:

Isa 23:8  
נִכְבַּדֵּי־אָרֶץ כִּנְﬠָנֶיהָ  
Isa 23:9  
כָּל־נִכְבַּדֵּי־אָרֶץ לְהָ קֵל כָּל־צְבִ֔י גְּא֣וֹן לְחַלֵּל  
Nah 3:10  
בַזִּקִּים רֻתְּק֥וּ וְכָל־גְּדוֹלֶ֖יהָ גוֹרָ֔ל יַדּוּ וְﬠַל־נִכְבַּדֶּ֙הָ  
Ps 149:8  
בַרְזֶל בְּכַבְלֵי וְנִכְבְּדֵיהֶם בְּזִקִּים מַלְכֵיהֶם לֶאָסֹ֣ר

These passages (especially the first three) suggest a non-native Hebrew idiom, which first was employed as a style-switching feature and which only later was expanded to general usage.37 Note that the two Isaiah passages are part of the prophet’s oracle against Tyre; while the Nahum passage is directed towards (as throughout this book) the Assyrians, even if the term here refers to the Egyptian notables. The fourth passage above also refers to the dignitaries of foreign countries, though one notes that the author of Ps 149 in the post-exilic period now uses the word in a generic fashion, without an association to specific foreign notables.

37 On style-switching, see Gary A. Rendsburg, “Style-switching,” *EHLL* 3:633–36, along with the sources cited there. Though one must admit that in the present instance no Phoenician or other cognate evidence exists.
This generalization of the word נכבדים (always in the plural, one notes) continues and may even be expanded in the book of Ben Sira. In the passages below, the “honoured ones” could just as easily (and indeed may) refer to Israelite dignitaries as to foreign ones:

Sir 11:6 (MS B) נכבדים נתנו יד עירם
Sir 48:6 (MS B) המורים 말ים על שחת נכבדים [משתות]

The first verse occurs in a typical wisdom context, while the second appears in the praise of Elijah.

When we turn to the Dead Sea Scrolls, we find the word נכבדים “honoured ones” attested in 1QpHab 4:2 cited above, and then three times in Pesher Nahum (4Q169):

4QpNah 3–4 ii 9 נ[מ]כבדים הושע[ים]
4QpNah 3–4 iii 9 פשרי אמרה ההובשת והאראים דרך נ[1]לי מששה נכסיר ה[ה
4QpNah 3–4 iv 4 נבורי נכבדים

Only the third of these is elicited by the lemma of Nah 3:10 (see above for the verse), whereas the first and second are used in pesher comments to passages occurring earlier in Nah 3. To be sure, the Pesher author presumably anticipated the attestation of נכבדיה in Nah 3:10; nevertheless one notes the more common usage of this word in QH, continuing the picture suggested by Ben Sira.

7.0. A characteristic feature of Pesher Habakkuk in particular is the omission of the he in the Hiphil infinitive.

While examples of this general phenomenon occur sporadically in other DSS texts (with Niphal and Hitpael, in addition to Hiphil), the seven-fold presence of laqṭīl infinitives in our text is truly striking.

Examples of this grammatical feature appear more or less equally distributed throughout the Bible (Exodus/1; Numbers/2; Deuteronomy/2; Samuel/2; Kings/1; Isaiah/4; Jeremiah/3; Amos/1; Psalms/3; Proverbs/1; Qohelet/1; Daniel/1; Nehemiah/1; Chronicles/1), as evidence for the colloquial dialect of ancient Hebrew which penetrated the written standard (= BH) at various times.

---

38 Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 48.
I am aware of three other instances of the loss of *he* in the Hiphil infinitive in the Qumran documents:\(^{40}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
4Q169 & (4QpNah) \ 3–4 \ iii \ 7 & \text{לעתה} \\
4Q171 & (4QPsa) \ 1–10 \ ii \ 16 & \text{לפיל} \\
4Q511 & (4QShirb) \ 2 \ i \ 4 & \text{לאיר}
\end{align*}
\]

As is well known, this feature becomes standard in MH.\(^{41}\) In this case, accordingly, *Pesher Habakkuk* does not represent the continuation of a feature observable in LBH (examples of which have dominated our discussion unto this point), but the regular use of the *laqṭīl* infinitive by the author/scribe of 1QpHab demonstrates nonetheless that his language is “on the way” to the still later attested register of the Tannaim.

8.0. I do not wish to give the impression, however, that there are no early features of ancient Hebrew in *Pesher Habakkuk*. Indeed, there are a number of linguistic usages that evoke SBH from the pre-exilic period, and in some cases these items even suggest Archaic Biblical Hebrew (ABH). Moreover, in the famous case of the 3rd person masc. sg. independent pronoun (see below, §8.6), we must contend with a feature that occurs nowhere else in the history of the Hebrew language.

Before presenting these items, however, I must state clearly that I do not consider these traits to be natural usages of the Qumran author/scribe, but rather conscious archaisms (or, in the one case, even an invention), used in imitation of earlier strata of the Hebrew language.\(^{42}\) Together these elements constitute evidence for understanding QH as an anti-language, used by the Yaḥad to distinguish itself intentionally from other Jews of the period, while

---

\(^{40}\) This may represent a slight increase in the ratio of occurrences, when compared to BH, though someone would have to produce a pure mathematical calculation to demonstrate the point (or to deny it).


\(^{42}\) Hence, most or all of these items would fall into the category of grammatical “pseudo-classicisms,” to use the term employed by Jan Joosten, “Pseudo-classicisms in Late Biblical Hebrew, in Ben Sira, and in Qumran Hebrew,” in *Sirach, Scrolls and Sages: Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah* (ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde; STDJ 33; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 146–59.
at the same time providing their texts with a patina of antiquity and hence authority. The following features fall into this category.

8.1. In the two places where the option was available, the Qumran author/scribe elected to use the older 3rd masc. pl. pronominal suffix attached to nouns ending in ות, i.e., -וֹתָם (as opposed to the later form -וֹתֶהֵם): 1QpHab 6:4 "their signs [sc. military standards]"; 1QpHab 6:4 "their wars." Note that the former term has biblical precursors in Ps 74:4 and Job 21:29 ואוהם.

8.2. 1QpHab 5:6 includes the phrase בֵּיהַ לָהֶם "in their distress," using the archaic form לא "their." This morpheme is limited to poetry in the Bible (57x; mainly in Job, Psalms, and Isaiah, though also 2x each in the archaic poems of Deut 32 and 33), whereas in QH it occurs quite "naturally" in prose compositions (see 1QS 4:14, 9:22, for example). Note that the Pesher comment here interprets Hab 1:12–13a, and not Hab 2:7, where the word לא occurs.

8.3. As is true throughout QH, so also in Pesher Habakkuk: the preferred term for God is אה "God." For QH as a whole, אה "God" occurs 694x; for the key text 1QS, this lexeme appears 56x. Pesher Habakkuk employs the term 23x: 1:6, 1:11, 2:3, 2:4, 2:8, 2:9, 2:15(r), 5:3, 5:4, 7:3, 7:4, 7:8, 7:13, 8:2, 8:10, 8:11, 9:10, 10:3, 10:13, 11:15(r), 12:5, 12:9, 13:3. For many of these attestations, see the construct phrases listed above, §3.3.2.

8.4. One of the main discriminants between SBH and LBH is the choice between נְא "community, congregation," used in the former (including P), versus its LBH equivalent נְא. Contrary to what one might expect, given the late linguistic profile observable in Pesher Habakkuk, our text utilizes the former

---


44 For general discussion, see Moshe Bar-Asher, "Lešon Qumran ben ha-Miqra’ li-Lšon Ḥazal (‘Iyyun bi-S’if be-Morfologya)," Meghillot 2 (2004): 137–49.

45 The full phrase is מלחמותם כֹּל "their instruments of war," but to bring out the grammatical point in the translation I present here simply מלחמות "their wars."

46 The symbol (r) indicates that the text has been slightly restored.

47 Indeed, this conclusion was one of the first of many such findings emanating from the pen of Avi Hurvitz; see his article, "Le-šimušo šel ha-Munaḥ ha-Kohani ‘ēdā ba-Sifrut ha-Miqra’it," Tarbiz 40 (1970–1971): 261–67.
word: בושקר (1QpHab 10:10). This usage is indicative of QH as a whole, with בושקר occurring 153x and קהל occurring 46x.48

8.5. A full-scale study of the difference(s) (if any) between בושקר and קהל in ancient Hebrew, both meaning “on account of, in order that,” remains a desideratum.49 I here present some basic information concerning the distribution of the two forms. The former occurs 51x in the Bible, as follows: Gen-Exod 22x; Josh 2x; Sam 15x; Jer 1x; Amos 2x; Mic 1x; Ps 3x; Job 1x; Chr 4x (3 of which ¶ Samuel), suggesting a decidedly early usage, which becomes less and less common with the passage of time. The latter occurs 272x, more or less equally distributed throughout the biblical corpus, though by the very nature of the decreased use of בושקר in late texts, one may assume an increased use of קהל in Persian-period compositions. In order to highlight this dichotomy between the two options, note the data provided in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>בושקר</th>
<th>Samuel 15x / LBH corpus 4x (3 of which ¶ Samuel)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>קהל</td>
<td>Samuel 3x / LBH corpus 16x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To complete the picture, note that Ben Sira uses each form 10x, a point that seems to run counter to the trend for decreased use of בושקר in LBH. I would posit, somewhat tentatively, that the unexpected increase in בושקר in Ben Sira is due to the poetic nature of this composition, with its tendency to evoke biblical language quite consciously.

Regardless, what is clear is Pesher Habakkuk’s undoubted preference for בושקר, which occurs in 1QpHab 8:2, 8:10, 9:11, 10:11, 10:12 (with only one instance of קהל in 11:14). This stands in contrast, moreover, to the choice between these two synonyms in the base text, with קהל occurring twice (Hab 2:2, 2:15), versus no instances of בושקר. In short, by favouring בושקר, Pesher Habakkuk resounds the more classical language found in SBH, as another instance of intentional archaism in support of the goal of anti-language.

48 These numbers, taken from DSSEL, reflect some double counting, since the same word that occurs in two different copies of the same composition is counted twice. See, for example, קהל in the specific form (בעדתם) in both CD 3:9 and its parallel text 4Q269 = 4QD4 2 3; and קהל in both CD 12:6 (אני הקהל) and its parallel text 4Q271 = 4QD7 5 i 21 (הקהל). Such instances, however, are relatively few and do not skew the data presented in any significant way.

49 The essential equality of the two terms may be determined by noticing the use of קהל in Gen 18:24 alongside the three instances of בושקר in Gen 18:29, 31, 32; the use of קהל in Gen 27:25 alongside its parallels in Gen 27:4, 19, 31; and so on. For an entrée to the subject, see Joüon and Muraoka, A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, 634–35.
8.6. The uniquely QH feature represented by הוהי “he” occurs in 1QpHab 1:9. And while the more normative הוא predominates thereafter (in 1QpHab 1:13, 3:2, 3:13, 5:6, 10:3, 12:3; in addition to several occurrences within the biblical lemmata), we nonetheless may observe how the author/scribe of Pesher Habakkuk sets the tone with his initial choice. This long form, moreover, is not an isolated morpheme, but rather stands as part of a much larger mix, with longer spellings of various types, all of which serve to create, at least in the eyes of the Yahad members, “a more official text, a more literary text, indeed a more archaic text.”

8.7. One final characteristic feature of the language of Pesher Habakkuk, and indeed of QH in general, is the lack of foreign loanwords (Aramaic, Persian, or Greek). To my mind, this stratagem fits the overall picture perfectly, as another indication of the Yahad’s commitment to produce “a more official text, a more literary text, indeed a more archaic text” (to repeat Steven Fassberg’s felicitous phrase). The main exception, of course, is the word רָז “secret, mystery” (borrowed from Persian), a key term in Qumran theology, which occurs 119x in the

---


51 Contrary to the opinion of many if not most scholars, I am not convinced that the key noun רָזִי interpretation” is an Aramaic loanword within Hebrew. True, the Aramaic form occurs 34x in Daniel vs. its more limited spread in Hebrew, with Qoh 8:1 as the sole attestation in the Hebrew portions of the Bible, in addition to Sir 38:14 (MS ב) (as feminine noun רָזִיה, albeit with the meaning “diagnosis” vel sim., given the medical context), and then QH (passim). But the picture is far from clear. First, note that the Tiberian Masorah transmitted the vocable in Qoh 8:1 as a Hebrew segolate noun רָזָה, reflecting no influence from Aramaic. Secondly, the semantic range of the word is greater in Hebrew than it is in Aramaic, a point stressed by Jonas C. Greenfield, “Etymological Semantics,” ZAH 6 (1993): 26–37, at 27; repr. in Al Kanfei Yonah: Collected Studies of Jonas C. Greenfield on Semitic Philology (ed. S. M. Paul, M. E. Stone, and A. Pinnick; 2 vols.; Jerusalem: Magnes, 2001), 2:821–32, at 822. For further discussion, see Schoors, The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words, Part II: Vocabulary, 466–67.

52 In addition to the parallels brought in my earlier article, “Qumran Hebrew (with a Trial Cut [1QS]),” 241 (including n. 56), note the following analogues from a period closer to the composition of the DSS: (a) the Hebrew register used for the prayers, which strikingly lack Greek and Latin loanwords, on which see Moshe Bar-Asher, “Les formules de bénéédiction forgées par les sages: étude préliminaire,” REJ 166 (2007): 441–61; and (b) the Syriac employed by Jacob of Edessa in his letters, which is distinguished by a lack of Greek loanwords, in conspicuous contrast to the writings of other Syriac Orthodox authors of the previous generation (information courtesy of Aaron M. Butts, Yale University).
Hebrew texts and 19x in the Aramaic documents from Qumran. Amongst the former are three attestations in 1QpHab, always as the construct plural רָזִי: 7:5 7:8, 7:14 (see above §2.6). Most likely this noun was admitted into the QH lexis because its morphology was well suited to the Hebrew language, with so many other basic nouns bearing this shape (זָב, רָע, רָב,ﬠָם, דָּם, דָּג, יָד, יָם, אָח, אָב, etc.)— in contrast to words such as פַּרְתְּמִים "nobles" or פִּתְגָּם "word, speech," which do not fit a Hebrew paradigm, not to mention such exceedingly long (for Hebrew, that is) vocables as אֲחַשְׁדַּרְפְּנִים "satraps," and אֲחַשְׁתְּרָנִים "royals." Naturally, I do not mean to imply that Qumran scribes had paradigm charts of the sort found in language primers. But individuals who spend their time (lives?) copying, studying, and composing texts gain more than facility in orthography and literary flair. They are just as likely to gain a firm understanding of the mechanics of the language, especially if their prose is girded by linguistic ideology.

9.0. This study demonstrates that, contrary to the opinion expressed by Young (and Rezetko and Ehrensvärd), the language of Pesher Habakkuk is representative of LBH, as opposed to SBH. These two varieties of ancient Hebrew do not constitute coeval stylistic taxons, but rather chronologically determined dialects. By the time of the main floruit of the Qumran community, ca. 150 BCE to ca. 50 BCE, during which period Pesher Habakkuk presumably was written,

---

53 Count according to DSSEL. Again, there are some double countings, e.g., in the phrase בְּמֵי חַיָּה in both 1QS 9:18 and its parallel text 4Q258 = 4QSד 8 3, but the number of such examples is relatively insignificant.

54 Naturally, I do not mean to imply that Qumran scribes had paradigm charts of the sort found in language primers. But individuals who spend their time (lives?) copying, studying, and composing texts gain more than facility in orthography and literary flair. They are just as likely to gain a firm understanding of the mechanics of the language, especially if their prose is girded by linguistic ideology.

55 See the very short comment in Fassberg, "Ha’adafat Ṣurot Mu’rakhot bi-Mgilot Midbar Yehuda," 231, and then the extended discussion in the present volume, Fassberg, "The Nature and Extent of Aramaisms in the Hebrew Dead Sea Scrolls," 21–22.


57 In fact, Pesher Habakkuk most likely was composed towards the end of this century span, given the repeated reference to the Kittim, a code name for the Romans, in 1QpHab 2:12, 2:14, 3:4, 3:9, 4:5, 4:10, 6:1, 6:10, 9:7. On the use of this code name, see Hanan Eshel, “The Kittim in the War Scroll and the Pesharim,” in Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmonaeans...
no Hebrew author was capable still of composing in SBH. Notwithstanding his noble effort to produce an ancient-looking text—through the use of archaisms, the adaptation of poetic forms for normal prose usage, the invention of specific forms, the non-use of foreign words, and more—the author of Pesher Habakkuk reveals the true nature of his “native” and “natural” Hebrew by the LBH features that dominate throughout, in both the morphological and syntactic realms.

To expand upon this last statement, I repeat here the conclusion of my earlier article on QH, with special attention to Serekh ha-Yahad, but which is equally applicable to this study focused on Pesher Habakkuk. Two counter trends are visible in this document:

a) The first trend 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 under formation in the hands of the sect’s leaders.

b) 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):58

---

58 Shelomo Morag, “Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations,” *VT* 48 (1988): 148–64, with the chart on p. 162. As the reader is by now aware, the present article has focused on elements (a) and (b) of the chart, with an occasional nod to element (d) and no discussion of element (c). The lack of treatment of variant stress patterns is not to minimize their importance, though. In a word, I would argue that they too could serve the goal of linguistic ideology. For examples in Pesher Habakkuk, note 1QpHab 4:6 (with dots both above and below the waw in the manuscript), 4:11, 9:5. The reading in 1QpHab 1:8 is presumably לֹא, but the lacuna occurs at the crucial spot. For additional comments, see Fassberg, “The Nature and Extent of Aramaic in the Hebrew Dead Sea Scrolls,” 12. For some recent data on the subject, see Martin G. Abegg, “The Linguistic Analysis of the Dead Sea Scrolls: More than (Initially) Meets the Eye,” in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (ed. M. L. Grossman; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 48–68, esp. 61–62.
(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

Adapted from Vetus Testamentum 48 (1988), p. 162