

## IV. Conclusion

Apart from the superscription and epilogue, the end of the book echoes its beginning. The words in 12:8 are virtually identical to those in 1:2. Together these verses frame the book by their common assertion that everything is utterly beyond human control: *הַכֹּל הֶבְרִילִים . . . הַכֹּל הֶבְרִילִים*, "Absolute vanity . . . all is vanity" (1:2; 12:8). The framing goes beyond these epigrams, however, for the final poem also echoes the introductory one in vocabulary and themes. At the same time, the final poem is undeniably conclusive. Despite the constant threat of darkness and gloom throughout the book, there has always been the possibility of enjoyment. Now in his final exhortation to enjoy (11:7–12:8), Qohelet has raised the spectre of an end of possibilities for all humanity. He begins with the passing of life from youth to old age (11:9–12:1). Popular litanies about geriatric woes might have inspired his final words. He does not dwell on old age, however. Rather, he recasts the vision of the end through a radical revision that is reminiscent of prophetic eschatology. He paints a picture of the end of the world, with the darkening of all the luminaries of the sky and every possibility of light (v. 2), sheer terror even among the strong and dignified (v. 3a), sudden cessation of life-sustaining activities and the anticipation of dashed hopes (v. 3b), the end of all economic activities and social intercourse (v. 4a), the noisy settlement of birds of prey in desolated human habitats (v. 4b), and panic in the thoroughfares (v. 5a). The languishing of nature, too, testifies to the cosmic character of the catastrophe (v. 5b), all because humanity is proceeding to an "eternal house," a place from which no one who goes can turn back (v. 5c). The permanence of the end of human existence is then reiterated through a couple of symbolic actions borrowed from funerary rituals: the smashing of durable lamps, symbolic of life and hope in immortality, and the destruction of earthen vessels, symbolic of corporeal reality (v. 6). The conclusion is that all of creation will be returned to their original state or their source—the body to the earth and the lifebreath to God (v. 7). Enjoyment is both a gift of God and an imperative for here and now because there will come a time when there will no longer be any possibility of enjoyment by anyone, because creation will be taken back. Indeed, as the author has stressed from beginning to end in the book, everything—humanity and all that goes with it—is ultimately *הֶבְרִיל* (12:8).

## QUMRAN HEBREW AS AN ANTILANGUAGE

WILLIAM M. SCHNIEDEWIND

University of California/Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1511

Qumran Hebrew (= QH) has presented a challenge to traditional approaches to the history of the Hebrew language. Although it was expected that QH would provide the link between Late Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew, it has only partially filled this role.<sup>1</sup> QH remains difficult to classify. The present study contends that the traditional formal and descriptive approaches have been particularly inadequate. Instead, it takes a functionalist approach that begins with the sociolinguistic premise that "language is a complex social fact."<sup>2</sup> Consequently, the complex character of QH can be appreciated only by reference to its social function within the Qumran community. This small, isolated religious community on the north shore of the Dead Sea used language ideologically as a means of differentiating and further insulating themselves.<sup>3</sup> In sociolinguistic terms, QH is an "antilanguage" created by conscious linguistic choices intended to set the speakers and their language apart from others.<sup>4</sup>

## I. Problems in the Study of QH

The study of QH has quite solid foundations. An excellent description of QH is available in Elisha Qimron's little volume *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea*

<sup>1</sup> S. Morag, "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations," VT 38 (1988) 148–63; C. Rabin, "The Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin; ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965) 144–61.

<sup>2</sup> In the words of Judith Irvine, who obviously borrows from Emile Durkheim, "When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy," *American Ethnologist* 16 (1989) 250.

<sup>3</sup> The identification of the Qumran community with the movement known as the Essenes in classical sources (Pliny, Philo, and Josephus) continues to be a topic of heated debate. I still find Frank Moore Cross's argument for the Essene hypothesis compelling; see *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973) 330–32.

<sup>4</sup> On the term "antilanguage," see M. A. K. Halliday, "Anti-languages," *American Anthropologist* 78 (1976) 570–84.

Scrolls.<sup>5</sup> This volume, alongside E. Y. Kutscher's masterful *Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa)*, provides a serviceable description of QH.<sup>6</sup> Additionally, studies by Z. Ben-Hayyim, M. Goshen-Gottstein, A. Murtonen, J. Naudé, H. Yalon, and others provide additional perspectives on QH.<sup>7</sup> For the most part, however, previous studies have dealt with the formal aspects of QH using the methods of historical, comparative, structural, and generative linguistics. These approaches have yet to completely account for the idiosyncrasies of QH. Hence, it remains difficult to neatly place QH on a historical continuum from Late Biblical Hebrew to Mishnaic Hebrew. To be sure, this issue is complicated by the fact the Classical Biblical Hebrew and its child, Late Biblical Hebrew, are literary linguistic registers, while Mishnaic Hebrew arises from the literarization of a colloquial linguistic register. Even so, the peculiarities of QH cannot be accounted for by merely appealing to the different registers of Classical and Mishnaic Hebrew. Something else must also be afoot.

The imprecision of the term "Qumran Hebrew" itself is at the root of some of the problem. Obviously not everything found in the caves was composed by the inhabitants of Khirbet Qumran; hence, every scroll does not necessarily reflect the community's particular use of language.<sup>8</sup> By most accounts, only one-third of the Qumran manuscripts are sectarian. Devorah Dimant distinguishes between "documents employing terminology connected to the Qumran Community" and "works not containing such terminology."<sup>9</sup> Clusters of

<sup>5</sup> See E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSM 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986); idem, "Observations on the History of Early Hebrew (1000 B.C.E.–200 B.C.E.) in Light of the Dead Sea Documents," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 349–61.

<sup>6</sup> E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa)* (STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974).

<sup>7</sup> Z. Ben-Hayyim, "Traditions in the Hebrew Language, with Reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 200–214; M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran Documents," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 101–37; A. Murtonen, "A Historico-philological Survey of the Main Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents," *Abr-Nahrain* 4 (1963–64) 56–95; J. Naudé, "Towards a Typology of Qumran Hebrew," *JNSL* 20 (1991) 61–78; H. Yalon, *מגילות מדבר יהודה* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1967). For a survey of Qumran Hebrew, see A. Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) 130–46, and the literature cited there.

<sup>8</sup> The recent archaeological work by Hanan Eshel conclusively ties the scroll caves with the site of Khirbet Qumran. Using a metal detector, Eshel discovered paths between the site, the caves, and other encampments by tracing the nails recovered from ancient sandals as well as coins (lecture, "New Data From the Excavations at Qumran," AAR/SBL, November 1996).

<sup>9</sup> D. Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–90* (ed. D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman;

terms and ideas concern four areas: (1) practices and organization, (2) history and present situation, (3) theological and metaphysical outlook, and (4) peculiar biblical exegesis. Dimant emphasizes that religious concepts and ideas themselves are not sufficient (e.g., *1 Enoch; Jubilees*) except when they are accompanied by distinctive terminology. Likewise, Emanuel Tov has emphasized this distinction by isolating what he describes as Qumran orthography; scrolls not written in the peculiar orthography of the community most likely were not written by the community's scribes (see further below).<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, just because a document was *copied* by a Qumran scribe does not mean it was *composed* within the community. Hence, orthography must still be studied in concert with terminology in determining whether each scroll is a sectarian composition.

An additional difficulty with the term "Qumran Hebrew" stems from the fact that the Khirbet Qumran existed for at least two hundred years. It must be assumed that the language of the community evolved over that period.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, many of the scrolls predate the Qumran settlement. These considerations underscore the necessity of limiting our analysis to the corpus of sectarian texts that reflect the language specifically of the group living at Khirbet Qumran.

## II. A Sociolinguistic Approach to Qumran Hebrew

Parade examples for the anomalous character of QH have been the personal pronouns הוֹיָא and הִיָאָה, and scholars have turned to historical and comparative linguistics for explanations of such forms.<sup>12</sup> Perhaps a better illustration of the anomalous character of QH would be the preference for אָבִיָהוּ, "his father," or אָחִיָהוּ, "his brother," over the regular classical forms אָבִי and אָחִי.<sup>13</sup>

Leiden: Brill, 1994) 32. Hartmut Stegemann even more narrowly defines the community's literary corpus by requiring connection with the Teacher of Righteousness ("Die Bedeutung der Qumranfund für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* [ed. D. Hellholm; 2d ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1989] 511).

<sup>10</sup> Emanuel Tov, "The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls found at Qumran and the Origin of These Scrolls," *Textus* 13 (1986) 31–57; idem, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism," *JJS* 39 (1988) 5–37. Tov's observations effectively demolish Norman Golb's objections to the scrolls' association with the site of Khirbet Qumran.

<sup>11</sup> Murtonen, "A Historico-philological Survey," 56–95.

<sup>12</sup> Frank Moore Cross, for instance, characterizes this "baroque orthography" as an artificial survival of Old Canaanite ("Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991*, vol. 1 (ed. J. T. Barrera and L. V. Montaner; Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1992) 4.

<sup>13</sup> אָבִיָהוּ occurs 221 times, while אָבִיָהוּ appears only 7 times (Judg 14:10, 19; 16:31; 1 Kgs 5:15; Zech 13:3; 1 Chr 26:10; 2 Chr 3:1). Most of these exceptions can be accounted for either as scribal errors or possibly as resulting from special circumstances like a frozen construct state (e.g., אָבִיָהוּ, "his father's house").

Qimron simply calls it a “historical spelling.”<sup>14</sup> But how is the description “historical spelling” sufficient? These forms do not follow the rules of Classical Biblical Hebrew. Although we understand the historical linguistic process that led to the elision of the *he* in Classical Hebrew, it remains difficult to explain the reappearance in QH. Historical and comparative linguistics are a valuable preliminary step to understanding a form like אִחִירִי, but they are not sufficient. Are we to believe that the language of the Essene community (in general) or the Qumran community (in particular) preserved this form against the natural linguistic tendencies as a result of a direct development of an earlier yet unknown Hebrew dialect? Or is it more likely that these peculiar forms result from the ideological creation of an idiolect for the community? In more general terms, do the idiosyncrasies of QH reflect a natural linguistic development, or are they the outcome of ideological manipulation of linguistic form?<sup>15</sup> The evidence seems to support the latter.

Linguistic diversity among the scrolls also becomes an occasion to argue that QH is an “artificial” language, independent from both Late Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew. R. Meyer, for example, argued that it reflected a *Dialektmischung*.<sup>16</sup> It is important to note, however, that such descriptions of QH as “artificial” arise purely from a formalist approach. From a functionalist and sociolinguistic perspective, there is no such thing as an artificial language.

There has been increasing interest among linguists in the social function of language. This social aspect becomes particularly important among groups that are “exclusive and sharply bounded” like the Qumran community. Judith Irvine writes,

the [linguistic] code’s origin in *counter-societies* is reflected in many aspects of their linguistic form, for instance in their elaboration of lexicon and metaphor relevant to their special activities and their attitudes toward the normative society. . . . Also significant is their conspicuous avoidance and violation of forms recognized as “standard.” . . . The anti-language is not, and has never been, anyone’s native tongue, nor are all its formal characteristics simply arbitrary. Both functionally and formally it is derived from the normative code, just as its speakers define their social role in opposition to the normative society.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 60.

<sup>15</sup> This issue has been particularly important in recent studies in sociolinguistics, e.g., Susan Gal, “Codeswitching and Consciousness in the European Periphery,” *American Ethnologist* 14 (1987) 637–53; Irvine, “When Talk Isn’t Cheap,” 248–67; Monica Heller, ed., *Codeswitching: anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (Contributions to the Sociology of Language 48; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1988). Also see the classic study by V. N. Voloshinov, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986).

<sup>16</sup> R. Meyer, “Das Problem der Dialektmischung in den hebräischen Texten von Chirbet Qumrân,” *VT* 7 (1957) 139–48; idem, “Bemerkungen zu den hebräischen Aussprachetraditionen von Chirbet Qumrân,” *ZAW* 70 (1958) 39–48.

<sup>17</sup> Irvine, “When Talk Isn’t Cheap,” 253.

These sociolinguistic observations seem especially apt for understanding the language of the Qumran community. Applying these observations to QH, we should expect that this phase of the language was at the same time a continuation of Late Biblical Hebrew and a reaction against the colloquial languages spoken in Palestine—both Aramaic and Mishnaic Hebrew. The attempt to form an antilanguage is most apparent in the surface structures of language (e.g., lexicon), while the deep structure (e.g., syntax) is less affected. Antilanguages both relexicalize and overlexicalize. Conversely, antilanguages nevertheless betray a familiarity with the native and colloquial languages through grammar—in the present case reflected by Aramaic and Mishnaic Hebrew. M. A. K. Halliday writes, “The principle is that of same grammar, different vocabulary; but different vocabulary only in certain areas, typically those that are central to the activities of the subculture and that set it off most sharply from the established society.”<sup>18</sup> Group ideology finds its reflex in a linguistic ideology. This, I believe, is the situation we confront in Qumran literature.

### III. Language Ideology in the Qumran Community

Language ideology is, according to the definition of Judith Irvine, “the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests.”<sup>19</sup> Sociolinguists have emphasized that language can be a political and ideological tool and, moreover, that these particular uses of language affect the linguistic development.<sup>20</sup> It is abundantly clear that a strong language ideology steeped in religious beliefs was held by the Qumran community.

In order to preface our sociolinguistic analysis, we must first understand the sectarian language ideology. The ideological role of language in the Qumran community can be illustrated by the numerous references to language in the sectarian literature. The most important term for language in QH is לשון, “language, tongue”; other related words in its semantic field include שפה, “lip, speech, language,” and דבר, “word.” Chaim Rabin already suggested that the scrolls allude to Mishnaic Hebrew as “a halting language” (לועג שפה, 1QH 4:16), “an uncircumcised language” (ערול שפה, 1QH 2:7, 18–19), and “a blasphemous language” (לשון גדופים, CD 5:11–12).<sup>21</sup> The last example is particularly instructive because it seems to imply that the community’s opponents believed in oral law:

<sup>18</sup> Halliday, “Anti-languages,” 571. Notably, Halliday considers the early Christian community an anti-society, and to a certain degree its language an antilanguage (p. 575). All the more so the Qumran community.

<sup>19</sup> Irvine, “When Talk Isn’t Cheap,” 255.

<sup>20</sup> For a survey of recent studies on language ideology, see Kathryn Woolard and Bambi Schieffelin, “Language Ideology,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23 (1994) 55–82.

<sup>21</sup> Rabin, “Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew,” 146.

Also they have corrupted their holy spirit; with blasphemous language they open their mouth against the laws of the covenant of God, saying, "They are not fixed (לא נכונ)."

It seems likely that the charge that the laws were "not fixed" refers to the oral law, which was necessarily more fluid.<sup>22</sup> Certainly, the legitimacy of the oral law was a hotpoint in the late Second Temple period. Here the inference seems to be that both the oral law and its language—that is, vernacular Hebrew—were blasphemous. Although there is room for debate here, Rabin's case is certainly strengthened by the references to "another language" (לשון אחרת), 1QH 2:19; 4:16). The ruin of those who do not belong to the community apparently has to do—among other things—with their use of "another language" (also note 4QpNah 3–4 ii 8). On the other hand, the community member was distinguished by his special use of language: "You [have taught me] Your covenant and my language is as one of Your disciples (ולשוני כלמורידך)" (1QH 7:10 alludes to Isa 50:4).

The *Thanksgiving Hymns* are a particularly rich mine of language ideology. They reveal that the community's language was unique and divinely inspired. For example, 1QH 1:27–29 reads,

(27) [ ] You created (28) breath for the tongue (לשון), and You know its words (רבריה). You determined the fruit of the lips (פרי שפתים) before they came about. You appointed words by archetype (דברים על קו) (29) and the utterance of the breath of the lips (ומבעי רוחה שפתים) by calculation. You sent forth archetypes (קיים) for their mysteries (לרזיהם), and the utterances of spirits (ומבעי רוחות) for their plan (להשבותם) . . .

From such liturgical ruminations it is clear that the Qumran community had a highly loaded ideology of language, which inevitably shaped their linguistic choices.

One particularly significant relexicalization in QH is the term קו, which comes to refer to the pattern or archetype for language and speech. This may already be inferred from the statement quoted above: "You appointed words by archetype" (1QH 1:28). Likewise, the expression of "the archetypes for their mysteries (קיים לרזיהם)" paralleling "the utterances of spirits for their plan (מבעי רוחה להשבותם)" suggests that a highly charged religious ideology lies behind the term קו. The translation of קו as "pattern" would be sufficient, except that it is clear that the sectarian theology of predestination colors their use of the term. For example, in Qumran literature the term קו is engraved (חקקתה על קו), "You engraved according to the archetype," 1QH 18:11; cf.

<sup>22</sup> Such a belief would lend more support to L. H. Schiffman's argument for the Sadducean origins of the Qumran community ("The Sadducean Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* [ed. H. Shanks; New York: Random House, 1992] 35–49).

1QpHab 7:13–14). It is paralleled with a "secret" (סוד) etched in stone (1QH 6:26). It is a metaphorical source (מקור) from which proper judgment derives (1QH 8:21).<sup>23</sup> The *Community Rule* speaks of the "law which is determined by the archetype of the ages" (חוק בקו עתים), 1QS 10:26; the Teacher instructs according to the "archetype of his justice" (אשה בקו משפט), 1QS 10:9). The Qumran community undoubtedly drew upon the enigmatic use of the term in the book of Isaiah, where several possible interpretations of its meaning have been offered including incoherent speech, foreign speech, and children's babbling (cf. 18:2, 7; 28:10, 13; also see Ps 19:5).<sup>24</sup> The Qumran community's particular relexicalization underscores the importance of language ideology. Their language is patterned after an ancient archetype. More than this, it would seem that QH was patterned on a preclassical archetype given at the foundation of the world.<sup>25</sup>

Language ideology also shapes the development of literary genre. Kathryn Woolard and Bambi Schieffelin write, "Genres are now viewed not as set of discourse features, but rather as orienting frameworks, interpretive procedures, and set of expectations."<sup>26</sup> Not surprisingly, a distinguishing feature of Qumran writings is their development and use of literary genres. Foremost, the community creates the *peshet* genre—including continuous (e.g., 1QpHab), thematic (e.g., 4QFlor), and ad hoc (e.g., Midrash on the Well, CD 6:3–21)—which highlights its exclusive insight into the true meaning of the prophets.<sup>27</sup> In these texts the inhabitants of Khirbet Qumran betray a strong sectarian impulse as well as a perceived conflict with the establishment.<sup>28</sup> The ideology of the sect must be understood as contributing to the formation of the *peshet* genre.

<sup>23</sup> The reference to a metaphorical source (מקור) suggests that the Qumran sectarians associated this term with the verb root קוה in its meaning "to gather water" and the related noun מקוה (e.g., Gen 1:9–10, where God gathers the primordial waters). It might be fruitful to pursue the relationship between this concept and the "well" motif; see M. Fishbane, "The Well of Living Water: A Biblical Motif and Its Ancient Transformations," in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. M. Fishbane et al.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992) 3–16.

<sup>24</sup> See R. E. Clements, *Isaiah 1–39* (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 165, 228, and the literature cited there.

<sup>25</sup> It is a well-known Jewish tradition that Hebrew was the language of creation, but for the most part this tradition did not take a conscious role in shaping linguistic choices. In Qumran, however, it apparently did.

<sup>26</sup> Woolard and Schieffelin, "Language Ideology," 59. They cite here W. F. Hanks, "Discourse genres in a theory of practice," *American Ethnology* 14 (1987) 670.

<sup>27</sup> See further G. Brooke, "Qumran Peshet: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre," *RevQ* 10 (1981) 483–503.

<sup>28</sup> Robert Wilson emphasizes that apocalyptic literature and movements arise in situations of deprivation—a situation reflected by some Qumran texts ("From Prophecy to Apocalyptic: Reflections on the Shape of Israelite Religion," in *Anthropological Perspectives on Old Testament Prophecy, Semeta* 21 [1981] 86–87).

#### IV. Social Differentiation in the Language of the Qumran Community

Four lines of evidence point to the conscious creation of an antilanguage by scribes within the Qumran community. These include (1) the avoidance of Aramaic and popular language (= Mishnaic Hebrew), (2) classicizing tendencies, (3) orthography and paleography, and (4) the use of code and symbolic terminology. Taken together, this evidence points to the use of language within the Qumran community as another vehicle for differentiating the group from other Jewish groups in the late Second Temple period.

##### *Avoidance of Aramaic and Colloquial Language*

A prominent feature of antilanguages is (according to Irvine) "their conspicuous avoidance and violation of forms recognized as 'standard.'" QH displays just such a studied avoidance of both Aramaisms and popular language. Indeed, it seems that none of the Aramaic scrolls found among the Qumran texts derives from the Qumran community; this is indicated by the lack of distinctively Qumran terminology or orthography among the Aramaic scrolls. The very fact that none of the Aramaic scrolls appears to have been composed by the Qumran sectarians already suggests a conscious avoidance of the Aramaic language.<sup>29</sup> This is not to say that the standard language did not influence the antilanguage; after all, the creation of the antilanguage arises out of the standard language. Nevertheless, there is a conscious reaction to the standard language, particularly in some of its most recognizable features (e.g., personal pronouns like *אני*).

QH is also conspicuous by the paucity of loanwords. E. Y. Kutscher, for example, writes, "it is astonishing that the DSS should contain so few new foreign loans except for Aramaic and those that are already part and parcel of BH."<sup>30</sup> This contrasts with Mishnaic Hebrew, which is replete with loanwords particularly from Aramaic and Greek but also from Latin.<sup>31</sup> It is noteworthy that the *Copper Scroll* and 4QMMT—two decidedly sectarian texts—both indicate that the scribes at Qumran could write in Mishnaic Hebrew. The *Copper Scroll* itself was first described as being written in "colloquial Mishnaic Hebrew."<sup>32</sup> J. T. Milik's official publication of the *Copper Scroll* included an extensive discussion of its language. Among other things Milik noted the exclusive use of the Mishnaic relative particle *-ש* as opposed to the regular classical term *אשר*, and the typical Mishnaic plural morpheme *ין-* instead of the classical

<sup>29</sup> I am indebted to Steven Weitzman for his insights and for letting me see his article, "Why did the Qumran Community Write in Hebrew?" *JAOS* 119 (1999), forthcoming.

<sup>30</sup> E. Y. Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1982) 100.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 135–41.

<sup>32</sup> Rabin, "Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew," 146.

*ין-*. These Mishnaic forms occur elsewhere in the scrolls but only irregularly.<sup>33</sup> The avoidance of typically Mishnaic Hebrew forms of language must thus be considered a studied avoidance.

To be sure, the Qumran scribes were not entirely successful in their avoidance of Aramaisms. Kutscher notes, "in spite of the strong desire . . . to preserve the purity of the Hebrew language, it was impossible to avoid the absorption—both conscious and unconscious—of elements from the rival tongue."<sup>34</sup> Kutscher assumes that the mother tongue of the scribe for the great Isaiah scroll was Aramaic and consequently that he "inadvertently grafted Aramaic forms upon the Hebrew text."<sup>35</sup> Such examples include the defective spelling *מזונים* (Isa 40:12; cf. also v. 15), which follows Aramaic over against Classical Hebrew *מזונים*, which derives from a popular etymology relating to the root *אזן*, "ear."

The easiest area in which the Qumran scribes could avoid popular language was in their lexicon. The most difficult area was in syntax. A paradigmatic example of this may be the use of the Classical Hebrew relative particle *אשר* as opposed to the Mishnaic use of *-ש*. From the perspective of lexicon this is a classicism. In fact, the feature becomes the first observation in Shelomo Morag's argument that general QH "is neither Biblical nor Mishnaic, but rather an independent entity."<sup>36</sup> On the other hand, the syntax of *אשר* approximates *-ש* in Mishnaic Hebrew. This is apparent first of all in the fact that *אשר* is employed more frequently in QH than in Classical Biblical Hebrew—a tendency that begins already in Late Biblical Hebrew, which eschews asyndetic syntax. More importantly, *אשר* is employed in ways more typical of *-ש* in Mishnaic Hebrew; for example, *אשר* begins to replace *כי*, "because," introducing a causal clause, just as we see in Mishnaic Hebrew.<sup>37</sup>

Other examples readily demonstrate that the use of Mishnaic or Aramaic syntax is frequent in Qumran literature. For instance, the use of the prohibitive construction *-ל + לא* with the infinitive is quite common in QH (e.g., 1QS 1:6 *ולוא ללכת*, "and he shall not walk").<sup>38</sup> This construction is exceedingly rare in biblical literature, with only ten occurrences, many from late contexts or in Biblical Aramaic texts.<sup>39</sup> This syntactical construction is a regular feature of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic and likely comes into Hebrew through Aramaic influ-

<sup>33</sup> Morag, "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations," 149.

<sup>34</sup> Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 23.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 24.

<sup>36</sup> Morag, "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations," 149.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. M. Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1927) 146.

<sup>38</sup> Other examples include 1QS 1:13, 14, 15, 17; 3:10; 6:11; 9:16; CD 2:16; 7:2; 1QH 7:15; 12:24; 1QH frg. 5 i 14; 4Q287 8 i 13; 4Q396 1–2 iv 6, 7; 4Q397 6–13 i 12; 11QT 50:2

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Judg 1:19; Isa 30:5; Jer 4:11; Amos 6:10; Dan 6:9, 16; Ezra 6:8; 1 Chr 5:1; 15:2; 2 Chr 12:12.

ence.<sup>40</sup> Likewise, the use of periphrastic constructions (i.e., הִיָּה + participle) in QH reflects a transition from Late Biblical Hebrew, where such constructions are relatively infrequent, to Mishnaic Hebrew, where these constructions become a regular feature of the language.<sup>41</sup>

Even in the area of lexicon the scrolls evidence the scribes' familiarity with Mishnaic Hebrew. Rabin provides examples that he terms "involuntary Mishnaisms."<sup>42</sup> Some examples include פָּרוּשׁ, "exact" (e.g., CD 2:13; 4:8); בָּסַר, "to pass over" (CD 3:3); חָרַבַן, "destruction" (CD 5:20); דַּחְתַּנִּיָּה, "fast" (CD 6:19); and סִדְךָ, "rule" (e.g., 1QS 1:1; CD 7:6; 10:4). A prime example of Mishnaic Hebrew morphology would be the infinitive לִירוֹשׁ, "to inherit" (CD 1:7); elsewhere QH invariably uses the classical form לִרְשָׁה (e.g., CD 8:4; 19:27; 1QpHab 2:15; 3:2; 11QT 51:16).<sup>43</sup> The last example would support Rabin's labeling of these forms as "involuntary."

Thus we find both similarity and distinction between Qumran and Mishnaic Hebrew. The similarity is most profound in the area of syntax, while the distinction is most significant in lexicon. The similarity between Qumran and Mishnaic syntax can best be viewed as resulting from the natural development of the language; that is, the syntax of QH does seem to reflect a transitional stage from Late Biblical Hebrew to Mishnaic Hebrew. On the other hand, there seems to be a conscious avoidance of Aramaic and Mishnaic Hebrew in the lexicon. This is perhaps best illustrated by the relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר, which is used even though it had probably dropped out of use in colloquial Hebrew. Nevertheless, the influence of the colloquial expression -שׁ is evident in the syntax of אֲשֶׁר. Even where scribes could replace Mishnaic Hebrew lexemes with their more classical counterparts, they were unable to eliminate the influence of contemporary syntax.

### Classicizing Tendencies

There is a general recognition of a classicizing tendency within Qumran literature. This is obvious, first of all, in the heavy reliance on biblical literature on many levels: direct citation, paraphrase, allusion, and typology. Particularly

<sup>40</sup> See W. Stevenson, *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962) 20.

<sup>41</sup> In spite of Segal's objections (*Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, 164–65), it seems obvious that the use of the periphrastic in Mishnaic Hebrew is the result of Aramaic influence. Even Segal concedes that the periphrastic occurs mainly in Late Biblical Hebrew, not Classical Hebrew. On the use of periphrastics in Biblical Hebrew, see B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990) §37.7; P. Jotou, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1923) §121g; there are substantive differences between Jotou's original discussion and T. Muraoka's translation and revision, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991).

<sup>42</sup> Rabin, "Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew," 146–48.

<sup>43</sup> Segal, *Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, §169.

good examples of this are in the *Damascus Document* and the *Thanksgiving Hymns*, but it is a general phenomenon in the sectarian literature. As S. Talmon so pointedly argues, the Qumran community (or *Yahad*, as Talmon prefers) envisioned themselves as the true heirs of the biblical tradition.<sup>44</sup> It is only natural that their use of language is heavily colored by biblical literature, since the community shaped its identity as the true "root of Israel" (e.g., CD 1:7–8).

Chaim Rabin was the first scholar to apply sociolinguistics to the study of the Hebrew language in general and QH in particular. In his masterful though abbreviated book, *A Short History of the Hebrew Language*, he surveys the history of the Hebrew language from the social perspective. The book briefly summarizes some of Rabin's seminal work on the Hebrew language. Concerning QH, Rabin wrote,

the writers of the Dead Sea Scrolls . . . employed a Hebrew which is much more like that of the Bible, and has only a few traits of the spoken language. This effort at purism was probably not a function of superior linguistic training, but part of the self-identification of that group with the generation of the Exodus from Egypt and the will to imitate not only the latter's religious customs, but also their way of speaking.<sup>45</sup>

This conclusion has found some support among scholars. Many scholars have noticed the heavy borrowing from biblical literature in Qumran literature. Texts like the *Damascus Document* and the *Thanksgiving Hymns* (*Hodayot*) at times seem like a pastiche of biblical quotations.<sup>46</sup> On the other hand, the explanation cannot be so simple. For example, there is no reason to think that the suffix pronouns in אֲבִירֹו and אֲחִירֹו, to cite the most prominent example, were modeled on Classical Hebrew. In other words, it is impossible to fully account for the linguistic peculiarities of QH by supposing that it was simply an attempt to imitate Classical Hebrew. Nor is there an extant Hebrew dialect to which such anomalies can be consistently traced back. Undoubtedly, the Qumran community, who apparently studied the scriptures day and night, knew this quite well. Their use of such linguistic anomalies seems like an attempt to reconstruct *preclassical* forms. To borrow the language of the *Thanksgiving Hymns*, they were recreating language after a pattern engraved at the foundation of the world.

The so-called long imperfect found in Qumran texts can only be a pseudo-

<sup>44</sup> S. Talmon, "Qumran Studies: Past, Present, and Future," *JQR* 85 (1994) 1–31.

<sup>45</sup> C. Rabin, *A Short History of the Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem: Haomanim Press, 1974) 37. Halliday points out, "An anti-language may be 'high' as well as 'low' on the diglossic spectrum" ("Anti-languages," 583); the classicizing tendency of QH obviously makes it a "high" register.

<sup>46</sup> On the language of CD, see Rabin's *Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958). On the *Hodayot*, see Bonnie Kittel, *The Hymns of Qumran* (SBLDS, 50; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981) 155–72.

classicism. The form apparently occurs only in the first person imperfect.<sup>47</sup> Such elongated forms in Classical Hebrew are cohortatives; however, already in Late Biblical Hebrew such forms are sometimes used as simple indicatives, and the cohortative (along with the jussive) tense completely disappears in Mishnaic Hebrew.<sup>48</sup> The Qumran writers employ what may only be understood as an attempt to use the cohortative form, but often without an understanding of the grammatical form. A particularly instructive example of the eclipse of the cohortative may be found in 11QT 56:13, where a scribe makes a supralinear correction, *וואמרתה אשים* עלִי מלֶךְ כְּכֹל הַגּוֹיִם, in order to bring back into line with Deut 17:14, *וואמרת אשים עלִי מלֶךְ כְּכֹל הַגּוֹיִם*, “and you shall say, ‘Let me set a king over me like all the nations.’” This error and correction exhibit the natural tendency for the cohortative forms to disappear. The frequent misuse of the cohortative suggests that the use of these long forms reflects the classicizing tendency of Qumran scribes.

The *waw* consecutive is another area where we witness a classicizing tendency alongside the natural development of the language.<sup>49</sup> On the one hand, its use imitates classical style, but the decreasing frequency and changing syntax of its use reflect the transition from Late Biblical Hebrew to Mishnaic Hebrew. This tendency undoubtedly reflects colloquial Hebrew; and it is hardly surprising, as J. MacDonald has pointed out, that the *waw* consecutive is generally avoided in direct discourse in biblical literature.<sup>50</sup> Mark Smith points out that Qumran literature “provides evidence for the complex distribution of unconverted and converted verbal forms.”<sup>51</sup> This inconsistency is a reflex of the Qumran corpus itself, which reflects over two hundred years of development, numerous literary genres, and both sectarian and nonsectarian compositions. And, for all the complexity, there is everywhere a breakdown in the syntax of

<sup>47</sup> Some examples include 1QS 10:12, 16, 25; 1QpHab 6:12; 1QM 13:12, 13; 14:13; 1QH 1:23; 2:30; 4:39; 6:6, 7; 9:8, 9, 13, 14; 10:20, 31, 34; 11:6, 20, 23; 12:3; 14:10; 1Q34bis 2+1 i 3; 4Q427 1 i 3, 4; ii 4; 4 i 1; 8 i 2; 4Q491 8–10 i 10; 4Q503 7–9 iv 3; 11QT 29:8; 30:1; 54:10; 55:4; 56:13.

<sup>48</sup> See Segal, *Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, 72, 153–55.

<sup>49</sup> My observations here are, first of all, indebted to a graduate seminar paper at UCLA by Roger Good entitled “Changes in the Use of the Prefix and Suffix Conjugation of the Verb in the Different Types of Qumran Literature.” Also see Mark Smith, “Converted and Unconverted Perfect and Imperfect Forms in the Literature of Qumran,” *BASOR* 284 (1991) 1–16; idem, *The Origins and Development of the Waw-consecutive: Northwest Semitic Evidence from Ugarit to Qumran* (HSS 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991); T. Thorion-Vardi, “The Use of the Tenses in the Zadokite Documents,” *RevQ* 12 (1985–86) 65–88; L. V. Montaner, “Some Features of the Hebrew Verbal Syntax in the Qumran *Hodayot*,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. T. Barrera and L. V. Montaner; Jerusalem: Magnes; Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1992) 273–86.

<sup>50</sup> J. MacDonald, “Some Distinctive Characteristics of Israelite Spoken Hebrew,” *BO* 32 (1975) 162–75.

<sup>51</sup> Smith, “Converted and Unconverted Perfect,” 14.

the *waw* consecutive. In Classical Hebrew prose the use of the *waw* consecutive is highly nuanced by its narrative context. This highly nuanced narrative syntax breaks down in QH. For example, a staple of Classical Hebrew prose is the narrative formula *ויהי*, “and it came to pass”—a feature no longer present in QH. While it was easy enough for Qumran scribes to use converted tenses in imitation of classical style, it was much more difficult to capture the nuances of its narrative syntax.

### Orthography and Paleography

The orthography of the Dead Sea Scrolls is quite unique. The most characteristic feature of Qumran orthography is the use of *scriptio plena*, or “full writing.” This is particularly true of the use of *waw*, which comes to represent long and short *hōlem*, *šūreq*, *qibbûš*, *qāmeš ḥatup*, *ḥātēp qāmeš*, and even sometimes *vocal shewa*.<sup>52</sup> Also characteristic is the use of *he* and *ʿaleph* as final vowel letters. Some orthographic peculiarities reflect the diachronic situation of QH. So, for example, the occasional use of *samek* where *šin* is expected may be understood within the context of a general tendency reflected also in Mishnaic Hebrew.<sup>53</sup> Yet, on the whole Qumran orthography is unique and unexpected.

Emanuel Tov has argued that the orthography of QH reflects a system that for the present must be considered unique and peculiar to the Qumran community.<sup>54</sup> According to Tov, notable features of this system include (1) the writing of the vowel /o/ by the *waw* (e.g., *וואור/וואור/וואור*, *כוא*, *לוא*, *כול*); (2) lengthened independent pronouns (e.g., *אורמה*, *אורמה*, *היאור*, *היאור*); (3) lengthened pronominal suffixes for second and third plural (e.g., *-מה*, *-כה*); (4) use of pausal forms (e.g., *וויקטורו*); (5) the form *כיא*; (6) the forms *מאורדה/מאורדה/מאורדה*; (7) the use of initial-medial letters in final position, and (8) the writing of divine names (*יהוה* and *אל*) in paleo-Hebrew characters. Although the general characteristics of this system are clear, Tov admits that the implementation is inconsistent. In fact, he remarks that “in only a few cases do all the features appear together in one scroll, such as 4Q174 (Florilegium).”<sup>55</sup> Although this system divides the scrolls quite neatly in two parts, the features of the system are nevertheless quite circumscribed. In fact, a reductionist summary of the system would point to two primary features: (1) the use of elongated forms with *ה-* and (2) the tendency toward full phonetic spelling. There is certainly not enough evidence

<sup>52</sup> See Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 5–8; Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §100.

<sup>53</sup> Segal, *Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, 32; Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §200.15.

<sup>54</sup> See Tov, “Orthography and Language,” 31–57; idem, “Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts,” 5–37.

<sup>55</sup> Tov, “Orthography and Language,” 36.

here to warrant the conclusion that QH represented a peculiar dialect.<sup>56</sup> The purpose of the peculiar orthography seems rather to be to mark off the sectarian texts from other Jewish literature in their library.

A slightly different explanation of Qumran orthography is hinted at by Kutscher in his study of the IQIs<sup>a</sup> scroll. He argues that the use of *plene* spelling in the Qumran scrolls arises from an attempt to avoid Aramaisms. He notes the natural tendency for homographs in Hebrew and Aramaic (e.g., לֵא, רֵאשׁ, יֵאמֵר, רֵאשׁ) to be pronounced according to their Aramaic (i.e., לֵא, יֵאמֵר, רֵאשׁ) rather than Hebrew (i.e., לֵא, יֵאמֵר, רֵאשׁ) pronunciation. He argues then that “for both nationalistic and religious reasons” the pronunciation was made clear through *plene* spelling (e.g., לֵיא, יֵיאמֵר, רֵיאשׁ, or רֵיאשׁ) in QH.<sup>57</sup> There probably is some truth in Kutscher’s analysis; however, as he himself admits, it does not account for all the anomalies in Qumran orthography. More than this, it is hard to believe that the readers of the scrolls, namely, the community itself, needed to be reminded that in Hebrew לֵא was pronounced /lō/ and not /lā/. While such orthography indeed marks off the texts as Hebrew and not Aramaic, this does not completely account for the peculiar orthography. Indeed, the pronunciation of common words like לֵא and כִּי was already clear. On the other hand, the scrolls themselves indicate that there were religious reasons that might have caused the Qumran community to mark off the language not only from Aramaic but also from the colloquial Hebrew of their contemporaries.

Frank Cross argues that Tov’s Qumran orthography could not have been invented by the Qumranites. He calls it “a learned attempt at archaism,” which he tentatively associates with the Sadducees.<sup>58</sup> Certainly, this is true, but it is not a simple classicizing. The archaisms in the Qumran orthography attempt to recreate preclassical forms, as I pointed out with the examples אֲבִיָּהוּ and אֲחִיָּהוּ. Such preclassical archaizing suggests an underlying language ideology that did not look to the classical period (as the Hasmoneans did), but to the preclassical period. There is no reason to believe that such an orthography would arise without a strong ideological motivation. More than this, it would have to be a peculiar ideological motivation that did not look to standard Biblical Hebrew. Cross himself admits that most, if not all, the “baroque texts” were copied at Qumran. Moreover, there are no examples of this orthography outside of Qumran. The working hypothesis must be then that the peculiar orthography of the Qumran scrolls was the product of the community living at Qumran, as Tov has proposed.

The many orthographic inconsistencies in the Qumran system indicate that the system consciously went against well-known scribal practice. This is

<sup>56</sup> Although it is often casually assumed that orthography faithfully and directly reflects pronunciation, this is a dubious linguistic assumption.

<sup>57</sup> Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 19.

<sup>58</sup> Cross, “Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies,” 5.

perhaps most clear in the use of supralinear corrections, which bring orthography in line with the Qumran system as well as the use of final letters in medial position (e.g., וּמִנְחָתָם<sup>ה</sup>, “their offering,” 11QT<sup>b</sup> frag. 14+15, 7; מִרְעֵיתְךָ<sup>ה</sup>, “your pasture,” 4Q266 18 v 13; בְּרִיתְךָ<sup>ה</sup>, “your covenant,” 1QH 2:22).<sup>59</sup> The appearance of scrolls in Qumran orthography (like IQIs<sup>a</sup>) alongside those in standard (or “proto-Masoretic”) orthography (like IQIs<sup>b</sup>) itself indicates that the Qumran scribes were well aware of the standard orthography. The frequent slips that resulted in final letters placed in medial position or that had to be corrected with supralinear notations suggest a conscious departure from the standard orthography—an orthography that the scribes not only knew but often inadvertently employed. The inability to consistently or fully implement their orthography suggests that it was a creation of the community and served their ideology.

For the most part, the Qumran orthography has not been found outside of the Qumran Scrolls. The nearest parallels are with the Samaritan tradition, which uses lengthened second and third person plurals (i.e., אֲחֻמָּה and הֻמָּה), lengthened suffixes, and the verbal form יִקְטִילוּ.<sup>60</sup> The Samaritan tradition, however, also diverges in many important ways. On the one hand, it does not have many important features of Qumran orthography, for example, the lengthened third singular forms (הוֹאֵה and הֵיאֵה), nor the general tendency toward *plene* spelling. On the other hand, the Samaritan tradition incorporates features unknown in either Qumran or standard orthography such as the second feminine singular pronoun אַתִּי. Other similarities to Qumran orthography may be found in the Severus Scroll, though these should not be overstated.<sup>61</sup> Tov is quite conservative in his conclusions regarding the peculiarity of Qumran orthography since it is possible that “new documents may be discovered which would undermine the uniqueness of the Qumran Scrolls.”<sup>62</sup> Tov’s immediate conclusion, namely, that the scrolls written in Qumran orthography were copied at Qumran whereas those in standard orthography were brought from outside, seems certain.<sup>63</sup>

One of the most perplexing problems in the paleography of the scrolls is the use of cryptic scripts. There are, however, only seven texts in cryptic scripts

<sup>59</sup> Other clear examples include 1QH 7:29; 4Q175 5, 6, 18; 4Q185 5; 4Q378 3 i 8; 4Q417 1 ii 7; 4Q504 1–2R v 5; 11QT 34:9; 59:10. I wish to express thanks to Martin Abegg for supplying me a complete list of supralinear letters and final letters in medial position in the Qumran texts.

<sup>60</sup> See Ben-Hayyim, “Traditions in the Hebrew Language,” 200–214.

<sup>61</sup> See Tov’s critique (“Orthography and Language,” 38–39) of J. P. Siegel, *The Severus Scroll and IQIs<sup>a</sup>* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975).

<sup>62</sup> Tov, “Orthography and Language,” 39.

<sup>63</sup> These observations also severely undermine Norman Golb’s argument that all the scrolls came from outside the community because there are too many scribal hands evidenced in the scrolls; see Golb, “The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124 (1980) 1–24.



(4Q186, 4Q249, 4Q250, 4Q298, 4Q313, 4Q317, and 4Q324c). The cryptic script must be considered a scribal experiment that did not take hold. The experiment with cryptic writing nevertheless points to a strong sectarian impulse. An analysis of the script labeled "Cryptic A" shows an eclectic assortment of influences. Stephen Pfann finds that the most prominent similarities are to the late Phoenician script; however, he also finds marked dissimilarities and rejects any direct relationship.<sup>64</sup> Cryptic A script is clearly a conscious and ideologically driven creation. Pfann observes that "the contents of this short scroll [4Q298] wouldn't seem to warrant such careful protection"; yet he concludes that use of the Cryptic A script suggests that "all Essene teaching, even the foundational principles, was treated as crucial, even mystical knowledge, and hence was worthy of concealment from non-members."<sup>65</sup> If we understand QH as an antilanguage, however, this need not be the case. Halliday points out that antilanguages do not merely arise from the desire for secrecy or to form group boundaries but reflect the subjective reality of the group.<sup>66</sup>

It is noteworthy that radiocarbon dating essentially confirms paleographic assessments, suggesting that these scripts arose in the late second century BCE (i.e., late Hasmonean),<sup>67</sup> that is, Cryptic A was created about the same time as the community at Khirbet Qumran was established. In this light, it seems likely that the creation of this script reflected the ideology of the early community's separation from the general population. Apparently, it was the ideology of the Teacher and the community rather than the content of the teaching that led to the creation of Cryptic A script. The purpose of cryptic scripts as well as the special Qumran orthography was more than simply an attempt at secrecy or to mark group boundaries; they were an expression of the ideology of the group.

#### Use of Code and Symbolic Terminology

Another feature of antilanguages is, as Irvine notes above, "their elaboration of lexicon and metaphor relevant to their special activities and their attitudes toward the normative society." This feature is reflected in the Qumran community's use of code terminology and metaphor as well as in the development of a peculiar lexicon. From a sociolinguistic perspective, this use of code (or "typological") terminology is a linguistic feature, part of the sectarian elabo-

<sup>64</sup> Stephen Pfann, "4Q298: The Maskil's Address to All Sons of Dawn," *JQR* 85 (1994) 216–21.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 225.

<sup>66</sup> Halliday writes, "An anti-language is the means of realization of a subjective reality: not merely expressing it, but actively creating and maintaining it" ("Anti-languages," 576).

<sup>67</sup> See A. Jull, D. Donahue, M. Broshi, and E. Tov, "Radiocarbon Dating Of Scrolls And Linen Fragments From The Judean Desert," *Radiocarbon* 37 (1995) 11–19 (also in *Atiqot* 28 [1996] 1–7). J. T. Milik originally dated 4Q249 ("Midrash Sefer Moshe") to the late second century on the basis of the title added to the back of the manuscript; likewise, Pfann is also able to date 4Q298 by the square script, which was used in the introduction to the small scroll ("4Q298," 216).

ration of lexicon. This code terminology is used for people such as "the Teacher of Righteousness" (e.g., 1QpHab 1:13; 8:3; CD 1:11; 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1–10 iii 15), "the Wicked Priest" (e.g., 1QpHab 1:13; 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> frgs. 1–10 iv 8), "the Man of the Lie" (e.g., CD 20:15; 1QpHab 5:11), and "the Lion of Wrath" (e.g., 4QpNah 3–4 i 5–6). It is used for concepts like "Damascus" (e.g., CD 6:5, 19), "the Kit-tim" (e.g., 1QpHab 2:12; 1QM 1:2; 4QpNah 3–4 i 3), or "the house of Judah" (e.g., CD 4:11; 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1–10 ii 13). Lexicon is developed to describe the community's interpretative activities (e.g., *peshet*) as well as to set it against the establishment who are "the seekers of smooth things" (דורשי בחלקות; e.g., CD 1:18; 1QH 2:32; 4QpNah 3–4 i 2) or "those who move the boundary" (מסיגי; e.g., CD 1:16; 5:20).

The community believed that it alone knew the Truth. This may be illustrated by the community's interpretation of Hab 2:2: "its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness to whom God made known all the mysteries of his servants the prophets" (1QpHab 7:3–5). The special revelation of truth to the community also isolated them from outsiders, as we see, for instance, in their interpretation of Hab 2:4: "its interpretation concerns all those who do the *Torah* in the House of Judah whom God will save from the House of Judgment. . . ." The use of symbolic terminology (i.e., House of Judah, House of Judgment) here and throughout the literature highlights the secret nature of the community's knowledge and their separation from the outside world (e.g., 1QS 2:25–3:8). This symbolic terminology ultimately becomes a language for the community alone, which in itself highlights the community's insulation.

#### V. MMT and Qumran Hebrew

By way of conclusion, it is worthwhile to reflect on how the recently published MMT (or "halakic letter") fits into our description of QH as an antilanguage.<sup>68</sup> MMT is apparently in the form of a letter that included a detailed legal discussion and was addressed from the community (probably *before* the Khirbet Qumran was settled) to the Jerusalem leadership. In their publications, Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell have emphasized some of the striking differences between the Hebrew of MMT and the rest of the sectarian literature. In a word, MMT is more Mishnaic. It uses, for instance, the usual Mishnaic relative pronoun *-š* as opposed to the regular Qumran *šš*. Qimron and Strugnell summarize the situation as follows: "a close examination of the linguistic components proves that the similarity to MH is restricted to vocabulary and to the

<sup>68</sup> See E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halakic Letter from Qumran," in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, April 1984* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985) 400–407; Strugnell and Qimron, *Discoveries in the Judean Desert, X: MMT* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

use of the particle  $\psi$ , whereas in areas of grammar (spelling, phonology, morphology, and syntax) there is very great similarity to the Hebrew of other Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>69</sup> Two factors account for these differences. First of all, MMT was apparently sent to the Jerusalem aristocracy intending a rapprochement; hence, it used more of the vernacular. Second, from the content of MMT it seems that it may have been composed *before* or shortly after the group separated itself from the Jerusalem establishment and moved to Khirbet Qumran. As such, MMT would reflect a period in the group's history before the development of the antilanguage. As Halliday points out, antilanguages arise as "a counter-reality, set up *in opposition* to some established norm."<sup>70</sup> The attempt at rapprochement in MMT would not have been conducive to the use of an antilanguage.

Ultimately, the study of MMT by Qimron and Strugnell emphasizes the problem of applying simple linear development to the Hebrew language.<sup>71</sup> This study draws attention to the problems inherent in a purely descriptive analysis of linguistic forms. We need to build upon and ultimately transcend the traditional paradigms of Hebrew philology. The sociolinguistic and functional theories of grammar have much to offer the study of the Hebrew language. To be sure, descriptive grammar will still be the foundation for the application for newer approaches. Yet the study of the Hebrew language, just like other fields in biblical studies, must move beyond the traditional paradigms.

<sup>69</sup> Qimron and Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter," 405.

<sup>70</sup> Halliday, "Anti-languages," 576.

<sup>71</sup> Qimron and Strugnell highlight differences between Qumran and Mishnaic Hebrew (see especially DJD 10, 107–8); this was to be expected, since Mishnaic Hebrew is more than two centuries removed from Qumran Hebrew and derives from a different *register* of the language. The problem of register in Mishnaic Hebrew only further calls out for a sociolinguistic analysis; see Seth Schwartz, "Language, Power and Identity in Ancient Palestine," *Past and Present* 148 (1995) 3–4.

## THE "MESSIANIC" IMPLICATIONS OF THE Q MATERIAL

EDWARD P. MEADORS

Taylor University, Upland, IN 46989-1001

In the past twenty-five years scholars devoted to the study of Q have abandoned the concept of a single homogeneous Q source in favor of a developing multistaged compositional theory. Q has become an archaeological dig promising to reveal successive layers of primitive Q community thought about Jesus and his teaching. Technical terms such as Q 1, Q 2, Q 3, QMt, QLk, the wisdom stratum of Q, the prophetic stratum, the apocalyptic stratum, and so forth have thus now become common among those who write on the subject. Correlating with this idea of a growing, developing Q composition is the concept that developmental or redactional stages may also be detected in the christological understanding of the editors of Q and the churches or communities they represent.<sup>1</sup> Thus, most recent reconstructions of Q attribute the presence of the

<sup>1</sup> Athanasius Polag (*Die Christologie der Logienquelle* [WMANT 45; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977]) divides Q into three developmental stages: (1) the original collection (*Die Kernstücke*); (2) the secondarily added major collection (*Die Hauptsammlung*); and (3) the final redaction of Q (*Spät Redaktion*). Polag assumes that the pedigree of the first two stages traces back to the historical Jesus, but the material he categorizes as late redaction he attributes to the creative work of the Q community. Walter Schmithals divides Q into two layers of tradition, which he dubs Q1 and Q (*Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1985] 384–404). The original Q layer lacked christological content altogether, while the editors of the second phase creatively painted Jesus as Son of Man and Son of God. John Kloppenborg reconstructs three Q compositional layers purportedly based on details of form/genre, not pedigree or content. See, however, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus," *HTR* 89 (1996) 307–44, where he concludes, "No less than Mark, Q is invention. . . . To some degree, therefore, the historical Jesus recedes behind the respective rhetorics of Q and Mark" (p. 344). Following familiar conventions of form criticism, Kloppenborg assumes that three separate social situations were responsible for producing Q's three hypothetical layers of redaction. He attributes all the Son of Man sayings and all the material dealing with Jesus' relation to John to his hypothetical second stage of Q's development, while attributing the Son of God material in the temptation narrative to Q's final "proto-biographical" stratum (see J. Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention, Self-Evidence and the Social History of the Q People," *Semeia* 55 [1992] 77–102, esp. 80–81). Burton Mack