

QUMRAN HEBREW



SBL

Society of Biblical Literature



Resources for Biblical Study

Marvin A. Sweeney,
Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Editor

SBL

Number 76

QUMRAN HEBREW

AN OVERVIEW OF ORTHOGRAPHY,
PHONOLOGY, AND MORPHOLOGY

Eric D. Reymond



Society of Biblical Literature
Atlanta

Copyright © 2014 by the Society of Biblical Literature

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, Society of Biblical Literature, 825 Houston Mill Road, Atlanta, GA 30329 USA.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Reymond, Eric D.

Qumran Hebrew : an overview of orthography, phonology, and morphology / Eric D. Reymond.

p. cm. — (Society of Biblical Literature resources for biblical study ; number 76)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-58983-931-1 (paper binding : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-58983-932-8 (electronic format) — ISBN 978-1-58983-933-5 (hardcover binding : alk. paper)

1. Hebrew language—Orthography and spelling. 2. Hebrew language—Phonology. 3. Hebrew language—Morphology. 4. Dead Sea scrolls. I. Title.

PJ4583.R49 2013

492.4'82421—dc23

2013035944

Printed on acid-free, recycled paper conforming to ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) and ISO 9706:1994 standards for paper permanence.



To Robin, Lucy, and Oliver

אשרי איש שמח באחריתו

ἐμακάρισα ... ἄνθρωπος εὐφραινόμενος ἐπὶ τέκνοις

Happy is the person who rejoices in his children. (Sirach 25:7)

אשרי

SBZ

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....	ix
Abbreviations.....	xi
A Note on Transliteration, Etymological Bases, and Manuscript Identification.....	xv
Introduction.....	1
1. Corpus.....	5
2. General Remarks.....	13
3. Orthography.....	23
3.1. Scribal Mistakes.....	23
3.2. <i>Plene</i> Orthography.....	35
3.3. <i>Aleph</i> as Internal <i>Mater</i>	43
3.4. Etymological Short /u/ Marked with <i>Waw</i>	47
3.5. Digraphs.....	51
3.6. Two <i>Yodhs</i> for a Consonantal <i>Yodh</i> and Two <i>Waws</i> for a Consonantal <i>Waw</i>	61
4. Phonetics and Phonology.....	65
4.1. Phonemic Inventory.....	65
4.2. Spirantization.....	70
4.3. Weakening of Gutturals.....	71
4.4. <i>Aleph</i> < <i>Yodh</i> and <i>Yodh</i> < <i>Aleph</i>	114
4.5. <i>Aleph</i> < <i>Waw</i> and <i>Waw</i> < <i>Aleph</i>	131
4.6. <i>Waw</i> < <i>Yodh</i>	134

4.7. Accent or Stress	135
4.8. Vowel Reduction	137
4.9. /â/ < /ã/ < Proto-Semitic /a/	138
4.10. Diphthongs and Triphthongs	140
5. Morphology	151
5.1. Prothetic <i>Aleph</i>	151
5.2. Pronouns and Particles	153
5.3. Nouns	164
5.4. <i>Waw</i> Marking /u/ Class Vowel in Nouns Where MT Has No /u/ Class Vowel	170
5.5. * <i>quṭl</i> Nouns	181
5.6. Verbs	188
5.7. <i>Qal</i> Imperfect+Suffix	209
5.8. <i>Qal</i> Imperative+Suffix	221
5.9. Adverbial <i>Heh</i>	223
Conclusions.....	225
Bibliography.....	235
Sources Index.....	257
Word Index.....	293
Author Index.....	307



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Although often written by a single individual, a book also represents a collaborative effort between many people, some of whom (I am thinking of my young children) are just beginning to comprehend the challenges involved in sitting at a desk for hours at a time, typing, deleting, typing more. For the past three years, I have had the good fortune to teach Biblical Hebrew to students at Yale Divinity School, students whose goals range from ministry to doctoral study. I have enjoyed and continue to enjoy the intellectual stimulus afforded by the daily interactions with these students. The book, as explained below, has its original impetus in my attempt at teaching some of these students post-Biblical Hebrew. Also at YDS, I have enjoyed the warm collegiality of the entire faculty and have benefited from numerous conversations on matters relating to the Hebrew language and the scrolls with my Bible colleagues. I am also grateful to my friends outside YDS who have read and commented on different aspects of this work. In addition, the staff of the YDS library has been an essential aid in finding and obtaining books; I have made much work for them and am thankful for their earnest assistance.

My thanks go out, in particular, to James Nati, a doctoral candidate at Yale, who read through my manuscript several times, identifying errors of argument, logic, and spurious reference; Joel Baden, who has generously shared his store of articles and books on grammatical matters that I might have otherwise missed; Jeremy Hultin, who drew my attention to articles that have informed my study of the Hebrew guttural consonants.

I also want to thank the editors and staff at SBL for helping me work through the manuscript. I have appreciated their attention especially in the pointing of so many words and forms throughout the book. Furthermore, they have been patient at my slow pace and have spotted many errors that I missed.

Finally, my deepest and most profound appreciation belongs with my wife and children. They have been an ever-present source of encourage-

ment and inspiration, not only in the patience they have shown at my frequent absences but also in the concerted efforts they have made to afford me more time to bring this project to its completion.



ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BDB	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. <i>Hebrew Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1906.
BHS ³	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> . Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1987.
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
BZAW	Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
DCH	<i>The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . Edited by David J. A. Clines. 8 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 1993–2007.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DNWSI	Hoftijzer, J., and K. Jongeling. <i>Dictionary of Northwest Semitic Inscriptions</i> . 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
DSSEL	<i>Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library</i> . Edited by E. Tov. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University, 2006.
DSSSE	<i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition</i> . Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997–1998.
GKC	<i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1910.

GQA	T. Muraoka. <i>A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic</i> . ANES Supp 38. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
HALOT	Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Translated by M. E. J. Richardson. 5 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000.
HAR	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>
HGHs	Bauer, Hans, and Pontus Leander. <i>Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments</i> . 2 vols. Halle: Niemeyer, 1922.
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
IPA	International Phonetic Alphabet
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JNSL	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
Joüon-Muraoka	Paul Joüon and T. Muraoka. <i>A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew</i> . 2 vols. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991.
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
LBH	Late Biblical Hebrew
LSAWS	Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and H. S. Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . Rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
MT	Masoretic Text, specifically the Leningrad Codex, as represented in <i>BHS</i> ³
RB	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
RH	Rabbinic Hebrew
RH1	Rabbinic Hebrew of the Mishnah, Tosefta, etc.
RH2	Rabbinic Hebrew of the Talmuds, etc.
SBH	Standard Biblical Hebrew
SBL	Studies in Biblical Literature
Sem	<i>Semitica</i>
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

<i>TAD</i>	Porten, Bezalel, and Ada Yardeni. <i>Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt</i> . Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1986–1999.
<i>ThWQ</i>	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten</i> . Edited by H.-J. Fabry and U. Dahmen. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011–.
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>VTSup</i>	Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series
<i>ZAH</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Althebraistik</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
3ms	third masculine singular
3fs	third feminine singular
2ms	second masculine singular
2fs	second feminine singular
1cs	first common singular
3mp	third masculine plural
3fp	third feminine plural
2mp	second masculine plural
2fp	second feminine plural
1cp	first common plural



SBZ

A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION, ETYMOLOGICAL BASES, AND MANUSCRIPT IDENTIFICATION

In the following pages I will generally transliterate the letters of the scrolls into the Hebrew/Aramaic block script (e.g., נביא “prophet”). The hypothetical pronunciation of these words is rendered in Roman letters in italics, as is the pronunciation of words presumed by the Tiberian vocalization tradition. The indication of pronunciation differs in several ways from the standard transliteration of Biblical Hebrew. For example, due to the quiescence of *aleph* at syllable end, I will not represent *aleph* in a word such as נביא “prophet”; this word is represented as *nābī*. Also, due to the fact that the etymological lateral fricative phoneme (often transliterated as *ś* and represented in the Tiberian text as ש) had merged with the sound of etymological *samekh*, I will render etymological /*ś*/ as *s*. Thus משא “utterance” is represented as *massā*. When referring to individual phonemes, I indicate the respective symbol between slashes (e.g., /*o*/ and /*s*/).

Etymological forms and bases are, as is customary, preceded by an asterisk and are put in italics (e.g., **qul*, **quṭl*). These forms may reflect different stages in the development of a given word or form; for example, the form preceded by an asterisk may reflect a stage of the language from circa 2000 B.C.E. or 1000 B.C.E. or 600 B.C.E. The precise dating is not crucial to the arguments presented below, so the hypothetical datings for specific forms are not given. The corresponding vocalizations of these forms in the Tiberian tradition are generally clear from the context and are sometimes explained by parenthetical comments. Nevertheless, to make clearer my presentation in the pages that follow, I wish to note three of the more common references to etymological forms and their realizations in Tiberian Hebrew. More complete explanations of such bases and their realizations in Tiberian Hebrew can be found in Joüon-Muraoka and *HGH*S.

III-*yodh* roots are realized in the *qal* perfect as in the examples of בנה “to build,” חזה “to see,” עשה “to do.” The *heh* in these forms is simply a

mater for the preceding vowel; the etymological *yodh* has disappeared. In the same way, the *heh* at the end of שָׂדֶה “field” is a *mater*; the root is III-*yodh*. Words from III-*waw* roots are comparatively less common; where these roots are attested and distinct morphologically from III-*yodh* roots, the *waw* consonant has often shifted to /ū/, as in בָּהוּ “emptiness”; תָּהוּ “formlessness.”

“Geminate” nouns or adjectives are those that etymologically had three root consonants the second and third of which were identical (**qall*, **qill*, **qull*). The paradigm words for these in many Biblical Hebrew grammars are, respectively, עַם “people,” חֵץ “arrow,” חֹק “statute.” These generally show the gemination of the second and third root consonants and the emergence of the etymological vowel when any suffix is added to the lexical form: עַמִּי “my people,” חֵצִי “my arrow,” חֹקִי “my statute.” Feminine geminate nouns (**qallat*, **qillat*, **qullat*) generally show the same features: אַמָּה “cubit,” פְּנֵה “corner,” חֹקֶה “statute.” Both masculine and feminine plural forms also show gemination and the emergence of the etymological vowel (e.g., עַמִּים, חֵצִים, חֹקִים, אַמּוֹת, פְּנוֹת, חֹקוֹת).

“Segholate” nouns or adjectives are those that etymologically had three distinct root consonants and only one vowel in their singular form (**qatl*, **qitl*, **quṭl*). The paradigm words for these in many Biblical Hebrew grammars are, respectively, מֶלֶךְ “king,” סֵפֶר “book,” קֹדֶשׁ “holiness.” Sometimes, despite their name, these nouns do not attest a *seghol*, as in בַּעַל “master.” When suffixes are added to the lexical form, the etymological vowel (or /o/ in the case of **quṭl* nouns) reemerges: מַלְכִי “my king,” סִפְרִי “my book,” קֹדְשִׁי “my holiness.” Feminine segholate nouns (**qatlat*, **qitlat*, **quṭlat*) generally show the etymological vowel (or /o/ in the case of **quṭlat* nouns) in their first syllable: מַלְכָּה “queen,” גְּבֻעָה “hill,” חֲרָבָה “desolation.” Most segholate nouns from II-*waw/yodh* roots have different vowel patterns in Tiberian Hebrew (**qatl*—מָוֶת “death” and בַּיִת “house”), as do III-*yodh* roots (**qatl* or **qitl*—פְּתִי “simple,” **quṭl*—חֲלִי “sickness”). Segholate nouns/adjectives usually have two vowels in their plural absolute bases, both masculine (**qatalim*—מְלָכִים and פְּתָיִים, **qitalim*—סִפְרִים, **qutalim*—חֲרָבִים and חֲלָיִים) and feminine (**qatalōt*—מְלָכוֹת, **qitalōt*—גְּבֻעוֹת, **qutalōt*—חֲרָבוֹת).

Specific passages from the nonbiblical DSS are identified in the standard fashion, with the cave number (1Q, 2Q, 3Q, etc.) followed by the manuscript number (1, 2, 3, etc.), followed by fragment number and/or column number, then line number. The exceptions are texts commonly indicated with an abbreviation, such as 1QS, 1QH^a, and 1QP^hHab. In order

to make the references to passages less cumbersome and the pages below less cluttered, I have not used the alternative designations for manuscripts such as 4QD^a or 4QDamascus Document^a but have restricted myself to the numerical titles, 4Q266. This means that individuals unfamiliar with the numeral designations may sometimes not recognize the text that is being referred to. For the sake of clarity, I present below the most commonly cited texts that might occasion confusion. The list is not comprehensive but points to the most commonly cited texts (e.g., Jubilees is also attested in other scrolls, but 4Q216–228 are the ones most frequently cited).

Jubilees and texts related to Jubilees: 4Q216–228

Damascus Document: 4Q266–273

4QMMT: 4Q394–399

Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: 4Q400–407

Instruction of the Maven (4QInstruction): 4Q415–418

Temple Scroll: 11Q19–20

In order to highlight the biblical DSS and to indicate the texts to which they correspond, the simple numerical title as well as their nonnumerical title are given together (e.g., 4Q88 [4QPs^f]). Specific passages in these texts are indicated by reference to scriptural passage; this succinctly provides reference to a location in a scroll (since almost all editions of DSS biblical texts indicate scripture verses along with column and line numbers), as well as to a location in the Bible.



SBZ

INTRODUCTION

The following pages began as a handout on the grammar of the Dead Sea Scrolls (= DSS). While preparing to teach a class on Post-Biblical Hebrew, I found that the descriptions of the Hebrew of the DSS in Qimron's *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (= *HDSS*) and Kutscher's *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Complete Isaiah Scroll* did not suit the needs of students.¹ Although Kutscher's treatment is thorough, careful, and nuanced, it treats a text that exhibits numerous idiosyncrasies not shared by other texts; as such it cannot easily be used to introduce students to the language of the DSS as a whole. Qimron's book, on the other hand, does assess the (non-biblical) scrolls as a whole; nevertheless, it too has some shortcomings. What I find problematic about Qimron's *HDSS* are the following: (1) The book presumes that many linguistic idiosyncrasies witnessed in the scrolls reflect a single vernacular dialect.² (2) The book proposes dramatic

1. Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986); this work is in some ways an expansion of, while also being a summary of Qimron's dissertation: *Grammar of the Hebrew Language of the Scrolls of the Judean Desert* (Hebrew; Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1976). E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Complete Isaiah Scroll* (STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974), originally published in Hebrew as *Ha-Lashon ve-ha-Reqa' ha-Leshoni shel Megillat Yesha'yahu ha-Selema mi-Megillot Yam ha-Melah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1959).

2. Qimron refers throughout the book to the language of the DSS as though the texts (with few exceptions) reflect a common dialect. That the idiosyncrasies of the scrolls' language are, in part, attributable to a spoken idiom is suggested by Qimron in the final paragraph of his concluding chapter, where he refers to (among other things) the pronouns הוואה and הוואה and *yqwtl* + suffix verb forms: "These unique features show that DSS Hebrew is not merely a mixture of BH, MH and Aramaic, but also draws on a distinct spoken dialect" (*HDSS*, 117–18). More recently Qimron writes: "It is my contention that the grammar of the DSS reflects the Hebrew of the period spoken in Jerusalem or its vicinity" (Elisha Qimron, "The Nature of the DSS Hebrew and Its Relation to BH and MH," in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* [ed. T.

differences between the language of the DSS and the Hebrew as evidenced in the MT, though the evidence for these differences is sometimes tenuous (based on a single example) and often ambiguous.³ (3) The book does not sufficiently discuss the ambiguities inherent in many of its examples and sometimes does not entertain other possible explanations. (4) The book is sometimes imprecise in its description; for example, it refers to the “weakening” of gutturals without a more precise description of where and when specific phonemes “weaken.” (5) The book, although it has recently been reprinted in 2008, contains no references to recently published texts or secondary literature (including Qimron’s own numerous publications).

Of course, the study of the Hebrew of the DSS is not limited to these two books. There are a plethora of studies and sketches on the languages of the scrolls. Nevertheless, these other sketches often give only an overview of the main features of the languages and do not present the background necessary for a student to understand the respective phenomena in Hebrew. For these reasons, I felt compelled to create my own descriptions and explanations, commenting especially where I disagreed with Qimron’s *HDSS*.

In reference to the above-listed criticisms, I should explain briefly my approach. (1) I have taken a broader view of the linguistic phenomena and assume that the linguistic peculiarities found in the scrolls are potentially due to a wide spectrum of causes, only one of which is the underlying spoken idiom of the sectarian writers and scribes. Moreover, I am not concerned with isolating the vernacular idiom of the writers; it

Muraoka and John F. Elwolde; STDJ 36; Leiden: Brill, 2000], 232). For criticisms of Qimron’s assumptions, see Avi Hurvitz, “Was QH a ‘Spoken’ Language? On Some Recent Views and Positions: Comments,” in *Diggers at the Well*, 110–114. See, also, Florentino García Martínez, “Review of E. Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*,” *JSJ* 19 (1988): 115–17.

3. For example, Qimron notes that the single spelling of “Sheol” with a prothetic *aleph* (אשׂאול), combined with the fact that the word is always spelled with a *waw* after the *aleph* is evidence that the word was always pronounced “eš’ol”; he also calls attention to the tendency in Samaritan Hebrew for the prothetic *aleph* to appear in the oral tradition but not in the written tradition (*HDSS*, 39). For more on this, see §5.1 below, “Prothetic *Aleph*.” In a similar way, he claims “For the contraction $\delta y \rightarrow \bar{o}$, I was able to find only one instance הוה (= הוי)” from 1QIsa^a at Isa 1:24 (*HDSS*, 35). He also suggests that the word מבוואי in 4Q405 23 i, 9 is further evidence of this (or a similar) shift, though a far more pedestrian explanation is also available (see §4.10, “Diphthongs and Triphthongs”).

is more important, it seems to me, for students to understand the reading and writing register(s) of those copying the scrolls and composing their texts. (2) I attempt, wherever relevant, to point to examples of phenomena from the MT that are similar to the phenomena found in the DSS. It is assumed that the MT is made up of texts that reflect numerous dialects and registers of Hebrew; I assume a similar diversity in the DSS. Nevertheless, I also assume that the writers of the DSS were (at least at times) attempting to write in a register that approximated the writing/reading register reflected in the MT.⁴ (3) I try to explore the ambiguities inherent in the examples cited by Qimron, Kutscher, and others, in order to illustrate different possible explanations and to question some underlying assumptions. (4) I attempt to be as precise as possible in identifying the parameters of certain phonological shifts; for example, each guttural consonant is described separately and its specific “weakness” explored. (5) I provide further examples of the same phenomena described by Qimron and others from my own readings as well as from consulting Accordance software and the *Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*; and I incorporate more recent insights from linguistics and philology of the DSS into my descriptions.⁵ Despite my best efforts at analyzing the following phenomena, I recognize that my observations do not represent the final word on these matters and in many ways remain preliminary.

It should be added that, although I disagree with Qimron’s book in many ways, it is also an incredibly rich source of information. Further, I do not entirely disagree with it. Many of the observations in it seem well-founded. The general approach of assessing the vernacular dialect(s) from

4. One indication that at least some writers of the DSS were familiar with the form of the MT as we know it is suggested by the close correspondence in spelling between some biblical scrolls and the MT: e.g., ותהינה (4Q70 [4QJer^a] at Jer 18:21) for MT ותהינה; יבדנני “he will honor me” (4Q85 [4QPs^c] at Ps 50:23) for MT יבדנני vs. *יבדני, which is what we would expect based on forms like תברכני “you will bless me” (Gen 27:19); also the defective orthography in ירגמהו “they will stone him” (4Q26a [4QLev^e] at Lev 20:2) for MT ירגמהו; בנו “his children” (4Q35 [4QDeut^h] at Deut 33:9) for MT בננו; כדרכו “according to his ways” (4Q70 [4QJer^a] at Jer 17:10) for MT כדרכו.

5. Martin G. Abegg, “Qumran Text and Tagging,” in Accordance 9.5 (Altamonte Springs, Florida: OakTree Software, 1999–2009); Martin G. Abegg et al., “Grammatical Tagging of Dead Sea Scrolls Biblical Corpus,” in Accordance 9.5 (Altamonte Springs, Florida: OakTree Software, 2009); Martin G. Abegg et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance* (3 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2003–).

the written sources is also profitable and well worth considering. It seems likely that many aspects of the language he outlines were, in fact, features of a dialect spoken by some writers and readers of the texts.

Two other very helpful resources that students should consult are the synopses of the Hebrew language offered by Martin Abegg in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* and in *Qumran Cave 1, II: The Isaiah Scrolls, Part 2: Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants*.⁶ Although for the first synopsis he could not draw on all the texts now available, and does not draw on the biblical scrolls, his statistics are still useful in getting a general idea for the frequency of certain forms and the basic outline of the language. The second synopsis offers observations not only on the Isaiah scrolls, but on all the scrolls in general. A third synopsis, that of Antoon Schoors, catalogs many forms and vocabulary, but only treats the texts considered part of the Wisdom tradition.⁷

I have chosen to describe around twenty-five topics. These, in my estimation, are not addressed sufficiently in Abegg's synopses (or in other synopses) and have not been treated adequately in Qimron's *HDSS*. Some items that are covered sufficiently in Qimron's *Grammar* and in his *HDSS* have not been addressed again here.⁸ This means, of course, that the following pages are not intended as a comprehensive grammar of DSS Hebrew.

As might already be obvious, the orthography, phonology, and morphology of the DSS are often intimately linked. Thus, I have tried not to repeat myself by addressing the same topic from the perspective of orthography, phonology, morphology, but have, instead, addressed topics where they are most relevant in the description of the language. Discussing the same features in three different sections would be needlessly repetitive and would obscure the explanations offered.

6. Martin G. Abegg, "The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 1:325–58 and idem, "Linguistic Profile of the Isaiah Scrolls," in *Qumran Cave 1, II: The Isaiah Scrolls, Part 2: Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants* (ed. Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint; DJD 32; Oxford: Clarendon, 2010), 25–41.

7. Antoon Schoors, "The Language of the Qumran Sapiential Works," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (ed. C. Hempel et al.; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 61–95.

8. For example, I have not provided a list of words found in the DSS according to their bases, as Qimron has done.