MEANING AND CONTEXT IN THE THANKSGIVING HYMNS

SBL

Society of Biblical Literature

Early Judaism and Its Literature

Rodney A. Werline, Editor

Number 42

MEANING AND CONTEXT IN
THE THANKSGIVING HYMNS

LINGUISTIC AND RHETORICAL PERSPECTIVES
ON A COLLECTION OF PRAYERS FROM QUMRAN

by

Trine B. Hasselbalch

Copyright © 2015 by SBL Press

For Jan, Liva, and Sara

Contents

Acknowledgments

This book is the revised version of my 2011 Ph.D. thesis from the University of Copenhagen. I want to thank a number of people and organizations that over the years have contributed to its completion. First of all, I want to express my gratitude to my supervisor Bodil Ejrnæs, who eagerly encouraged me to go ahead and apply for a Ph.D. scholarship in the first place. Second, thanks to the Faculty of Theology at the University of Copenhagen for giving me the opportunity to get started. Apart from Bodil, I have had the pleasure of being supervised by Jesper Høgenhaven and Niels Peter Lemche in Copenhagen. Each in their own way, they have guided me well at different points in the process of the Ph.D. work.

I had the opportunity to spend a semester in Manchester and enjoy fruitful master classes and discussions with George Brooke. The project took a decisive turn during this stay, and I am much obliged to George Brooke for this, and also to Todd Klutz, who introduced me to sociolinguistics. The visit to Manchester would not have been possible without generous grants from the following institutions: the Carlsberg Foundation, the Oticon Foundation, Julie von Müllen's memorial trust, Johannes Pedersen's memorial trust, the University of Copenhagen Fund for Theological Students and Graduates, and Nørregaard's Travel Fellowship.

On my Ph.D. committee were Eibert Tigchelaar (Leuven), Jutta Jokiranta (Helsinki), and Søren Holst (Copenhagen). I want to thank them for meticulously reading and commenting on my thesis and thus getting me a decisive step further. I want to thank Judith Newman, the now former editor of this series, for accepting my manuscript for peer review. Warm thanks go to the two peers who anonymously worked their way through the manuscript and gave me some very encouraging and valuable advice. Finally, I am grateful for the patience of my editor, Rodney Werline, and for all that he has done to enhance my work. Birthe Hasselbalch has done a great job revising the English, and any English problems left at this point are completely my own responsibility.

Many people have enriched my working process—and my life—during the years of work. Some are people that I know well, whereas others were inspiring, albeit brief, acquaintances. I am grateful for all of them, but will mention only a few, such as my colleagues at the Department for Biblical Exegesis in Copenhagen, whose company I have much enjoyed through the years. Very special thanks go to Pernille Carstens and my colleagues at the Centre for Bible and Cultural Memory: they were wonderfully supportive, and the Centre has provided the best conceivable environment for my work. I also want to thank everyone engaged in the Nordic Network in Qumran Studies; this fellowship, too, has been immensely valuable, as I trust it will be in the future.

I warmly thank my parents, Tor and Anne Bjørnung, for their enduring support and encouragement. Finally, my husband, Jan Hasselbalch, has my endless gratitude for his unfailing support and for his unbelievable patience from the very beginning to the very end.

Abbreviations

ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
CTJ	*Calvin Theological Journal*
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
DSSR	*The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. Edited by D. W. Parry and E. Tov. Leiden: Brill, 2004–2005.
DSSSE	*Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*. Edited by F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar. Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998.
DTT	*Dansk teologisk tidsskrift*
ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSP	*Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*
HS	*Hebrew Studies*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
RB	*Revue biblique*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumran*
SBFLA	*Studii biblici Franciscani liber annus*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

1
Introduction

It can be tempting for a Dead Sea Scrolls scholar working on ancient texts on the basis of damaged manuscripts to complain about the missing parts and think it is they that prevent her from fully understanding a text. It is tempting to surmise things about the contents of a missing line, thinking it might be the clue to wonderful new insights, and it is frustrating not to know for sure. One is aware that something is missing and cautious not to ignore this.

However, it is not only in the handling of material that caution is called for. Also when everything originally written in a manuscript is still in its place, the text carries knowledge that is not explicitly stated. This has to do with how texts are related to their literary, physical, situational, social and cultural environments, both at the time of composition and in later usage. The issue is how texts do, or do not, express a number of contextual factors. It is most pertinent to Dead Sea Scrolls studies since so many efforts have been made to read the Dead Sea Scrolls as sources to the life and history of the Dead Sea community. Yet, the theoretical and methodological assumptions behind scholarly identifications of sociohistorical contextual factors are often implicit and unclear. For obvious reasons, we are less aware of that which is simply not stated than of clearly missing bits of parchments, letters and words in a manuscript.

This fundamental problem underlies the present work on 1QHodayot[a], a collection of prayer texts from Qumran. Greater attention to this general problem in close textual analyses may lead to conclusions about this prayer collection's place in the life of the Dead Sea community, indeed about the community itself and its theology, that differ significantly from most current interpretations. The aim is not to prove earlier interpretations wrong, or to prove this particular interpretation correct. Rather, by applying theories that properly address the relationship between discourse

and context I want to show that alternative readings are viable. Others will have to judge if these readings are also preferable, and I hope this book can contribute to reconsiderations of the methods used in linguistic and literary analyses of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

1.1. The Composite Nature of 1QHodayot[a]

1QHodayot[a] is a collection of thanksgiving hymns or prayers. The collection belongs with a group of documents designated Hodayot, literally "thanksgivings," due to the reiterated formula, "I thank you, Lord," at the beginning of several compositions. Sukenik introduced this designation in the very first edition of the text in 1948, and it has continued to be used ever since. [1] 1QHodayot[a] was found as early as 1947 in the first cave of Dead Sea Scrolls discovered near Khirbet Qumran. From an early point of research the scrolls were thought to belong to a religious community settled there, and because 1QHodayot[a] was among the first manuscript findings, it has had its share of influence on how we perceive the historical and social realities behind the production of the Dead Sea Scrolls. It has been pointed out by Moshe Bernstein that 1QHodayot[a] and other large documents found at an early stage in the scholarly history of the Dead Sea Scrolls have exerted an unduly large influence on our understanding of the Dead Sea community simply because the rich and variegated Cave 4 materials were found and published much later.[2]

---

    1. 1QHodayot[a] consists of nineteen to twenty-four thanksgiving hymns distributed on twenty-eight columns of text. The *editio princeps* is Eleazar Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (1955), which was published in Hebrew (אוצר המגילות הגנוזות שבידי האוניברסיטה העברית) in 1954. Smaller parts of the scroll were published in his מגילות גנוזות. מתוך גניזה שנמצאה במדבר יהודה in 1948 and (with a few more comments on the contents) in 1950. A new edition by Eileen Schuller and Hartmut Stegemann has been published quite recently: *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayot[a] with Incorporation of 1QHodayot[b] and 4QHodayot[a–f]* (DJD XL). Stegemann, who had spent years improving Sukenik's reconstruction, passed away, and Schuller completed the work. Smaller and generally more damaged Hodayot documents have been found—1QH[b] (1Q35); 4QH[a–f] (4Q427–4Q432). Different orders of hymns are seen in them. I use the designation Hodayot when speaking of 1QHodayot[a], which is the object of analysis here, as well as of all the texts considered to be of the same genre.
    2. Bernstein, "Introductory Formulas," 30. See also Schuller, "Prayer, Hymnic, and Liturgical Texts," 155.

On the other hand, our notions about the Dead Sea community have also left their stamp on our interpretations of this collection of hymns, and I believe they have to some extent been influenced by dubious scholarly images of the underlying social reality. To be more precise, according to general consensus the compositions are divided into two main categories: "teacher hymns" or "leader hymns" on the one hand, and "community hymns" on the other. In 1960, Günter Morawe and Svend Holm-Nielsen both published dissertations in which, independently of each other, they divided the collection into two main types of compositions. Morawe distinguished one group, which he named thanksgiving songs (*Danklieder*), from the remainder, called hymnic songs of confession (*hymnischen Bekenntnislieder*). His distinction was based on the inclusion in the former group of the speaker's accounts of how he had suffered at first, but had eventually experienced salvation. These accounts were lacking in the latter group.[3] Holm-Nielsen made his division on the basis of differences both in form and in content. The one category, called by him psalms of thanksgiving, concentrated on the "surrounding world" of the community, whereas the other, called hymns, concentrated on the "conditions of the community" itself.[4] As it happens, Morawe and Holm-Nielsen's categories largely correspond to each other, and they have been adopted by subsequent scholarship roughly as they were outlined by these two scholars.[5]

The two categories have come to mirror a fundamental scholarly perception of the social realities behind the collection of hymns. As early as 1950, Eleazar Sukenik suggested that this collection of anonymous compositions in its entirety had been composed by the Teacher of Righteousness, the founding leader described in other Dead Sea Scrolls (CD I 4–11; 1QpHab I 17–II 10; VII 4–5; 4Q173 1 4; 2 2).[6] It was later suggested by

---

3. Morawe, *Aufbau und Abgrenzung*, 108–13; 135–38. The book, published in 1960, is a slightly shortened but otherwise unaltered version of his dissertation, which was defended in 1957 (ibid., 5).

4. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 320. This dissertation was both defended and published in 1960, and it contains no references to the work of Morawe.

5. See Douglas, "The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited," 245, for an outline of how Holm-Nielsen, Morawe, Jeremias, Becker and Kuhn demarcate the categories of compositions.

6. Sukenik, מגילות גנוזות (1950), 32. See also idem, אוצר המגילות הגנוזות שבידי האוניברסיטה העברית, 34, and the English edition, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*, 39; Dupont-Sommer, *Le livre des hymnes*, 10–12 ; Delcor, *Les hymnes de Qumrân*, 22–23.

Gert Jeremias that the Teacher of Righteousness was the author of only a part of the compositions, the part categorized by him as individual thanksgiving hymns (*individuelle Danklieder*).[7] Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn proposed that the Hodayot should be seen as Teacher Hymns, hymns composed by the Teacher of Righteousness, and Community Hymns, respectively.[8] Others doubted that the Teacher of Righteousness had authored any of the compositions,[9] and Philip Davies argued that the Teacher of Righteousness was not the actual but the implied author.[10] The Teacher of Righteousness's real or implied authorship continues to be argued or asserted by scholars, and so does the idea that the bifurcation of the collection mirrors the different social roles of their speakers.[11] Those who have reservations about this position tend not to reject the possibility that the Teacher of Righteousness could have been the author, but they find the arguments methodologically unsound.[12] The issue of the Teacher's authorship seems to be of secondary importance to these scholars: matters of theology take priority, and perhaps this explains why designations like "Teacher/Leader/Individual Hymns" and "Community/Collective Hymns" are still widely used—perhaps out of habit.

Carol Newsom is also critical of the idea that a subset of the hymns came from the hand of just one prominent leader. She explains the dif-

---

7. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer*, 168–77. With few exceptions, this group corresponds to Holm-Nielsen's psalms of thanksgiving and Morawe's thanksgiving songs. Jeremias operates not with two but three categories of compositions: hymns, psalms, and thanksgiving songs. Ibid. 170.

8. Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 24–25.

9. Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns*, 45; Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 25–26; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 118–19. Holm-Nielsen did not find the question of authorship particularly relevant. On the contrary, he found the contrast between individualistic and collective ways of understanding the speaking voice artificial: "Es ist zu gleicher Zeit 'individuell' und 'kollektiv', weil es den Einzelnen allein kraft seiner Zugehörigkeit zum Ganzen repräsentiert" ("'Ich' in den Hodajoth," 222).

10. Davies, *Behind the Essenes*, 88–90.

11. Michael Douglas has argued at length that a subset of the compositions was authored by the Teacher of Righteousness. See Douglas, "The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited," 247–57; "Power and Praise," 239–394. Others in favor of this position are Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 200–2; Tanzer, "The Sages at Qumran," 113, 116, 140; Charlesworth, "Jewish Hymns, Odes, and Prayers," 413–14.

12. See Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 327–28; Kittel, *The Hymns of Qumran*, 8–11; Davies, *Behind the Essenes*, 87–90; Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community*, 190–96; Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 15–16.

ference between the types of compositions not by their authorship, but rather by the rhetorical and identity-formative power they potentially had in their social context. She believes that the general leadership is represented by the speaker in the one group of compositions, the community members in the other. [13] Newsom's approach is intriguing because it opens up new questions about the *meaning* of the composite whole, which is also the focus of this book.

In any case, the status quo is that the dichotomy between leadership and ordinary membership is maintained in readings of 1QHodayot[a]. One subset of compositions continues to be seen as representing a form of community leadership. The remainder, on the other hand, are thought to express the sentiments of ordinary community members, and usually this goes without discussion. As an exception to the rule, Sarah Tanzer suggested as early as 1987 that "[t]he title, Hymns of the Community, seems to have been applied as a way of distinguishing these Hodayot from the very personal character found in the Hymns of the Teacher. Yet, it may not be the best way to characterize this group of twenty-five compositions."[14] She identified two subgroups of community hymns, the Deuteronomic Hodayot and the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* Hodayot, but with few exceptions these designations have not gained ground in subsequent scholarship.[15] In the following discussions, I shall refer to the two sets of compositions as the so-called Leader Hymns and the so-called Community Hymns, respectively.

Clearly, there is a literary basis for the bifurcation of 1QHodayot[a]. A conspicuous difference between the two groups of compositions is the introductory formulas. The so-called Leader Hymns consistently employ the formula "I thank you, Lord" (אודכה אדוני), whereas the so-called Community Hymns prefer "Blessed be you" (ברוך אתה אל / ברוך אתה אדוני).[16]

---

13. Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 287–300, argues that the institutional leadership of the Dead Sea society, and not one single leading figure, is the implied author of these hymns.

14. Tanzer, "The Sages at Qumran," 144. Harkins, "The Community Hymns Classification," 140–54, has recently argued that some of them, the so-called *maśkîl* hymns, had circulated independently and might originate outside of the Dead Sea community.

15. Tanzer, "The Sages at Qumran," 144–54.

16. Stegemann, "The Number of Psalms in the 1QHodayot[a]," 222. Within the so-called Community Hymns the variant אודכה אלי occurs in 1QH[a] XIX 6 and possibly also in line 18. The latter example, which occurs a few millimeters from the left margin, is preceded by a small ink dot, and this leads most scholars to assume that

Also, the consistent use of the first-person singular in the so-called Leader Hymns is broken in the so-called Community Hymns.[17]

Already Jeremias held that the speaker of the so-called Leader Hymns must have been an individual, because he, unlike the speaker of the so-called Community Hymns, recounts his inner feelings.[18] Stegemann agreed that the speaker referred to personal experiences, but according to him, these were external events involving the speaker's enemies, which are mentioned by several names in the so-called Leader Hymns, but not in the Community Hymns.[19] Several scholars have pointed out that each set of compositions favors a particular vocabulary, and this tendency has been confirmed in recent years, for example, by Michael Douglas's identification of rare and idiosyncratic language usages in the so-called Leader Hymns.[20] Émile Puech acknowledges that there are differences between the groups of hymns, but still underscores their "unmistakable unity of style and vocabulary." In his view, the Teacher of Righteousness could have

---

אודכה אלי was preceded by a now lost word of transition (e.g., ואני); this would indicate that a new composition did not begin in line 18. See Schuller and Stegemann, *1QHodayot[a]* (DJD XL), 242–3, 245–6.

17. 1QH[a] VII 12–20 consistently employs the first-person plural. The orthography of this composition deviates from the orthography of the compositions surrounding it, and this suggests that the hymn had been transmitted independently before its incorporation into 1QHodayot[a]. Angela Harkins also points to some other signs of a plural speaker in 1QHodayot[a]: a reference to a plural subject (אוזננו) in 1QH[a] VI 13; a list of groups of people that could be included in this subject in the following lines (13–15); a reference to the community (בשיחד צול אנשי סודי 1QH[a] VI 29). Finally, the fragmentary composition(s) found in 1QH[a] XXV–XXVI (The Self-Glorification Hymn and the Hymn of the Righteous) does not preserve any occurrences of the first-person plural, but its parallel text in 4Q427 does, so there is a possibility that the Cave 1 text originally did too. See Harkins, "Observations on the Editorial Shaping of the So-Called Community Hymns," 246–47, 253–54.

18. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer*, 170.

19. "Diese durchweg im Ich-Stil formulierten 'Lehrerlieder' enthalten nun zahlreiche Aussagen über Gegner ihres Autors, die nicht einfach als allgemeine Klagen über die Bösheit seiner Umwelt zu berurteilen sind, sondern auch nach Art der Darstellung konkrete geschichtliche Bezüge haben müssen" (Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*. Bonn: Published privately, 1971, cited in Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community*, 239 n. 18).

20. Douglas, "The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited," 247–56. Earlier analyses of differences in language usage are found in Jeremias, *Der Lehrer*, 173–76; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 320–22.

been the author of all compositions, because he was probably able to vary his expression as needed.[21]

One can argue that the speaker in the so-called Leader Hymns depicts himself as someone who has special leadership duties toward other people.[22] As Kuhn already pointed out, the speaker's authority in this regard was rooted in certain revelatory qualities: in compositions where the speaker depicts himself as a mediator of revelatory knowledge he also distinguishes between himself and the community.[23] The so-called Community Hymns, on the other hand, use sapiential rather than apocalyptic language, as argued by Sarah Tanzer in her Ph.D. dissertation. Tanzer demonstrated that there is a strong presence of wisdom elements in the so-called Community Hymns, but hardly any in the so-called Leader Hymns. Such elements include themes like creation theology and determinism, the future reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked, expressions of low regard for humanity given in the form of *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien* and rhetorical questions.[24]

In his recent Ph.D. dissertation on religious epistemologies in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Shane Berg has confirmed Tanzer's conclusion regarding the so-called Community Hymns, and he has examined the character and function of the wisdom elements found there. He analyzes three works: the Tractate on the Two Spirits, 4QInstruction, and the Hodayot; and he concludes not only that the former two and the so-called Community Hymns are all sapi-

---

21. Puech, "Hodayot", 366.

22. In the so-called Community Hymns the speaker sometimes states that he will tell others about the glory and the wonders of God (1QHᵃ XVIII 16–17; 22–23; XIX 9). In the so-called Leader Hymns, however, the speaker in various claims about how he affects other people indicates that he has functions to fulfill vis-à-vis them. For instance, he describes himself as "a mocking song for transgressors" and "a banner for the elect of righteousness" (1QHᵃ X 13–15); "a snare to transgressors but healing to all who repent of transgressions, prudence for the simple, and a resolute purpose for the eager" (1QHᵃ X 10–11). God has made him "a father to the children of kindness and like a foster-father to the people of good omen" (1QHᵃ XV 23–24), but he faces difficulties when trying to address his disciples "in order to revive the spirit of those who stumble and to support the weary with a word" (1QHᵃ XVI 36–37). The translations are from Schuller and Stegemann, *1QHodayotᵃ* (DJD XL).

23. Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 22. Kuhn remarks that where the speaker depicts himself as a mediator of revelatory knowledge, he also distinguishes between himself and the community.

24. For an overview, see Tanzer, "The Sages at Qumran," 55–56, 75–79.

ential, but also that they represent a particular development within wisdom literature. Unlike the view of earlier wisdom traditions, the wisdom of God according to these texts is not immanent and therefore is not available to everybody. Divine wisdom is available only to an elect group of people who receive it through spiritual revelation. Thus, Berg argues, the epistemological outlook of the so-called Community Hymns paves the way for a sectarian mentality where only a limited number of people have access to God's knowledge—and it is this knowledge that will enable them to live according to the will of God. Furthermore, Berg explores the epistemological outlook of the so-called Leader Hymns and finds that they have an apocalyptic outlook inspired by prophetic modes of revelation. This epistemology, too, undergirds a sectarian identity, but in a different way: it conveys divine knowledge only through exclusive revelation to a prophet-like mediator who may subsequently share his wisdom with a select group of like-minded people. Berg's definition of these epistemological outlooks is based on observations on the anthropology of each group of compositions and on analyses of their central concepts.[25] In this way Berg conveys convincing arguments for the bifurcation of 1QHodayot[a] according to literary criteria.[26] In sum, a variety of criteria have been identified over the years to justify a division between two main groups of hymns:

So-Called Teacher Hymns	So-Called Community Hymns
Personal and authoritative speaker	Universal speaker
Accounts of personal and historical experiences	References to general experiences

---

25. In order to emphasize man's lowly nature and his inability to achieve knowledge of his own accord, the so-called Community Hymns draw on the creation imagery of Gen 2, according to which man has been created from dust and earth. See Berg, "Religious Epistemologies," 161–95. The so-called Leader Hymns, on the other hand, rarely make such general claims about human nature, but focus instead on the speaker's suffering due to social and religious conflicts. Some of the central concepts investigated by Berg in the so-called Leader Hymns are what he labels "metaphors for revelation" in the field of teaching and instruction (שכל, ידע), concealing and revealing (גלה, חבה, סתר), building and construction (אמץ, כון), light and illumination (אור, יפע) (ibid., 213–28). In the so-called Community Hymns he looks into concepts which in this context are used to show man's ability to obtain knowledge of God's covenant and the ability to live up to God's will: "spirits" (רוחות), "understanding" (בינה), "wonder" (פלא) and "secrets" (רזים) (ibid., 173–99).

26. Ibid., 153–264.

Apocalyptic epistemology	Sapiential epistemology
Rare and idiosyncratic language	Stereotyped language
Consistent introductory formula	Varied introductory formulas
אודכה אדוני	ברוך אתה אל /ברוך אתה אדוני
Consistent use of the first-person singular	Occurrence of first-person plural

1.2. Social Implications of a Literary Bifurcation?

The well-founded literary division of 1QHodayot[a] tends to be interpreted under the influence of suppositions about the sociohistorical realities behind the texts. This is the case not least among scholars who identify the speaker of the so-called Leader Hymns as the Teacher of Righteousness, and I want to draw attention to a couple of examples.

Michael Douglas criticizes Jeremias, Becker, and Kuhn for having made this identification in an unjustified way, because they had not proved on literary grounds that only one author had written the so-called Leader Hymns.[27] His own interpretation, however, provides a significant example of the fault he criticizes in others. He puts forward the premise that one can legitimately begin to discuss the historical identity of the speaker of a group of compositions if and only if it has been "established by literary criticism" that they were written by only one person.[28] He then identifies variants of the phrase הגבירכה בי, occurring five times in cols. X–XIII (and only there), as the *signature phrase* of one individual.[29] Based on the signature phrase and occurrences of other idiosyncratic expressions in these and the following columns, Douglas argues that the compositions in cols. X–XVII were "substantially the work of a single author," and that col. IX was subsequently added as a sort of introduction to his work.[30] Douglas goes on to argue that the author of cols. X–XVII was the Teacher of Righ-

---

27. Douglas, "The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited," 247.

28. Ibid.

29. Ibid., 247–49. He argues that this phrase, not found in any of the biblical or pseudepigraphical texts, is unique; and, because it occurs several times in the Hodayot compositions under consideration, that it must be one particular individual's way of expressing himself.

30. Ibid., 256.

teousness.[31] At one stage this group of texts, labeled "The Teacher's Book," was incorporated into the collection we know as 1QHodayot[a].

Douglas's linguistic analysis is persuasive insofar as it points to a different authorship for this group of compositions compared to other compositions in 1QHodayot[a]. His claim that only one person could have been the author of the so-called Leader Hymns, however, is not entirely convincing. He sees these hymns as composed close to the events to which they refer: according to him, they were directed to authorities in Jerusalem in an effort to make them endorse the views of the Teacher of Righteousness, and not the views of his antagonists.[32]

One problem with this reading is that, in the spirit of Gert Jeremias, it presumes identity between the author and the speaker. A related problem is that it rests on the assumption that the compositions came into being as rhetorical actions intended to solve pressing communal matters. This, however, is not necessarily the case. First, the genre of prayer may not be the most suitable medium for such rhetorical action. Secondly, the idea of the compositions as rhetorical action composed in the wake of a single, concrete situation underrates their capacity for *reflecting* on ideas, or on events that were rather more remote. This is a question of experiential distance that has implications for the argument that there could be only one author: if the so-called Leader Hymns did not emerge directly from pressing, political events, but came into being over a longer lapse of time, they could very well have been written collectively by a group of like-minded people.

Shane Berg reaches similar conclusions as Douglas and contends that the literary bifurcation mirrors a sociohistorical group with a leader-

---

31. The reasons Douglas gives for this opinion are basically the following: The signature phrase and other distinct linguistic expressions show that the speaker identifies himself not as just any member, but as a revolutionary leader, as "the sifter who determines who pleases and who displeases God" (ibid.). Furthermore, the "Teacher's Book" clearly refers to the experience of being expelled, to a breach with opponents, and to an escalating crisis resulting in a final schism. Consequently, the compositions (which on these points resemble accounts about the Teacher of Righteousness) must relate to events taking place in the earliest stage of the community. Finally, Douglas repeats an argument made earlier by Jeremias: he claims that there could not have been room for two revolutionary leaders in the community simultaneously, and therefore that the author of the "Teacher's Book" must have been the Teacher of Righteousness (ibid., 258–64).

32. Ibid., 263.

ship (specified as the Teacher of Righteousness) and ordinary members. In spite of their lowly nature, community members would have received divine knowledge through the spirit of God and other spirits because this was God's will. The Teacher of Righteousness, on the other hand, would have received revelatory insights directly from God, like a prophet, and conveyed it to other community members.[33]

It is to Berg's credit that he reflects on the societal function of the two religious epistemologies. Yet his conclusion that 1QHodayot[a] with its two groups of compositions and two different epistemologies corresponds with a social bifurcation within the Dead Sea community is not wholly convincing due to an asymmetry between the two epistemologies. If God had indeed chosen to impart divine wisdom to a collective of Dead Sea community members, why would he need a Teacher of Righteousness to prophesy his messages to them?[34] I am not saying that the two epistemologies might not have worked together in some way in the Dead Sea community—apparently they did—but it is quite likely that they originated in different social contexts before they were adopted into the literary context of 1QHodayot[a]. In that case, it is hardly self-evident, as Berg implies, that the two groups of compositions must represent the perspective of a leader and that of his followers, respectively. On the contrary, it is possible that the two groups of compositions were juxtaposed because they were felt somehow to *overlap* and to express, each in their own way, a common core of ideas or experiences. Such a common core might be the sense of a "sectarian outlook" according to which access to divine knowledge is restricted, *in one way or another*, to those who are predestined from their creation to belong in the covenant with God.[35]

The problems that I have identified in the approaches of Douglas and Berg relate to an insufficient consideration of the genre of the Hodayot and, on a general level, of how discourse and texts relate to their social

---

33. Berg, "Religious Epistemologies," 239.

34. Berg asks the following in regard to the speaker of the so-called Leader Hymns: "Might not the hymnist simply be expressing in powerful terms the presence and activity of God that is available to any devoted disciple? The answer to this reasonable question is 'no.'… [T]he hymnist regards his experience of God to be unique. God is directly present to the hymnist and imparts revelation to him, but for others in the community such revelation is mediated to them by the hymnist. The Teacher's role is unique within the community" (ibid., 213). From this perspective, the epistemology of the so-called Community Hymns seems to be rather superfluous.

35. Ibid., 20.

and cultural contexts. How do we know that the literary dichotomy identified by numerous scholars in numerous ways mirrors a particular social dichotomy among the owners of the prayer collection at a particular point in time? Do we know exactly *how* the sociohistorical context of the Dead Sea community has put its imprint on this collection of prayers? This is fundamentally a question about how texts are related to their contexts. For this reason, it is also a question underlying the present work on the compositional meaning of the Hodayot. Theoretical aspects of the relationship between text and context preoccupy many linguists, but to my knowledge it is hardly discussed in Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship. Linguistic perspectives on this problem would be welcome, however, and some of them will be included in my analysis of 1QHodayot[a].

1.3. Fundamental Assumptions of This Study

Before the specific research problem is introduced, I am going to outline some of the basic assumptions underlying this study. Some of these assumptions pertain broadly to the nature of the relationship between discourse and context while others pertain to issues of genre and function in relation to 1QHodayot[a] in particular. All of these issues bear on the important question of how the texts are related to their social contexts of production.[36]

---

36. The combination of "linguistic" and "rhetorical" perspectives in the title of this book also hints at the importance of considering connections that exist between a text and its context. Rhetorical needs and authorial intentions are one side of the coin, and they are often involved in discussions of the Hodayot; unintentional linguistic vestiges of the mental and communicative activity behind discourse are the other side of the coin, but they rarely come into play. Even if 1QHodayot[a] and other Hodayot compilations are well-planned literature, they contain linguistic choices that do not reflect conscious rhetorical needs related to specific rhetorical situations, yet still reveal aspects of their social contexts. Peter MacDonald touches upon the difference between linguistic, or discourse, analysis of texts and rhetorical analysis of genre: "In addition to having specific functions for linguistic devices, each discourse type (narrating, describing, teasing, dreaming, etc.) has a set of characteristic strategies that may be used to accomplish its global speech act…. This is familiar territory for those scholars versed in classical rhetoric. The difference is that, unlike the rhetoricians, who attempted to relate the forms of discourse to the intentions of the speaker, discourse analysts attempt to relate the patterns of discourse to the subconscious attitudes and psychological strategies that have given rise to them" ("Discourse Analysis and Biblical Interpretation," 164).

Assumption 1: The meaning of 1QHodayot[a] is situated not only in the extant words.

This is true of texts in general. Just as the meaning of oral discourse resides in the situation of speech, the meaning of a text is also context-dependent.[37] In the words of archaeologist Ian Hodder, meaning "does not reside in a text, but in the writing and reading of it."[38] This insight is especially important when we deal with composite works like 1QHodayot[a]: The redactor or compiler does not explain which criteria guided his inclusion of one text or another. We have to guess on the basis of our own textual analyses and our sparse knowledge of the contextual background.

Following John L. Austin, we can describe different levels of meaning in discourse in terms of *different ways of doing things with words*: Through the enunciation of words and phrases (locution) discourse participants produce statements, requests, orders, wishes, promises and other *speech acts* (illocution). These kinds of meaning are largely expressed directly in the words themselves, and in the grammatical and syntactical patterns used by the speaker or writer. In the course of a discourse, however, contextual factors like the discourse participants' motives and desires, their power relations, and their use of bodily gestures may invoke additional effects, such as persuasion, fear, comfort, or relief (perlocution). This is true especially of oral discourse, taking place between co-present interlocutors with first-hand knowledge of the situation of speech. Their immediate experience of the situation will influence their perception of that which

---

37. George Brooke thus aptly points to the situation that texts originating in worship do not convey the whole religious experience: "[T]he theological significance of prayer and worship can only ever be somewhat partial, since the texts that reflect such spiritual activities cannot in themselves convey the fullness of the religious experience, either corporate or individual, that they were intended to facilitate. That is not least because prayers and liturgies are not just reflections of intellectual activity, but find their complete significance only when they are recognised as part of a much wider context. Liturgical texts are the limited vehicles that help create the lived experiences that are enacted by the whole person or group as they put themselves before God, but they do not contain that whole ritual experience" ("Aspects of the Theological Significance of Prayer and Worship in the Qumran Scrolls," 36).

38. Hodder, "The Interpretation of Documents and Material Culture," 158. He draws upon the view of Jacques Derrida in *Writing and Difference* on the difference between oral and written discourse.

is enunciated, and it will invoke meanings that they could not deduce from the words and sentences alone.[39]

With Paul Ricoeur, texts can be described as discourse that has been fixed in writing. In the process of being written, some of the fundamental characteristics of (oral) discourse are lost. Like speech, the writing of texts takes place in social contexts, but written discourses do not convey as much contextual information to readers as oral discourses do to interlocutors. What we are left with in written discourse are mainly the ostensible referential contents *inscribed* in the form of words and sentences (the locutionary and illocutionary meaning); namely, discursive elements that can be expressed in grammatically and syntactically well-formed sentences. The perlocutionary meaning, on the other hand, does not easily get inscribed. Therefore, the written discourse is itself largely bereft of the context-dependent, uninscribed meaning that was nevertheless involved in the writing process.[40]

All of this this may seem commonplace. Nevertheless, when interpreting texts in relation to their assumed original contexts—and we do this to the Hodayot and other Dead Sea Scrolls literature all the time—we do well not to forget about the presence of uninscribed meaning. Moreover, the distinction between inscribed and uninscribed meanings is pertinent also when we interpret redacted or composite works like 1QHodayot[a] and try to explain their *reuse* of existing texts. Like writing processes, processes of quoting, alluding, redacting or juxtaposing existing texts are imbued with meanings that are not clearly inscribed in the final product.

To many readers, reading largely makes sense exactly because they are ignorant of some uninscribed meanings and instead add, or ascribe, new ones relative to the new situation of use—for example, their own goals and desires. From the perspective of usage, texts are comparable to material objects in the sense that they come to obtain new, evocative meanings in a community by being used in its common, social practices. Ian Hodder explains how texts not only carry their once-inscribed, linguistic meaning but are also imbued with new, however mute, meanings in new contexts of use.[41] Such new meanings may be very different from their enduring, inscribed messages, because:

---

39. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, esp. 98–107.
40. Ricoeur, "The Model of the Text," 189.
41. In his article, "The Interpretation of Documents and Material Culture," Hodder basically contrasts the linguistic, representational meaning of documents

> [T]here is often a tension between the concrete nature of the written word, its enduring nature, and the continuous potential for rereading meanings in new contexts, undermining the authority of the word. Text and context are in a continual state of tension, each defining and redefining the other, saying and doing things differently through time.[42]

To Hodder this tension between inscribed and uninscribed meaning shows that texts share some qualities with material artifacts, such as utensils and memorial monuments: the artifacts are mute about their concrete meanings which can only be deduced from experience and their context of use. Similarly, texts carry muted, uninscribed meanings that can only be deduced from their contexts of production and use. In the same vein, the anthropologist Brigittine French argues that texts and artifacts are involved in similar semiotic processes because the social meaning of both changes from one context of use to another: "Although usually etched in stone, the meanings of official state memorial projects are not fixed. As a state's geopolitical commitments and military conflicts shift, so do the messages embedded in monuments and memorials."[43]

In sum, texts are similar to mute things in that they carry not only their explicit, inscribed meanings but also uninscribed meanings that change throughout their existence, from one context to another. If we want to hypothesize about the sociohistorical significance of a text at the time of its production or in any later context of use we need to be aware of this duality in meaning and perhaps seek alternative ways to explore that which is not immediately visible on the inscribed manuscript sheets.

Without doubt, the theoretical viewpoints presented above on the types of meaning involved in the production and use of texts must bear on how we understand the production of larger, composite works. The complete meaning of any single part of a complex, redacted work must have changed during its movement from one context of use to another. Theoretically, this situation has been described by linguists and anthropologists in terms of *entextualization*, which is the (re)use of existing pieces

---

with the nonlinguistic, evocative meaning of artifacts. Artifacts have not been created to produce meaning, but are intended for, and become meaningful through, their practical usages. Documents, on the other hand, are intended to be meaningful; their meanings are largely produced linguistically and work through symbolism. And yet, they too have evocative meanings. See especially pp. 156–64.

42. Ibid., 157.

43. French, "The Semiotics of Collective Memories," 342.

of discourse in new social and literary contexts. What is important about entextualization is that it has a *metadiscursive* dimension. The linguist Jan Blommaert describes it as a process of decontextualization and recontextualization that "adds a new *metadiscursive context* to the text."[44] The moment when a piece of text is inserted into another text—for example, through juxtaposition, allusion or rephrasing—it has de facto been recognized as something already existing and belonging in a different social, cultural, historical, or literary context, and peoples' awareness of such uninscribed meaning adds to the meaningfulness of texts. A text's original context of production fades away as it "is accompanied by a metadiscursive complex suggesting all kinds of things *about* the text (most prominently, the suggestion that the discourse is indeed a text)."[45] In other words, just as there is more meaning in the process of writing than that which becomes inscribed in the text, there is a surplus of meaning involved in processes of entextualization; for example, in a redacted or collected work. The implication of this is that composite works come into existence through discursive processes that are *larger* than the textual remains that we are left with. Thus, as implied by the title of a central work on entextualization, *Natural Histories of Discourse*, processes of entextualization should be investigated on the level of discourse, not text. [46]

In biblical and Dead Sea Scrolls studies, discussions about redactional processes usually revolve around *texts* and their development. It is texts that become the natural objects of investigation. Texts are, after all, what we have available. Furthermore, we tend to see these texts, as a matter of course, as natural expressions of the Jewish society in which they belonged. Problems arise if we assume that the texts express something like the essence of the beliefs and worldview of their owners. Thus, Michael Herzfeld, one of the contributors to *Natural Histories of Discourse*, terms such bias toward texts as a "decentering of discourse." According to him, the very idea of a "text" is an expression of essentialism, especially when we think of a text as something that has to be in a "correct version" (correct in relation to what?—every written text comes out of a social situation) because it assumes "a bounded semantic universe located outside the passage of time."[47]

---

44. Blommaert, "Text and Context," 187.
45. Ibid.
46. Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban, eds. *Natural Histories of Discourse*.
47. Herzfeld, "National Spirit or the Breath of Nature?," 279.

Every composition included in 1QHodayot[a] must have evoked ideas in the collector or redactor about its meaning apart from the literal, inscribed meaning. He must have had knowledge or assumptions about whose experiences the compositions related to, how they could be used, on which occasions and under which circumstances. He must have found that the compositions shared some of those social meanings, and this must have warranted his act of bringing them together into a single collection. It is hardly the case that compositions were included simply out of habit or as tokens of the community's past or conventions. Rather, they were familiar and reusable cultural expressions felt to pinpoint present situations or even foreshadow future worlds. Thus, if we want to make suggestions about how the work of 1QHodayot[a] may have made sense to its composers and ideal audience, we should consider both the enduring, inscribed meanings visible in the compositions, and the uninscribed, evocative meanings that they may have had in shifting contexts of production and use.

The juxtaposition of different compositions in 1QHodayot[a] carries mute vestiges of evocative meanings that the compositions once had. My suggestion is that, in the eyes of the redactor(s) or compiler(s), the compositions in various ways bespoke and evoked one and the same type of worshiper: someone seeing himself as belonging to the elite and taking some sort of leadership responsibility upon himself.

Assumption 2: The Hodayot are prayers and, therefore, remains of a profoundly social activity aiming to affect God.

There has been some controversy over the question of the function of the Hodayot—were they compositions intended for liturgical purposes or not? Apart from the occurrence of thanksgiving formulas, blessings, and doxologies, which could indicate a liturgical setting, signs of liturgical usage found in other hymnic compositions from Qumran are sparse in the Hodayot.[48] This is the reason for my reluctance to view the Hodayot as liturgical in the sense that they must have been recited or sung on

---

48. See, however, Puech's suggestion about five occurrences of dedications to the *maśkîl* in 1QHodayot[a]. Puech assumes that each dedication stood at the beginning of a section, and that the collection was divided into five parts, like the book of Psalms: "These five 'rubrics' suggest grouping the Hymns of 1QHodayot[a] into five sets, which cannot help but be reminiscent of the ordering of the scroll of the 150 biblical Psalms into five small books. It is thus possible, and even likely, that the Hodayot Scroll, or at

specific occasions as part of the service of God. Bilhah Nitzan is probably correct to assume that the Hodayot were not liturgical according to her definition of liturgy as "[t]he service of God through prayer, conducted in the community in accordance with a fixed order and pattern."[49] However, the one alternative she offers—namely, that the Hodayot must have been "poetry of the individual"—is not satisfactory either. It rests on the unjustified assumption that only prayers conducted in accordance with a recognizable, fixed pattern could be part of social life. Even suggestions that the Hodayot were originally composed by individuals and were later used in collective settings to convey theological messages to the community are unsatisfactory. What such models and their categories provide are some restricted social situations to choose from, but they do not bring us nearer to an understanding of the significance of the Hodayot in the community.

Instead, the Hodayot can be seen more broadly as prayer compositions. With regard to form, I employ Judith Newman's rather elastic definition of prayer: "Prayer is address to God that is initiated by humans; it is not conversational in nature; and it includes address to God in the second person, although it can include third person description of God."[50] This definition excludes representations of dialogues between God and human beings in the narrative parts of the Hebrew Bible, as well as human speeches that are prompted by the initiative of God.[51] On the other hand, it includes both prose texts and poetic texts, independent compositions and compositions embedded in narratives and other genres, and it does not distinguish between texts that employ stereotypical phrases and texts that do not.

Newman seems to believe that this variety of prayers shares the same basic function—such an assumption would justify the inclusiveness of her definition—but she does not concretize such a general function of prayer. It is doubtful whether one can explain the function of a prayer adequately simply by determining the specific situation in which the prayer

---

least most of the Hymns, rather early on (about 100 BCE at the latest) had a liturgical purpose" ("Hodayot," 366–67).

49. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, 64.

50. Newman, *Praying by the Book*, 6–7.

51. Ibid., 7. According to these criteria, the dialogues of Abraham with God in Gen 18 are not prayers because they are dialogic in character and are initiated by God. The same applies to Cain's complaint to God in Gen 4:13–14.

is used; the function of each and every prayer should be understood also on the basis of what prayers accomplish on the most general level. For this reason, I also employ the complementary, function-oriented definition of prayer given by the sociologist Marcel Mauss: "Prayer is a religious rite which is oral and bears directly on the sacred."[52] Because Mauss defines religious rites, the concept of which is included in his definition of prayer, as "efficacious, traditional actions which have a bearing on things that are called sacred,"[53] it becomes clear that he sees prayer as a kind of *action*. To pray is not only to pour out one's inner feelings and thoughts, but also to participate in a profoundly *social* activity.[54] This applies even when prayers are not uttered aloud or in a group, but take place in someone's mind, because "however freely one prays, one always observes the general principles of ritual simply by not violating those principles. Consciously or not, one conforms to certain norms and adopts an approved attitude. And it is with the language of ritual that the internal discourse is composed."[55]

Mauss's definition problematizes the notion that prayer develops from free, often individual usage into fixed, institutionalized practice. This is an idea that has been expressed most clearly by Bilhah Nitzan. According to her, psalms and prayers in the Hebrew Bible, even when occasionally they accompanied sacrifices, were "no more than a cultural expression of the individual and collective religious experience and of the natural need to pour out one's heart in supplication or in song of thanksgiving and praise."[56] Nitzan contrasts this sort of prayer with fixed prayer, which is evidenced in the Dead Sea Scrolls and involves the duty to perform prayers as a form of sacrificial cult, at fixed times, and according to fixed patterns.[57] Naturally, such distinctions between prayers according to their particular settings

---

52. Mauss, *On Prayer*, 57. The definition was worked out by Mauss in his unfinished dissertation on the subject of prayer. It was based on anthropological studies of religious practices among Australian Aborigines. Mauss intended to undertake a comprehensive study that was to include both primitive and highly developed, modern levels in the evolution of prayer. He failed to do so, but notice should be taken that his declared goal was to avoid a definition biased by modern, Western conceptions of prayer. See ibid., 27–30.

53. Ibid., 54.

54. Ibid., 33–37.

55. Ibid., 34.

56. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, 38.

57. Ibid., 47–69.

and preconditions are important for studies of how prayer practices developed, [58] but they are less important for this study.

Because of their formal communicative situation, the Hodayot represent the discourse of human beings directed to God. This applies whether the compositions were performed publicly or in private, on specific occasions or randomly, and whether they were sung, spoken, or meditated upon. More importantly, the formal communicative situation, an obligatory feature of the genre of prayer and expressive of its purpose and meaning, is a constant factor in the Hodayot. It is repeated throughout the collection and reminds us of the fact that any rhetorical function that the Hodayot might have served must have been subordinate to the primary function: whichever practical, political, ideological, or other motivations lie behind their performance at different times in the life of the community, they would have to be in accordance with the fundamental function of prayer, which is in Mauss's words to "[cause] the god to act in a certain way."[59] Mauss concedes that prayers may have additional effects, and that they are often hoped to affect changes in the life of the praying persons and in their environment. Nevertheless, these additional effects are categorized as a "by-product," and are not the essential aspect of prayer.[60]

By way of an example, I want to illustrate the conflict between rhetorical approaches and the approach encouraged by the function-oriented definition of prayer utilized here. In her monograph, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, Carol Newsom analyzes identity construction in the Hodayot and in the Rule of the Community (Serekh ha-Yaḥad). She builds on the theoretical insights of Mikhail Bakhtin and his linguistic circles.[61] According to Bakhtin, each discourse type springs from a particular speech community (within a larger speech community) and gives voice to it, so to speak. Newsom is interested in the dialogical character of discourses in a society in the sense that the various discourses are in constant interaction with each other. Within this framework, Newsom explains how the Hodayot's

---

58. Aspects of the historical development of prayer have been treated by several scholars, including Baumgarten, "Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarians," 153–54; Chazon, "Prayers from Qumran," 273–77; and Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, 40–45.

59. Mauss, *On Prayer*, 54. This is another way of expressing how, according to his definition, prayer "bears directly on the sacred."

60. Ibid., 56–57.

61. Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 6–12.

so-called Leader Hymns and the Rule of the Community each in their way represent the community leadership: the Rule exercises leadership authority whereas the Hodayot appeal to the continued loyalty of the community members by way of a masochistic self-representation.[62] These discourse types both provide symbolic representations of community identities, and they do it in complementary ways.

Newsom is right to allot complementary functions to the two genres, but she seems to put too much stress on the rhetorical function of the Hodayot. Seeing the so-called Leader Hymns as appeals from the leadership to community members, she reads them as rhetorical means to assert control over the community. The implication is that they were spoken from a relatively fixed position by someone who had identified a particular rhetorical situation—the threatening disloyalty of community members—with specific problems that needed to be solved on the social level. [63] The speaker then sought to resolve this situation through rhetorical persuasion of community members. I acknowledge that hodayot compositions may have functioned rhetorically in this way, but this function was hardly exhaustive.

A purely rhetorical (human) view of prayer texts is inexpedient if we grant that the primary function of prayer is to affect God and cause him to act. Admittedly, the speaker of the Hodayot gives thanks rather than supplication. Nevertheless, the relation of the praying person to God deserves to be taken into consideration, and we need to take care that rhetorical analyses relating to "down-to-earth" social situations do not come into conflict with this perspective. In so far as the speaker has a "situation" in mind when addressing God, it must involve an acknowledgment of God's will and the speaker's commitment to it. This means that the speaker cannot rely solely on his own judgment of the situation; he must remain open also to God's evaluation and response. This viewpoint informs my approach to the Hodayot in general, and receives special attention in chapter 3.

---

62. Ibid., 325–27.

63. According to the definition by Lloyd Bitzer ("The Rhetorical Situation," 5–6), a rhetorical situation is "a necessary condition of rhetorical discourse." It is a situation that "needs and invites discourse capable of participating with situation and thereby altering its reality." Correspondingly, discourse capable of meeting the demands of the situation is rhetorical discourse.

Assumption 3: The Hodayot constructs the speaker as an agent of God.

It is generally recognized that the Hodayot draw on psalms literature from the Bible.[64] References in the Hodayot to biblical psalms, however, do not usually consist of verbatim quotations. Therefore, it is difficult to establish when and if there is a direct relationship of dependency. John Elwolde, who has investigated possible Hodayot references to biblical psalms, suggests that the authors' use of the Psalms often took place unconsciously. He believes this reveals that the authors saw themselves as "living in the same world that the figures of the Bible lived in, to be, as it were, still living in the biblical period, and, therefore, open to divine revelation and inspired interpretation."[65] Even if there was such a deep and emotional dependence on the Psalms, however, the Hodayot deviate from them with regard to formal features, contents, and perspectives.[66] Carol Newsom gives a brilliant description of how the Hodayot carry an extra layer of reflection in their representation of agony and deliverance:

> The sectarian's formative moment is not that of crying out and being heard but one of recognition of his place in an already scripted drama. Even when the Hodayot use the drama of danger and deliverance, so familiar from the Psalms, it is not the deliverance per se but the insight into the true meaning of his experience that is what the speaker has to tell.[67]

Exactly because the Hodayot resemble the Psalms, it is significant when they deviate from the scriptural compositions, which represent a

---

64. See Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*; Carmignac, "Les citations de l'Ancien Testament," 391; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 307–309, 357–58 (a list of biblical psalms used in the Hodayot).

65. Elwolde "The Hodayot's Use of the Psalter," 80–81. Elwolde remarks that there are frequent divergences "for linguistic or literary reasons" from the biblical text as we know it from MT, and this also indicates that it was the meaning of the psalms, rather than the accurate reproduction of them, that concerned the authors of the Hodayot.

66. Formally, the Hodayot resemble biblical psalms, particularly the thanksgiving psalms, but they still deviate from this scriptural *Gattung*, for instance by their inclusion of elements from biblical psalms of complaint. See Kittel, *The Hymns of Qumran*, 1. With regard to contents, the speaker of the Hodayot is distinguished by expressing his gratitude for *knowledge* of God's redemptive actions, and not primarily for the redemptive acts themselves. See Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, 344 n. 60.

67. Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 208.

common Jewish heritage and tradition. Differences in the compositions can be seen as indications of a changing social context and of a developing ideology and self-perception. In some of the Hodayot, the speaker clearly displays himself as someone who plays an active part in God's salvation of other people:

> I became a snare to transgressors but healing to all who repent of transgression; prudence to the simple, and a resolute purpose for the eager. (1QHᵃ XV 23–24)[68]

> Through me you have enlightened the face of the many and you have increased them without number. For you have let me know your wonderful secrets and in your wonderful council you have shown strength in me. (1QHᵃ XII 28–29)[69]

> According to someone's [un]derstanding, let me draw him near; and according to the amount of his inheritance, let me love him. Let me not turn my face to the evil and not acknowledge an unrighteous, corruptible person. Let me not exchange your truth for riches or any of your judgments for a bribe. For according as [a ma]n [… let me lo]ve him, and according as you keep him at a distance, let me abhor him. And let me not bring into the council of [your tru]th [anyone] who has not taken account [of] your covenant. (1QHᵃ VI 29–33)[70]

> Though you made the tongue strong in my mouth, unrestrained, yet it is not possible to lift up (my) voice or to make (my) disciples hear, in order to revive the spirit of those who stumble and to support the wary with a word. (1QHᵃ XVI 36–37)

The self-representation of the speaker in these utterances is markedly different from that of the psalmist in any of the biblical psalms. In the book of Psalms, the psalmist's experience is generally that of being, or hoping to become, subject to God's redeeming actions; there he speaks of himself as of any human being and not as someone who has special functions or obligations. Admittedly, a couple of scriptural psalms have indications that

---

68. Unless other information is given, I use the translations of Carol Newsom in Schuller and Stegemann, *1QHodayotᵃ* (DJD XL).
69. My translation. See chapter 5.
70. My translation. See chapter 3.

the psalmist might see himself as a role model or representative of others, but not in a particularly distinct or emphasized way.[71]

The innovative way of self-representation in 1QHodayot[a] is theologically significant. It implies that 1QHodayot[a] as a collection contains the idea that a praying person can conceive of himself as someone with an active role to play in the agency of God and not just as an object of it: when claiming to be a "healer" the speaker suggests that he is part of God's scheme to redeem those who repent. Likewise, by pointing to his own role in acts such as enlightening people and drawing them near, he shows himself as someone who contributes to the preservation of others in the covenant. Most of the time, this agency pattern is expressed in vaguer terms than the quoted examples. Yet, I aim to show by the end of this book that it is present and can be identified in other instances as well. In any case, the frequency is less important than the fact that it occurs at all. Perhaps the impression that the speaker was an agent of God was not so much an opinion that the authors particularly wanted to advance as it was a relevant experience or self-understanding that unavoidably put its imprint on some of these compositions.[72]

One could argue that the speaker's self-representation in the examples above simply sustains the notion that some of the hymns must have originated within the institutional community leadership. However, this explanation in itself does not show the real significance of these utterances.[73] When occurring in a context that must be expected to have had some sort of communal function, whether didactic, edifying, or liturgical, this agency pattern must be expected to have had an exemplary function. It unfolds a particular self-understanding that can be taken over by others through their identification with the voice uttering the compositions. To say the least, being an agent of God in this sense was hardly as exclusive an

---

71. Pss 69:7; 119:79.

72. Daniel K. Falk thus makes the important distinction between "ideology underlying and motivating the practice of prayer," on the one hand, and "ideology and theology that is communicated by prayers," on the other ("The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls," n.p.). See also Collins, "Prayer and the Meaning of Ritual in the Dead Sea Scrolls," focusing on enacted versus propositional meaning. "The explicit theology expressed in prayers and treatises…provides context for the ritual action, but it does not necessarily exhaust its meaning or fully articulate its effectiveness" (84).

73. Of the examples quoted above, the first two are from the so-called Leader Hymns. The last quotation is from a hymn that is normally treated as a community hymn, an assumption that I question in chapter 3.

experience as that of Moses, the one and only giver of the Torah. Whatever we make of the utterances above in relation to the history and social organization of the Dead Sea community, we must acknowledge that they have some theological implications: the God of the Hodayot is demonstrably someone who continues to ally himself with human partners; they become his representatives or agents among other human subjects. This argument applies whether the Hodayot were used by a small group of community members (for example, leading persons), or by the community at large.

This is not the place to explore the exact content and function of the speaker's place in the agency of God, but we can make some general observations. In all likelihood, the development and poetic expression of this new agency pattern in 1QHodayot[a] would have been perceived by covenanters as congruous with the community's deterministic worldview; perhaps they perceived biblical psalms to be incongruous with the idea that every person's place with either God or Belial was preordained. There was a tension in particular between determinism and petitionary prayers, typically involving the praying persons' expectations that their acts of repentance would restore their relationship with God and change their situation for the better.[74] As Esther Chazon has pointed out, there are a number of penitential elements in the Hodayot; declarations of God's justice are particularly frequent.[75] Petitions, however, are remarkably absent.[76] Instead of petitioning, the speaker repeatedly declares his knowledge and understanding of how things are (destined to be).[77] Due to his God-given knowledge and understanding, he is in a position to discern between those people who have been included in the covenant with God and those who

---

74. For a definition of petitionary prayer, see Werline, "Defining Penitential Prayer," xv. For discussions of the tensions between determinism and petition, see Knohl, "Between Voice and Silence," esp. 29–30; Schuller, "Petitionary Prayer," esp. 38–41 (focusing on the Hodayot) and 45; Arnold, "Repentance and the Qumran Covenant Ceremony," esp. 170–71.

75. Examples include: 1QH[a] IV 32; V 36; VI 26–27; VIII 26–27; IX 28–29; XII 31–32, 38–39, 41; XIX 10–11, 21; XX 22–23. See Chazon,"Tradition and Innovation."

76. The speaker refers to the act of petitioning or supplicating (e.g., 1QH[a] XVII 9–13; XIX 37; XX 7), but does not actually make petitions (cf. Ezra 9:10–15; Neh 9:32; Dan 9:15–19). The supplications of Ezra 9 and Neh 9 are in a way similar to the references in the Hodayot, as the speaker seems to reckon on the favor of God in spite of all the peoples' wrongdoing. For apocryphal examples, see Chazon, "Tradition and Innovation," 57.

77. See 1QH[a] IV 33–36; IX 9–11, 21–22.

have not. He seems to think he can even contribute to the inclusion of people in the covenant, or their exclusion from it, in accordance with their preordained destination.[78] This is how, I imagine, the ideal audience of 1QHodayot[a] may have conceived of itself. This particular collection of hymns would have sustained this way of thinking, as the reading or reciting of at least some of the compositions would involve the enactment of peoples' active participation in the agency of God.

Let me briefly summarize these basic assumptions, which bear on my analyses of individual compositions in the following chapters. First, with regard to the relationship of texts to their social contexts, we must be aware that not all meaning is grammaticalized and inscribed. Individual compositions and the collected work provide but glimpses of experienced realities and larger discourses that took place. Second, we need to consider that no prayer could function purely on the social plane as an instrument of social control; we must expect that the prayers were felt by praying persons to be adequate means to address and even manipulate God as well. In other words, those two perspectives must converge in the textual analyses. Third, the agency structures and the praying person's place in them have social and ideological implications. Indirectly they bear witness to real life experiences of being human, of belonging to a particular social group and setting, and of being related to God. The agency structures carry information that may not have been inscribed and put forward in clear propositions in every composition. They index additional, contextual meaning.

1.4. Research Problem

Over the years, scholars have provided insights into the literary character of 1QHodayot[a] that should encourage a renewed interest in the question of how the collection mirrors its social context. It has been realized that the collection is more complex than first assumed, and that the so-called Community Hymns are not simply a homogeneous group of compositions. Günter Morawe and, subsequently, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn showed that these hymns were marked by different themes and messages,[79] and

---

78. In this context, I understand "covenant" broadly and not as coincident with the Dead Sea community as a social and ideological unit.

79. Morawe gave seven criteria (*Gattungselemente*) for distinguishing the Hymnic Songs of Confession (*Aufbau und Abgrenzung*, 21–91 and 159–61). Kuhn restricted himself to three: *soteriological confessions* (always introduced by the formula ואני ידעתי כי

others have continued this work and shown that the group of so-called Community Hymns is far from homogenous.

Further, several scholars have pointed out compositions that for one reason or another defy classification. As mentioned above, Sarah Tanzer demonstrated that some of the Hodayot compositions have a strong presence of wisdom traits, whereas others have a fainter sapiential flavor.[80] Tanzer demonstrated that wisdom material dominates in the so-called Community Hymns, but is absent or limited in the so-called Leader Hymns (or Teacher Hymns, as she calls them).[81] However, she categorized six hymns, all among the so-called Leader Hymns, as *hybrid* compositions, arguing that each of these compositions includes some wisdom material typical of the so-called Community Hymns.[82] In all of these examples the wisdom material is more or less confined to one part of the composition and is not present throughout.[83] Therefore, it appears that the sapiential material has been added to the compositions at some point in time. The so-called Leader Hymns and the so-called Community Hymns are not homogeneous groups according to Tanzer, but each has its subcategories of compositions. Thus, the general picture emerging from Tanzer's study is that of a heterogeneous collection where individual compositions consisting of elements of differing origins have been brought together.

Subsequently, other scholars have pointed to ambiguous traits in some of the other compositions. In contrast to prior scholarly consensus, Newsom

---

or ואדעה בי, contrasting the situation of the speaker with that of the ungodly), *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*, and *Elendsbetrachtungen* (*Enderwartung*, 26–29).

80. Tanzer, "The Sages at Qumran," 155–56. For an early highlighting of principal differences within the group of so-called Community Hymns (some generally resembling biblical songs of praise and others marked by the specific ideas of the Dead Sea community), see Holm-Nielsen, "'Ich' in den Hodajoth," 220–21.

81. See Tanzer, "The Sages at Qumran," 130–34, for a schematic outline of her findings.

82. These compositions are: 1QHᵃ X 5–21 (X 3–19/*II 3–19*); XI 20–37 (XI 19–36/*III 19–36*); XII 6–XIII 6 (XII 5–XIII 4/*IV 4–V 4*); XIII 22–XV 9 (XIII 20–XV 5/*V 20–VII 5*); XV 37–XVI 4 (XV 34–XVI 3/*VII 34–VIII 3*); XVI 5–XVII 36 (XVI 4–XVII 36/*VIII 4–IX 36*). See page 40 below for an explanation of how I make references to columns and lines in 1QHodayotᵃ. For a brief overview of the hybrid compositions, see Tanzer, "The Sages at Qumran," 139–40.

83. In contrast, the wisdom material in the so-called Community Hymns, although limited, tends to be spread throughout the compositions. See Tanzer, "The Sages at Qumran," 128–29.

interprets 1QH[a] VI 19–33 as a leader hymn, and she also addresses the ambiguities contained in some other compositions:

> If I am correct in attributing the hodayah in 1QH[a] 10:20–30 and 11:1–18 to the ordinary sectarian rather than the leader, then he, too, is represented as a solitary individual besieged by enemies and saved by God for the purposes of God's manifestation of glory. Certainly 1QH[a] 11:19–36, which is generally regarded as a hodayah of the community, represents the individual as redeemed from guilt and the eschatological judgment not by entry into the sect but by being placed with a heavenly community of rejoicing. The language throughout is highly personal and highly emotional. A heightened, dramatic, highly figured quality characterizes the experience.[84]

Newsom categorizes the two compositions, 1QH[a] X 22–32 (X 20–30) and XI 2–19 (XI 1–18), in ways other than what is customary. Her argument is basically that the apparently personal as well as emotional accounts of life experiences in the Hodayot are symbolic representations that "serve to create a standardized experience for all members of the community."[85] She perceives the last composition mentioned, XI 20–37 (XI 19–36), as a somewhat atypical community hymn because of its heightened language, but this does not seem to be a problem to her. Elsewhere, she points out that the ambiguity about the identity of the speaker is what "makes such a first-person singular prayer, creed, or pledge so powerful an instrument in the formation of subjectivity."[86] It can potentially lend voice to different persons and identity types within the community. In Newsom's treatment, then, the categories of leadership and community compositions are maintained, but due to the symbolic and elastic quality of the language used, they appear to be blurred—and less decisive for the way in which each composition is interpreted.

---

84. Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 296.

85. Ibid., 240. In connection with this argument, Newsom notes that most of the few explicit references to the community are found in the so-called Leader Hymns, and that community perspectives are generally not made visible in the so-called Community Hymns (ibid., 239).

86. Ibid., 201. Tanzer describes this particular hymn as a conglomerate consisting of parts from several source types. Yet, she interprets it as a leader hymn due to the choice of introductory formula and its placement within the block of so-called Leader Hymns (Tanzer, "The Sages at Qumran," 106–7, 126).

Julie Hughes finds that 1QHᵃ XI 6–19 and 1QHᵃ XI 20–37, due to their diversity in style and contents, can be categorized as neither leader (or teacher) hymns nor community hymns—categories that, in this case, she refers to as "inadequate." Instead, she suggests that the compositions be seen as a "sectarian 'class exercise' in poetic interpretation."[87] Moreover, because of how the composition 1QHᵃ XVI 5–XVII 36 is saturated with scriptural language, she expresses doubts about the common classification of it as a leader hymn.[88] Such findings lead Hughes to conclude that the hymns in question and the Hodayot in general had "a variety of backgrounds."[89]

In several articles, Angela Kim Harkins explores the complexity of the so-called Community Hymns from a redaction-critical perspective.[90] Unlike Tanzer, she has had access to previously unpublished and partly overlapping Hodayot manuscripts from Cave 4.[91] In one of her earlier articles she approves of Puech's view that the Community Hymns may have had an independent existence as a collection of *maśkîl* hymns in five parts, analogous to the book of Psalms.[92] She also differentiates this material, noting that the *maśkîl* hymns in the columns neighboring the so-called Leader Hymns in 1QHodayotᵃ contain some language typical of the literary productions of the Dead Sea community, while hymns that are located farther from the so-called Leader Hymns do not.[93] More recently she has suggested that the so-called Leader Hymns and the group of Community Hymns following it (the latter group referred to by Harkins as CH II) had circulated in tandem before they were juxtaposed to a different group of

---

87. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 233. See also pp. 206–7 and 228–30 for discussions of each of the hymns.

88. Ibid., 154, 170. This hymn is quite often described as a teacher hymn. Due especially to the heavy influence of Isa 40–66 on this hymn, Hughes sees it as an exegetical hymn, developing themes that would support a collective identity, rather than as an autobiographical composition. See especially pp. 167–73, unfolding the exegetical achievements, and the concluding remarks on p. 183. According to Tanzer, it is a hybrid and thus, in her opinion, to be placed among the Teacher Hymns.

89. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 233.

90. Harkins, "Observations on the Editorial Shaping"; "The Community Hymns Classification"; "A New Proposal for Thinking about 1QHᵃ." Previously she has published under the name Angela Y. Kim: "Authorizing Interpretation" and "Signs of Editorial Shaping."

91. Harkins, "Observations on the Editorial Shaping," 233–56.

92. Puech, "Quelques aspects," 39–40.

93. Harkins, "The Community Hymns Classification," 153.

Community Hymns (referred to as CH I), which in 1QH[a] is located before the so-called Leader Hymns. The former two groups share orthographic praxis as well as contents, specifically the idea that the speaker experiences communion with heavenly beings. With regard to both orthography and contents they differ from the latter group, which according to Harkins displays the speaker only in the context of human fellowships.[94]

I do not intend to discuss Harkins's suggestions here in any detail,[95] but only to stress how important it is to investigate the complexity and developmental aspects of the material in the way she does. The recognition of smaller units that occur in more than one manuscript and appear to have circulated in more than one literary or social setting is an important step away from the habit of unconsciously referring to the compositions *as if* they represent one of only two identity categories within a particular community at a particular time in history.[96] Instead of insisting that the composite character of 1QHodayot[a] mirrors a social dichotomy in the Dead Sea community, Harkins explains it as the result of *redactional activity*. The heterogeneous collection may be the result of a wish to address various aspects of life in the community, perhaps to some didactic end.[97]

The observations of various scholars with regard to the complexity of 1QHodayot[a] can be grouped together schematically like the table on page 31:

---

94. Harkins, "A New Proposal for Thinking about 1QH[a]," 110–24.

95. The two analyses by Harkins do not seem compatible, but that is beside the point here.

96. Thus, Harkins questions the idea that the Community Hymns largely belonged to one particular community, and she indicates that 1QHodayot[a], as a sectarian document, may have inherited some of the hymns from outside of the sect. See "The Community Hymns Classification," 140–41.

97. Schuller likewise points to the variations in scope, length, contents, and order of the compositions that appear in the Hodayot from Cave 4. In addition, there are a number of often fragmentary "Hodayot-like" compositions that in several cases could be included in the Hodayot tradition. See Schuller, "The Classification *Hodayot* and *Hodayot*-Like." Furthermore, she notes the different handwritings, the dating of the various manuscripts, and the occurrence of a plural speaker. See "Prayer, Hymnic, and Liturgical Texts," 167–68.

	Feature	Argument	Implication
Tanzer	Wisdom language merged into non-wisdom compositions	Blending of originally distinct features	Compositions are redactional hybrids
Newsom	Apparently personal, first-person accounts in so-called community hymns	Symbolic expression of communal identity	Blurring of the categories
Hughes	Systematic use of scriptural language in so-called leader hymn	At variance with identification as leader-hymn	Category inadequate
Hughes	Diversity with regard to style and contents	No clear community leader or community member profile	Category inadequate
Harkins	Sectarian language in the so-called Community Hymns clustered around the so-called Leader Hymns	The Community Hymns were originally nonsectarian, but some of them seem to be influenced by sectarian language through redactional activity	Blurring of the categories
Harkins	Special affinities between so-called Leader Hymns and one group of so-called Community Hymns	Hymns not belonging in the group of so-called leadership hymns do not constitute a unity, either in form or in content.	Blurring of the categories

Clearly, these observations about hybridity, blurred categories, and redactional activity within the Leader Hymns and Community Hymns prompt us to avoid explanations that depend heavily upon a rigid bifurcation of the collection and on the notion that the different authors of the compositions must be the key to the social meaning of the compilation. As Angela Harkins has noticed, there are signs that the collection of 1QHodayot[a] "has been compiled in a purposeful way…, even though today it is not clear what the purpose was."[98]

In light of the seemingly dissolving literary dichotomy of 1QHodayot[a], it becomes difficult to abide by the traditional conception that the collection represents its social milieu as consisting of its rank and file members on the one hand, and its leadership on the other. Within that explanatory framework, it is possible to account for the juxtaposition of the so-called Leader Hymns and the Community Hymns and explain it as resulting from an authorization process where the more authoritative group of texts could lend some of its legitimacy to less reputable compositions.[99] However, the partition of 1QHodayot[a] into hymns of the leadership and hymns of the ordinary members can hardly explain the redactional merging of the different categories into hybrid compositions, as identified initially by Tanzer. Previous attempts at doing so tend to be overly rhetorical and instrumental in their focus. I suspect this is because they mostly resort to social categories and human affairs but ignore that, among the owners of the collection, the genre of prayer must also have functioned as organizer of the relationship between the human and the divine spheres—whatever social functions the prayer may have had.

For instance, Tanzer believes the compositions with strong wisdom elements served other purposes than the non-wisdom compositions, which are generally found among the so-called Leader Hymns. She states that the function of the former was didactic, whereas the function of the latter was to "build a sense of security for a persecuted individual or possibly persecuted community through an expansion of thanksgiving to,

---

98. Harkins, "Community Hymns Classification," 135.

99. One model has it that the authoritative compositions of the great leader, the Teacher of Righteousness, could lend some authority to the anonymous Community Hymns. See Kim, "Authorizing Interpretation," 31–32. Another model is that the so-called Community Hymns, which resemble other prayer literature of the time, could lend their natural legitimacy to the somewhat more anomalous compositions of the teacher.

and sometimes, confidence in, God."[100] Her explanation of the merging of wisdom material into some of the non-wisdom Teacher compositions takes its starting point in the observation that those hymns are generally quite concerned about the wicked people and their destiny, whereas the group of "righteous" are referred to only briefly. Then, according to Tanzer, a specific situation, "a possible split in the community, in which people are being seduced away from following the psalmist," may have necessitated a redactional intervention devoting more attention to the righteous followers of the psalmist, who were also the intended audience for the hymns.[101] Tanzer seems to think that these Teacher Hymns, originally the product of a leading individual facing persecution, were recontextualized into a broader community setting at a later stage and adapted by that community in order to meet threats of seduction by an opposing party within it.[102] So, all in all, as far as the redactional hybrids are concerned, her explanation points to a rhetorical situation prompting such redactional action.

This sort of rhetorical explanation has two shortcomings. First, as briefly mentioned above, it does not adequately explain the meaning of the genre. Whichever functions the different categories of prayers may have had on an interpersonal, social level of communication, it should not be forgotten that the genre of prayer does more than just solve rhetorical situations involving human beings. Therefore, the relationship between the praying persons and the deity, which is consistently reflected in the formal communicative situation, should also in some way be accounted for when we consider the meaning of juxtaposing different categories of compositions.

Second, when considering the purely social level, we must be aware that, whichever persons and social groups were originally behind each category of compositions, the texts would take new meanings when juxtaposed to other categories of compositions in new literary settings. In their new literary and social contexts they could potentially mirror other social groups and categories of people. This is a matter of *entextualization*, and the implication of it is that scholarly notions and even basic knowledge of the authorship and social origin of groups of prayers are not sufficient to explain the meaning of the collection as such. The fact that 1QHodayot[a] is the result of redactional or compilatory arrangements—

---

100. Tanzer, "The Sages at Qumran," 78

101. Ibid., 113.

102. Ibid., 138–39.

and there is general agreement that this is the case—undermines the idea of a simple causal relation between the origin of individual compositions (or parts of compositions) and their meaning within the redactional whole. We must be open to the possibility that the various compositions were included in the collection because the evocations they triggered were fundamentally alike.

1.5. Approaches

Current theories about the social background of 1QHodayot[a] are unable to explain its heterogeneous character. Against this background, I would like to suggest a reading strategy that leaves our presumptions about the underlying social contexts aside for a while. In relation to traditional perceptions of the milieus behind the so-called Leader and Community Hymns, the hybrid character of some compositions may seem to pose a problem. As long as alternating literary traits (for example, between apocalyptic and sapiential outlooks) are thought to correlate with alternating speakers, it becomes difficult to explain why such disparate features have been merged within some of the compositions (and thus in the collection as a whole). This applies especially since 1QHodayot[a] lacks indications of a liturgical usage that could account for alternating speakers throughout a composition. Instead, I shall work on the assumption that in the eyes of the compilers the diverging compositions had *common denominators*—evocative or textually explicit—which rendered their fusion meaningful in some way. In other words, I choose to see hybridity as a *clue* rather than an obstacle to an understanding of 1QHodayot[a] as a whole.

Provisionally, common denominators can be sought in the genre and its formal features, which is something that runs through the whole of 1QHodayot[a] and most Hodayot prayers in general. A speaker, mostly in the singular, addresses God with thanksgiving and blessing.[103] Doing this, he acts out a particular role vis-à-vis God and his fellow community members. On one level, at least, the speaking "I" possesses a fundamental unity throughout the collection by virtue of the genre, the formal communicative situation, and the recurring introductory formulas.[104] In so far as single compositions are hybrids, this recurring speaker is a hybrid as well,

---

103. Kittel also remarks on "the consistent style of addressing God" (*The Hymns of Qumran*, 174).

104. Introductory formulas used within the so-called Leader Hymns contain the

and it is this hybrid speaker and the processes in which he participates that are going to be the object of investigation. This strategy will enable us to offer a meaningful explanation of 1QHodayotᵃ as a collection—in spite of and *because of* the occurrence of "hybrid" compositions within it.

Methodologically, this is a multifaceted approach. It should be clear by now that I do not expect to be able to offer a comprehensive explanation of the logic behind this collection based solely on the information that is textually explicit or grammaticalized in the compositions. In all likelihood, some of the factors that guided the collectors of 1QHodayotᵃ to include some compositions and leave others out were not, or only vaguely, expressed directly in the compositions. In some cases valuable information that has not been given in clear propositions may still be indexed in the texts. The ancient collectors may have taken such hints about the social significance of a composition because of their specific cultural and sociocontextual knowledge. To some extent, I believe, modern, attentive readers can also retrieve information that has not been put forward in clear propositions.

For instance, I have already suggested that the Hodayot reflect an agency hierarchy according to which God acts through someone—the speaker of these hymns—who becomes a mediator between God and other people. This agency hierarchy is quite easily spotted in some of the so-called Leader Hymns, but may also be present in a subtler manner or through evocation in other compositions, even if it has not been expressed directly. In some of the textual analyses to come, I will retrieve such information with the help of *transitivity analysis*, a tool developed within Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). This is an analytical approach undertaken on clauses, yet it is not grammatical analysis. It seeks to describe in some detail the processes that are expressed in clauses and thereby to characterize the logical subjects (and other participants) of those clauses.

This kind of analysis is exemplified at the end of chapter 2, where in a demonstration of SFL I show how the speaker in 1QHᵃ X 22–32 repeatedly describes himself as "standing" and "walking": "from you comes my *steadfastness*"; "from you are my *steps*"; "my *standing* is due to your kindness." These propositions can easily be interpreted as expressions of how the speaker is completely dependent upon God's mercy. An analysis of

---

verb אודכה, as in אודכה אדוני, "I thank you, Lord." Otherwise, blessings containing the verb ברך are used (mostly ברוך אתה).

the circumstantial information, however, shows that his walking/standing denotes a quality that he possesses in three very different situations: first, it is a secret quality, unnoticed by his adversaries; second, it occurs in connection with his redemption by God; third, it occurs as God redeems other people through the speaker. Thus, a close linguistic analysis shows this special quality in the speaker both when he appears to be a passive receiver, and when he plays an active part in the agency of God. The composition displays the speaker in different roles and situations and thus exemplifies how the speaker of 1QHodayot[a] at large is multifaceted.

The goal in applying transitivity analysis, and occasionally other elements of SFL, is to investigate possible similarities between texts that, on the grammaticalized surface, appear to express conflicting ideas. This is a concrete way to account for the possibility of evocative meaning. By way of transitivity analysis it is possible systematically to register nuances in the clauses and propositions that are not self-evident or detectable through ordinary grammatical or rhetorical analysis. Experiential and ideational meanings that have not been stated directly are still indexed in the choice of words and are available for analysis. Yet another SFL tool, lexical strings, can help identify experiential and ideational meanings that do not become apparent through investigations of the intended information structures of a text. These sociolinguistic tools are far from common among Dead Sea Scrolls and biblical scholars—indeed, they are quite different from traditional, philological approaches and belong in a specialized field of their own. Accordingly, chapter 2 offers a short introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics—its premises and those of its analytical tools to be used here.

My approach to the meaning of 1QHodayot[a] is holistic; there is no analytical method that on its own can explain the range and impact of uninscribed and indexical meaning in a text. I therefore apply various additional methods accordingly as I address different problems. These methods are introduced in the chapters where I (first) use them, and in the following I will mention them only briefly.

1.6. Compositions Analyzed in This Book

Four Hodayot compositions, all of which can be characterized as hybrids in one way or another, will be analyzed. Hybridity is not defined by fixed criteria, and in what follows I abandon Tanzer's narrow, redaction-critical definition according to which hybrids occurred when wisdom material

had been fused into otherwise non-wisdom compositions. The texts manifest hybridity in varying ways, and only one of the compositions, 1QH[a] XII 6–XIII 6, is a hybrid according to Tanzer's definition. This composition, by general consensus a leader hymn, includes some wisdom passages of the kind that is so typical of the so-called Community Hymns. This "classic" hybrid will have our attention in chapter 5. Apart from this, I use the designation "hybrid" about compositions that *otherwise* appear to contradict the notion that the two main categories of compositions identified in 1QHodayot[a] represent distinct social groups or types (leadership and membership, respectively) within the Dead Sea community.

In chapter 3, I analyze the text of 1QH[a] VI 19–33, which is traditionally treated as a community hymn. More specifically, it has been argued that it was used ritually at initiation or confirmation ceremonies and expresses community members' creedal statements and pleas for acceptance into the community. The composition is a hybrid on the level of *expectancy* because, as Newsom argues and contrary to the usual expectations, it shows elements of leadership. Transitivity analysis is applied in this chapter and brings out aspects of leadership agency in the composition which has not yet been noticed by scholars. I also include a discussion of modality because this turns out to be a decisive factor in discussions of whether this hymn is spoken by a (prospective) member or a leader. Modality is difficult to assess in Hebrew and is rarely discussed in analyses of the Hodayot. The chapter therefore includes an excursus on modality. Finally, I engage with the performance theory of Jeffrey Alexander in yet another attempt to address the purpose of this composition. Alexander points out a number of criteria that must be fulfilled in order for a ritual or performance to be trustworthy and effective. On the basis of these criteria I question the idea that the composition was spoken by community members at initiation ceremonies.

Chapter 4 deals with two texts: 1QH[a] XX 7–XXII 39 has much in common with the concluding hymn of 1QS, including the fact that the speakers of both compositions appear to see themselves as *maśkîlîm*. However, whereas scholars see the Hodayot composition as spoken by a community member, they mostly see the 1QS text as representative of the leadership. For lack of a better term, we describe this as hybridity on an intertextual level, because two similar-looking texts are interpreted as markedly different based on their appearance (entextualization) in two different works. Theoretically, the very similar features of the texts may have represented two distinct social identities within the Dead Sea commu-

nity. This is questionable, however, and a comparison of the compositions suggests that they exhibit different aspects of one particular self-understanding, the identity of a *maśkîl*. Another prominent feature that the two compositions have in common is the fact that they include calendrical sections. It is reasonable to infer that in the context of 1QS, which explicitly gives instructions to the *maśkîl*, the calendrical section functioned to give instructions about the right times for prayers. This explanation may not be exhaustive, however, and in the context of the Hodayot such an instructional function seems somewhat out of place. I seek to demonstrate in both cases that the calendrical section is an integral part that adds to the meaning of the composition as a whole. In the case of the Hodayot text, it is difficult to outline the structure of the composition and the relationship between the parts because of the poor state of the manuscript. For this reason I include the SFL tool lexical strings in my analysis of the Hodayot text in order to bring out its coherence and thus establish the basis for a comprehensive analysis of the composition. Transitivity analysis is also central in this chapter.

The concept of "suture" developed in part by Émile Benveniste will have a part to play in the discussion in chapter 5 of 1QH[a] XII 6–XIII 6, the hymn that fits Tanzer's classical definition of a hybrid. Suture is the process by which members of an audience come to identify themselves with elements in a text (or in a film or play). Thus, it is useful in investigations of how the Hodayot may have functioned to shape the self-understanding of their audience. Previously, Carol Newsom has applied the concept of suture in her analysis of 1QH[a] XII 6–XIII 6. She believes it is a hymn through which the community leadership wanted to persuade its audience into loyalty. The audience of the hymn would perceive the speaking "I" as the voice of its own community leadership, and it would identify itself with a group which in the composition is designated "the many" and presented as followers of the speaker. Considering that this composition is a hybrid, things get more complicated, and I have found the concept of suture as employed by Newsom useful with a view to including considerations of hybridity in the discussion.

In chapter 6 I deal with a text that consists of two quite different looking compositions, the Self-Glorification Hymn and the Hymn of the Righteous. The text occurs in a fragmentary version in 1QH[a] XXVI, and I work primarily with a better-preserved version in another Hodayot document, 4Q427. Because this text reveals attempts to knit together two distinct compositions—traditionally seen as spoken by a unique

individual and a collective of worshipers, respectively—it has a sort of redactionally achieved hybridity. The two compositions also appear together in the apparently earlier, non-Hodayot manuscript 4Q491c, and it is intriguing to observe that efforts have been made in the Hodayot to integrate the two compositions more closely than in the 4Q491c version. In this chapter I leave SFL methods aside completely and focus on how and why the two compositions, and thus their speakers, have been joined by fusion.

In each chapter I pinpoint ideas and experiences surfacing in the texts while trying to detach my reading of them from common notions about their particular sociohistorical significance within the Dead Sea community. In most cases transitivity analysis is involved because this enables descriptions of the speaker and his roles in God's agency with minimal recourse to extratextual information. This process can be described as an attempt to decontextualize my readings, but eventually I do suggest some sort of social and contextual meaningfulness. What I try to avoid is the pitfall of *essentialist reading*, mentioned in section 1.3 ("Assumption 1"), where some compositions are thought to express the essence of a particular group of people while slightly different looking compositions are consequently thought to express the qualities of another, *essentially different*, group of people.

To those who used and composed Hodayot compositions, uninscribed and evocative knowledge added significantly to their meaning. This extratextual, communal knowledge influenced the work of those who composed or compiled 1QHodayot[a]. I have described this process on a general level in terms of entextualization. In chapter 7 I want to concretize this process and outline a scenario of how 1QHodayot[a] may have developed in its sociohistorical context, and of how it may have served to shape a particular self-understanding. I argue that the composers and owners of 1QHodayot[a] saw themselves as religious elites with special obligations to fulfill in the agency of God, and that all of the compositions, or rather, the whole compilation, could function to support this self-understanding among the users.

Focus shifts in chapter 7 from the texts to their owners and the cognitive processes underlying the work of collecting and compiling. Teun van Dijk, a specialist in text linguistics and discourse analysis, has developed a sociocognitive theory about how people process large amounts of knowledge in order to produce discourse that makes sense. They must be capable both of identifying knowledge relevant to the situation and of making

inferences about the knowledge and other prerequisites of the address-ees. The theory implies that people sharing the same social knowledge can produce relevant discourse because of their competence to identify both knowledge that is already shared, and which may therefore remain implicit, and knowledge that must be introduced to the addressees during the discourse.[105] Van Dijk introduces the concepts of *context model* and *K-device* in order to describe these processes, and these concepts will also be used in chapter 7 to explain how different looking Hodayot composi-tions could in a complementary way express aspects of just one identity for a single group of people.

On the practical level, readers should be aware that references to 1QHodayot^a follow the arrangement of columns and line numbers found in *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayot^a with incorporation of 1QHodayot^b and 4QHodayot ^{a–f}*, edited by Hartmut Stegemann and Eileen Schuller (Discov-eries in the Judaean Desert XL, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009).[106] When necessary or particularly helpful, the column and line numbers of *DSSSE* are included in parentheses. Likewise, the numbering from Sukenik's *editio princeps* is sometimes provided in italics. Thus, for example, 1QH^a X 22 may be cited like this: 1QH^a X 22 (X 20/*II 20*). Unless other information is given, translations from the Dead Sea Scrolls are my own. Translations of biblical texts are taken from the New Revised Standard Version.

---

105. Van Dijk calls this an epistemic community (*Discourse and Context*, 87–88).

106. See also Émile Puech, "Quelques aspects," 38–55; Hartmut Stegemann, "The Material Reconstruction of 1QHodayot," 272–84. The line numbering of Sukenik is used in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (*DSSSE*).