

Qumran Hebrew

**An Overview of
Orthography, Phonology,
and Morphology**

Eric D. Reymond

QUMRAN HEBREW

SBL

Society of Biblical Literature



Resources for Biblical Study

Marvin A. Sweeney,
Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Editor

Number 76

QUMRAN HEBREW

AN OVERVIEW OF ORTHOGRAPHY,
PHONOLOGY, AND MORPHOLOGY

Eric D. Reymond

Society of Biblical Literature
Atlanta

Copyright © 2014 by the Society of Biblical Literature

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

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Reymond, Eric D.

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

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

Includes bibliographical references and index.

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

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

PJ4583.R49 2013

492.4'82421—dc23

2013035944

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



To Robin, Lucy, and Oliver

אשרי איש שמח באחריתו

ἑμακάρισα ... ἄνωθρος εὐφραϊνόμενος ἐπὶ τέκνοις

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

CONTENTS

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

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

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

ABBREVIATIONS

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

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

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

A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION, ETYMOLOGICAL BASES, AND MANUSCRIPT IDENTIFICATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Jubilees and texts related to Jubilees: 4Q216–228

Damascus Document: 4Q266–273

4QMMT: 4Q394–399

Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: 4Q400–407

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

Temple Scroll: 11Q19–20

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CORPUS

The corpus of the Dead Sea scrolls preserves texts mostly in Hebrew, though some are in Aramaic and Greek. The texts are often associated with the Essenes, though in its broadest sense, the Dead Sea scrolls—that is, the texts found around the Dead Sea—are from a number of groups, including the followers of Bar Kokhba, the Masada Zealots, as well as other groups. Nevertheless, the term Dead Sea Scrolls typically refers to those texts discovered in caves near or adjacent to Wadi Qumran and an ancient group of structures called collectively Qumran. (Some believe the structures were home to the writers of the scrolls, others think it might have been a garrison, or served some other purpose.) Those texts discovered around Wadi Qumran are often subdivided into those that seem to be from the “Essenes” or the “Qumran Community” and those that are not; in other words, those that imply the theological ideas of the “sect” (like dualism) as well as their vocabulary, and those that do not reflect these specific notions or vocabulary. Often it is difficult to determine whether a partially preserved text should fit into one or the other category since such a text could have contained expressions of “Essene theology” in the portions that have been lost. Another common way of dividing the texts is between biblical manuscripts and nonbiblical manuscripts (in other words, manuscripts that contain texts that would later become part of the Bible and those that did not). Here, too, categorizing texts is not always as unambiguous as one might initially think. First, the very concept is anachronistic since what the ancients felt to be scripture and what moderns think of as scripture are not coterminous. Second, some scrolls are made up of only portions of what we identify as scripture; the other material does not belong to any modern canon. For the sake of simplicity, “biblical” in relation to the scrolls will refer to those nonpesher, non-reworked scrolls that contain texts that are currently part of the Jewish

canon, though portions of them may have no parallel in the contemporary Tanakh. The phylactery texts, although of a different character than the biblical texts, will here be labeled “biblical” based on the similar labeling in the *Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance* and in Accordance software. “Nonbiblical” will refer to everything else. In all, much of the nonbiblical material seems to bear “sectarian” ideas. These texts also contain certain peculiarities in spelling that may (or may not) reflect peculiarities of pronunciation and morphology. In the analyses below, both biblical and non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls are considered; the abbreviation DSS will refer to all texts found in the caves around Wadi Qumran.

As just described, there are various ways of dividing up the DSS. When discussing especially the linguistic features of the scrolls, most scholars follow a model something like that presented by Morag in which the texts that exhibit distinctive linguistic features (such as 1QS and 1QM with the long form of the 3ms independent pronoun הוֹאֵה) are set in one group and characterized as reflecting General Qumran Hebrew (= GQH); 4QMMT is set in another group and its language is characterized as closer to Mishnaic Hebrew than most other texts (perhaps reflecting the spoken idiom of the sect, as Qimron suggests); the Copper Scroll (3Q15) is set in a third group as its language bears the strongest affinities to Mishnaic Hebrew.¹ Despite this rather common-sense approach, which we will also partially follow, there is a problem with it: a significant minority of the texts do not actually exhibit the most distinctive linguistic traits. These texts might be understood as reflecting only a more conservative orthography, their orthography not representing how the words were really pronounced. For example, one might assume that the 3ms independent pronoun was always pronounced as *hūʾā*, not only when it is spelled in a distinctive manner with final *heh*, הוֹאֵה, but also when it is spelled in a more conventional way, as הוֹה.

In addition, we will attempt to determine whether the linguistic traits investigated are peculiar to the texts that exhibit a special scribal practice, as described by Tov.² Since we will concentrate on attempting to under-

1. Shelomo Morag, “Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations,” *VT* 38 (1988): 149; Elisha Qimron, “The Language,” in *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat Maʿase ha-Torah* (ed. Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell; DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 108.

2. See Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004). By contrast, some view the existence of a scribal practice associated specifically with the sectarians as dubious (see,

stand the peculiar linguistic traits that distinguish the scrolls from texts that would become part of the Hebrew Bible, it might be expected that we will find these traits concentrated in texts that exhibit the scribal practice associated with the authors of the sectarian scrolls. If not, then the linguistic traits may be part of a widespread linguistic phenomenon.

The abbreviation DSS-SP9 will refer to those texts identified by Tov in the ninth appendix of his book *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*; most of these texts evidence one or more of the following morphological traits whose explicit indication through orthography Tov believes is part of “Qumran scribal practice.” In other words, the scribal practice of those who, he believes, lived at Qumran and wrote many of the sectarian scrolls. These traits are: long 3ms, 3fs, and 2mp independent pronouns: הוואה, היאה, אתמה, respectively; long 3m/fp and 2m/fp pronominal suffixes on nouns and prepositions: מה- and כמה- (for nouns), המה- and כמה- (for prepositions); long 2mp suffix conjugation forms in *qal* and other stems: for example, קטלתמה; forms of the *qal* prefix conjugation with object suffix that attest a *waw* between the first and second root consonants, that is, *yqwtl* + suffix (יקוטלני); long forms of adverbs like מואדה; the writing of the word כִּי as כִּיא.³ The presence of one or more of these traits does not exclude the occurrence of the more regular forms known from the MT.⁴ The texts included in this category are listed below.⁵

Biblical Texts: 1Q4 (1QDeut^a); 1QIsa^a; 2Q3 (2QExod^b); 2Q7 (2QNum^b); 2Q12 (2QDeut^c); 2Q13 (2QJer); 4Q13 (4Q[Gen–]Exod^b); 4Q27 (4QNum^b); 4Q37 (4QDeut^j); 4Q38 (4Q Deut^{k1}); 4Q38a (4QDeut^{k2});

e.g., P. Alexander and G. Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX: 4Q Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* [DJD 26; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998], 8).

3. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 337–38.

4. It might be mentioned that some traits that are sometimes said to be characteristic of the DSS are not listed in the above list, including so-called “pausal” verbal forms occurring where one would not expect a pausal form to occur, the spellings of זאת as זוט, of כה as כוה, of משה as מושה, of לא as לוּא, of כל as כול, and the long form of the 2ms suffix conjugation קטלתה. These traits occur in the texts listed above, though they also occur in other texts too.

5. The list is based on “Appendix 9” in Tov’s *Scribal Practices*, 339–43. The biblical texts 2Q3, 11Q7 and the nonbiblical 1QH^b, 1Q36, 4Q433a, 4Q435, 4Q440, 4Q505 do not exhibit the above-listed traits that occupy columns 1–3, 5–6, 8–10, 16 in Tov’s appendix but are nonetheless considered by Tov to exhibit Qumran Scribal Practice due to the presence of other diagnostic features.

4Q40 (4QDeut^m); 4Q53 (4QSam^c); 4Q57 (4QIsa^c); 4Q78 (4QXII^c); 4Q80 (4QXII^e); 4Q82 (4QXII^g); 4Q96 (4QPs^o); 4Q109 (4QQoh^a); 4Q111 (4QLam); 11Q5 (11QPs^a); 11Q6 (11QPs^b); 11Q7 (11QPs^c); 11Q8 (11QPs^d). And Phylactery Texts: 4Q128 (4QPhyl A); 4Q129 (4QPhyl B); 4Q134–136 (4QPhyl G–I); 4Q137–138 (4QPhyl J–K); 4Q139–141 (4QPhyl L–N); 4Q142 (4QPhyl O); 4Q143 (4QPhyl P); 4Q144 (4QPhyl Q).⁶

Nonbiblical Texts: 1Q14 (1QpMic); 1QpHab; 1Q22 (1QDibreMoshe); 1Q26 (1QInstr); 1Q27 (1QMyst); 1QS (= 1Q28); 1QSa (= 1Q28a); 1Qsb (= 1Q28b); 1QM (= 1Q33); 1QH^a (= 1Q34); 1QH^b (= 1Q35); 1Q36 (1QHymns); 4Q158 (4QRP^a); 4Q159 (4QOrdin); 4Q160 (4QVisSam); 4Q161 (4QpIsa^a); 4Q163 (4Qpap pIsa^c); 4Q165 (4QpIsa^e); 4Q166 (4QpHos^a); 4Q171 (4QpPs^a); 4Q174 (4QFlor); 4Q175 (4QTest); 4Q176 (4QTanḥ); 4Q177 (Catena A); 4Q180 (AgesCreat A); 4Q181 (AgesCreat B); 4Q184 (4QWiles); 4Q186 (4QHorosc); 4Q200 (4QTobit^e); 4Q215 (4QTNaph); 4Q215a (4QTimes); 4Q219 (4QJub^d); 4Q221 (4QJub^f); 4Q222 (4QJub^g); 4Q223–224 (4QpapJub^h); 4Q225 (4QpsJub^a); 4Q227 (4QpsJub^c); 4Q251 (Halakha A); 4Q254 (ComGen C); 4Q256 (4QS^b); 4Q257 (4QpapS^c); 4Q259 (4QS^e); 4Q260 (4QS^f); 4Q265 (Misc Rules); 4Q266 (4QDamascus Document^a); 4Q267 (4QDamascus Document^b); 4Q268 (4QDamascus Document^c); 4Q269 (4QDamascus Document^d); 4Q271 (4QDamascus Document^f); 4Q273 (4QpapDamascus Document^h); 4Q274 (4QToh A); 4Q277 (4QToh B); 4Q280 (4QCurses); 4Q285 (4QSefer ha-Milḥamah); 4Q286 (4QBer^a); 4Q287 (4QBer^b); 4Q289 (4QBer^d); 4Q292 (4QWork Cont. Prayers B); 4Q299 (4QMyst^a); 4Q301 (4QMyst[?]); 4Q303 (4QMeditation on Creation A); 4Q364 (4QRP^b); 4Q365 (4QRP^c); 4Q365a (4QT^{a?}); 4Q369 (4QPrayer Enosh); 4Q375 (4QapocrMos^a); 4Q377 (4QapocrPent B); 4Q382 (4Qpap paraKgs); 4Q384 (4Qpap apocr Jer B?); 4Q393 (4QCom-Conf); 4Q394 (4QMMT^a); 4Q396 (4QMMT^c); 4Q397 (4QMMT^d); 4Q398 (4QpapMMT^e); 4Q400 (4QShirShabb^a); 4Q401 (4QShirShabb^b); 4Q402 (4QShirShabb^c); 4Q403 (4QShirShabb^d); 4Q405 (4QShirShabb^f); 4Q410 (4QVison Int); 4Q414 (RiPur A); 4Q415 (4QInstr^a); 4Q416 (4QInstr^b); 4Q417 (4QInstr^c); 4Q418 (4QInstr^d); 4Q418a (4QInstr^e); 4Q419 (4QInstr-like Composition A); 4Q420 (4QWays^a); 4Q421 (4QWays^b); 4Q422 (4Q

6. The listings of 4Q134–136 (4QPhyl G–I); 4Q137–138 (4QPhyl J–K); 4Q139–141 (4QPhyl L–N) follow the DJD numbers in Emanuel Tov, *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 32, not those of Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 340, which lists them as 4Q137 (4QPhyl G–I); 4Q138 (4QPhyl J–K); 4Q139 (4QPhyl L–N).

4QParaGen–Exod); 4Q423 (4QInstr^g); 4Q426 (4QSapiential Hymn Work A); 4Q427 (4QH^a); 4Q428 (4QH^b); 4Q429 (4QH^c); 4Q432 (4QpapH^f); 4Q433a (4QpapHodayot-like text); 4Q435 (4QBarki Nafshi^b); 4Q436 (4QBarki Nafshi^c); 4Q437 (4QBarki Nafshi^d); 4Q438 (4QBarki Nafshi^e); 4Q440 (4QHodayot-like text C); 4Q443 (4QPersonal Prayer); 4Q460 (4QNarrative Work); 4Q462 (4QNarrative C); 4Q464 (4QExposition on the Patriarchs); 4Q471 (4QWar Scroll-like text B); 4Q473 (4QTwo Ways); 4Q474 (4QText Concerning Rachel and Joseph); 4Q477 (4QRebukes Reported by Overseer); 4Q491 (4QM^a); 4Q496 (4QpapM^f); 4Q501 (4QapocrLam B); 4Q502 (4QpapRitMar); 4Q503 (4QpapPrQuot); 4Q504 (4QDibHam^a); 4Q505 (4QpapDibHam^{b?}); 4Q506 (4QpapDibHam^c); 4Q509 (4QpapPrFêtes^c); 4Q511 (4QShir^b); 4Q512 (4QpapRitPur B); 4Q513 (4QOrd^b); 4Q522 (4QProph Josh); 4Q524 (4QT^b); 4Q525 (4QBe-attitudes); 5Q13 (5QRule); 6Q18 (6QpapHymn); 11Q11 (11QapocPs); 11Q12 (11QJub + XQText A); 11Q13 (11QMelch); 11Q14 (11QSefer ha-Milhamah); 11Q16 (11QHymns^b); 11Q19 (11QT^a); 11Q20 (11QT^b); 11Q27 (11QUnidentified C); Mas 1k (MasShirShabb); Mas 1n (MasUn-identified Qumran-Type Frag.).

Additional texts, labeled in what follows as DSS-SP1c, are listed in “Appendix 1c” in Tov’s *Scribal Practices*.⁷ These texts contain few if any of the above-listed traits associated with the “Qumran Scribal Practice,” though they are sometimes associated with the sectarians and/or are alternative versions of texts in DSS-SP9: 1Q16 (1QpPs); 1Q29 (1QTongues Fire); 1Q30 (1QLit Text? A); 1Q31 (1QLit Text? B); 3Q4 (3QpIsa); 3Q5 (3QJub); 3Q6 (3QHymn); 3Q9 (3QSectarian Text); 4Q162 (4QpIsa^b); 4Q164 (4QIsa^d); 4Q167 (4QpHos^b); 4Q168 (4QpMic[?]); 4Q169 (4QpNah); 4Q172 (4QpUnidentified); 4Q182 (4QCatena B); 4Q185 (4QSap Work); 4Q255 (4QpapS^a); 4Q261 (4QS^g); 4Q262 (4QS^h); 4Q263 (4QSⁱ); 4Q264 (4QS^j); 4Q270 (4QDamascus Document^e); 4Q272 (4QDamascus Document^g); 4Q290 (4QBer^e); 4Q304 (4QMeditation on Creation B); 4Q305 (4QMeditation on Creation C); 4Q306 (4QMish of People who Err); 4Q317 (4QCryptA Lunisolar Cal); 4Q320 (4QCal Doc/Mish A); 4Q321 (4QCal Doc/Mish B); 4Q322 (4QMish A); 4Q323 (4QMish B); 4Q324 (4QMish C); 4Q324a (4QMish D); 4Q324b (4QpapCal Doc A[?]); 4Q324c (4QMish E); 4Q325 (4QCal Doc/Mish D); 4Q328 (4QMish F); 4Q329 (4QMish G); 4Q329a (4QMish H); 4Q330 (4QMish I); 4Q337 (4QCal Doc E[?]); 4Q371

7. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 285–87.

(4QNarr and Poet Comp); 4Q390 (4QapcroJer C^e); 4Q392 (4QWorks); 4Q399 (4QMMT^f); 4Q404 (4QShirShabb^e); 4Q407 (4QShirShabb^h); 4Q409 (4QLiturgical Work A); 4Q412 (4QSap-Didactic Work A); 4Q418c (4QInstr^f); 4Q424 (4QInstruction-like Comp B); 4Q425 (4QSap-Didactic Work B); 4Q430 (4QH^d); 4Q431 (4QH^e); 4Q434 (4QBarki Nafshi^a); 4Q439 (4QLament); 4Q442 (4QIndiv Thanksgiving B); 4Q444 (4QIncant); 4Q457b (4QEschat H); 4Q461 (4QNarr B); 4Q463 (4QNarr D); 4Q464a (4QNarr E); 4Q471a (4QPol Text); 4Q471b (4QSelf-Glorifying Hymn); 4Q475 (4QRenewEarth); 4Q487 (4QpapSapB[?]); 4Q492 (4QM^b); 4Q493 (4QM^c); 4Q494 (4QM^d); 4Q495 (4QM^e); 4Q498 (4QpapSap/Hymn); 4Q499 (4QpapHymn/Prayer); 4Q500 (4QpapBenediction); 4Q507 (4QPr Fêtes^b); 4Q508 (4QpapPr Fêtes^b); 4Q510 (4QShir^a); 5Q10 (5QapocrMal [5QpMal?]); 5Q11 (5QS); 5Q12 (5QDamascus Document); 6Q9 (6Qpap apocrSamKgs); 6Q12 (6Qapocr Proph); 11Q15 (11QHymns^a); 11Q17 (11QShirShabb); 11Q29 (11QFrg Rrelated to S).

Tov does not include the Copper Scroll (3Q15) in the lists from which the above categories are drawn. It is best to think of this text as in its own category. However, as we will see, many idiosyncrasies found in the DSS-SP9 are also found in 3Q15. For ease of reference, where summaries are offered of how many times a given feature occurs in the DSS, the instances from 3Q15 will be included with those from DSS-SP9 texts, though the number of occurrences in 3Q15 will also be singled out.

The rest of the scrolls do not evidence the “Qumran scribal practice”; they are labeled hereafter as DSS-NSP. These are also sometimes related to the texts of DSS-SP9, like 4Q300 (4QMyst^b).

Several things will be immediately apparent upon glancing at these groupings. First, DSS-SP9 includes texts that many would not label as “sectarian.” As Joosten remarks, however, those nonbiblical scrolls whose attribution to the sect is disputed “such as Jubilees, 4QInstruction, or the Temple Scroll—evince a linguistic profile that is rather close to that of the sectarian scrolls.”⁸ Second, the DSS-SP9 list groups 4QMMT together with the other sectarian writings (1QS, 1QM, and so on) and nonsectarian ones (Jubilees, and so on), despite the fact that 4QMMT exhibits palpable differences from all the other texts. The distinctive character of 4QMMT will be addressed when relevant and necessary; examples drawn from this

8. Jan Joosten, “Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University, 2010), 355.

work will always be identified explicitly. And, even excluding 4QMMT, it should be recognized that there is not necessarily consistency within the DSS-SP9 texts. For example, 1QIsa^a exhibits characteristics that are not shared with many of the other scrolls. Again, where necessary, specific traits of this scroll will be mentioned.

It will become apparent fairly quickly that, in addition to the texts mentioned immediately above like 1QIsa^a, 3Q15, and 4QMMT, certain texts exhibit concentrations of particular scribal/linguistic traits. For example, 4Q175, although relatively short, exhibits at least six misspellings related to *aleph*, reflecting the letter's quiescence. Another relatively short text, 4Q491c, exhibits at least twenty examples of the digraph א׳- to mark word-final /ī/. A relatively short biblical text, 4Q107 (4QCant^b), exhibits numerous features attributable to Aramaic influence. Such concentrations will be remarked on in the appropriate places.

In addition to the texts listed above, the following notes will draw on other scrolls from surrounding sites (e.g., Masada), where such texts contain examples of phenomena also attested in the DSS.

GENERAL REMARKS

The language of the scrolls bears traits that connect it, on the one hand, with Standard Biblical Hebrew (SBH) as found in the Masoretic Text (MT), with Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH) as also found in the MT, with Mishnaic Hebrew (MH), even in some instances with Samaritan Hebrew, and the Hebrew of the Babylonian tradition.¹ And yet, the Hebrew of the scrolls also represents features that have no parallel in other traditions. Although these basic ideas are affirmed by almost everyone, there is still much that remains unsettled. Scholars differ, for example, in how they describe the language of the scrolls, whether they emphasize the aspects that reflect a naturally developed and developing spoken dialect or emphasize the aspects that reflect a literary heritage with earlier Hebrew. Kutscher, Morag, and Qimron, for instance, describe the language of the scrolls especially in light of what it reveals about the natural speech of their writers.² A slightly different approach, but one not entirely incompatible with this, is to describe the language of the DSS as a literary idiom based in LBH, as Blau does.³ On the other hand, Schniedewind, Rendsburg, and

1. See, e.g., Kutscher, *Isaiah*, passim; Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (ed. R. Kutscher; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1982), 93. See also Joosten, “Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek,” 357: “In diachronic perspective, Qumran Hebrew represents a phase that neatly fits between Biblical Hebrew on the one hand and Mishnaic Hebrew on the other.” For a summary of the proposed characteristics shared between DSS Hebrew and Babylonian and Samaritan traditions, see Qimron, *Grammar*, 28–30.

2. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 3; Shelomo Morag, “Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations,” 148–64; Qimron, “Observations on the History of Early Hebrew (1000BCE—200CE),” in *Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, 349–61; and Qimron “The Nature of DSS Hebrew and Its Relation to BH and MH,” 232–44. See also Rudolf Meyer, “Das Problem der Dialektmischung in den hebräischen Texten von Chirbet Qumran,” *VT* 7 (1957): 139–48.

3. See Blau, “A Conservative View of the Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in

Charlesworth emphasize (following the lead of Rabin) that the language of the scrolls should be thought of as an artificial and archaizing language, generated in opposition to the language spoken by the writers' religious rivals; they refer to the Hebrew of the scrolls as an "anti-language."⁴ In all these cases, however, the assumption seems to be that some aspects of the pronunciation and morphology in the scrolls are unique among other Hebrew traditions.

Some scholars see in the idiosyncrasies of the scrolls' orthography two basic dialects, one spoken and one literary, a situation sometimes described as diglossia.⁵ Recently, however, Naudé has argued that such a twofold view is too simplistic, pointing to the variety of factors that contribute to linguistic variation ("time, society, and the individual") and the fact that even individuals "have multiple grammars, for example, to

Diggers at the Well, 22. Morag states: "It is not the spoken language of Qumran which emerges in the literature of the Scrolls...the texts themselves, as we have them, are literary" (Morag, *Studies on Biblical Hebrew*, 114–15, as quoted by Hurvitz, "Was QH a 'Spoken' Language," 114; see also Shelomo Morag, "Language and Style in *Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah*: Did *Moreh ha-Šedeq* Write This Document?" [Hebrew], *Tarbiz* 65 [1996]: 209–23). It might be mentioned that the dichotomy between spoken and literary languages can, itself, become complicated when considering whether the sectarians would have *spoken* to each other in a *literary* dialect—for this idea one may consult William M. Schniedewind, "Linguistic Ideology in Qumran Hebrew," in *Diggers at the Well*, 246. For a concise summary of the different ways that the scrolls have been approached, see Jacobus A. Naudé, "The Transitions of Biblical Hebrew in the Perspective of Language Change and Diffusion," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology* (ed. Ian Young; London: T&T Clark, 2003), 195–96. He notes that Kutscher viewed the language of the scrolls as heavily influenced by Aramaic (*Isaiah*, 8–9); he also notes that Joseph A. Fitzmyer saw it as an imitation of Biblical Hebrew (*A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* [Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1979], 44–45).

4. Chaim Rabin, "Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin; ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958), 144–61; William M. Schniedewind, "Qumran Hebrew as an Anti-language," *JBL* 118 (1999): 235–52; idem, "Linguistic Ideology in Qumran Hebrew," 245–55; Gary A. Rendsburg, "Qumran Hebrew (with a Trial Cut [1QS])," in *Dead Sea Scrolls at Sixty: Scholarly Contributions of New York University Faculty and Alumni* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and Shani Tzoref; STDJ 89; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 217–46; James H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 20.

5. See Naudé, "Transitions of Biblical Hebrew," 196, who cites J. C. Kesterson, "Tense Usage and Verbal Syntax in Selected Qumran Documents" (Ph.D. diss.; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1984), 172.

generate different linguistic styles or registers, idiolects, local dialects and standard speech.”⁶

More basic than questions of dialect, subdialect, and idiolect is the question concerning what the marks on the scrolls indicate. Do they accurately reflect their writers’ pronunciation or are the words written one way and intended to be pronounced in an entirely different way? For example, where the 3ms independent pronoun is written הווא in a text that predominantly spells the word with a final *heh mater*, הוואה, are we to assume that the shorter form was pronounced like the longer (that is, *hū’ā*)?⁷ A similar problem pertains to even short words like כִּי. This word is often spelled כִּיא in the DSS-SP9. Does the spelling with *aleph* reflect a different pronunciation (as Ben-Ḥayyim argues) or is it simply an orthographic peculiarity that does not reflect a special pronunciation (as Kutscher and others presume)?⁸ This problem pertains to almost every phonological and morphological question. It is compounded by the fact that to an even greater degree than in the MT spelling varies from text to text, even from line to line.

Another good example of these problems is the question of the pronunciation of the gutturals, especially *‘ayin*. Does the occasional spelling of words without an internal *‘ayin*, which ended a historically closed syllable (e.g., וישה *wayyase* in 1QIsa^a at Isa 5:4 [reflecting etymological **ייעשה* **wayya’āse*] for what MT preserves as ויעש) suggest that the voiced pharyngeal fricative (/ʕ/) was never pronounced in this environment and that when we find יעשה in this text (e.g., in both 1QIsa^a and in the MT at Isa 56:2) the same pronunciation is implied, *wayyase*? Or, should we assume that the phoneme was only occasionally dropped from the end or middle

6. Naudé, “Transitions of Biblical Hebrew,” 213, 207. He notes that such an explanation as diglossia “excludes the possibility of more than two grammars and complicates the explanation of inter-relation between innovation and diffusion in QH” (ibid., 207). See also J. J. Ohala, “Sound Change,” in *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (ed. Keith Brown; 14 vols.; 2nd ed.; Oxford: Elsevier, 2006), 11:522 and Douglas Biber, *Dimensions of Register Variation: A Cross-Linguistic Comparison* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1995), 1–2.

7. E. L. Sukenik, e.g., argued that the full and defective spellings reflected the same pronunciation so that, in relation to 1Q8 (1QIsa^b), הווא reflects the same pronunciation implied in the form הוואה (*The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1955], 31).

8. Zēv Ben-Ḥayyim, *Studies in the Traditions of the Hebrew Language* (Madrid: Instituto Arias Montana, 1954), 82–85; Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 178–79.

of a word, due, for example, to a hurried pronunciation and that the spelling יִשָּׁה reflects *wayyase* and the spelling יַעֲשֶׂה reflects *ya'āse*?⁹ Or, was the phoneme always dropped in the spoken vernacular of some scribes and writers but normally retained in the writing/reading register of the same scribes (or of some subset of the Qumran scribes)?

Yet another axis of debate concerns the question of Aramaic's influence; some linguistic traits may derive from the writers' or scribes' knowledge of Aramaic or they could be the result of common linguistic developments shared between Aramaic and Hebrew. For example, does the 3mp possessive suffix הוּם - derive from Aramaic הּם - or from the etymological form of the suffixed pronoun, common to both Aramaic and Hebrew, *-humu*?¹⁰

One also wonders to what degree a given morpheme, word, or syntax is due to the influence of Biblical Hebrew.¹¹ Since the writers of the DSS revered earlier scriptural writings so much, it is not surprising to find they imitate its words and phrases, even when not directly alluding to a specific passage. A similar influence of Biblical Hebrew is felt on Mishnaic Hebrew.

The variables and uncertainties do not stop here. Blau mentions many of the factors that contribute to making DSS Hebrew and its description so opaque.

9. A similar elision of the glottal stop due to rushed pronunciation is also commented on by scholars. See G. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Vogel 1918 [vol. 1 phonology and morphology]; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1926–1929 [vol. 2 verb]), 1:92, as well as the discussion below in the section titled “Weakening of Gutturals” (§4.3).

10. For the forms of the pronominal suffix with this apparent Aramaic form, see Qimron, *HDSS*, 39. The example of this suffix is found in עֲלֵיהוּם (4Q176 20, 3). Although the morphology of one language is less likely to be influenced by that of another, the Hebrew of the DSS does evidence some influence from Aramaic in this regard, e.g., the 3ms suffix on plural nouns וְהִי -. For cross-linguistic evidence, see Bloomfield, *Language*, 406–7, cited by Qimron, “History of Early Hebrew,” 353 n. 10, and, for a summary of Aramaic influences on morphology, Joosten, “Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek,” 359, and the section below “Conclusions” (§6).

11. Joosten writes: “It is undoubtedly correct to view Qumran Hebrew as a continuation of Biblical Hebrew, but it is not true that the two languages are identical. To an important extent, the similarity between the two is artificial. It is due to the conscious effort of the sectarian authors to imitate the style of the older corpus” (“Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek,” 359).

[T]he simplest explanation of all the linguistic facts known to us remains that Qumran Hebrew reflects basically the latest stage of artificial (literary) biblical language, exposed, to some extent, to the influence of the spoken vernaculars, viz. Aramaic and some sort of Middle Hebrew, which later crystallized as Mishnaic Hebrew, but also representing various traditions, genres, fashions, scribal schools, and personal inclinations, which introduced changes into the language of the Dead Sea Scrolls, just as they modified Middle Arabic by using, e.g., an artificial literary feature like accusative *fa'alilan*.¹²

This, to my mind, concisely touches on many of the variables that affect languages in general, and in particular the language of the DSS.¹³

In fact, most scholars addressing the language, whether they view it as artificial or natural, as reflecting a spoken idiom or a literary one, try to nuance their position in a way that recognizes the many dimensions of language use. For example, Kutscher, when summarizing the dialect of the scribes of 1QIsa^a, writes: “the component linguistic factors normally differ from locality to locality, from class to class and from individual to individual.”¹⁴ Morag, while investigating the grammar in view of finding traits of a specific spoken dialect, recognizes the possible existence within the language of “boundaries of Hebrew dialects and speech-types” which were most likely due to separate geography, but which “may, of course, have marked social or sectarian groupings as well.”¹⁵ He further recog-

12. Blau, “Conservative View,” 22. Blau emphasizes that just because a language is not spoken does not mean it does not change. A similar thesis is argued by John C. Poirier (“The Linguistic Situation in Jewish Palestine in Late Antiquity,” *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 4 [2007]: 86), who cites Yohanan Breuer’s list of sixteen linguistic features that distinguish Amoraic Hebrew from Tannaitic (see Breuer, “On the Hebrew Dialect of the *’Āmōrā’im* in the Babylonian Talmud,” in *Studies in Mishnaic Hebrew* [ed. Moshe Bar-Asher; ScrHier 37; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1998], 149).

13. Other scholars also remark on different variables; see Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, “Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran Documents,” in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 101–37 and Joosten, “Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek,” 354. Moshe Bar-Asher, in referring to orthography, writes: “To sum up: the orthography of every ancient text is unique, due to the personal habits of scribes, the varieties of practices taught in scribal schools, and features which accrue through copying” (“On the Language of *‘The Vision of Gabriel,’*” *RevQ* 23 [2008]: 498).

14. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 61–62.

15. Morag, “Qumran Hebrew,” 150.

nizes that the scrolls are literary in nature, writing: “It would be superfluous to say that the texts do not precisely represent the language spoken by the scribes who were bound, in their orthography, grammar and lexicon, to a certain literary tradition.”¹⁶ Qimron, in describing the language of 4QMMT, writes: “In dealing with Hebrew as a living language, we must recall that we are dealing with sporadic representations of the language, from different places and times, as transmitted to us in different traditions of pronunciation.”¹⁷ Joosten, referring to the linguistic diversity revealed among the scrolls, writes: “Partly, such diversity may reflect the stylistic predilections of individual authors, and partly the orthographic idiosyncrasies of scribes.”¹⁸ He also remarks “[T]he different registers of the language interpenetrated one another in several ways.”¹⁹ Given these many variables, it is helpful to outline some of the assumptions I hold in what follows.

From a theoretical standpoint, I assume that the DSS reflect a combination of idioms and registers, each text containing an idiosyncratic blending of literary idioms (stylized not *in accord with* LBH, but reflecting in part a development of the literary tradition found in LBH, as well as other genre-specific expectations); influence of the writers’ or scribes’ spoken dialects; Aramaicizing tendencies (perhaps due to the individual writers’/ scribes’ spoken dialects); archaizing tendencies; a desire to mimic SBH orthography, vocabulary, and style; a desire to deviate from the same SBH categories; and different scribal traditions of orthography. Some of these phenomena must have changed over time and some variations within and between texts may be due to the different periods in which the texts were written or copied. In theoretical terms we do not need to limit ourselves to the dichotomy of spoken versus written expression; rather, we can recognize that the way in which individuals listened was different from the way

16. Ibid. In relation to Biblical Hebrew, Morag has also called attention to the lack of homogeneity in a single individual’s language (“Historical Validity,” 307–8). Another scholar, Steve Weitzman, exploring why the sectarians used Hebrew, recognizes genre as a possible determining factor in language (“Why Did the Qumran Community Write in Hebrew,” *JAOS* 119 [1999]: 37). Weitzman also suggests comparing the status of Aramaic and its use within specific genres (ibid., n. 17).

17. Qimron, “Language,” 106. See also Elisha Qimron, “The Language and Linguistic Background of the Qumran Compositions,” in *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World* (ed. Menahem Kister; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2009), 2:553.

18. Joosten, “Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek,” 354.

19. Ibid., 353.

in which they spoke or wrote. I imagine the way they perceived writing could admit of various different registers, depending on what they were hearing (scripture, liturgy, instruction), where they were hearing it (in an assembly, in a smaller group, from another individual), and why they were hearing it (for worship, contemplation, the purpose of copying out a text). Such variables might have resulted in different pronunciations and different perceptions of pronunciation. Perhaps due to this, slightly different morphologies emerged. For example, it is conceivable that slower pronunciation (e.g., in an austere ritual context) would have affected the form of certain verbs, creating what are sometimes called “pausal forms” (e.g., the *qal* imperfect: יִקְטֹלוּ).²⁰ Such pronunciations could have been perceived as “more correct” by an audience of scribes who remembered these and later used these forms in their writing.

In general, I attempt to describe the salient features of the writing/reading register(s) of the scrolls. When possible, I try to identify features of the language that are more likely to be characteristic of a vernacular spoken idiom and/or features that might be part of a particular writer’s or scribe’s subdialect or idiolect. In essence, I assume that the pronunciation of the writing/reading register will more closely match the spelling of words (e.g., אָבִיהוּ = ‘*ābihū* “his father”), while the spoken idiom may not (e.g., אַבִּיהוּ = ‘*ābiyū*).²¹ I often (but not always) interpret varying orthography as a reflection of different phonetic realizations in the writing/reading register, where the literary dialect(s), vernaculars, and idiolects are mixing and coming together (in other words, אָבִיהוּ = ‘*ābihū* and אַבִּיהוּ = ‘*ābiyū*). That the Masoretes could preserve various and divergent morphologies in

20. Kutscher makes a similar argument to explain different pronunciations of the word נֹאֲמַי in 1QIsa^a as *nūm* versus *nəūm*; he writes: “It is probable that in the Jewish pronunciation, since they took pains to insure correct liturgical reading of the Bible, this difference was manifest in quick speech opposed to slower speech. When speaking quickly they would say *nu:m*...but in slow reading were careful to pronounce the *shwa*” (*Isaiah*, 499). Similarly, Blau writes in relation to II-*aleph* nouns in Biblical Hebrew (*Phonology and Morphology of Biblical Hebrew: An Introduction* [LSAWS 2; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2010], 55). See also Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 1:92.

21. Compare Muraoka’s comments on the writing of the suffixed pronouns in DSS Aramaic: “[W]e are assuming that the orthography in Q[umran] A[ramaic], as far as the representation of word-final vowels is concerned, reflects a certain phonetic reality. In other words, the spelling -C implies that the consonant was not followed by a full vowel, whereas -Cִּ or -Cֵּ indicates a full vowel following the -C-” (GQA, 43).

their literary tradition (e.g., פִּיהוּ and פִּיו “his mouth” in Exod 4:15) suggests that previous scribes probably could too—something suggested in the orthography of the scrolls themselves (e.g., פִּיהוּ and פִּיו in 1QIsa^a at Isa 34:16 and 29:13, respectively; אַבִּיהוּ and אַבִּיו in 4Q416 2 iii, 16 and 2 iv, 1, respectively).²² Based on what linguists have observed concerning the variety of ways language is used by single individuals, such variations would not be surprising.

Furthermore, since at the time of the DSS the biblical texts held numerous variations in orthography, phonology, and morphology, I assume that the writers and scribes connected with the DSS were at least partially familiar with these variations. In choosing forms to write, the scribes might have drawn from their knowledge of a standard orthography (reflected in the MT) or might have chosen a rare form.²³ I assume that the scribes felt a degree of freedom in this process due, in part, to the literary tradition that included orthographic variation.

This approach to the Hebrew of the scrolls leads to the impression that some linguistic phenomena were the outcome of natural processes that presumably reflect one or more spoken idioms, while others are secondary or artificial. One senses that some linguistic developments as well as many orthographic practices helped to preserve the etymological contours of words, while other linguistic developments tended to obscure them. In general, these conflicting trends suggest a context where scribes and writers were speaking and composing in Hebrew as well as Aramaic; a context where scribes and writers were inventing new genres and literary idioms while engaging intensively with former genres and idioms; a

22. The fact that אַבִּיו may be part of an allusion to Gen 2:24 is tangential to this point (see John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2, 4QInstruction (Mūsār Lē Mēvīn), 4Q415 ff.* [DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999], 126). In commenting on the different dialects reflected in the DSS, Meyer writes: “Man wird also mit Fug und Recht sagen dürfen, dass in Qumran ein ausgesprochenes Dialektgemisch vorliegt, wobei nicht übersehen werden darf, dieses Gemisch auch im masoretischen Konsonantentext noch nachklingt und zugleich von hier aus bestätigt wird” (“Problem der Dialektmischung,” 144).

23. Compare James Barr’s ideas on spelling variation in the Hebrew Bible (*The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1986* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989], 194), as well as the critique of this view offered by Tov, “Review of James Barr, *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible*,” in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* [TSA] 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008], 15–16, originally published in *JSS* 35 (1990): 303–16.

context in which the boundaries between spoken and written registers, vernacular and literary idioms, local and distant dialects were constantly mixing and interacting.

ORTHOGRAPHY

3.1. SCRIBAL MISTAKES

Everything discussed below depends on understanding the orthographic representation of words as intentional in some sense. By intentional I mean that the scribes intended to write a particular word according to a specific orthographic style (for example, **יעשה** “[who] will do” in 1QIsa^a at Isa 56:2), or, when diverging from this style (even unintentionally), they wrote letters with the assumption that they indicated specific sounds (for example, **ויעשה** *wayyase* “it made” in 1QIsa^a at Isa 5:4 for what is in the MT **ויעש**).¹ Despite this, there are many cases where scribes have simply made gaffs or errors in their spelling—errors that are only graphic and that do not (presumably) reflect the pronunciation of a word or phoneme.² These are attested in all text groups (DSS-SP9, DSS-SP1c, and DSS-NSP).

The purpose of the following lists is not to present a complete index of mistakes, but to emphasize the frequency and nature of mistakes. Recognition of these matters can help inform our interpretation of certain word forms where the spelling may or may not reflect something significant about the phonology and/or morphology of the language. For example, the metathesis of *maters* between nonguttural letters suggests that a similar metathesis between guttural letters may not necessarily reflect the elision of the guttural phonemes; they may simply be visual mistakes. Similarly, the fact that various sibilant consonants are confused, and that various velar/uvular consonants are confused suggests

1. On the transliteration of *śin* with *s*, see above, “A Note on Transliteration, Etymological Bases, and Manuscript Identification,” and §4.1, “Phonemic Inventory.” Conceivably, the word in 1QIsa^a was realized as *wayyāse* due to compensatory lengthening.

2. See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 221–39; idem, *Scribal Practices*, 221–30.

that where pharyngeal consonants (that is, *ayin* and *heth*) are confused this may be due to the common place of their articulation, not to the loss of all distinction between them.

The well-known mistakes of dittography, haplography, and metathesis are attested throughout the scrolls. Examples of dittography include repetitions of individual letters, sequences of letters, words, and phrases: מאלוהים (4Q400 2, 3) corrected to מאלוהים “from God”;³ בבבבן (1QH^a XV, 5) for בבוין* “in the mire”;⁴ נכונה העצת היחד (1QS VIII, 5) corrected to נכונה עצת היחד “the council of the community is founded”; ולצפון (11Q19 XXXVIII, 14) for ולצפון* “and to the north”; זהב טהוב (4Q365a 2 ii, 7) for זהב טהור* “pure gold”;⁵ שפתי שפתי “lips of, lips of” (1QH^a XV, 14–15);⁶ העם העם (11Q19 LVIII, 5) corrected to העם “the people”; כיא הואה כיא הואה (4Q417 2 i, 5) corrected to just היא הואה “because he.” Cases of two *yodhs* or *waws* written together to represent one (or two juxtaposed) consonantal *yodh* or *waw* are possible examples of dittography, though at least some of these probably represent an alternative orthographic practice (see §3.6, “Two *Yodhs* for a Consonantal *Yodh* and Two *Waws* for a Consonantal *Waw*”).

Examples of haplography (including those subsequently corrected) include: אל [והי]ם מברכים “[they] bless God” (4Q405 19, 7); ואלה המשפטים “and these (are) the judgments” (1QS VI, 24); אנש שחת “man of the pit” (1QS X, 19); בליעל על “Belial, over” (1QH^a XI, 30); אל וידבר אל אל “God said to” (1QpHab VII, 1); בכלו אתו (4Q381 33a–b + 35, 8) for בכלוא* אתו “when (he) restrained him”; לאנוש עם עם רוח “to Enosh with a people of spirit” (4Q417 1 i, 16); טוה רוחות (4Q405 20 ii - 22, 11) for טוהר* רוחות

3. See Carol Newsom, “Shirot ‘Olat HaShabbat,” in *Qumran Cave 4. VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (ed. E. Eshel et al; DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 188.

4. See Hartmut Stegemann, Eileen Schuller, and Carol Newsom, *Qumran Cave 1. III: 1QHodayot^a with Incorporation of 4QHodayot^{a-f} and 1QHodayot^b* (DJD 40; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009), 201.

5. See E. Tov and S. White “Reworked Pentateuch,” in *Qumran Cave 4. VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (ed. H. Attridge et al.; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 328. Note that although Accordance and DSSEL parse טהוב as from טוב, the word טוב preceded by זהב only occurs once in the scrolls (זהב טוב 11Q19 XXXVI, 11), while there are nine examples of what I interpret (following DSSE) as the intended phrase, זהב טהור, in the nonbiblical DSS (e.g., 1QM V, 10 and 12).

6. See Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:203, for other, less likely interpretations.

“...purely, spirits.” The simple dropping of a letter is found too: [מ]לשמע “better” to hear” (4Q109 [4QQoh^a] at Qoh 7:5) for MT שמע.⁷

Examples of metathesis include: אכשיל (1QH^a XVIII, 8) for *אשכיל “I will consider”;⁸ החיד (1QS VI, 3) for *היחד “the community,” שרי (1QSa I, 16) corrected to רשי “heads of”;⁹ דרכיו (4Q425 1 + 3, 6) for *דרכיו “his paths”; [י]אצאו “they will go forth” (4Q491 1–3, 9 = MT יאצאו);¹⁰ כער (4Q27 [4QNum^b] at Num 24:9) for MT כרע “he bowed down”; ולקרוב (4Q58 [4QIsa^d] at Isa 57:19) for MT ולקרוב “to the one near”; מבדבר (4Q62 [4QIsa^h] at Isa 42:11) corrected to מדבר, for MT מדבר “wilderness”; בשקתי (4Q107 [4QCant^b] at Song 3:1) for MT בקשתי “I sought”; and perhaps also הנא יאנה (11Q19 LIII, 20) for what would be in the MT הנא יניאה “he will surely forbid her.”¹¹

A special variety of dittography and metathesis involves *maters*: קיראי (1QS VIII, 6) corrected to ובחרי “and the chosen ones of”; קיראי (1QSa II, 2) for *קריאי “those called of”;¹² עיצה (1QpHab X, 1) for *עציה

7. Some examples are ambiguous: אביה (11Q19 LXVI, 13) for *אביהו; it is conceivable (albeit less likely I think) that אביה reflects the Aramaic pronoun (see Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* [3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983], 2:299).

8. See Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:237. They note that a scribe noted the *kaph* as an error with marks above and below the letter, but he did not add further corrections.

9. See James H. Charlesworth and Loren Stuckenbruck, “Rule of the Congregation,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 112 n. 12.

10. This is a case of uncorrected metathesis or a case of *aleph* as a *mater* for /ē/ (cf. עואר 1QIsa^a at Isa 42:19 [twice] and 43:8 and see §3.3, “*Aleph* as Internal *Mater*”).

11. The 11Q19 text alludes to or paraphrases Num 30:6, which has just the perfect form הניא. Understanding the verb in 11Q19 to mean “he will lament” or “he will offend” (i.e., from one of the verbs associated with אנה) does not make good sense, especially with what looks to be the preceding *hiphil* infinitive absolute of נוא.

12. Note that this is the reading of J. T. Milik “Textes Non Bibliques,” in *Qumran Cave 1* (ed. D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik; DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 110. Later editions have read this as קוראי (e.g., DSSSE, 102 and Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck “Rule of the Congregation,” 114), i.e., as the *qal* passive participle with metathesis of the *resh* and *waw mater* or with the displacement of the /u/ vowel to the first syllable. The biblical parallels are not terribly helpful in disambiguating: the similar phrase in Num 16:2 (קראי מועד) implies reading the second letter of the DSS word as a misplaced *yodh*, as does the *kethib* of the similar phrase in Num 1:16 and the *qere* in Num 26:9, though the *qere* to Num 1:16 and the *kethib* to 26:9 imply the

“its wood”;¹³ מבכירה (1QH^a XI, 8) for *מבכירה “one bearing a child”;¹⁴ וגזעו (1QH^a XVI, 8) for *גזעו “its stock”;¹⁵ מתוך (1QH^a XXI, 25) corrected to מתך reflecting what would be in the MT מִתְּךָ (a *hophal* participle of נתך) in the absolute “poured out”;¹⁶ נושיאי [ם] “those bearing” (4Q364 11, 3 at Gen 45:23) for MT נושאים;¹⁷ ואתועדה “I will stand up” (4Q382 23, 1) for *ואתעודדה;¹⁸ מרישיעי (4Q387 3, 6) for *מרשיעי “those doing wrong”;¹⁹ יקופץ (4Q418 88, 5) corrected to יקפוץ “it will shut”; אויב

gal passive participle. Milik implies that the mistake is due to the uvular nature of the *resh* (“Textes Non Bibliques,” 116).

13. Unless the *yodh* is representing the /ē/ that follows the ‘*ayin*, as seems to be the case in עיצים (4Q176 24, 2).

14. Most scholars understand this as a *hiphil* participle, though *DSSEL* reads it as a *min* preposition plus the word “firstborn,” reflecting the interpretation of earlier scholars.

15. Unless, the first *waw* should be read as a *yodh* (as in Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:216 [גיזעו for *גיזעו]), though this seems less likely based, in part, on the *plene* writing in other passages, where it is more common for a word-internal /u/ or /o/ vowel to be marked with a *mater* than for an /i/ vowel to be so marked.

16. See the interpretation of this word in Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:266. It is likeliest that this is a simple case of metathesis of the *mater*, with the expected *mater* (for the initial /u/ vowel) left out, the mistake perhaps being caused in part by the commonness of the sequence מתוך. The possibility that this represents the words “from the midst of” (= MT מִתּוֹךְ) seems unlikely since the scribe would likely not have erased the *waw mater* in this case; all the other examples of תוך “midst” in 1QH^a (and the scrolls in general) carry the *waw mater*. Alternatively, it is possible (though less likely) that, as Stegemann and Schuller suggest, the scribe first wrote a nominal form (i.e., a **maqṭul* or **maqṭāl* base noun) and then corrected it to a *hophal* participle; the absence of such a *mem*-preformative noun in Biblical Hebrew and in RH suggests that this is less likely than a simple scribal slip.

17. Perhaps this spelling reflects the quiescence of *aleph*, the scribe hearing *nōsīm* and then remembering the more conservative form with *aleph*/glottal stop: *nōsəʾīm*. Certainly, the metathesis evidenced in התנאה (4Q107 [4QCant^b] at Song 2:13) for MT התאנה is most likely due to the quiescence of *aleph* and subsequent misplacement of the letter, as Tov suggests (Emanuel Tov, “Canticles,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* [ed. Eugene Ulrich et al.; DJD 16; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000], 212). Note also מלאכה “work” (4Q263 3) for *מלאכה.

18. See Saul Olyan, “ParaKings et al.,” in DJD 13:375. This is perhaps also influenced by the weakness in pronunciation of the ‘*ayin*; see §4.3, “Weakening of Gutturals.”

19. D. Dimant writes confusingly that the *yodh* after the *resh* in this word “may stand for the *i*-sound of *reš* which was pronounced as the *i*-sound of the following *šin*” (*Qumran Cave 4.XX: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4, Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* [DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001], 193).

(4Q44 [4QDeut^q] at Deut 32:42) for MT אֹיֵב “enemy.”²⁰ A similar phenomenon of metathesized *mater*s is found in the MT, as reflected in the *kethib* to Job 26:12: וּבִתְּוֹבְנָתוֹ “and in his understanding.”²¹ The fact that dittography and metathesis occur among nonguttural letters like *gimmel*, *peh*, and *shin* is one piece of evidence that suggests that mistakes like וּבִיחֵרִי are not attributable simply to the weakness of gutturals (and *resh*), as has been previously implied.²² The inherent weakness of the gutturals is only one factor.

In some instances two *mater*s are written next to each other for one vowel: מעשייכה “your deeds” (1QSb III, 27); כּוּל “all” (1QH^a IX, 10) corrected to כּוּל;²³ קצוות “to cut off” (1QpHab IX, 14) for what would be in the MT קצות;²⁴ בתוּךְ עממי “in the midst of my peoples” (4Q216 VII, 10); העדוות “the testimony” with correction dots above and below the second *waw* (4Q364 17, 3); זיות “this” (1QIsa^a at Isa 9:11).²⁵ Note the similar mistake in the MT, דְּבָרוֹ (Ps 105:28). On the one hand, it seems best to inter-

20. This interpretation seems easier than positing a **qittūl* noun otherwise unattested in Hebrew (except in some manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch). In other cases metathesis produces a reading that is plausible in its context, as in וְהוּי “and O, ...” (1QIsa^a at Isa 49:23) for MT וְהִי “and they will be.” Similarly for dittography: כְּהַתְּמַכְךָ “when you are humbled (מכך)” (1QIsa^a at Isa 33:1) for MT כְּהַתְּמַךְ “when you are finished (תמם).”

21. For this and other possible examples, see Friedrich Delitzsch, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1920), 52–53. Note especially נָטְיָ (Ps 73:2), the *qere* implying *נָטְיָ; and the name מְוִימָן (Esth 1:16), which is spelled correctly, מְוִימָן, in Esth 1:14 and 21.

22. See Milik’s analysis of קִירָאִי in the above footnote 12 and Qimron, *Grammar*, 95.

23. Note also כּוּל (4Q376 1 iii, 2); כּוּל corrected to כּוּל in 4Q504 1–2R iv, 11.

24. This understanding assumes that the letters represent the *qal* infinitive construct “cutting off,” which appears in the MT at Hab 2:10 as קצות. In a following line of this manuscript, in X, 2, the text of Hab 2:10 is quoted again, this time where the relevant word has just one *mater*: קצות. Alternatively, it may be that both words should be translated “ends of,” which also makes sense in the context: “you have counseled shame for your house and (the) ends of many peoples.” If this is right, then קצוות may represent the plural construct of קצת (= MT קָצַת, pl. cstr. *קָצוֹת) and קצות in 1QpHab X, 2 may represent the plural construct of קצה (= MT קָצָה, pl. cstr. קָצוֹת). For more on these words, see §3.3, “Aleph as Internal *Mater*.”

25. More uncertain is כְּעוֹנְתֵינוּ [כעוןנתינו] in 4Q84 (4QPs^b) at Ps 103:10 (for MT כְּעוֹנְתֵינוּ) since the two *yodhs* are heavily damaged according to the transliteration in Eugene Ulrich et al., eds., *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls* (VTSup 134; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 665; Accordance reconstructs the entire word.

pret these as cases of dittographic error (especially since some of them were actually corrected). On the other hand, this does not explain cases, as in *זוֹת*, where a second *mater* was actually added to the word. One is left to wonder about the reason for such interlinear additions; was it perhaps a way for a later scribe to confirm that a possibly ambiguous mark was a *waw* and not a *yodh* or vice versa? In a few cases, the *mater* is left off a word, as in *בְּתוּלָה* (11Q19 LXV, 10) for **בְּתוּלִי* “virginity of”; and *יֹר* (4Q35 [4QDeut^h] at Deut 33:10) for MT *יֹרֵד* “they will teach.”

In some rare examples, it seems that the sounds of a preceding word have affected the spelling of a following word. For instance, *שְׁלוֹם עוֹלָם* “perpetual peace” (1QH^a XIX, 30 for what would be in the MT **שְׁלוֹם עוֹלָם*).²⁶ A similar phenomenon is evidenced in the MT: *וּמִצְאָיו וּמִבּוֹאָיו* “its exits and entrances” (Ezek 43:11) for **וּמִבּוֹאָיו וּמִצְאָיו* and similarly *אֶת־מוֹצְאָהָ וְאֶת־מְבֹאָהָ* (2 Sam 3:25).²⁷

Sometimes a mistake is also due to confusion of similar sounding consonants; especially common are confusions between the sibilants and between velar/uvular consonants.²⁸ Such confusions do not imply that the respective letters were pronounced in an identical manner, rather, it merely reflects the common place of their articulation.²⁹ Note especially *עֵשִׁים* (4Q365 23, 5) corrected to *עֵצִים* “trees”; *אִפֶּס* (4Q418 7b, 11) for *אִפֶּס* “nothing” (4Q416 2 i, 20); *הַחַרוּשׁ* (4Q491 8–10 ii, 13) for **הַחַרוּקִין* “the

26. It seems very unlikely that this would be the aberrant form of the word attested in 2 Chr 33:7, *עֵלֹם*. The tentative suggestion Qimron (*HDSS*, 39) makes that the same spelling for “eternity” (*עוֹלָם*) is found in 1QSb V, 23 is not followed by more recent editions of that text in James H. Charlesworth and Loren Stuckenbruck’s edition (“Blessings,” in *Dead Sea Scrolls... Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, 128), in *DSSSE*, or in *Accordance*, all of whom read *עוֹלָם*.

27. See Delitzsch, *Lese- und Schreibfehler*, 52.

28. For similar confusions in the MT, see Delitzsch, *Lese- und Schreibfehler*, 123–129. For the confusion between *sadeh* and *sin/shin*, note first the parallel verbs *צָחַק* and *שָׂחַק* “to laugh” and the two versions of Isaac: *יִשְׁחַק/יִצְחַק*; note also the different verbs in the parallel accounts in 2 Sam 8:3 (*לָהֵשִׁיב*) and 1 Chr 18:3 (*לָהֵצִיב*) and the presumed mistake in Hos 5:11: *צוּ* for **שוּ* (ibid., 125). For confusion of velar consonants, consider the possible error in 2 Sam 15:24: *וַיִּצְקוּ* “they poured” for **וַיִּצְגּוּ* “they set” (ibid., 125).

29. Assuming that the following mistakes reflect an identical pronunciation for the respective sets of letters would imply that the language had lost distinction between *samekh*, *sade*, *sin*, and *shin*, as well as between *gimmel*, *kaph*, and *qoph* and between *daleth*, *tet*, and *taw*. Such a simplification of the phonemic inventory seems wholly unjustified.

appointed”;³⁰ רוכנים (1QS XI, 1) for *רוגנים “(those) murmuring”;³¹ תנכה (1QSb V, 27) for *תנגח “may you gore”; אגזרי (1QIsa^a at Isa 13:9) for MT אכזרי “cruel”; יקדילו (4Q403 1 i, 31) for *גדילו “they magnify”;³² דקלי (4Q503 51–55, 8) for *דגלי “divisions of”; עמלך (4Q14 [4QExod^c] at Exod 17:8) for MT עמלק “Amalek.”³³ A confusion between dentals is presumably the cause of different readings: הנפתר (1QS VII, 10) corrected to הנפטר “the one separated”; ישפתו (4Q73 [4QEzek^a] at Ezek 23:45) for MT ישפוט;³⁴ טמוט (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 93:1) for MT תמוט “it will (not) be shaken.”³⁵ On the other hand, confusion in the spelling of words containing *šin* and *samekh* is due to the identical pronunciation of the letters (for examples and explanation, see §4.1, “Phonemic Inventory”).

Guttural consonants are prone to be confused in the DSS-SP9 texts, as illustrated in “Weakening of Gutturals” (§4.3). For perhaps similar reasons, *resh* was also frequently elided in spelling (see §4.1, “Phonemic Inventory”). Qimron notes that *resh* “is omitted far more often than any other nonguttural root consonant.”³⁶ He also observes that such misspellings typically occur next to gutturals; he counts thirty-five total instances of “spelling irregularities” related to *resh* among all the scrolls, twenty specifically among the Hebrew nonbiblical scrolls.³⁷ His examples suggest this phenomenon occurred especially with certain words in certain texts: המערכות “battle formation” (1QM V, 3; VI, 5); מערכת (1QM VI, 10); משע “from the gate of” (11Q19 XL, 15) for *משער; משער (11Q19 XLIV, 15); אבחר “I will choose” (11Q19 LII, 16).³⁸ Other examples include תקצר

30. See Maurice Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 25, who notes the complexities of the reading.

31. See Zé'ev Ben-Hayyim, “Traditions in the Hebrew Language, with Reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 202. There is no need to propose a new verb (as done in *DCH*); such a verb would be easily confused with the homophonous Aramaic root רכן “to incline,” which is clearly not a possible derivation for the word in 1QS XI, 1.

32. See Newsom, DJD 11:270 and references there.

33. For some of these examples, see Qimron, *HDSS*, 27.

34. See Judith E. Sanderson, “Ezekiel” in *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (ed. Eugene Ulrich et al.; DJD 15; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 210.

35. Note also לעת (1QIsa^a at Isa 64:8) for MT לְעַד “forever” (though LXX has ἐν καιρῷ) (see Ulrich et al., *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 457).

36. Qimron, *HDSS*, 26.

37. *Ibid.*, 26–27; idem, *Grammar*, 94–96.

38. Kutscher (*Isaiah*, 531) notes אשו (1QIsa^a at Isa 36:2) for *אשור “Assur,” and

“it will (not) be short” (4Q504 7, 6); **יואמר** “he will say” (4Q129 [4QPhyl B] at Deut 5:27); **אבעים** (11Q5 [11QPs^a] XXVII, 9) for ***ארבעים** “forty.” The examples derive from all text groups, including DSS-NSP (e.g., **וספינו** “we recounted” 1Q36 25 ii, 3 and **הסיפד** “the nettle” 1Q8 [1QIsa^b] at Isa 55:13).³⁹

In other cases, similarly shaped letters will lead to confusion: **מבוד** (1QpHab XI, 9) for ***מכבוד** “more than glory”; **באש** (1QH^a X, 28) corrected to **כאש** “like fire”;⁴⁰ **הניבד** “the one honored” (4Q403 1 i, 4); **ונכב** “and those honored” (4Q521 2 ii + 4, 11); **ויבס** “it will be washed” (11Q2 [11QLev^b] at Lev 13:58); **בקודעו** (4Q403 1 i, 31) for ***בקודשו** “in its holiness”;⁴¹ **אכס** (1QIsa^a at Isa 54:15) for MT **אָפּס** “nothing.”⁴² Especially frequent is the confusion of *daleth* and *resh*: **גדי** (1QH^a XV, 15) for ***גרי** “those attacking me”;⁴³ **ויתעבד** (4Q31 [4QDeut^d] at Deut 3:26) for MT **וַיִּתְעַבֵּר** “he was angry”; **אבידי** (4Q111 [4QLam] at Lam 1:15) for MT **אֲבִירִי** “my mighty ones.”⁴⁴ In some cases, a mistake was engendered by the graphic similarity of whole words: **ורחץ במים** “he will wash in water” (11Q19 L, 14) corrected to **ורחץ בים** “he will wash in the day of,” the former phrase appearing in the same text a few lines later (in 11Q19 LI, 5). Note also the confusion of *heh* and *heth* due to their graphic similarity, discussed below in §4.3, “Weakening of Gutturals.”

It seems that the fatigue of writing the same word over and over again has sometimes contributed to a mistake, as in **וחצוירות** “trumpets of” (1QM III, 2); **[ש]בעה בשבעה** “seven, with seven...” (Mas 1k ii, 23), and the similar mistakes of **בקד הקדשים** (4Q364 17, 3) and **בקוד קודשים** (4Q503 15–16, 5) for **ב(ק)דש(ו)ק(ו)דשים** “in the holiest sanctuary.” In other cases,

חמ (at Isa 29:16) for ***חמר** “clay,” as well as **וחרבו** “they will be dry” (at Isa 19:6); **תלשישה** corrected to **תרשישה** “toward Tarshish” (at Isa 23:6); **ויואמר** “he said” (at Isa 39:8 and 63:8); and **מעוצר** “from oppression” (at Isa 53:8).

39. For more examples, see Qimron, *Grammar*, 94–95.

40. See Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:139.

41. See Newsom, DJD 11:270 and references.

42. Similar confusions appear in the MT, see Delitzsch, *Lese- und Schreibfehler*, 103–123. Note especially the confusion of *beth* and *kaph* in **ויבנו** (2 Kgs 3:24), the *qere* reflecting ***ויבנו** which occurs earlier in the verse (ibid., 110); confusion of *ayin* and *shin* in **וידע** (Judg 8:16) for a presumed ***וידש** (ibid., 119).

43. See Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:203.

44. For parallels in the MT, see Delitzsch, *Lese- und Schreibfehler*, 105–107. Note especially **וידא** (Ps 18:11) versus **וידא** (2 Sam 22:11) (ibid., 105); and the confusion of names: **ריפת** in Gen 10:3 and **דיפת** in 1Chr 1:6 (ibid., 107).

the scribe seems simply to have been confused by the multiple meanings of words and/or by the multiple words with the same general meaning, as in *למכאובנו* “for our pain” (4Q179 1 i, 14) corrected to *למכתינו* “for our blows”; *כאב* “like a father” (4Q416 2 iii, 16) for *כאל** “like a God”;⁴⁵ *שועתם* “their cry” (4Q434 1 i, 3) corrected to *זעקתם* “their cry”;⁴⁶ *ישראל-* “Isra-” (4Q462 1, 19) corrected to *ירושלם* “Jerusalem”; *אברהרם* (4Q464 3 i, 6, for *אברם*) corrected to *אברהם* “Abraham”; *תורישון* “you will dispossess” (4Q140 [4QPhyl M] at Deut 5:33) for MT *תירשון* “you will possess.”

Another kind of mistake is the incorrect division of words. For example, in 4Q259 III, 17–18 one finds *וואם תיתם דרך סוד / היחד לה [לך]*.⁴⁷ The text should perhaps be read, however, ... *ואמת יתם* “of truth and [he will] give them” (*DSSSE*) or ... *ואמת ותם* “truth, and the perfection” (Qimron and Charlesworth).⁴⁸ In either case, the reading above seems to imply that the scribe thought the text should be a circumstantial clause, “if the behavior of the council of the community is perfect, going...,” an understanding engendered by similar phrases like *אם תתם דרכו* “if his behavior is perfect” (in 1QS VIII, 25).⁴⁹

Sometimes these mistakes were combined, as in the simultaneous confusion of *daleth* and *resh* in *מוסדרות [ימו]* (11Q7 [11QPs^c] at Ps 2:3) for MT *מוסרותימו* “their bonds,” the spelling in 11Q7 reflecting a confusion of the words *מוסדה* “foundation” and *מוסר* “bond.” In still other cases, it is hard to understand the mistake: *כנחה* (11Q1 [11QpaleoLev^a] at Lev 26:19) for MT *כנחשה* “like copper”; *אלמושה* (4Q27 [4QNum^b] at Num 19:1) for MT *אל-מששה* “to Moses”; *ויכה* “he struck” (1Q7 [1QSam] at 2 Sam 23:12). These cases suggest that the loss of a letter is not always triggered by clearly discernible phonetic or visual causes.

45. See Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:120.

46. See Emanuel Tov, “Correction Procedures in the Texts from the Judean Desert,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 257.

47. This follows the reading in Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:145. Elisha Qimron and James H. Charlesworth read *תותם* (“Cave IV Fragments,” in *Dead Sea Scrolls ... Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, 88).

48. The correct reading is based on a partially parallel text in 1QS IX, 18–19 and 4Q258 VIII, 3, where both have *ואמת בתוך אנשי היחד*.

49. The *plene* writing of the verb is unusual, but has a precedent in *איתם* (Ps 19:14). See Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:149.

The frequency with which the gutturals and *resh* are elided has already been noted. Note also the frequency with which *daleth* and *lamedh* seem to disappear (before being inserted above the line). Most examples derive from DSS-SP9 texts, though not all (for example, 4Q74 is DSS-NSP).

Daleth is dropped (at least initially) in מוסיי “foundations of” (4Q286 1 ii, 3); למקיש “to the sanctuary” (4Q394 [4QMMT] 3–7 i, 8); ציק “righteousness” (4Q403 1 i, 27); עית “the congregation of” (4Q403 1 ii, 24); אבדינים “Abaddons” (4Q491 8–10 i, 15); קישא[י]ם “holy ones” (4Q509 7, 6); ליהויה “for Judah” (4Q51 [4QSam^a] at 2 Sam 6:2); מדבר “desert” (1QIsa^a at Isa 63:13); עמיו “they stood” (4Q74 [4QEzek^b] at Ezek 1:21); ויאב (4Q77 [4QXII^b] at Zeph 2:13 for MT ויאבד “then he will destroy); ועבדיה “your slave” (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 119:140). Presumably, *daleth*’s graphic similarity to other letters like *beth*, *kaph*, and *resh* is partially attributable for its elision.

Lamedh is dropped initially and then written above the line in וינחילם “he caused them to inherit” (1QS XI, 7); ולא “and not” (4Q381 69, 8); נפלאותיו “his wonders” (4Q403 1 i, 19); לאלפים “to thousands” (4Q491 1–3, 10); שאול “Sheol” (4Q491 8–10 ii, 17); הפלה “to do a wonder” (4Q491c 11 i, 8); וכולעצביכם “all your laborers” (1QIsa^a at Isa 58:3); קול “voice” (4Q56 [4QIsa^b] at Isa 13:4); מעליו “his works” (4Q70 [4QJer^a] at Jer 17:10); יכילנו “(who) will sustain it?” (4Q78 [4QXII^c] at Joel 2:11) for MT יכילנו; קול “voice” (4Q135 [4QPhyl H] at Deut 5:28).⁵⁰ The letter is dropped entirely in חקקא (1QS X, 1) for חקק אל* “God inscribed.”

Nun is also sometimes elided: שים (4Q216 VII, 15) for שנים* “two”; ולימוגי “and to those melting at” (4Q491 8–10 i, 4); ליגוע “to touch” (4Q53 [4QSam^c] at 2 Sam 14:10); פניך “your face” (4Q70 [4QJer^a] at Jer 17:16); אנח[י] “we” (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 124:7).

There is sometimes confusion in the spelling of III-*waw/yodh* roots such that they are spelled with a final *aleph mater* instead of a *heh mater* (for example, התורא in 1QSa I, 11 for התורה* “the law”; בזא 4Q434 1 i, 2 for בזה* “he despised”); sometimes the reverse also happens (וירה 4Q381 50, 4 for וירא* “he feared”). Some texts show a concentration of this kind of error (for example, 4Q381 shows eight examples of *aleph* written for

50. I have not included instances where the erasure or secondary inclusion of *lamedh* is due to confusion over the *lamedh* preposition, as seems to be the case in some passages like למועד[ד] (1QH^a XVII, 23); בצלהם (4Q380 2, 4); לשבט corrected to שבט (4Q491 1–3, 8); ולמאיות (4Q491 1–3, 10); לכחצ (1QIsa^a at Isa 49:2); לעולם (1QIsa^a at Isa 51:6); and לקדוש (1QIsa^a at Isa 55:5).

heh, as in **מא** for ***מה**).⁵¹ A similar confusion is more common in Aramaic and is due to the merging of III-*waw/yodh* roots with III-*aleph* roots.⁵² The same merger does not appear to happen regularly in the Hebrew of the DSS, where (to judge from the orthography) the two root types are almost always distinguished (for more on this, see the subsection “Lack of Confusion between III-*Waw/Yodh* and III-*Aleph* Verbs” in §5.6, “Verbs”).

It should also be pointed out that, as Tov comments, sometimes errors were only partially corrected, even when they were recognized.⁵³ He cites, as an example, **איש ל לפי** “each person according to” (4Q266 5 i, 13), where the first *lamedh* is not erased or marked by any cancellation marks. Other examples include **אכשיל** (1QH^a XVIII, 8) for **אשכיל** “I will consider” (quoted above), where the *kaph* is marked with cancellation marks, but another *kaph* is not written between the *shin* and *yodh*; **ורחץ במים** “he will wash in water” (11Q19 L, 14) corrected to **ורחץ בים** “he will wash in the day of” (quoted above), where the scribe has not included a *waw mater* in the word “day” though the overwhelming consistency in the spelling of this word in the nonbiblical scrolls (**יום**) would seem to have demanded it;⁵⁴ **עשו** “they made” (1QIsa^a at Isa 40:24) for MT **נָשַׁף** “he blows,” corrected to **נעשף**, where the final *waw* was reshaped into a final *peh*, an interlinear *nun* was added, but the *‘ayin* was not erased or marked with cancellation marks.⁵⁵ Another case is **עליו** (4Q53 [4QSam^c] at 2 Sam 15:3) corrected to **אליו** by attempting to reshape the *‘ayin* into an *aleph*; this resulted in a messily written letter, so the scribe wrote a second, interlinear *aleph* to indicate the intended letter, but did not erase the initial *‘ayin/aleph* or mark it with cancellation marks.⁵⁶ Such examples suggest that other spellings may reflect recognized but uncorrected errors. Thus, it is conceivable that **ישור** “uprightness of” (1QH^a XIV, 13) reflects the correction of **ישור** to **יושר**, though the scribe did not place cancellation marks around the second *waw* nor did he erase it. Similarly, **יעיבורנה** “he will not cross it”

51. See Eileen Schuller, “Non-Canonical Psalms,” DJD 11:90.

52. See Muraoka, *GQA*, 23–24.

53. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 221.

54. Out of the hundreds of attestations, the word is spelled defectively in only three other instances in the nonbiblical scrolls, according to my search of Accordance.

55. See Ulrich et al., *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 408; Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 507. For other examples, see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 28–29.

56. See Frank Moore Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel* (DJD 17; Oxford: Clarendon, 2005), 261.

(1QIsa^a at Isa 35:8) may reflect the correction of יעבורנה to יעיברנה. In such cases, the spelling of similar forms should be taken into account. For example, given the spelling of other **qu!l* nouns with two *waw* *maters* in similar positions, it seems less likely that ישור represents an uncorrected mistake (see §5.5, “**qu!l* Nouns”). On the other hand, since no other *qal* imperfect verbs carry two *waw* *maters* before and after the second root consonant, it is likeliest that יעיבורנה does represent a correction for an intended spelling of יעיברנה (see §5.7, “*Qal* Imperfect + Suffix”).

It is also important to note that, even when spelling was corrected through interlinear additions, the correct letter was sometimes added just to the left or right of the space where it should go. This was sometimes due to the spacing of the other letters and sometimes, presumably, due to the cramped writing space. In the majority of cases, therefore, one should not assume that these reflect peculiar pronunciations. For example ההיגי “the meditation” (4Q267 9 v, 12) for ההגויי;⁵⁷ המל איחז “the king Ahaz (1QIsa^a at Isa 14:28) for MT אֶחָזְ אֶחָזְ יָמִי (1QIsa^a at Isa 38:10) for an intended יָמִי (akin to בִּימִי “in days of” in 1QIsa^a at Isa 1:1 and יומי “days of” in 1QS II, 19 and III, 5) for MT יָמִי “my days”;⁵⁸ תשיא “do (not) bear” (4Q70 [4QJer^a] at Jer 17:21) for MT תשאו.⁵⁹

Finally, we should note here that sometimes what is a word-initial/medial letter appears in final position and what is a word-final letter appears at the beginning or in the middle of the word. Tov attributes some of these mistakes to the development of final forms of letters and the gradual adoption of these forms by scribes.⁶⁰ Note, for example, המלכ “the king” (4Q448 II, 2); עמב “your people” (II, 3); ממלכתב “your kingdom” (II, 8). In other cases, initial/medial-letters are found frequently at the end of short words like גמ “also” and אם “if”; word-final letters are often found as the penultimate letter of a word, suggesting that in these

57. This assumes that the interlinear *waw* is not intended to replace the *yodh* (see Joseph M. Baumgarten, “Damascus Document,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Volume 3: Damascus Document II, Some Works of the Torah, and Related Documents* [ed. James H. Charlesworth; Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006], 100). Note the spelling הגוי in 4Q417 1 i, 17 (see Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:165 on the occurrence of the same spelling in 4Q417 1 i, 16).

58. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 531. The spelling of “days” sometimes occurs with a *waw* in 1QIsa^a and 1QS, as it does in Aramaic.

59. See Emanuel Tov, “Jeremiah,” in DJD 15:165.

60. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 230.

cases, as Tov puts it, “the scribe must have thought that he had finished the word.”⁶¹ Some texts show the final form of the letter in all positions, like the final form of *mem* in at least eight separate words in 4Q68 (4QIsa^o). For example, משרש “from the root of” (at Isa 14:29); נמוג “melt” (at Isa 14:31); ומה “what” (at Isa 14:32). The same phenomenon is attested twice in 4Q116 (4QDan^e) (for example, השמים [ם] “the heavens” at Dan 9:12).

3.2. *PLENE* ORTHOGRAPHY

The orthography of the scrolls varies from text to text, version to version. In some ways it follows a model more-or-less similar to that of the MT and in other ways it seems to follow a model like that found in Mishnaic Hebrew and later forms of Rabbinic Hebrew, with a tendency for *plene* or full spellings. Despite such tendencies, it bears mentioning that, just as in the MT, there is never consistency in spelling. As Qimron illustrates, in 1QH^a כול “all” appears at least 208 times and כל at least thirteen times.⁶² Further, certain forms are attested in different distributions in different texts. For instance, the spelling of the 2ms perfect with a final *heh* marker (קטלתה) is found almost uniformly in most texts of the DSS-SP9 category (for example, 1QS and 1QH^a), as indicated in the ninth appendix to Tov’s *Scribal Practices*.⁶³ All the same, some texts, like 1QIsa^a, show a greater tendency to oscillate, from verse to verse, between the defective and *plene* spellings (קטלתה/קטלת). Texts of the DSS-NSP category (for example, 4Q381), on the other hand, often do not attest the *plene* spelling of the 2ms perfect verb, though rarely they do. Sometimes there is a clear distinction within a single scroll; in 1QH^a, the first eight columns are dominated

61. *Ibid.*, 232.

62. Qimron, *HDSS*, 18. The analysis of the same word through Accordance produces similar, but slightly different numbers; for example, there are twelve examples of the spelling כל according to Accordance, not thirteen. See also Qimron’s lists of defectively spelled words according to their etymologies (*Grammar*, 39–52 for *waw* and 55–56, 60–61 for *yodh*).

63. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 339–343. All the same, note that the exceptions are more widespread than Tov’s lists would lead one to believe. For example, although Tov’s list labels as “all” the number of occurrences of the 2ms perfect verb in 1QH^a spelled with final תה-, there are actually two forms of the 2ms perfect that are defective, יצרת “you formed” 1QH^a IX, 17 and סתרת “you hid” 1QH^a XIII, 28 (Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:125). Tov comments that the label “all” indicates simply five or more occurrences of a given feature (Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 337).

by defective spelling of the 2ms suffixed pronoun (ך-), while the following columns are dominated by the *plene* form (כה-); despite this, the 2ms perfect verbs are still spelled *plene* throughout 1QH^a. For certain forms, defective orthography is not uncommon and is encountered with approximately equal frequency in the biblical and nonbiblical texts among the DSS-SP9 and DSS-NSP texts. For example, defective spelling is routinely encountered (at least fifty times) in the 3ms pronominal suffix on plural nouns (for example, אבותו “his fathers” 4Q365 26a–b, 8) and prepositions (for example, עלו 1QpHab VIII, 7).⁶⁴ However, defective spelling for other pronominal suffixes on plural nouns and prepositions is not found nearly as often (for example, for the 2ms suffix, perhaps as many as three times in the nonbiblical texts, all in 4QInstruction, and as many as six times in the biblical scrolls, where the defective orthography often matches the orthography in the MT).⁶⁵

Note also the following peculiar distributions of defective spelling. The 3mp imperfect plus suffix is spelled defectively (without a *waw* to mark the masculine plural /ū/) six times in 1QS (where there are no *plene* forms, for example, יכתובו “they will write him” 1QS VI, 22) but very rarely outside this text among the nonbiblical scrolls.⁶⁶ Word-internal /ē/

64. See “Diphthongs and Triphthongs” (§4.10).

65. See נעוותיכה “your perversities (4Q417 2 i, 13); חטאותיכה “your sins” (4Q417 2 i, 15), where the last three letters are heavily damaged; גבורותיכה “your great deeds” (4Q418a 14, 1), which mirrors the spelling of this word in the plural with suffix in Deut 3:24 and Isa 63:15. The examples from biblical scrolls are וכןגבורתיכה (4Q27 [4QNum^b] at Num 20:13 in an addition, found in the Samaritan version spelled *plene* עבדך “your servant” (4Q53 [4QSam^c] at 2 Sam 14:31) for MT עבדך; וגבורתיכה (1QIsa^a at Isa 63:15) for MT וגבורתיך; [מ]צותך (1Q10 [1QPs^a] at Ps 119:32) for MT מצותיך; בדרכך (4Q89 [4QPs^g] at Ps 119:37) for MT בדרכיך; למשפטך 4Q89 [4QPs^g] at Ps 119:43) for MT למשפטך. There are perhaps only five cases of the 2mp suffix on plural nouns and prepositions being spelled defectively: נפשתיכמה “your-selves” (11Q5 [11QPs^a] XVIII, 1) מקנכם “your possessions” (4Q31 [4QDeut^d] at Deut 3:19) for MT מקנכם; לאבותיכמה (4Q138 [4QPhyl K] at Deut 11:9) for MT לאבותיכם; idem (4Q130 [4QPhyl C] at Deut 11:21) for MT לאבותיכם; אלוהיכמה (1QIsa^a at Isa 40:9) for MT אלוהיכם.

66. See Qimron, *HDSS*, 18 n. 4 and the literature there. More predictably, in the biblical scrolls, the defective writing often parallels the defective writing in the MT, almost exclusively among the DSS-NSP texts (e.g., ירגמרו “they will stone him” 4Q26a [4QLev^e] at Lev 20:2 for MT ירגמוהו; [י]שתהו “they will drink it” 1Q8 [1QIsa^b] at Isa 62:9 for MT ישתהו), while DSS-SP9 texts exhibit *plene* forms (e.g., ישתהו 1QIsa^a at Isa 62:9).

vowels are sometimes not represented in the orthography, though they are in the MT: *tētib* תטיב “you will do good” (4Q525 10, 6) and יטיב “he will do good” (4Q525 10, 6) for what would be in the MT תיטיב and ייטיב.⁶⁷ The defective spelling of *qal* passive participles appears rarely among non-biblical scrolls (primarily in DSS-NSP texts, for example, בהרים “those chosen” 4Q381 46a + b, 5), while in the biblical scrolls they are found more commonly (again primarily among DSS-NSP texts), both where this parallels the MT spelling (פקדיהם “those accounted for” 4Q23 [4QLev-Num^a] at Num 4:40 for MT פקדיהם), but also where the MT spelling is *plene* (שדופת “scorched by” 4Q5 [4QGen^e] at Gen 41:6 for MT שדופת; רצעים “warriors” 4Q31 [4QDeut^d] at Deut 3:18 for MT רצעים; חלוצים “those oppressed” 1Q8 [1QIsa^b] at Isa 58:6 for MT רצוצים). This kind of minor disparity between the orthography of the biblical scrolls and that of the MT is seen in a number of ways among the DSS-NSP texts. For example, the text 4Q107 (4QCant^b) attests defective spelling where the MT has *plene* forms (קול “voice,” מר “myrrh” הראני “show me” versus קול, מור, והראני) and *plene* forms where the MT has defective spelling (הרועה “the one shepherding,” סב “turn,” שפתותיך “your lips” versus הרעה, סב, שפתותיך); in many other cases it parallels the spelling of the MT.⁶⁸ Peculiarly, sometimes the biblical scrolls attest a defective spelling that occurs only once in the MT. For example, in the MT, the spelling of the 3/2fp imperfect and *waw*-consecutive imperfect of היה is usually written with two *yodhs* (והיהינה or והיהיין), but it is once written with a single *yodh*: והינה (Jer 18:21); by contrast, in the biblical scrolls, the form with just one *yodh* appears three times, both in a DSS-NSP text (4Q70 [4QJer^a] at Jer 18:21) and in a DSS-SP9 text (1QIsa^a at Isa 16:2 and 17:2), while the form with two *yodhs* appears just twice (1Q8 [1QIsa^b] at Isa 16:2 and 4Q22 [4QpaleoExod^m] at Exod 25:27).⁶⁹

Despite the peculiarities just mentioned, the increased use of *maters* in the DSS is part of a tendency evidenced throughout the first millennium; initially consonant letters are used to indicate vowels at the ends of words, then they are used for the same purpose within words. The development is

67. Note that the majority of the spellings of this word in the DSS use a *plene* orthography, parallel to the one found in the MT (i.e., ייטיב). Cf. יליל *yēlil* “he will wail” (1QIsa^a at Isa 15:2) for MT יליל and ילילו (4Q82 [4QXII^g] at Hos 7:14) for MT ילילו, where the sequence *yayē-* has collapsed to *yē-*.

68. See the list of disparities between this text and the MT in Tov, DJD 16:208.

69. See Tov, DJD 15:150.

also attested in the Bible itself, in the spelling of words like David, spelled without a *yodh mater* in the earlier texts (דָּוִד) and often (but not always) with a *yodh mater* in later writings (דְּוִיד). The spelling of words among the DSS witnesses to the general continuation of this trend.⁷⁰

One nuance to the use of *maters* in the MT is that frequently when one might expect to see two *maters* in a single word, as in the plural form of “voice” קוֹל, one often finds only one *mater* or none at all: *קולות (never), קלות (six times), קולת (once), and קלת (five times).⁷¹ In the DSS, by contrast, one often finds two *maters*: קולות (four times in the nonbiblical scrolls and once in the biblical scrolls), קלות (four times in the biblical scrolls), קולת (never), and קלת (never). Compare also the regular defective writing of “generations” in the MT (דָּרוֹת and with suffixes often -דָּרַת), but the consistent *plene* spelling in the nonbiblical DSS (דורות [with and without suffixes], at least thirty-five times in nonbiblical texts and five times in biblical texts). Where a *waw* appears as a consonant before an /o/ vowel or when a *yodh* appears before an /i/ vowel, *plene* spelling is found in the DSS more often than in the MT. However, the most frequent spelling in the DSS is still that of the MT (that is, a defective spelling). For example, looking at the form of the words without suffixes, in the MT גוֹיִם “peoples” appears hundreds of times and גוֹיִים only twice; in the nonbiblical DSS, גוים occurs at least sixty times and גויים thirteen times; similarly, מְצוּת “commandments” occurs around thirty times in the MT and מְצוֹת only once, while in the nonbiblical scrolls מצות occurs around nine times and מצוות twice. It also bears mentioning that the *plene* spellings of these or similar nouns are attested in all text groups (DSS-SP9, DSS-SP1c, DSS-NSP).

In the DSS, final *maters* presumably represent the same types of vowels that they represent in the MT. That is, the *heh* is used to mark /ā/, /ē/, /e/, what would be in the MT *qamets-gadol*, *sere*, *seghol* (= /ā/ [IPA ɔ], /ē/, /e/ [IPA ε]).⁷² The use of word-final *aleph* in the DSS to mark the vowels /ā/,

70. Of course, the use of *maters* does not develop in a straight line. Alexander and Vermes note in their introduction to the *Serekh* texts from Cave 4 that “Predominantly full spelling seems to be found throughout the S tradition, but predominantly defective spelling occurs only in later manuscripts” (DJD 26:8).

71. See GKC §8k–l.

72. The possibility of word-final *heh* representing /ō/ in the DSS depends on how one understands the *heh* suffix representing the 3ms pronoun (see §5.2, “Pronouns and Particles”).

/ē/, /e/ is rare.⁷³ Similarly, word-final *waw* typically represents /o/ and /u/ class vowels; word-final *yodh* represents /ī/ and /ē/ vowels. Word-internal *maters* also represent the same kinds of vowels as they do in the MT.

In general, the DSS witness to a greater use of the *heh maters* to represent /ā/ and *waw maters* to represent /o/ and /u/ class vowels. The use of *heh* is primarily found at the ends of words (for example, on the 2ms perfect קטלתה and 2ms possessive suffix כה-) while the *waw* is found word-internally and in word-final position. The way that the *waw* is used to represent all manner of /o/ or /u/ vowel (what would be, if found in the MT, *hatef-qamets*, *qamets-hatuf*, *holem*, *holem-waw*, *qibbutz*, *shuruq*) is certainly one of the obvious ways that the orthography of the scrolls differs from that of the MT; for more on this, see §3.4 below, “Etymological Short /u/ Marked with *Waw*.” In addition, word internal /a/ and /ā/ vowels are sometimes indicated with *aleph*, as explained below in §3.3, “*Aleph* as Internal *Mater*.” Instances of /e/ or /ē/ represented by word-internal *aleph* are rare.

Occasionally two different *maters* are used to mark a single word-final vowel; these examples are illustrated in “Digraphs” (§3.5). The doubling of *waw* and *yodh* to mark word-internal vowels are best construed as errors (see §3.1, “Scribal Mistakes,” for some examples), while the same doubling at the end of a word is usually indicative of a phonetic shift (see §§4.4–5, “*Aleph* < *Yodh* and *Yodh* < *Aleph*” and “*Aleph* < *Waw* and *Waw* < *Aleph*”).

Yodh as marking short /i/ is uncommon but seems to be found, for example, with תישאום “you [mp] will lift them” (1QIsa^a at Isa 15:7) for MT ישאום “they will...”; היגד “he declared” (1QIsa^a at Isa 21:2) for MT הגד “it was declared”; יזל “let it flow” (1QIsa^a at Isa 45:8) for MT יזלו “let them...”;⁷⁴ פיתאום “suddenly” (1QH^a XVI, 19);⁷⁵ היראתי “I showed” (4Q158 4, 6) for

73. See Qimron, *HDSS*, 23 and Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 327–328. Note that the relative pronoun *sh* is spelled *sh* in 4QMMT (4Q394 3–7 i, 5, 29; 3–7 ii, 14; 4Q396 1–2 i, 3).

74. For a summary of examples, see Qimron, *Grammar*, 53–54. Kutscher reads the last example as יזל (*Isaiah*, 400). Alternatively, the reading יזלו might be interpreted as an example of a consonantal *yodh* written twice (see §3.6, “Two *Yodhs* for a Consonantal *Yodh* and Two *Waws* for a Consonantal *Waw*”).

75. Stegemann and Schuller (DJD 40:221) note that the reading, פותאים, proposed by Carmignac (“Compléments au texte des hymes de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 2 [1959–1960]: 552) and preferred by Qimron (“The Distinction between *Waw* and *Yod* in the Qumran Scrolls” [in Hebrew], *Beth Mikra* 52 [1972], 110–11) does not fit the context.

what would be in the MT **וּכְבַּשׁוּהָ**;⁷⁶ **הִרְאִיתִי** (4Q483 1) for what would be in the MT **וְכִבְּשׁוּהָ**, though the scroll is extremely fragmentary and the *yodh* damaged.⁷⁷ Many of the other possible examples are debated: **לְנִכְנָעִים** (1QS X, 26; for what would be in the MT **לְנִכְנָעִים** “to those humbled”) is also read **לְנוֹכְנָעִים** as a *nuphal* stem (see the subsection “Conjugations” in §5.6, “Verbs”); similarly **וְנִקְפוּ** “they were struck down” (4Q161 8–10, 6; in a quotation of Isa 10:34, which has in the MT **וְנִקְרָה**) is also read **וְנוֹקְפוּ**, as a *nuphal*. Other possible examples are listed and discussed by Qimron.⁷⁸ The practice of marking a short /i/ with a *yodh mater* is far more common in the Aramaic scrolls.⁷⁹

Yodh as a marker for /i/ is used in a way analogous to how it appears in the MT.⁸⁰ Unfortunately, as in the MT, its application is inconsistent and in some cases this creates difficulty in determining the parsing of a given word. A good example of this is seen in the *hiphil* infinitives. Although the infinitive construct is usually marked in the DSS with a *yodh mater*, it is not in several instances.⁸¹ This makes the words look like infinitives

Another possible example of the same spelling, **פִּיתָאוּם**, occurs at 4Q178 5, 2, though the text is very fragmentary.

76. Although Accordance reads here **הִרְאִיתִי**, the photograph in the *DSSSEL* shows a clear *yodh* after the *heh* (the photograph in the DJD edition contains a shadow due to a fold in the leather).

77. See Baillet, DJD 7:2 and Elisha Qimron, “Waw and Yod,” 104. The text is so fragmentary that its identity is ambiguous, as reflected in its descriptive title: “4Qpap-Gen or papJub?” The reading **כּוֹבְשֵׁי** [ם], as Baillet comments, is also possible. The reading **וּכְבַּשׁוּהָ** could reflect the *piel* (as Accordance parses); another possibility is to read **וְכִבְּשׁוּהָ** (similar to the *qal* imperative plus suffix presupposed in the reconstruction **וְדוֹרְשׁוּהָ** in 1QSa II, 10).

78. See his *Grammar*, 53–54 and the various discussions in Qimron, “Waw and Yod.” Certainly, it seems preferable in some cases to follow Qimron’s readings (e.g., **גּוֹזְעוּ** 1QH^a XVI, 9 instead of **גִּזְעוּ** as in Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:216). In other cases, it is hard to decide. The word **מַחִיתָה** in 4Q438 4 ii, 5 is read as **מַחֹתָה** “terror” by Qimron (see *HDSS*, 66 and “Waw and Yod,” 111–112), **מַחִיתָה** “terror” by M. Weinfeld and D. Seely, “Barkhi Nafshi,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (ed. E. Chazon et al.; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 330, and **מַחִיתָה** “you have wiped out” by *DSSSE*. See also the discussion of forms like **כּוֹבוּד** or **כִּיבוּד** in “**quṭl* Nouns” (§5.5).

79. See Muraoka, *GQA*, 26.

80. See Qimron, *HDSS*, 19.

81. Among just the nonbiblical scrolls (as parsed by Accordance): **לְהַבְרֵךְ** (1QS VI, 5 and 6); **לְהַשְׁבֵּ** (1QS VIII, 6); **לְהַקֵּם** (1QS VIII, 10); **לוֹסֵף** (1Q14 8–10, 7); **לְהַמְטֵר** (1Q22 1 ii, 10); **לְהוֹבֵחַ** (4Q302 3 ii, 7); **לְהַשְׁבֵּ** (4Q368 10 ii, 5). These are from both

absolute. Abegg notes that the defective forms of the *hiphil* infinitive occur primarily after the negative particle **אין** and after the *lamedh* preposition.⁸² In the MT, by contrast, defective spellings of the *hiphil* infinitive construct are most often (though not exclusively) when the infinitive has a suffix.⁸³ A similar tendency affects the orthography of Ben Sira manuscripts from Masada and the Genizah; in the case of these manuscripts, other parts of the *hiphil* paradigm are also written defectively (participle, perfect, imperfect).⁸⁴ One may also note the rarity of the *yodh mater* in *hiphil* forms in epigraphic Hebrew.⁸⁵

The use of *yodh* in association with /ē/ (either as a historical spelling or as a *mater*) is also somewhat inconsistent and diverges from the model found in the MT. Qimron stresses that we sometimes find no *yodh* where we might expect one from the MT, and find a *yodh* where we would not expect one in the MT.⁸⁶ Thus, the *qal* 3mp imperfect of **ישב** is spelled **יִשְׁבוּ** “they will dwell” (4Q158 14 i, 8; compare MT **יִשְׁבוּ**); the imperative **שיבנא** (4Q382 9, 6, reflecting 2 Kgs 2:4 **שִׁבְנָא**);⁸⁷ the *niphal* 1cs imperfect of **חלל** is **איחל** “(why) should I be profaned” (1QIsa^a and 4Q57 [4QIsa^c] at Isa

DSS-SP9 and DSS-NSP text categories. Qimron sees these as infinitives construct (HDSS, 47).

82. Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 341. See the subsection “Infinitives” in §5.6, “Verbs.”

83. E.g., **הִקְרַב** (Num 9:7); **הִשְׁמְרָךְ** (Deut 7:24); **הוֹדַעְךָ** (Deut 8:3). James Barr considers the defective spellings of the *hiphil* in the MT as reflective of an earlier short vowel (*The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy*, 1986 [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989] 84–85).

84. See Wido Th. van Peursen, *The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira* (SSL 41; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 44–46. He considers the possible cases of the infinitive construct written defectively to be examples of the infinitive absolute, used in a manner akin to the infinitive construct.

85. See S. L. Gogel, *A Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew* (SBLRBS 23; Atlanta: Scholars, 1998), 138–149. Other examples of defective writing for /i/ from the DSS are found in some attestations of historical I-*yodh* roots in the *qal* imperfect, as in **אִירְאוּ** *wəyir’ū* “and they will fear” (11Q19 LVI, 11; 1QIsa^a at Isa 41:5; and passim); **יִטַּב** *yīṭab* “it will be good” (4Q137 [4QPhyl J] at Deut 5:16 for MT **יִטַּב** and passim in the phylactery texts); see the subsection “Explanation of DSS Forms” in §4.4, “*Aleph* < *Yodh* and *Yodh* < *Aleph*.”

86. Qimron writes “The use of *yod* as a vowel letter to represent the sound *e* shows considerable inconsistency, and a tendency to deviate from the largely etymological spelling found in the Bible” (HDSS, 19–20).

87. See Olyan, DJD 13:369.

48:11) for MT יָחַל “(why) should it be profaned”; the *piel* is written תְּשׁוּיַע *təšawwē* “you will cry out” (1Q8 [1QIsa^b] at Isa 58:9) for MT תְּשׁוּעַ;⁸⁸ the *hiphil* 2ms perfect + 1cp suffix [וְהוֹצִיאָתֶנּוּ] (4Q364 26c–d, 2 at Deut 9:28) for MT הוֹצִיאָתֶנּוּ.⁸⁹ These examples do not represent the typical spellings of these forms; that is, there are no other examples of I-*yodh* verbs like יִשַׁב that take a *yodh mater* in the imperfect prefix. We should also remember that the MT contains numerous examples of defective writings and even inconsistent uses of the *yodh mater*, as in תִּישָׁבְנָה “they will dwell” (Ezek 35:9, *kethib*) and אֵיתֵם “I will be complete” (Ps 19:14). The *yodh* in the DSS can also mark word-internal /ē/ in nouns and adjectives, as in וְשֵׁשׁ “and linen” (4Q365 12a i, 4 at Exod 36:35 for MT וְשֵׁשׁ); רֵיעִיכָה “your friend” (11Q19 LIV, 20 for what is more commonly רֵיעִיכָה; compare רֵיעִיכֶם in Job 6:27); בִּיבִישָׁה “in dry ground” (1QH^a IV, 16).

Another idiosyncrasy of DSS orthography is the use of *yodh* to mark /ē/ at the end of singular III-*waw/yodh* words that are in construct: מַעֲנֵי לְשׁוֹן “answer of tongue” (4Q171 3–10 iv, 27) for what would be in the MT and elsewhere in the DSS מַעֲנֵה *לְשׁוֹן (for example, 1QH^a X, 9 and passim). This happens repeatedly in some scrolls, even those that are DSS-NSP, עֲטִי “one wrapping oneself” (4Q86 [4QPs^d] at Ps 104:2) for MT עֲטָה and עֲשִׂי “one making” (4Q86 [4QPs^d] and 4Q93 [4QPs^l] at Ps 104:4) for MT עֲשָׂה.⁹⁰ More rarely a similar thing occurs at the end of III-*aleph* words: וְחֹטִי נִפְשָׁכָה “incurring the penalty of your life” (1QpHab X, 2) quoting Hab 2:10: וְחֹטֵא נִפְשָׁךְ.⁹¹ In 1QIsa^a, *aleph* is sometimes replaced by a *yodh* that seems to function as a *mater* for what would be a *sere* in the MT (for example, וְטָמְאָתֶם “you defiled” at Isa 30:22 for MT וְטָמְאָתֶם); this does not represent a loss of distinction between III-*aleph* and III-*waw*/

88. The pronunciation *təšawwē* reflects what would be in the MT a pausal form: תְּשׁוּעַ (see Job 24:12). Alternatively, תְּשׁוּיַע could be read תְּשׁוּעַ, where two consecutive consonantal *waws* are represented with two separate *waws*; see §3.6, “Two *Yodhs* for a Consonantal *Yodh* and Two *Waws* for a Consonantal *Waw*.”

89. Also, note the form מְשָׂרִיתָכָה (1QH^a XIII, 23) that is corrected to מְשָׂרִיתָכָה “those serving you,” the initial form reflecting the metathesis of the *mater* or the scribe’s *plene* writing of the *piel* participle without suffix (*מְשָׂרִיתָ **məšārēt*).

90. It is rare to see what would be a *seghol* in the MT marked with a word-internal *yodh mater*: וְהִצִּיאוּ [וְ] “they went forth” (4Q365 6b, 6 at Exod 15:20) for MT וְהִצִּיאוּ.

91. Qimron, *Grammar*, 61–63. In the case of this example, the participle is not necessarily in construct with the following noun.

yodh roots, as in Aramaic, but rather the *plene* marking of /ē/ and the quiescence of the glottal stop.⁹²

Note also that in some cases the inconsistent use of the *yodh mater* is due to confusion over the spelling and/or etymology of the word. For example, Qimron lists the inconsistent spellings of “rams” and “divine beings.”⁹³ In the DSS, the plural “rams” (אֵילִים = MT אֵילִים) is sometimes spelled like the plural “angels” or “divine beings” (אֱלִים = MT אֱלִים) and vice versa.⁹⁴ Perhaps, due to the metaphorical meaning of “ram” as “ruler,” speakers became confused as to whether or not “ram” and “divine being” were etymologically related and, therefore, should be spelled the same.⁹⁵

3.3. ALEPH AS INTERNAL MATER

In the minds of those writing, copying, or reading the scrolls, it might have appeared that *aleph* could function as a *mater* for /ā/ and perhaps also for /ō/ word-internally. As explained below in “*Aleph < Waw* and *Waw < Aleph*” (§4.5), verbal forms like באוּ “they came” (4Q398 [4QMMT] 11–13, 2 and 3), for what would be in the MT בָּאוּ, presume the pronunciation *bāwū*, where the *aleph* assimilates to the following /u/ vowel and becomes /w/. It is difficult to know if the *aleph* in the spelling באוּ and similar words was construed as a historical spelling, as an indication of the preceding vowel, or both.⁹⁶ In other cases, where the *aleph* is clearly not etymological, it often seems to be a *mater* for /ā/: דַּאוּה “unwell” (4Q223–224 2 i, 45) for what would be in the MT דָּוָה; עִישָׂאוּ “Esau” (4Q223–224 2 ii, 4, 12; 2 iii, 12; 2 iv, 18; 4Q364 3 ii, 7) for what would be in the MT עִשָׂו; יֵאָבוּאוּ “they will come” (4Q277 1 ii, 8) for יָבוּאוּ* (unless this is a case of metathesis); רַאשׁ and רַאשׁוּ “possess” (4Q364 24a–c, 4 and 26a ii, 3, respectively, at Deut 2:31 and 9:23 for MT רָשׁ and רָשׁוּ); שְׁבִיא[ם] “their captivity” (4Q385a 18 i a–b, 7), which echoes the phrase from Jer 30:10 and 46:27 שְׁבִיָּם; as well as

92. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 505, and the subsection “Lack of Confusion between III-*Waw/Yodh* and III-*Aleph* Verbs” in §5.6 below, “Verbs.”

93. Qimron, *HDSS*, 19.

94. Qimron, *HDSS*, 19. E.g., אֵלִים “rams” (11Q19 XVII, 15 and passim) and אֱלִים and אֵלִי “angels” (4Q381 15, 6; 4Q403 1 i, 38; 4Q418 69 ii, 15; 4Q511 10, 11). Note that “rams” is spelled without a *yodh* in Exod 36:19, Ezek 32:21, and 2 Chr 29:22 and “angels” is spelled with a *yodh* in various medieval biblical manuscripts. See BDB and *HALOT*.

95. See Strugnell and Harrington, *DJD* 34:291; Newsom, *DJD* 11:308.

96. See also: רַאוּ (1QIsa^a at Isa 66:19) for MT רָאוּ.

the many cases from 1QIsa^a; יתום “orphan” (at Isa 1:17, 23) for MT תום; תבמות “the high places” (at Isa 15:2) for MT תבמות; איאל “deer” (at Isa 35:6) for MT איל; גמלאם “he rewarded them” (at Isa 63:7) for MT גמלם; פריאם “their fruit” (at Isa 65:21) for MT פריים; יואן “Javan” (at Isa 66:19) for MT יון; and עאון “iniquity” (at Isa 1:15, though the word is not found in the MT version) for what would be in the MT עון.⁹⁷

In some cases, it seems likely that a scribal confusion has led to the *aleph* and it is not due to a scribal convention of marking a preceding /a/ vowel: תאמר (4Q418 8, 6) reflects either *tammēr* “do (not) embitter (מרר),” *temer* “do (not) reject” (compare Ps 106:33 מרה + רוח), or *tāmēr* “do (not) exchange (מור).” The writing with *aleph* likely reflects a scribe’s confusion at seeing תמר in the manuscript he was copying from and thinking this a defective spelling for the verb “to say,” as found, for example, in יומר a few lines later in the same text, 4Q418 8, 11; and תמרו “you said” (4Q129 [4QPhyl B] at Deut 5:24) for MT ותאמרו.⁹⁸ A similar situation likely relates to ויאמרו “they showed disobedience (*hiphil* of מרה)” (4Q370 1 i, 2).⁹⁹

In the case of עאון (1QIsa^a at Isa 1:15), it is possible that here the *aleph* is marking a glottal stop, reflecting the shift /w/ > /ʾ/: ‘āʾōn (see §4.5, “*Aleph* < *Waw* and *Waw* < *Aleph*”). The same explanation is not likely for קצאוות *qāṣāwōt* “ends of” (1QIsa^a at Isa 41:5) for MT קצות “ends of”; the *aleph* in the scroll’s word appears to be a *mater* for a preceding /ā/ vowel. The word קצאוות appears to be the plural construct of קצת (MT קצת, plural abs. (קצות)) while the word in the MT version of Isa 41:5 is the plural construct of קצה, both words meaning “end.”¹⁰⁰ The word קצת is an Aramaic-like

97. The examples from 1QIsa^a are drawn from Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 160–161. Qimron also lists examples from 1QIsa^a and elsewhere (“Initial *Alef* as a Vowel in Hebrew and Aramean Documents from Qumran Compared to Later Hebrew and Aramaic Sources” [in Hebrew], *Leshonenu* 39 [1975]: 134–35; this is the title provided in the English summary section, but “Medial *Alef*...” seems intended). Some other examples are somewhat more conjectural. For example, הנא יאנה in 11Q19 LIII, 20 (for what would be in the MT הַנָּא יִנְיָאָה “he will surely forbid her”) might be conceived of as representing *hānē yānīhā*, presupposing the quiescence of the *aleph* root consonant and the contraction of the *hiriq* and *seghol* vowels, though a scribal slip reversing *aleph* and *nun* seems more likely.

98. See Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:98.

99. See Carol Newsom, “Admonition on the Flood,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (ed. M. Broshi et al.; DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 93.

100. Kutscher (*Isaiah*, 207) explains קצאוות as an Aramaized plural construct (קצאות < קצאות).

noun (in which the /ā/ vowel does not reduce, even in construct), while קצה is Hebrew.¹⁰¹ In two other places where the MT vocalization reflects the word קצות (קצות at Isa 40:28 and 41:9) 1QIsa^a has a form reflecting קצת (קצוות); similarly note קצוות *qəṣāwōt* “ends of” (4Q365 13, 1 at Exod 39:17) for MT קצות. It might also be mentioned that the *aleph* of קצאות cannot be part of a digraph for /ō/ since the first of the two *waws* is consonantal.¹⁰² Furthermore, if one were to argue that the *aleph* represented a shift from *waw* (analogous to the *aleph* resulting from the shift /y/ > /ʔ/ in מנאות), then one would have to suppose that the two *waws* were a double *mater*. Since the repetition of the *mater* is relatively uncommon (though note the apparent spelling of the etymologically similar *qal* infinitive construct קצוות in 1QpHab IX, 14), and since the representation of word internal /ā/ with *aleph* is relatively common in 1QIsa^a, it seems best to interpret קצאות as using an *aleph mater* to help represent *qəṣāwōt*.¹⁰³

The word כליות “kidneys of” (1QIsa^a at Isa 34:6) for MT כליֹת bears an *aleph*, perhaps, for the same reason (to mark preceding /ā/), as though from *כלת, though such a noun is not attested in Hebrew or even in Aramaic. Alternatively, the scribe perhaps wrote the absolute form of the word (= MT כליֹת), with a word-internal *aleph mater*, though the context demands a construct form.¹⁰⁴

A similar graphic convention to mark word-internal /ā/ with an *aleph* is found in the MT: דג “fish” (Neh 13:16), though normally דג; as well as with *qal* II-*waw/yodh* roots: לִטְ “secrecy” (Judg 4:21), though normally

101. See *HGhS*, 463x”. For a morphological parallel to קצת, note מנת “portion” and the construct forms: מנִיֹּת “portions of” (Neh 12:47) and מנִיֹּת (Neh 12:44). For this word, *yodh* is the etymological third root consonant and it shifts to *aleph* in the second attestation in Nehemiah (see §4.4, “*Aleph* < *Yodh* and *Yodh* < *Aleph*”). In the MT, מנת appears only in construct, always with a *qamets* (Jer 13:25, passim). Note also that the singular קצת is found four times in the MT Hebrew sections of Daniel and three times in the Aramaic sections. On this word, see also Moshe Bar-Asher, “Some Unusual Spellings in the Qumran Scrolls” [Hebrew], *Meghillot* 3 [2005]: 173–74).

102. See “Digraphs” (§3.5).

103. For קצוות in 1QpHab, see §3.1, “Scribal Mistakes.” The pronunciation *qəṣāwōt* would be the same for the other examples of the word spelled with two *waws*: קצוות cited above, as well as in 1QM I, 8 and 4Q511 63 i, 4. Presumably, the spellings without the double *waw* reflect *qəṣōt* as in 4Q181 2, 9.

104. Contrast this explanation with Kutscher’s tentative suggestion that the spelling of this word suggests that the shewa was pronounced as /a/ (*Isaiah*, 501–2).

לְטָרָאשׁ “poor” (2 Sam 12:1), though normally רָשׁ.¹⁰⁵ It is also found in the Aramaic of the DSS. Muraoka comments that this convention is “rather common” in the Aramaic of the scrolls.¹⁰⁶ The fact that 1QIsa^a contains the most examples of this phenomenon is, thus, not surprising; it seems simply another trait in which Aramaic influence can be found in this scroll.¹⁰⁷ All the same, note that in all the examples (with the exception of ראשו/ראש, הבִּימֹת, גַּמְלָאם, דְּאוּה) the *aleph mater* comes before a consonantal *yodh* or *waw* (בְּלֵאיוֹת, קִצְאוֹת, עֵאוֹן, עֵישָׂאוּ, דְּאוּה) or after a consonantal *yodh* or *waw* (יֹאזָן, פְּרִיאָם, אֵיאל, יֵאתוֹם, שְׁבִיא[ם], יֵאבוּאוּ).¹⁰⁸ At least for Hebrew, then, although the internal *aleph mater* does not explicitly mark the following or preceding *waw/yodh* as consonantal, it does help to disambiguate the value of these two consonants in relation to a preceding or following /ā/. Such usage is not typical in DSS Aramaic.¹⁰⁹ Thus, if the practice of using *aleph* to mark /ā/ was adopted from Aramaic, it seems to have been used especially where useful in producing a more explicit orthography in relation to *waw* and *yodh*.

In addition, the short /a/ seems to be marked with an *aleph* in למְעֵאן “so that” (4Q175 4) for what would be in the MT לְמַעַן, as well as in יֵאכֶה “he will strike” (1QIsa^a at Isa 30:31) for MT יִכֶּה and הַאֲזוּרָה “the crushed one” (1QIsa^a at Isa 59:5) for MT הַזְּזוּרָה.¹¹⁰ The *aleph* in תְּתִיאַמְרוּ (1QIsa^a at Isa 61:6) for MT תִּתְיַמְרוּ “you will boast” (*hithpael* of אָמַר) could be a *mater* and/or a historical writing. The *aleph* in לְאִשׁוֹ “vainly” (4Q129 [4QPhyl B], 4Q137 [4QPhyl J], 4Q139 [4QPhyl L] at Deut 5:11) for MT לְשׁוֹאֵן may reflect a use of the letter as a *mater*, if not also a repeated scribal confusion. The *aleph* marking a short /a/ seems also to be attested, though rarely, in DSS Aramaic, as in אֵיתַאי “there is” (4Q542 3 ii, 13).¹¹¹

Kutscher suggests that *aleph* is also used as a *mater* for /ē/ where the *aleph* is not part of the etymology of the word. This occurs primarily with

105. See GKC §9b and 72p.

106. Muraoka, *GQA*, 28.

107. The few other texts where it is attested are DSS-SP9 (4Q175, 4Q227, 4Q223–224, including perhaps 4QMMT [4Q398]). Only one DSS-NSP text attests this practice: 4Q385a.

108. See Qimron “Initial *Alef*,” 136. The examples above suggest that for Hebrew this distribution was more-or-less equal, the *aleph* just as likely to come before *waw/yodh* as after.

109. Muraoka, *GQA*, 28 n. 194.

110. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 160–161.

111. See Muraoka, *GQA*, 29 for more possible examples.

the word עוֹרָר “blind” (1QIsa^a at Isa 42:19 [twice] and 43:8), but also וְנִאֲלָכָה “we may go” (1QIsa^a at Isa 2:3).¹¹² In addition, note נֹכַר “foreign” (4Q372 1, 11 and 15 and 4Q387 3, 6) for what is usually נִכַר (= MT נִכָּר);¹¹³ and perhaps יֵצְאוּ “they will go forth” (4Q491 1–3, 9) for what would be in the MT יֵצְאוּ (if this is not a scribal mistake; see §3.1, “Scribal Mistakes”). Note as well the cases of the digraph -א- for /ē/, noted below in “Digraphs” (§3.5): תִּמְיִנוּ *tēmīnū* “you turn to the right” (1QIsa^a at Isa 30:21 for MT תִּמְיִנוּ < *tēmīnū* [compare וְיִמְנֶה in Gen 13:9] or < *taymīnū* [compare מִיִּמִּינִים in 1 Chr 12:2]), כִּסֵּי *kissē* “throne” (4Q57 [4QIsa^c] at Isa 9:6 for MT כִּסֵּא). Conceivably the forms in which *aleph* functions as a *mater* for /ē/ were derived by analogy from spellings like דְּנִיָּאֵל “Daniel” (in the DSS and MT passim), which was pronounced in the writing/reading register of the DSS as it is in the MT דְּנִיָּאֵל = *dāniyēl* (see §4.4, “*Aleph* < *Yodh* and *Yodh* < *Aleph*”). Kutscher’s hypothesis that *aleph* marks /ē/ is encouraged by the use of *aleph* to mark word-internal /ē/ in DSS Aramaic words, like פּוֹתָאֵהוֹן “their width” (5Q15 1 ii, 7); גַּאפָּה “its bank” (11Q10 XXXV, 2); רֵאסִין “stadia” (4Q554 1 i, 15).¹¹⁴

For the use of *aleph* as part of a digraph with *waw* or *yodh* to mark /o/ and /u/ class vowels, see “Digraphs” (§3.5).

3.4. ETYMOLOGICAL SHORT /U/ MARKED WITH *WAW*

One of the most obvious orthographic differences between the DSS and the MT is that etymological short /u/ is often marked in the DSS with a *waw*.¹¹⁵ This is the case in most classes of words, like those with the bases **qul* (for example, תוֹר “dove”), **qull* (for example, חוֹק “statute”), **quṭl* (קוֹדֵשׁ “holiness”), **qaṭul* (עֲמוֹק “deep”), **quṭul* (בְּכוֹר “firstborn” and the *qal* imperative קְטוּל and infinitive קִטּוּל),¹¹⁶ **quṭulat* (אֲחֻזָּה “possession”),

112. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 162. Ben-Hayyim, on the other hand, argues that נִאֲלָכָה should reflect the *piel* form of הִלָּךְ (“The Tradition of the Samaritans and its Relationship to the Linguistic Tradition of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic Language” [Hebrew], *Leshonenu* 22 [1958]: 236–237).

113. See Matthew Morgenstern, “Notes on the Language of the Qumran Scrolls” (Hebrew), *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 161–162.

114. See Muraoka, *GQA*, 29.

115. See, e.g., Qimron, *HDSS*, 17.

116. Alternatively, the infinitive construct derives from the same base as the infinitive absolute, **qaṭāl*; see Yoo-Ki Kim, “The Origin of the Biblical Hebrew Infinitive Construct,” *JSS* 57 (2012): 25–35.

**quṭtal* (and related *pual* forms: קוטל, יקוטל, מקוטל), **huqṭal* (and related *hophal* forms: הוקטל, יוקטל, מוקטל), **yaqṭul(u)* (that is, the *qal* imperfect and *waw*-consecutive imperfect of strong roots יקטול and ויקטול), **way-yaqul* (that is, the *waw*-consecutive imperfect of II-*waw* roots: ויקול).

However, it is not the case for all historic /u/ vowels. Note the absence of an initial *waw mater* in the typical *qal* imperative and infinitive just cited from the base **quṭul*, as well as in the bases **quṭulat*, **quṭāl* (אנוש “person”), **quṭūl* (כרוב “cherub”)—all presumably for the same reason, that is, the initial /u/ shifted to /i/ and then to /o/ before the DSS were written.¹¹⁷ For other words, it seems that it is a secondary vowel that is given a *waw mater* while the etymological /u/ vowel does not get a *mater*, as in some construct forms of **quṭl* nouns like קדוש *qōdoš* “holiness of” (4Q418 81 + 81a, 4) and in צהורים “noon” (1QIsa^a at Isa 58:10 and 59:10) for MT צְהַרִים.

Furthermore, it bears mentioning that marking short /u/ with a *waw* is common, but not universal. Many forms that would take a *waw* do not receive one. Note, for example, that approximately half the **quṭl* nouns and *pual* forms in 1QIsa^a do not bear a *waw* in the appropriate place; as Kutscher remarks, it seems very unlikely that the *plene* and defective spellings reflect different pronunciations.¹¹⁸ The *plene* spellings among nonbib-

117. There are exceptions, apparently, as suggested by עוזז in 1QIsa^a at Isa 42:25 and perhaps לאובולה (*qal* infinitive + suffix or noun) in 4Q176a 19–20, 3 (see below, footnote 121). In the case of some nouns of the **quṭulat* base the first historical /u/ was lost, but then another /u/ class vowel emerged due to assimilation: אוחזות (1QS XI, 7); [ת]בוהונו (4Q400 1 ii, 19); כוהנתנו (4Q400 2, 6); פועלתי (1QIsa^a at Isa 49:4); פועלתם (1QIsa^a at Isa 65:7) (see Elisha Qimron, “A Work Concerning Divine Providence,” in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* [ed. S. Gitin et al; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995], 199; and the sections below titled “Digraphs” [§3.5] and “Waw Marking /u/ Class Vowel in Nouns Where MT Has No /u/ Class Vowel” [§5.4]). In the case of these words, it is the second /u/ that is not represented by a *waw mater*. Notice, also, that the *qal* infinitive construct when followed by suffix and the imperative when followed by suffix do often evidence a *waw mater* after the first root consonant but not after the second; inf. const.: שופטם in 1QH^a XII, 19 and impv.: עובדם in 4Q416 2 iii, 17; this is in keeping with the developments also evidenced in the Tiberian tradition where these verbal forms look like they derive from a **quṭl* base.

118. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 138–141. For the ninety-five examples of *plene* writing of short /u/ and /o/ in the MT, see Francis I. Andersen and A. Dean Forbes, *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible: Dahood Memorial Lecture* (BO 14; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1986), 95–100.

lical texts are found in all three corpora (DSS-SP9, DSS-SP1c, and DSS-NSP). The defective spelling, without a *waw*, may be found in all corpora too, but is less common overall. Thus, one finds the word “holiness” (= MT קִדְּוֹשׁ) written with a *waw mater*, קוּדֹשׁ, in DSS-SP9 (1QH^a XV, 13), DSS-SP1c (4Q185 4 i, 3), and DSS-NSP (4Q179 1 i, 7) texts; the spelling without a *waw* appears rarely in all three corpora as well. A similar pattern holds for the *pual* forms. A greater discrepancy is found, however, among the biblical scrolls; the biblical scrolls that are part of the DSS-SP9 texts often have forms with a *waw*, while the biblical scrolls that are part of the DSS-NSP texts have words that lack a *waw* and which are closer to the forms one finds more commonly in the MT. Such a distribution presumably reflects the conservative nature of copying biblical texts among the scribes associated with DSS-NSP texts and the corresponding freedom of the scribes associated with DSS-SP9 texts.

Conceivably, as Qimron suggests, **quṭlat* nouns like חכמה are really of another base, like **qaṭlat*, and a word like “wisdom,” when written defectively, represents the pronunciation *ḥekmā* (with Tiberian vowels: *חֶכְמָה).¹¹⁹ This seems less likely now since there are more examples of חֶכְמָה written with *waw mater*.¹²⁰ There are also additional examples: “shrewdness of” (4Q299 3a ii - b, 5); אוכלה “food” (4Q378 3 i, 5 [interlinear *waw*] and 11Q19 LIX, 7);¹²¹ חורבה “ruin” (4Q462 1, 14 and

119. Qimron, *HDSS*, 17. Qimron implies a kind of uniformity in relation to these nouns when he writes: “עֲרֻמָּה is always written defectively (7 times) and ... the word חֶכְמָה is written 10 times without *waw* and only once with *waw*.”

120. In a more recent study, Qimron counts thirteen examples of חֶכְמָה spelled *plene* versus twenty-six without a *waw* (“Work Concerning Divine Providence,” 192). According to Accordance, the absolute form of the word חֶכְמָה with *waw mater* is found in 1QH^a V, 20; 4Q299 17 i, 2; 4Q413 1-2, 1; 4Q487 2, 8 (partially preserved); 4Q525 1, 1 and 2; 23, 6; 11Q5 (11QPs^a) XVIII, 3; 11Q5 (11QPs^a) at Ps 104:24; PAM43686 9,1. Schoors also lists 1Q27 1 i, 3, though the reading of the word is significantly damaged (“Language of the Qumran Sapiential Works,” 64). In addition, the word חֶכְמָה is found with a *waw mater* in the construct and with suffixes numerous times: 1QH^a IX, 16; XVIII, 4 (partially preserved); 4Q299 3a ii - b, 5; 4Q300 1a ii - b, 4; 3, 3; 4Q418 126 ii, 5; 139, 2; 4Q432 5, 2; 4Q88 (4QPs^f) at Ps 107:27; 11Q5 (11QPs^a) XXVIII, 14. The cumulative count, including the passage from 1Q27 and others that are partially preserved is twenty-one instances of the word with a *waw mater* out of a total of sixty-five (biblical scrolls: 10; nonbiblical scrolls: 55). Thus, the *plene* spelling of חכמה is found in a third of the word’s occurrences.

121. Devorah Dimant notes that the occurrence in 4Q378 might also be construed as the infinitive construct of the verb אכל, though it seems more likely to be the

11Q19 LIX, 4). It also seems significant that the instances of חוכמה occur primarily among the DSS-SP9 texts, where we might have expected to see the best evidence for the alternative form *חֻכְמָה.¹²² Thus, it seems more likely that nouns of the *quṭlat pattern did not get a *mater* as regularly as nouns of other patterns. On the other hand, some words like טהרה “purity” may really be from a different base; this word occurs over sixty times where at least the first two root consonants are preserved and only three times is it written with a *waw mater* טוהרה (1QS VI, 22; 4Q266 6 ii, 11; 4Q525 5, 5).

That *quṭlat nouns are not consistently represented with a *waw mater* (חכמה, ערמה), though the etymologically similar vowel in *quṭl nouns with suffixes (for example, *quṭlō, *quṭlāh, *quṭlām) is almost always represented with a *mater* in the DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts (קודשו in 1QSB V, 28 and קודשך in 1QH^a V, 25; קודשם in 4Q405 23 ii, 8) suggests that the inclusion of a *waw mater* may not have been exclusively determined by phonetics, but also partially conditioned by the common spelling of the singular absolute form.¹²³ Exceptions to this rule are rare; note the com-

noun “food,” based on the ancient translations (LXX, Peshitta, Targum Neophyti) of Deut 31:17 (on which verse the text of 4Q378 and 11Q19 is based) (“Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3i–ii),” *RevQ* 23 [2007]: 49). She also notes that Ezek 34:8 has a similar expression with “food.” By contrast, Deut 31:17 in the MT has the infinitive construct. Note also לאוכלה (4Q176a 19–20, 3; based on the reading by Menahem Kister, “Newly-Identified Fragments of the Book of Jubilees: Jub. 23:21–23, 30–31,” *RevQ* 12 [1985–1987], 531–534); DSSSE and Accordance read לאוכלוהו, which seems unlikely based on the photographs. The spelling seems to be a conflation of the infinitive and nominal forms, perhaps precipitated by the kind of alternative readings evidenced in the MT and versions of Deut 31:17.

122. The word חכמה with *waw mater* occurs four times in the DSS-NSP texts (4Q88, 4Q300, 4Q413) and once in a DSS-SP1c text (4Q487). Qimron writes “It is less likely that all the cases of חכמה (without *waw*) are defective spellings, since some of them occur in manuscripts that consistently mark any *u/o* vowel with a *waw*” (“Work Concerning Divine Providence,” 193). While this might be the case, the word occurs both with and without a *waw* in at least four texts: 1QH^a; 4Q299; 4Q300; 4Q418. As Kutscher observes for *quṭl nouns and *pual* forms in 1QIsa^a, it seems unlikely that the *plene* and defective forms reflect different pronunciations (*Isaiah*, 138–141).

123. The few examples of *quṭl nouns with suffixes attested in DSS-NSP texts suggest that they occurred without the *waw mater*. The tendency to write *quṭlat nouns without a *waw* may be to avoid confusion between “her cleverness” (*עורמה) and “cleverness” (ערמה). The singular *quṭl nouns that always or almost always see a *waw mater* in their first syllable when followed by a suffix include אִין (9 out of 13 times),

monly occurring word רוקמה “embroidered work,” spelled some twenty times with a *waw* (though early editions of 1QM usually read the occurrences in this scroll as ריקמה).¹²⁴

As is well recognized, the orthography of the DSS often does not represent the etymological origin of the /u/ and /o/ vowels in the same way that the orthography in the MT does. For example, in the MT an /ō/ from an etymological /u/ in a monosyllabic noun often is not marked with a *waw mater* (for example, בָּל), though an /ō/ from an etymological /ā/ often is (for example, טוֹב); in the DSS both are marked with a *mater* (בּוֹל, טוֹב). Although this is the case, there is at least one group of nouns where the *plene* spelling in the DSS actually seems to reflect the etymology of the vowel more clearly than the orthography in the MT. The plural form of the word שָׁרֵשׁ “root” appears with suffixes most commonly in the MT with a *qamets* under the initial *shin*, שָׁרְשָׁיו (Hos 14:6), in contrast to the etymologically expected form with *shewa* or *hateph-qamets* *שָׁרְשָׁיו or *שָׁרְשָׁיו. The plural for קֹדֶשׁ “holiness” appears in the MT after the definite article in the expected manner הַקְּדוּשִׁים but without the article as קְדוּשִׁים. In the DSS, by contrast, the plural forms of the words are regularly given a *waw mater* after the first root consonant, indicating clearly the quality of the vowel: קוּדְשִׁים (4Q274 2 i, 9 [with definite article], 1QS VIII, 8 [without definite article]); מְשׁוּרְשָׁיו (4Q433a 2, 9), even where the MT has a form with *qamets* מְשׁוּרְשָׁיו (1QIsa^a at Isa 11:1) for MT מְשָׁרְשָׁיו.

3.5. DIGRAPHS

As indicated in “*Aleph as Internal Mater*” (§3.3), the *aleph* might have been construed in some forms as a *mater* for /a/ class vowels. In addition, it seems to have been used to mark /i/, /o/, and /u/ vowels at the end of words, often when accompanied by a *waw* or *yodh mater*. A similar orthographic

אכל (3/3), ארך (5/7), גבה (9/9), גדל (4/4), גרן (1/1), חזק (0/1), טהר (2/3), כפר (2/2), נגה (2/3), סלת (1/1), עצם (1/1), ערף (8/8), קדש (84/87), רבע (1/1), רחב (7/8), שרש (1/1), תאר (2/5). Where they do not, the text is usually a DSS-NSP.

124. For more on this word and its orthography, see John Elwolde, “*RWQMH* in the Damascus Document and Ps 139:15,” in *Diggers at the Well*, 77–79. That the word is רוקמה and not ריקמה is based, in part, on the rarity of internal *yodh* marking short /i/ and the frequency of *waw* marking short /o/ and /u/. Another word where one sees some variation is in the feminine plural עושרות (e.g., 1QM II, 17) for what is in the MT עֲשָׂרַת, though the singular in the DSS regularly does not contain the *waw*.

practice is evidenced within words where the presence of an *aleph* is due to the etymology of the word: ראש/רואש “head” (for MT ראש) and ריאשון/ראישון “first” (for MT ראשון).¹²⁵ These and similar words are also addressed in this section, though technically these are best construed not as containing digraphs per se, but rather cases of *aleph* being preserved as a historical spelling and accompanied by a *waw/yodh mater*.

At first blush, the place of the *waw* or *yodh* in relation to the *aleph* does not seem to matter, the variation being a result of the *aleph*'s quiescence.¹²⁶ That is, it seems one could write either וּא- (as would be expected from the MT) or אּו- in any environment. Thus, לקראו “to call” in 1QIsa^a at Isa 8:4 appears for MT קראו; ויבאו “so that he may enter” in 1Q8 (1QIsa^b) at Isa 26:2 appears for MT ויבא; likewise ויבאו “he entered” in 4Q73 (4QEzek^a) at Ezek 23:44 for MT ויבוא,¹²⁷ and יבאו “he will come” in 4Q76 (4QXII^a) at Mal 3:1 for MT יבוא.¹²⁸ But, it is not true that the *mater* could exchange places with the *aleph* in any circumstance. This variation is not found regularly in words where the *aleph* separates two syllables; in these cases, the *aleph* consistently precedes the *mater*. Thus, we find מאור *mā'ōr* “light”

125. Of the fifty times the word ראש is spelled with *aleph* in the nonbiblical texts, it is spelled ראש in around ten passages from 1QM, 4Q186, 4Q364, 4Q403, 4Q416, 4Q418, 11Q19 (DSS-SP9 texts) and רואש in around fifteen passages from 1QS, 1QSa, 1Qsb, 1QM, 4Q160, 4Q163, 4Q267, 4Q289, 4Q365, 4Q405, 4Q494, 11Q19 (DSS-SP9, with one exception: 4Q494 is among the DSS-SP1c texts). The common MT spelling ראש is found in all manner of texts, including some of those listed above, like 1QM, 4Q416, 4Q418, as well as from some DSS-NSP texts like 4Q216, 4Q381, and 4Q385. For more on this noun, see the subsection “Quiescence of Aleph” in §4.3, “Weakening of Gutturals.” As a comparison, note the spelling of the common word “flock” in the MT at Ps 144:13: צאוננו.

126. See Abegg, who writes “the weakened *'alep* often (30x) changes position with the following *o* or *u* vowel, acting then as a digraph rather than a consonant” (“Linguistic Profile,” 29).

127. Conceivably, ויבאו in 4Q73 represents the 3mp; in the MT the verb ויבא is in the singular but later in the verse one finds באו “they came.” In the preceding verse in the MT, the *qere* to יינה implies the plural “they prostitute themselves.” The scroll is fragmentary and contains none of these other verbs.

128. A similar alternation appears in the DSS and the MT with infinitives construct from III-*aleph* roots, like מלואת (1QS VII, 20, 22) versus מלאות (4Q258 VII, 2; 4Q259 II, 3, 5; 4Q367 1a-b, 6, 8; 11Q1 [11QpaleoLev^a] at Lev 25:30) in the DSS and מלאות (Jer 25:12 and passim) versus מלאות (Est 1:5). See GKC §74h. Note also שמאול “left” (1QIsa^a at Isa 9:19) for MT שמאול versus שמואל (1QIsa^a at Isa 54:3) for MT שמאול.

occurring around thirty-five times where relevant letters are preserved, always with *aleph* and with the *mater*, where it occurs, after the *aleph*. In at least fifteen of its occurrences **מאור** would have, according to the Tiberian tradition, a shewa after the *mem* (in the plural absolute and construct forms), an environment where we might expect the quiescence of the *aleph* and/or the misplacement of the *waw* (***מואר**). This never occurs. Similarly, the plural form **נפלאות** *niflā'ōt* “wonders” occurs around sixty-five times always with an *aleph* and with the *mater*, where it occurs, after the *aleph* (with one exception in a broken context where the letters are damaged, and, thus, the reading less certain: [נפלא]ואתיב[ה] in 1QH^a II, 12).¹²⁹ This word occurs in at least fifty passages in the construct or with a suffix, where the *aleph* is preceded by a shewa according to the Tiberian vocalization (*niflā'ōt*). The name **שאול** *š'ōl* “Sheol” occurs around seventy times (twenty times in nonbiblical scrolls, fifty in biblical) always with *aleph* and the *mater* after it; **צבאות** *šabā'ōt* “hosts” occurs around twenty times in the nonbiblical scrolls and 120 times in the biblical scrolls, where the relevant letters are preserved, and only once (11Q19 LXII, 5) is the *waw* initially written before the *aleph* (**צבואת**) and even here it was corrected to the proper spelling;¹³⁰ the forms of **הטאת** “sin” (= MT **חטאת**) that exhibit quiescence of the *aleph* in the MT (that is, the plural construct and plural form with suffixes [= MT **חטאת** < * *ħaṭṭā'ōt*]) are spelled with and without an *aleph* (**הטאות** and **הטות**), though where they are spelled with an *aleph* and *waw*, the *aleph* always comes first (seven times in the nonbiblical scrolls and eight times in the biblical scrolls); **גאון** “majesty” (= MT **גאון**) is spelled consistently two times in the nonbiblical scrolls and twenty-one times in the biblical scrolls (in all but one case where the word is in construct or followed by a suffix); **גאות** “majesty” (= MT **גאות**) is spelled consistently four times in the nonbiblical scrolls and six times in the biblical scrolls (at least three times in construct or with suffix); **שאון**

129. In the case of this misspelling, it is important to note that the form (if read correctly) would presumably have a shewa in the syllable preceding *aleph* (according to the MT model) and, thus, the *aleph* might have quiesced resulting in the pronunciation *niflōtekā*, or, conceivably, the *aleph* shifted to *waw*, *niflāwōt*.

130. Note also **הטמואת** (11Q19 LI, 6) corrected to **הטמאת**. Presumably, the misspellings reflect the respective pronunciations *šabāwōt* and *ħaṭṭōmāwōt* and the shift *aleph* > *waw* due to the *aleph*'s assimilation to the following /o/ vowel. See Elisha Qimron, “Diphthongs and Glides in the Dead Sea Scrolls” (in Hebrew), *Mehqarim* 2–3 (1987): 271; and §4.5 below, “*Aleph* < *Waw* and *Waw* < *Aleph*.”

“roar” (= MT שֹׁאֵן) is spelled consistently twice in the nonbiblical scrolls and at least eleven times in the biblical scrolls; הביאותה “you brought” and other *hiphil* perfect forms of בוא with the /ō/ connecting vowel occur about twelve times in the nonbiblical scrolls, never with the *mater* before the *aleph*. Note also words like לאומים “peoples” (at least fifteen times in the biblical and nonbiblical texts; never without *aleph*; never with *waw* before the *aleph*); ראובן “Reuben” (twenty times; three times spelled without *aleph* but never with *waw* before *aleph*); and the *qal* infinitive ראות “to see” (spelled consistently in every occurrence, around fifty times in biblical and nonbiblical scrolls).¹³¹ Although the word “utterance” (= MT נִאֵם) seems to defy this pattern, occurring often as נואם instead of נאם or נאום, it seems likely that the word was understood (and pronounced) as a **quṭl* noun (see §5.5, “**quṭl* Nouns”). The same applies for מאד “much” and תאר “form.”

The same consistency holds for combinations of prefixal particles and words that begin *aleph* + *waw mater*. For example, באור “with light” appears consistently seventeen times in the nonbiblical scrolls and three times in the biblical scrolls; לאור “for light” and כאור “like light” attest the order *aleph-waw* in all their occurrences (לאור seven times among the nonbiblical scrolls and twenty-one times among biblical scrolls; כאור once in the nonbiblical scrolls and four times in the biblical scrolls). In many of these cases the noun “light” is in construct with a following noun and, according to the Tiberian system, the preceding preposition would take a shewa. Similar consistency is found with all nouns that begin in this way: אהל “tent,” אוב “necromancer,” אופיר “Ophir,” אופן “wheel,” אוצר “storehouse,” אור “fire,” אורה “light,” אורים “Urim,” אות “sign,” אזן “ear,” איב “enemy,” אכל “food,” אכלה “food,” אניה “ship,” ארך “length.” Only one exception emerges from these many examples: [בוארים בארם כבוד] (4Q57 [4QIsa^c] at Isa 24:15) for MT בְּאֲרָיִם כְּבוֹדוֹ “in the east, honor...” Conceivably, here the scribe of 4Q57 was representing *bōrīm*, in other words, the preposition ב followed by the word אורים “lights” in the absolute; the passage from 4Q57 might be translated: “with lights in Aram (is) [his] glory” (for a parallel, see 4Q503 21–22, 1: באור כבודו “his glory is in

131. I have not found exceptions among other, less frequently occurring common nouns/adjectives, like מאומה or תוצאות. I have found only one exception among proper nouns: יואר in 4Q55 (4QIsa^a) at Isa 23:3 for MT יֹאזֵר. Note, by contrast, the name “Saul” שאול is spelled the same way thirty times.

the light” and 4Q403 1 i, 45: [הכ]בוד באור אורותם “the glory is in the light of their lights”).¹³²

In a similar way, there is consistency among III-*aleph* verbs in the 3cp perfect and in the 3mp and 2mp imperfect (and *waw*-consecutive imperfect), in other words, the forms that end in *-ū*. The sequence *aleph* + *waw mater* is consistently present in over three hundred clearly legible examples in biblical and nonbiblical texts (according to Accordance). I could find only two exceptions where the *waw* precedes the *aleph*, both in 1QIsa^a (מחוא “they will clap” 1QIsa^a at Isa 55:12 for MT ימחאו and תקרוא “you (mp) will be called” at Isa 61:6 for MT תקראו); the first perhaps could be explained as a case of the *aleph*’s quiescence after a muttered vowel and the second as an example of *aleph* assimilating to a following /u/ (as in ראו *rāwū* “they saw” 1QIsa^a at Isa 66:19 for MT ראו).¹³³

The preceding examples (found in DSS-SP9, DSS-SP1c, and DSS-NSP texts) demonstrate that the combination of *aleph* + *waw mater* is almost always preserved when a vowel (often even shewa) immediately precedes the *aleph*, when the *aleph* separates two syllables. When the vowel that would have preceded *aleph* is a shewa (at least according to the MT tradition) then the *aleph* will rarely be lost, but, where the *aleph* is preserved, the *waw mater* almost always follows the *aleph* (for example, מאור *mā’ōr*). Where the *waw mater* frequently alternates with *aleph*, it is always where the *aleph* comes at the end of a syllable and/or is no longer pronounced: ראש/רואש “head,” יאומר/יואמר “he will say,” יבוא/יבאו “he will enter,” לקרוא/לקראו “to call,” מלאות/מלואת “to fill, fulfill,” זואות/זואת “this.”¹³⁴ The cases where *aleph* should separate syllables but is found, instead, after the *waw mater*, can be explained as examples where the glottal stop has quiesced due to a preceding muttered vowel, the *aleph* being preserved as a historical writing (for example, [נפל]ואתיכ[ה], בוארים, יואר, ימחוא)

132. Or, בוארים might represent *bāwūrīm* “in the east” (see §4.5, “*Aleph* < *Waw* and *Waw* < *Aleph*”). If this explanation is right, then בארם “in Aram” is a gloss. The text of 4Q503 is from a broken context and might also be translated “in the light of his glory” (see DSSSE).

133. It is less likely the spellings are due to confusion between III-*aleph* and III-*waw/yodh* verb types, since even in 1QIsa^a the confusion of III-*aleph* and III-*waw/yodh* verbs is not common. See the subsection “Lack of Confusion between III-*Waw/Yodh* and III-*Aleph* Verbs” in §5.6, “Verbs.”

134. See the discussion of מלאות/מלואת in the subsection “Infinitives” in §5.6, “Verbs.” For more examples of words where the *waw* alternates with *aleph* and there is no preceding vowel, see Qimron, *Grammar*, 72.

or as examples where the glottal stop has assimilated to a neighboring vowel, the *aleph* again being preserved as a historical writing (for example, תַּקְרוּא, הַטְמוּאָת, צְבוּאָת).¹³⁵ These observations help encourage the view that etymological *aleph* was usually pronounced as a consonantal glottal stop at the beginning of syllables.¹³⁶ For a full explanation, see the subsection “Quiescence of *Aleph*” in §4.3, “Weakening of Gutturals.”

The preservation of the *yodh mater* within a word after an etymological *aleph* shows a similar distribution (even when the *aleph* is preceded by a silent shewa), though there are far fewer examples. Thus, the relevant *hiphil* forms for II-*aleph* roots evidence the sequence *aleph* + *yodh mater* (תְּדַאִיגִי “do [not] be anxious” 4Q223–224 2 ii, 11), as do examples of verbs like אֹר “to light” where the *aleph* is preceded by a muttered vowel in the Tiberian tradition (for example, הַאִירוּתָה “you give light” 1QH^a XVII, 27 and מְאִירִי[ם] “they give light” 4Q405 19, 5). By contrast, in words in which we find the sequence consonant + /i/ + *aleph* + consonant (that is, -CiC-), the sequence of the *aleph* and *yodh mater* will vary, just as the *aleph* and *waw mater* vary in words like יְאוּמֵר/יְאוּמֵר; thus we find רִאִישׁוֹן *rīšōn* “first” (1QM VI, 1 and passim, = MT רִאִישׁוֹן) as well as רִאִישׁוֹן *rīšōn* (4Q252 I, 22; 11Q12 3, 2).

The sequences וֵא-, אֵא-, יֵא-, אֵי- are sometimes used to mark word-final vowels; these are cases where two *maters* represent a single vowel. In almost every case, where such digraphs appear at the end of words, the

135. That the spellings הַטְמוּאָת, צְבוּאָת reflect assimilation is suggested by other cases of assimilation, where the phonetic shift is more explicit due to two *waws* being written together: בּוּו, בּאּוּו, בּאּוּו (see “*Aleph* < *Waw* and *Waw* < *Aleph*” [§4.5]). A similar spelling where the *aleph* is not part of the etymology of the word is עְדוּאָתִיךְ ‘*ēdāwōtekā* “your decrees” (4Q90 [4QPs^h] at Ps 119:14) for MT עֲדוּתֶיךָ; and תְּעוּאָת *ta’āwōt* “errors” (4Q381 79, 5) for *תְּעוּת (sing. תְּעוּת *ta’ūt*). In these cases, presumably, the *waw* is consonantal, as well as part of the digraph indicating /ō/. Perhaps the *aleph mater* helps to indicate not only the /ō/ vowel, but also the consonantal value of the preceding *waw*, as the *aleph* seems to do in association with /ā/ vowels; see §3.3, “*Aleph* as Internal *Mater*.” In other cases, a spelling with *aleph* is due to analogy to another word, as in לְנוּאֵם in 1QIsa^a at Isa 56:10 for MT לָנוּם “to slumber,” where the form in the DSS is (presumably) influenced by the word “utterance” a few verses earlier at the beginning of 56:8 (נוּאֵם in 1QIsa^a for MT נְאֻם).

136. In addition, these observations suggest for nouns like פּוּעֵלָה “work” the development **pu’ulā* > **pə’ulā* > **pə’ullā* > *pu’ullā* (see §5.4, “*Waw* Marking /u/ Class Vowel in Nouns Where MT Has No /u/ Class Vowel”), and for the noun/adverb מוּאָדַב “much” the pronunciation *mōd* (see §5.5, “**quṭl* Nouns”).

waw or *yodh* appears first and the *aleph* second. Qimron lists two cases where *waw* + *aleph* marks a final long /ō/ vowel: in the preposition *beth* followed by the 3ms suffix, בּוֹא “in it,” in 4Q174 I, 6, and the *kaph* plus -*mō* affix, כּמוֹא “like,” in 1QH^a XIV, 24 (= MT כְּמוֹ).¹³⁷ It bears mentioning that this kind of supplementation of a final long vowel (ō, ū) with a following *aleph* is also found in the MT with several different particles (for example, אֶפּוֹא for אָפוֹ, and לוֹא for לוֹ).¹³⁸ The word אֶפּוֹ appears in one DSS spelled with a final *aleph*, אֶפּוֹא (4Q423 6, 3), while in other cases a word has no *aleph*, even where the MT does, as in לוֹ (4Q51 [4QSam^a] at 2 Sam 19:7) for MT לֹא.¹³⁹ Spelling word-final /o/ or /u/ vowels with א- , although rare, seems to be attested in all groups of texts (DSS-SP9, DSS-SP1c, and DSS-NSP). Although it might be based on analogy to words like רֹאשׁ/רוֹאשׁ, it seems more likely that it was influenced by the negative particle, which is spelled לוֹא in LBH and in the DSS.

The digraph אֵ- in final position often marks /ī/, usually on short words, specifically the conjunction כִּי as כִּיא and the interrogative pronoun מִי as מִיא, but also occasionally on other words.¹⁴⁰ In 4Q491c 11 i, the digraph appears associated not only with the particles כִּי and מִי, but with many words and particles ending in /ī/, like הִגִּיא “meditation” (4Q491c 11 i, 21), even the 1cs pronominal suffix: בִּיא “in me” (4Q491c 11 i, 13); יִגִּדִּנִיא “they will attack me” (11 i, 17); אִנִּיא “I” (11 i, 18); כְּבוֹדִיא “my glory” (11 i, 18). Word-internal use of the digraph is also sometimes found, as in [שׁ]אֵר “he will [not] inherit” (4Q365 1, 2), though this case might be attributable to a scribe who initially thought the verse should read: “the son of this handmaid will not marry (שׁאֵר)”; he recognized his mistake and added an interlinear *yodh* but then failed to erase the *aleph* or mark it with cancellation dots. Kutscher suggests that the DSS forms like כִּיא and

137. Qimron, *HDSS*, 21. Note also cases like יֵאֵמִינוֹא (1QpHab II, 6) (see Qimron, *Grammar*, 100).

138. GKC §23i.

139. It should also be noted that the inclusion of a final *aleph* is, according to Muraoka, also found in Aramaic, once in an inscription from the Sheikh Fadl Cave Inscription (twice written נְכוֹא for “Necho,” elsewhere in the same text נְכוּ, as in the MT of Jeremiah and 2 Chronicles) and once in Ezra 6:15 (שִׁיעִיא). See T. Muraoka, “Hebrew,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:341.

140. A supplementation of word final /ī/ by a following *aleph* is also found in the MT with נְקִיא for נְקִי “innocent” (GKC §23i).

נִיָּא are based on analogy to such words as נְבִיא “prophet.”¹⁴¹ The fact that this word (and similar words) is spelled in 1QIsa^a with and without the final *aleph* (נְבִי at Isa 28:7), while כִּי is also spelled with and without the final *aleph* perhaps reinforces this thesis. On the one hand, such variation in spelling may reflect confusion as to which words should be written with an etymological *aleph* (נְבִיא) and which do not (כִּי), or may reflect the fact that scribes simply liked to vary their spelling.¹⁴² James Barr has argued a similar preference for variation in spelling in the MT, writing that spelling varied simply “because the scribes liked it to vary.”¹⁴³

Although Kutscher’s suggestion of analogy to words like נְבִיא is quite possible, one wonders if the spelling of כִּי was encouraged by other forms too, like the spelling of the more common 3fs independent pronoun הִיא, which, no doubt, would be considered to reflect an old, prestigious spelling tradition.¹⁴⁴ Due to its frequency and similar shortness, it might have offered a better model for spelling word-final /i/ with an *aleph* in words like כִּי, not to mention a good pedigree for this spelling.¹⁴⁵

141. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 21. Compare the similar lack of *aleph* in forms from the MT: יְשִׁי for *יְשִׁיאַ in Ps 55:16; יְנִי for *יְנִיאַ in Ps 141:5. For many other examples, see GKC §74k.

142. Note the frequent variation in the spelling of short words like כִּי within the same text, sometimes from one line to the next (e.g., 1QH^a VII, 34 has כִּי, line 35 has כִּי, line 36 has כִּי, and line 37 has כִּיאַ).

143. Barr, *Variable Spellings*, 194. He continues: “Their approach to spelling was not systematic or consistent but occasional, opportunistic and at times exceptional: they did something, but they did not do it all the time; either they did it occasionally, or they did it most of the time, but if they did it most of the time they also made exceptions some of the time. If they liked variation, they could also equally well prefer consistency for a time and produce a block spelling of a word over a long series of instances.” Tov writes in relation to this idea: “Simple ‘inconsistency’ is another way of formulating the combination of block spellings and rapid alternation” (“Review of Barr, *The Variable Spellings*,” 15–16).

144. Blau considers the spelling of הִיא, along with words like בְּרִיאַ, as the possible origin of mistaken writings like נְקִיאַ in the MT (*On Pseudo-Corrections in Some Semitic Languages* [Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1970], 31).

145. Notice, in relation to this pronoun, that even though it often has a final *heh* (הִיאַה), the form familiar to us from the MT is also found, even in texts that attest הִיאַה (e.g., 1QH^a V, 30; XII, 14 versus הִיאַה in XII, 19 and XX, 12; see also 4Q266 where the short form occurs in frag. 6 i, 3 and the long form in 6 i, 5, and similarly *passim*). And, whether or not it is spelled with a final *heh*, the combination of *yodh-aleph* is always present in the word. Most examples of this phenomenon are among the DSS-SP9 texts.

The sequence -א- rarely seems to mark word-internal or word-final /ē/ or /ī/; when it does, one or the other letter can usually be construed as a historical writing. For example, the *aleph* can be construed as a historical writing in א כסיא *kissē* “throne” (4Q57 [4QIsa^c] at Isa 9:6 for MT כִּסֵּא).¹⁴⁶ The second *yodh* in [ש] יאר “he will [not] inherit” (4Q365 1, 2) can be construed as a historical writing (though see above for the complexities of the word). An apparent exception is רציאן (1QIsa^a at Isa 9:10) for MT רָצִין.¹⁴⁷

Similarly, the *yodh* could be construed as a historical writing in תיאמינו *tēmīnū* “you turn to the right” (1QIsa^a at Isa 30:21) for MT תִּאֲמִינוּ, though a better understanding is probably Aramaic influence, as suggested by Kutscher, since in Aramaic I-*aleph* verbs appear as I-*yodh* in the *haphel*.¹⁴⁸ Such an origin also explains האיריכי (1QIsa^a at Isa 54:2) corrected to האריכי.

The sequence א- is found rarely: שדאים *šēdīm* “demons” (4Q510 1, 5; elsewhere שדים);¹⁴⁹ נכאי “stricken” (1QIsa^a at Isa 66:2 for MT נָכָה).¹⁵⁰ The correction reflected in אאיחל “(why) should I be profaned?” (4Q58 [4QIsa^d] at Isa 48:11) for what would be in the MT אחל* perhaps reflects how א- could represent /ē/, though it is perhaps more likely the correction reflects the scribe’s intention to write אחל, in line with the MT orthography.¹⁵¹

Another, less common digraph, is the sequence הא- to mark word-final /ā/: דעהא “knowledge” (1QS VII, 4, = MT דַּעָה); עתהא “now” (4Q175 11, quoting Num 24:17) for MT עֵתָה; חופהא “canopy” (4Q321a V, 7 = MT חֻפָּה); היהא (1QIsa^a at Isa 5:1, 12:2) for MT הָיָה and הָיָה.¹⁵² The

146. Note also ויוציא “he brought forth” in 11Q5 (11QP^s) at Ps 136:11 for MT וַיּוֹצֵא.

147. However, note the complex etymology of the name (Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 119).

148. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 200.

149. Perhaps also קדשא[י] (4Q509 7, 6) for *קדשים.

150. The writing might be occasioned by the preceding word עניא “humble” (= MT עָנִי), or to indicate a synonymous root with *aleph* root consonant (נכא “to strike”), while also indicating explicitly the preceding /ē/ vowel (similarly with ראיש “head” in DSS Aramaic, e.g., 1Q20 XIV, 9; see Muraoka, *GQA*, 29).

151. If this is correct, then the scribe did not bother to erase the mistaken א. It is also conceivable, though unlikely, that the *niphal* of יחל was intended (vocalized according to Tiberian Hebrew אִיחַל*). The MT has יחל, which seems like a mistake itself, or, following the LXX, the verse is missing its intended subject שָׁמִי.

152. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 185. היאה (1QIsa^a at Isa 65:10) and היאה (2Q13 [2QJer] at Jer 48:27), in each case for MT הָיָה, perhaps represent the 3fs independent pronoun.

origin of this digraph is unclear. Perhaps, this marking is on analogy to the 3fs possessive suffix on plural nouns, as in חטותיהא “her sins” (4Q176 1–2 i, 6, quoting Isa 40:2) for MT חַטָּאוֹתֶיהָ. Note also that הַא- is a rare spelling for the 3fs suffix on singular nouns in 1QIsa^a where the MT has ה- (= -āh), as in כותבהא “write it” (1QIsa^a at Isa 30:8) for MT כָּתְבָהּ and באה “in it” (at Isa 34:10, 11; 62:4; 66:10) for MT בָּהּ.¹⁵³

Scholars have proposed various explanations for these digraphs. Qimron believes they make explicit that the preceding vowel is /o/, /i/, or /e/, not /ā/ or /ε/.¹⁵⁴ Kutscher believes their primary function is to insure a Hebrew pronunciation over against an Aramaic one, while Ben-Ḥayyim thinks they indicate a particular pronunciation, for example, מִיַּא miyya “who?” (= TH מִי).¹⁵⁵ Kutscher also suggested that these spellings derived from a wish to archaize; he wrote: “Even if—as I think really was the case—this spelling developed thanks to a vogue for archaism...” and “the more complicated a spelling, the more archaic and erudite it appears.”¹⁵⁶

To my mind, both Kutscher’s and Qimron’s ideas contribute something to the explanation of this orthography. The inclusion of *waw* and *yodh maters* in general were attractive to the DSS writers due to the fact that they clearly indicate the vowel (for example, the case of וַא- and אַא- in words like רואש and its variant ראוש, as well as in יואמר, לוֹא, יאמר, רֵאשׁ). The *maters* would have facilitated pronunciation of the words, even encouraged quicker acquisition of reading, not to mention they would have made the words distinctly Hebrew in form (as opposed to Aramaic רֵאשׁ, יאמר, רֵאשׁ). But, word-final digraphs are not essential in discriminating between different vowels. In the case of these digraphs, it would seem that Kutscher’s explanation is more likely; they are due to a mimicking of what was perceived to be archaic spelling.

For a discussion of the use of *aleph* in place of a *yodh* and *waw* in words like כתאים “Kittim” and מצאותי “my commandments,” see the respective

153. See §5.2, “Pronouns and Particles.” The reverse sequence (הַא-) also occurs where it is precipitated by the quiescence of the *aleph* and the incorrect insertion of the letter: מלכאה “work” (4Q263 3) for *מלאכה; התנאה “the fig” (4Q107 [4QCant^b] at Song 2:13) for MT הַתְּאֵנָה (see Tov, DJD 16:212).

154. Qimron, *HDSS*, 22.

155. Qimron, *HDSS*, 21–22. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 21. Ben-Ḥayyim, *Studies in the Traditions*, 82–85.

156. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 21.

discussions in §§4.4–5, “*Aleph < Yodh* and *Yodh < Aleph*” and “*Aleph < Waw* and *Waw < Aleph*.”

3.6. TWO *YODHS* FOR A CONSONANTAL *YODH* AND TWO *WAWs* FOR A CONSONANTAL *WAW*

Two *yodhs* are sometimes written when comparable MT forms have a single consonantal *yodh*. The numerous examples suggest that these are not simply cases of dittography. Two *yodhs* for a single consonantal *yodh* occur with the verb הִיָּה “to be,” as well as with a few nouns. The examples include those instances from 1QIsa^a, cited by Kutscher: *qal* perfect 3ms: הִיָּה (at Isa 19:20); 3fs: הִיָּתָה (1:21, 6:13, 11:16 [twice], 17:9, 28:4, 29:2 [twice], 34:9, 34:13, 50:11, 64:9); הִיָּתָה (17:1, 19:17); and infinitive הִיָּתָה (60:15).¹⁵⁷ Additional examples include the *qal* perfect 3ms הִיָּה (4Q219 II, 21); *qal* imperfect 3ms: יִהְיֶה (4Q252 II, 6); *niphal* perfect 3ms נִהְיָה (1QS III, 15).¹⁵⁸ Note too יִשְׁיִיכָה *yaššiyākā* “may he (not) deceive you” (1QIsa^a at Isa 37:10) for MT יִשְׁאָךְ, the *hiphil* imperfect 3ms + 2ms suffix; here the spelling in the scroll reflects the shift /' / to /y/, which is found especially where the preceding vowel is /i/.¹⁵⁹ Alternatively, the second *yodh* could be a *mater* and the word pronounced *yaššiyekā*, analogous to the pausal form of the imperfect + 2ms suffix יִשְׁחִיתְךָ “he will (not) destroy you” (Deut 4:31). Among the nouns that Kutscher lists as having an extra *yodh*, the most important to note is: בְּעֵיִם “with the heat/strength of” (1QIsa^a at Isa 11:15) for MT בְּעֵיִם.¹⁶⁰ Other examples of verbs and nouns may be יִזֵּל “it will flow” (1QIsa^a at Isa 45:8) for MT יִזְלוּ;¹⁶¹ יָדָי “two hands of” (1QM XVII, 11); בְּיָד “in the hand/power of” (4Q219 II, 26); רַעֲיִיתוֹ “his companion” (4Q502 1, 7).¹⁶² The same phenomenon is found in Qumran Ara-

157. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 159–160. Kutscher also lists הִיָּתָה (16:2) which is now read as הִיָּתָה corrected from הִיָּתָה (see Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 361).

158. Note also the *niphal* participle נִהְיֶה (in CD II, 10). The spelling יִיכָל (4Q266 5 ii, 7) is another possible example, though perhaps this spelling is due to an attempted correction of *waw* in place of *yodh*.

159. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 516; §4.4, “*Aleph < Yodh* and *Yodh < Aleph*.”

160. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 159.

161. This is the reading of Accordance and Ulrich et al., *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 420. Kutscher reads this as יִזֵּל (*Isaiah*, 400). Conceivably the second *yodh* marks the short /i/ vowel; see §3.2, “*Plene Orthography*.”

162. The word רַעֲיִיתוֹ is parsed by Accordance and the *Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance* as the noun רַעֲיָה (= MT רַעֲיָה) “companion.” Accordance identifies it as singu-

maic with the participle כוייה “burn,” in 4Q204 1 i, 26. Comparable nouns + suffixes occur in Hebrew inscriptions from the Common Era, as noted by Kutscher, as well as in texts of the Mishnah, as in the spelling of the *qal* feminine singular passive participle ראייה in *m. Pe’ah* 5:1 and *m. Soṭ.* 4:3 in the Kaufmann manuscript (versus ראייה in *m. Sanh.* 1:6 and 8:4).¹⁶³

More rarely, two *yodhs* are written for two adjacent consonantal *yodhs*, as in ענייה “afflicted one” (1QIsa^a at Isa 54:11) for MT ענייה “the sea” (1QpHab XI, 2); היימים “the days” (4Q219 II, 31); צי[ה] “dry” (4Q286 5a–c, 2).¹⁶⁴ This too is evidenced in later Hebrew, as in היירקות “the green vegetables” from *m. Ber.* 6:1.

A similar phenomenon appears to take place with *waw*. The MT שוא “nothingness” is written שוו (1QpHab X, 10 and 11), similar to its spelling שוא in the Kaufmann manuscript of *m. Šebu.* 3:11.¹⁶⁵ The MT עול “injustice” is written עול in 11Q13 II, 11 in quoting Ps 82:2. Note also הוות “destructions of” (1QH^a XI, 39) for what would be (presumably) in the MT הוות*, though הוות might also be construed as one consonantal *waw* surrounded by two *mater waws*.

Two separate *waws* written for two adjacent consonantal *waws* may be evidenced in the 3ms *piel waw*-consecutive imperfect form of צוה “to command,” ויצוהו “he commanded him” in 4Q219 I, 12.¹⁶⁶ Conceivably, תשויע “you will cry out” in 1Q8 (1QIsa^b) at Isa 58:9 for MT תשויע is another example of this and should be read תשווע.¹⁶⁷ The spelling עוה

lar, though one wonders if it should not be read as plural רעיותו. The text is extremely fragmentary. Examples like תענייות “humiliations” (4Q511 8, 5 and 121, 2 [with interlinear second *yodh*]) are probably due to analogy to other gentilic words like כתיים (see §4.4, “Aleph < Yodh and Yodh < Aleph”).

163. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 160. M. H. Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1927), 35. Similarly, note שייר in, e.g., *m. Pe’ah* 3:8 (Kaufmann manuscript).

164. More conjectural is וייכ[תבו] (4Q269 10 ii, 10).

165. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 148 for this example. Another example Kutscher cites from 1QpHab (IX, 9), [בא]ון, is now read as בעון by Accordance and DSSSE.

166. The fact that ויצוהו is a singular verb is based on the fact that this passage from *Jubilees* has Abraham speaking to Isaac. The superficially similar תצומו “you (mp) will command them” (4Q364 30, 5) uses an initial *waw* to mark the consonant and a second to mark the /ū/ vowel, cf. MT תצומו (in Deut 32:46); see Tov and White, DJD 13:243. The possibly similar ישתחוה from 1QIsa^a at Isa 45:14 is probably a spelling mistake since the MT form is plural ישתחוו (see Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 148).

167. See §3.2, “Plene Orthography.”

“ruin” in 11Q5 (11QPs^a) XIX, 15 for what would be in the MT עִוָה may be another example of this orthographic practice, though I prefer reading the word as עִוָה “iniquity.”¹⁶⁸

Although Qimron writes that the “occasional instances of the spellings וו,” are mostly misreadings by modern editors,” there are a sufficient number of cases to suggest that this was a rare reflex of the orthography, particularly when the preceding consonant is a guttural or *waw*.¹⁶⁹ All the texts cited above are from the DSS-SP9 texts, except 4Q252 and 1Q8 (1QIsa^b), which are DSS-NSP.

168. See Eric D. Raymond, *New Idioms within Old: Poetry and Parallelism in the Non-Masoretic Poems of 11Q5 (= 11QPs^a)* (SBLEJL 31; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 154, 160.

169. Qimron, *HDSS*, 24. He also cites his earlier article “The Language of the Temple Scroll” (Hebrew), *Leshonenu* 39 (1975):144. In his *Grammar* (65), he lists only three cases of *yodh* written twice to indicate a consonant outside 1QIsa^a.

PHONETICS AND PHONOLOGY

4.1. PHONEMIC INVENTORY

The phonemic inventory of the Hebrew attested in the DSS is unknown, but it seems quite possible that it was similar to that found in Tiberian Hebrew. The following list of Tiberian Hebrew consonants gives the phoneme between slashes and the approximate phonetic realization in brackets (using the IPA system of phonetic notation). Labials /b/ [b], [v]; /m/ [m]; /p/ [p], [f]; /w/ [w], [v]; dentals/alveolars: /t/ [t], [θ]; /d/ [d], [ð]; /t̥/ [t̥]; /s/ [s]; /z/ [z]; /ʃ/ [ʃ]; /š/ [ʃ]; /n/ [n]; /l/ [l]; palatals: /y/ [j]; velars and uvulars: /k/ [k], [χ]; /g/ [g], [ʁ]; /q/ [q]; /r/ [ʀ]; laryngeals/pharyngeals: /h/ [h]; /ʕ/ [ʕ]; /ħ/ [ħ]; /ʕ/ [ʕ].¹ The assumption that the *begadkephat* letters were spirantized in the Hebrew of the DSS is addressed below in §4.2, “Spirantization.”

As explained below in detail, the gutturals (/ʕ/, /h/, /ħ/, /ʕ/) certainly seem to be confused in particular texts, suggesting that there was less distinction between them than in earlier Hebrew and less than that reflected in the Tiberian tradition. Nevertheless, this is not a universal phenomenon; not all texts reveal such confusion and not all gutturals were equally indistinguishable.

I assume that the /y/ sound was preserved in the writing/reading register of most DSS, both in intervocalic position and at the beginning of a word, though sometimes it did shift to a glottal stop (as explained in §4.4, “*Aleph* < *Yodh* and *Yodh* < *Aleph*”). I also assume it forms a diphthong where it appears at the end of a word (e.g., םג = *gōy*). Nevertheless, in some

1. See Geoffrey Khan, “The Tiberian Pronunciation Tradition of Biblical Hebrew,” *ZAH* 9 (1996): 3–13. The above list is a simplification of Khan’s more subtle and nuanced description.

texts and dialects it is conceivable that /y/ was not pronounced. Qimron asserts that the earlier syllable-initial *yi-* shifted to *i-* and that this is evidenced in the misspelling of a single personal name: “Ishmael” (1QM II, 13) being written as אשמעל in 4Q496 13, 1.² A similar shift is asserted for Biblical Hebrew, where ישי “Jesse” (1 Sam 16:1 and passim) is spelled אשי once (1 Chr 2:13).³ Another biblical example may be אש “there is” (2 Sam 14:19) for יש.⁴ If such a shift is prevalent in the Hebrew of the DSS, it is strange that there is just one example of it. One wonders if this is best understood in the MT as well as in the DSS as a rare expression of a different (sub-)dialect of Hebrew. Muraoka is cautious as to the existence of this phenomenon in DSS Aramaic.⁵ In the Hebrew of the scrolls, *yodh* may also rarely be lost at the end of syllables and words (for examples, see §4.10, “Diphthongs and Triphthongs”).

Mem and *nun* are distinguished, I assume, in the writing/reading register. Where *mem* appears for *nun* and vice versa, one can often attribute such a shift to Aramaic influence or hypercorrection due to a perceived Aramaic influence. Cases where *nun* appears for a *mem* in the masculine plural morpheme are probably due to Aramaic influence (פחין “traps” 4Q184 1, 2; ימין 11Q20 XII, 5 corrected to ימים “days”; בשמין 4Q107 [4QCant^b] at Song 4:10 for MT בְּשָׂמִים “spices”) as are the forms of the 3mp suffix with a *nun* (ובשוכן 4Q405 20 ii–22, 12, for what would be in the MT וּבְשָׁכָם “and in their descent [from שכך]”; אביהן 4Q17 [4QExod–Lev^f] at Exod 40:15 for MT אֲבֵיהֶם “their father”).⁶ Cases of hypercorrec-

2. Qimron, *HDSS*, 32 n. 31 and “Diphthongs and Glides,” 264 n. 24.

3. Joüon-Muraoka §26e. They note that initial *yi-* was pronounced *i-* “at least in certain schools.” See also Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 1:104–5 and Gumpertz, *Mivta’e Sefatenu*, 55–65. The same shift is evidenced in Modern Israeli Hebrew (Dorit Diskin Ravid, *Spelling Morphology: The Psycholinguistics of Hebrew Spelling* [Literacy Studies 3; New York: Springer, 2012], 92).

4. C. D. Isbell, “Initial *’Alef-Yod* Interchange and Selected Biblical Passages,” *JNES* 37 (1978): 228.

5. Muraoka, *GQA*, 21.

6. The word פחין (see John Strugnell, “Notes en marge du volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7 [1970: 264] is read as פחון “wantonness” (a noun or infinitive) by John M. Allegro (*Qumran Cave 4.I* (4Q158–186) [DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968], 83) and Qimron (*HDSS*, 112). Note the concentration of apparent Aramaisms in 4Q107, noted by Tov, DJD 16:209. Notice also that the Hebrew words that have a *nun* in the plural are words that also occur in DSS Aramaic. Others (e.g., *DSSSE* and Accordance) derive ובשוכן from שכך “to dwell.” On the similar shifts

tion may include **מדיים** (1QIsa^a at Isa 9:3 and 60:6) for MT **מִדְיָן** “Midian”; **נתן ולבנימ'ם נתן** “to Benjamin he gave” (4Q364 11, 2); **ובנימ'ים** “and Benjamin” (4Q385a 18 ii, 7); **אתנם** “wages” (4Q166 II, 18), for what would be **אַתְנָן** in the MT, in a quotation of Hos 2:14 for MT **אַתְנָה**.⁷ All the same, there might also have been a confusion of the two phonemes in some dialects. According to Kutscher, the final *mem* of some words was pronounced as a *nun*, though still written with a *mem* in dialects of Hebrew from the region of Jerusalem south.⁸ Qimron, on the other hand, believes there is no distinction between the two consonants at the end of words.⁹

In some cases, where one would expect a *nun* to assimilate to a following consonant, it does not. Qimron lists numerous cases where this occurs with the preposition *min* (e.g., **מן טהרת** “from the purity of” 1QS VII, 3, instead of ***(מטהרת)**).¹⁰ He notes that this tendency also appears in the MT and that Kutscher observed the same phenomenon in 1QIsa^a and attributed it to influence from Aramaic (in Aramaic, the *nun* on the corresponding preposition does not typically assimilate). If this is so, then it is ironic, since the Aramaic of the DSS seems to show the influence of Hebrew in this respect, as Muraoka observes: the assimilation of /n/ of the preposition *min* is “fairly common in Q[umran] A[ramaic].”¹¹ Other apparent cases of nonassimilation include **וינתן** (4Q17 [4QExod–Lev^f] at Exod 40:18, 20, 22) for MT **וַיִּתֵּן** “he set”; this may reflect dissimilation of gemination through nasalization, as in Aramaic (though note the possible assimilation of the *nun* in other attestations of the same verb in this same manuscript, e.g., **נתת** at Exod 40:8). In other cases, the nonassimilation may be part of the idiosyncracies of the scroll and its scribes, as in **נתן** “he will give” and **ניצר** “he will guard” in 4Q175 3 and 17, respectively,

in Aramaic, see Muraoka, *GQA*, 19. Note too the **ן**-ending on all m.p. nouns in the Copper Scroll (3Q15).

7. On **מדיים**, see Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 61. On the spelling of Benjamin with a *mem*, see Kutscher, *Galilean Aramaic*, 62 n. 82. Sometimes the replacement of *nun* with *mem* is due to the generic use of the 3mp suffix, as in **קולם** (4Q104 [4QRuth^a] at Ruth 1:9) for MT **קולן** (cf. **עשיתם** in the MT Ruth 1:8 and **לכם** Ruth 1:9, in each case with Naomi's daughters-in-law as antecedent).

8. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 61. Kutscher bases his conclusion on various misspellings from inscriptions and the LXX, especially where a place name that should end with a *mem* ends with a *nun* or Greek *nu*.

9. Qimron, *HDSS*, 27.

10. Qimron, *HDSS*, 30–31.

11. Muraoka, *GQA*, 7.

together with the numerous other oddities of this scroll (e.g., לַמַּעַן “so that” in line 4 for what should be *לַמַּעַן).¹² Another possible explanation is the preference for pausal forms (in the MT, I-*nun* verbs in pause sometimes do not evidence assimilation).¹³

The pronunciation of *resh* in the MT depends on certain variables, according to Khan.¹⁴ Alone, it would be pronounced either as a voiced uvular rhotic or as a uvular frictionless consonant, a pronunciation close to that of the spirantized version of *gimmel* (which was articulated as a voiced uvular fricative similar to the pronunciation of French *ar* and Arabic *ḡayin*).¹⁵ Near an alveolar consonant (/d/, /z/, /ʒ/, /s/, /t/, /ʔ/, /l/, /n/), however, *resh* would be articulated as a velarized or uvularized “linguo-alveolar roll.”¹⁶ The uvular articulation of this letter means that it was (at least sometimes) made in the mouth close to where the gutturals are made. It would seem that the pronunciation of *resh* was similar in the time of the DSS.¹⁷ Thus, it is no wonder that, like the gutturals, the *resh* was sometimes dropped from the spelling of some words, though often reintroduced as a correction (see §3.1, “Scribal Mistakes”). Such mistakes should be distinguished (to the extent possible) from the confusions that derive from *resh*’s graphic similarity with *daleth* (אבִּידִי [4Q111 (4QLam) at Lam 1:15] for MT אַבִּירִי); that derive from metathesis (תברנו “you created us” [4Q504 1–2R iii, 7] corrected to תרבנו “you made us numerous”); and from haplography (טוה רווחות [4Q405 20 ii–22, 11] for טוהר* רווחות “...purely, spirits”).

As in Tiberian Hebrew, the pronunciation of *samekh* and etymological *sin* is identical: /s/. In early Hebrew, the single symbol ש represented two separate phonemes, one a lateral fricative (/ʃ/) and the other an unvoiced postalveolar fricative (/ʂ/).¹⁸ In exilic and postexilic books of the Bible,

12. Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 342.

13. See Joüon-Muraoka §72b and Muraoka, *GQA*, 8, 10–11.

14. Khan, “Tiberian Pronunciation Tradition,” 11.

15. *Ibid.*, 4, 11.

16. *Ibid.*, 11.

17. Kutscher together with other scholars concluded that *resh* in the DSS “was not firm.” See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 531 and the references there.

18. See Richard C. Steiner, *The Case for Fricative-Laterals in Proto-Semitic* (AOS 59; New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1977); *idem*, “Addenda to *The Case for Fricative-Laterals in Proto-Semitic*,” in *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau* (ed. A. S. Kaye; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991), 1499–1513; *idem*, “Ancient Hebrew,” in *The Semitic Languages* (ed. R. Hetzron; London: Routledge, 1997), 148; and Khan, “Tibe-

the lateral fricative phoneme appears to have merged with the phoneme represented by **ס**, an unvoiced alveolar sibilant (/s/).¹⁹ Most words that had the earlier lateral fricative phoneme, nevertheless, continued to be written with the **ש** symbol. By the time of the Masorettes, a diacritic dot was placed above the letter **ש** to distinguish those instances in which it was representing /s/ and those instances in which it was representing /š/. Since the scribes of the DSS era did not have such a diacritic mark, it is not surprising that one sometimes finds words with an etymological lateral fricative (/š/) spelled with **ס** and words with an etymological unvoiced alveolar sibilant (/s/) spelled with a **ש**.

The cases where etymological /š/ is spelled with *samekh* are generally considered spelling errors which reflect the merging of the respective phonemes. Examples are relatively common and listed by Abegg.²⁰ For the sake of clarification, I give two: **בסר** “flesh” (1QH^a XXIV, 26) for ***בשר** and **תסיג** “it will (not) reach” (4Q418 126 ii, 13) corrected to **תשיג**. Most of the examples that Abegg cites come from DSS-SP9 texts, though examples can also be found in DSS-NSP texts: **יסטמוני** “they accuse me” in 4Q88 (4QPs^f) at Ps 109:4 for MT **יִשְׁטַנּוּנִי**. The reverse mistake (of writing a *sin/shin* [ש] for etymological *samekh* /s/) is also evidenced: **פשה** (4Q136 [4QPhyl I] at Exod 12:48) for the expected ***פסה** “Passover”; **כשפו** (4Q136 [4QPhyl I] at Exod 12:44) for MT **כֶּסֶף** “silver”; **מאשו** (1QpHab I, 11) for **מאסו** “they rejected”; **משיגי** (4Q271 1, 2 or 4Q280 3, 2) corrected to **מיסיגי** “one who moves back”; **שכות** (4Q522 9 i–10, 14) for ***סכות** “Sukkoth.”²¹ Again, most examples are from DSS-SP9 texts, though this kind of misspelling is also found in DSS-NSP texts: **מ[ש]ה** (4Q14 [4QExod^e] at Exod 17:7) for MT **מַסָּה** “Massah”; **שפרתי** (4Q90 [4QPs^h] at Ps 119:13) for MT **סִפְרַתִּי** “I recount”; **ישד** (4Q93 [4QPs^l] at Ps 104:5) for MT **יִסַּד** “he founded.” Although Qimron suggests that the latter kind of misspellings can only be explained as hypercorrections, or as reflecting the collapse of the two separate phonemes, /s/ and /š/, it seems far likelier that scribes had simply

rian Pronunciation Tradition,” 12. The transliteration of the lateral fricative in the IPA is /ʃ/ and that of the postalveolar fricative is /ʃ/.

19. Gary A. Rendsburg, “Ancient Hebrew Phonology,” in *Phonologies of Asia and Africa* (ed. A. S. Kaye; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 73.

20. Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 327.

21. On 4Q280, B. Nitzan writes: “This little fragment was ascribed by the first generation of editors to two different compositions” (“Curses,” in DJD 29:8).

become confused as to the etymology of the words and sometimes wrote a Ψ when the etymology presumed Σ and vice versa.²²

The vowels for DSS Hebrew also are not known, but conceivably correspond to the vowels of Hebrew in the early part of the first millennium C.E.: /a/ [a]; /e/ [ɛ]; /o/ [o]; /u/ [u]; /i/ [i]. I assume that there was still a distinction in vowel length at this time, something reflected in various sources, including the *Secunda*.²³ For the discussion of the supposed shift of Proto-Semitic /a/ to /ā/, see §4.9 below, “/ā/ < /ā/ < Proto-Semitic /a/.”

4.2. SPIRANTIZATION

The development of spirant versions of /b/, /g/, /d/, /k/, /p/, /t/ is posited for Aramaic based on readings like אַחױית “I was informed” (a passive A-stem, 4Q196 2, 1), which was interpreted as אַחבױית “I hid myself” (from an earlier אַתחבױית) by the LXX translators.²⁴ Muraoka cites Fitzmyer, who believes spirantization is evidenced for Hebrew in וגױתם “(in?) their body” (4Q169 3–4 ii, 4 in a quotation of Nah 3:3 which has in the MT בַּגְוִיֹּתָם).²⁵

22. Qimron, *HDSS*, 28–30. If the phonemes /s/ and /š/ had really collapsed, we would expect to see more examples of etymological /š/ written with a *samekh*, but Qimron lists only one well-accepted example, יכחס (1QS VII, 3) for what should be *יכחשׁ “he will deceive.” Furthermore, confusion of *samekh* for the etymological /š/ does not necessarily presume hypercorrection, as though the scribe thought that the root actually contained an etymological /š/. See also Steiner, “Addenda,” 1501–3.

23. For the hypothetical correspondences between the vowels presumed by the *Secunda* and those of the Hebrew text, see G. Janssens, *Studies in Hebrew Historical Linguistics Based on Origen’s Secunda* (Orientalia Gandensia 9; Leuven: Peeters, 1982), 111–33 and *passim*. On the complexities of studying the *Secunda* and what era of Greek it represents, consult *ibid.*, 20–23; Einar Brønno, “Zu den Theorien Paul Kahles,” *ZDMG* 100 (1951): 532–33; Geoffrey Khan, “The Historical Background of the Vowel *šere*,” *BSOAS* 57 (1994): 133–44.

24. Muraoka, *GQA*, 13. Klaus Beyer, on the other hand, dates the development of spirantized allophones in Aramaic from the first century B.C.E. to the third century C.E., though the aspiration of /k/, /p/, /t/ occurs around 250 B.C.E. (*Die Aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer, samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984], 125–28). For the evidence from Greek sources, see Janssens, *Studies in Hebrew*, 45–50.

25. See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Tobit,” in *DJD* 19:10. Despite the *daghesh* in the *beth*, the preceding word ends in a vowel, thus making the spirantization of the *beth* in the DSS version possible

Allegro mentions a similar kind of mistake in 4Q171 3-10 iv, 7, where an erased *waw* stands before *בהשפטו* “in his being judged”; he assumes that the *waw* is due to confusion with a spirantized *beth* (the preceding word ends with a vowel).²⁶ Other possible examples also exist. The phrase *יורו לחתוף* (4Q429 2, 10) is similar to *לחתף יורבו* “they lie in wait (ארב) for prey” (1QH^a XIII, 12).²⁷ If the verb *ארב* was intended in 4Q429, then the writing *יורו* may imply a pronunciation where the second *waw* represents the spirantized *beth* (*yōrābū*), though it seems more likely that the scribe simply forgot to write the *beth* or that the verb *ירה* was intended.²⁸ Another possible example is *צפה* *šāfā* “he watches” (4Q111 [4QLam] at Lam 1:17) for MT *צִוה* “he commanded.”²⁹ I assume that spirantization in Hebrew derives from Aramaic influence and that it was a feature of the writing/reading register of most scribes and writers.

4.3. WEAKENING OF GUTTURALS

Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky makes the following straightforward statement: “There is a consensus among Hebraists that the gutturals underwent weakening in the idiom of the DSS.”³⁰ The statement seems characteristic of brief descriptions of DSS Hebrew phonology.³¹ He, like most scholars who

26. Allegro, DJD 5:41, 49.

27. See Eileen Schuller, “Hodayot” in DJD 29:186. Note also that the 1QH^a passage had *לחתוף* initially, though the *waw* was erased.

28. For more on this line, see Schuller, DJD 29:187 and the literature cited there and Menahem Kister, “Three Unknown Hebrew Words in Newly-Published Texts from Qumran” (Hebrew), *Leshonenu* 63 (2000–2001): 38–39.

29. Cross (“Lamentations,” in DJD 16:237) thinks that the original text must be that of the scroll; note also that the vowels of the two verbs are not close.

30. Yuditsky, “Weak Consonants,” 236.

31. From the early era of DSS studies is the example of Goshen-Gottstein who writes: “It will not come as unexpected news that the system of four separate laryngeal and pharyngeal phonemes has collapsed in [the] Q[umran] S[crolls]” (“Linguistic Structure,” 107). Angel Sáenz-Badillos, recognizing the possibility of multiple dialects, writes in relation to the phonology in the scrolls “Weakening, merger, and loss of laryngeals and pharyngeals is typical” (*A History of the Hebrew Language* [trans. J. Elwolde; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1993], 137). More recently, Muraoka writes: “The frequent deletion of guttural letters ... and their indiscriminate interchange ... attest to the general weakening of these consonants” (“Hebrew,” 1:341). Frequently, however, in-depth sketches, including those just quoted, often try to nuance this weakening in one way or another. For example, after the sentence just quoted from page 107,

make similar statements, is, I think, referring to a spectrum of guttural weakening in the “living substratum” of Qumran Hebrew.³² Nevertheless, the statement (and others like it) is problematic due to its vagueness. First, one is left to wonder whether the “weakening” applies to all gutturals equally, primarily the laryngeals, or some other grouping. Second, one wonders what is implied by “underwent weakening.” Did the respective phonemes disappear from the language all together, were they usually unarticulated, or only occasionally unarticulated?

Compounding the confusion is that Yuditsky, like almost all others who comment on the phenomenon, cites, in a footnote, references to Kutscher’s work on Isaiah and then to Qimron’s *HDSS*. In the relevant passage, Kutscher states that “the laryngeals and pharyngeals were indistinguishable in the dialect of the scribe of the [Isaiah] Scr[oll]. This feature, with some variations, is true of the other writings of the sect as well, but this is not the place for a detailed discussion.”³³

This suggests to my mind that all the gutturals were equally indistinguishable from all the other gutturals and that this was a feature not only of 1QIsa^a, but of all the DSS generally. But, this is not exactly what Kutscher means. He writes more precisely in an earlier part of his book:

Apparently they [the laryngeals and pharyngeals] had become so weak that no differentiation was made between ן-ה, ף-ח and quite likely very little was made even between the two groups. The “ח” was not pronounced.... The “ף” seems to have been like the “ח” in this respect.... The “ן” was apparently pronounced very nearly like a “ה”.³⁴

Goshen-Gottstein remarks: “whereas in some places the ‘original’ sounds could be still realized correctly, at least under certain circumstances, inhabitants of other localities were completely incapable of the ‘correct’ pronunciation” (“Linguistic Structure,” 107). Muraoka too notes that such weakening does not imply the weakening of the consonants in all dialects throughout Palestine (“Hebrew,” 1:341). When Rendsburg mentions guttural weakening, he refers specifically to 1QIsa^a (“Qumran Hebrew,” 221). Abegg qualifies it in the following way: “Although there is some confusion in the representation of gutturals which points to the lack of distinction or weakening of their pronunciation (*HDSS* §200.11), the vast majority of the misspellings concerns the confusion of ח and ה or the elision of ח” (“Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 327).

32. For the term “living substratum” see Joosten, “Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek,” 355.

33. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 508. Note that Yuditsky cites Kutscher’s work in Hebrew, 398–403; the above quoted text occurs on page 401 of the Hebrew edition.

34. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 57. The confusion between *aleph* and *‘ayin* on the one hand

Kutscher backs his statement up with numerous examples of slips that the scribes of 1QIsa^a made in representing the etymological gutturals, as well as cases where gutturals were introduced where they are not part of a word's etymology. He specifies that this phenomenon (that "laryngeals and pharyngeals were indistinguishable") was not pervasive in all dialects of Hebrew and Aramaic in Palestine.³⁵

Qimron emphasizes that although there are eighty cases (among the corpus he studied) of words containing gutturals that are misspelled, misspellings are "chiefly with *alef*, less often with *he*, *ayin*, and *het*."³⁶ Despite the lopsided data, Qimron comes to a conclusion similar to that of Kutscher: "gutturals in the Qumran pronunciation were weakened."³⁷ He clarifies what he means by "weakened," at least in relation to the dialect of 4QMMT, when he notes in his summary of the language of the text that "gutturals were 'weakened,' i.e., often so little pronounced as to be imperceptible."³⁸ Notice, however, that Qimron is less specific than Kutscher and does not indicate explicitly, for example, that 'ayin had disappeared to the degree that *aleph* had. In fact, Qimron is quite explicit that he views *aleph* as totally quiesced in intervocalic position.³⁹ He does not say this about the other gutturals.

Things become more muddled when comparing these evaluations with those of other scholars. Goshen-Gottstein, for example, does not describe the falling together of *aleph* and 'ayin, but, instead, implies the falling together of *aleph* and *heh*.⁴⁰ Murtonen seems to agree with Goshen-Gottstein's view, asserting that the *het* and 'ayin were preserved longer than *aleph* and *heh*, and suggests that since confusion between words containing *het* and 'ayin occurs primarily in the first half of 1QIsa^a, the scribe

and *heh* and *het* on the other is the same confusion recounted in the Jerusalem Talmud for people in the towns of Haifa, Beth-Shean, and Tibeon (see *ibid.*, 58).

35. *Ibid.*, 59.

36. Qimron, *HDSS*, 25.

37. *Ibid.*

38. Qimron, "The Language," in *DJD* 10:69. Does he mean that there was not a distinction between laryngeals and not a distinction between pharyngeals? Or, does he mean that the gutturals had all collapsed to a single phoneme?

39. Qimron, *HDSS*, 31.

40. Goshen-Gottstein refers to the "collapse of the laryngeal-pharyngeal system, especially of the weakening of the laryngals [i.e., א and ה]" ("Linguistic Structure," 108–9).

of this portion of the scroll did not pronounce them, while “the writers of the model exemplars probably still did.”⁴¹

Although statements asserting the weakening of gutturals in the Hebrew of the DSS are frequent, most words in the DSS are spelled correctly with *heh*, *ḥeth*, and *‘ayin*, as Qimron and others specify.⁴² The simplest explanation for this is that the writers of the DSS, with some possible exceptions (like the scribes who copied 1QIsa^a), still knew the standard or “correct” pronunciation of the respective letters. They perhaps did not recognize the twofold pronunciation of *ḥeth* (as /h/ and /ḥ/) and of *‘ayin* (as /‘/ and /ḡ/), but they would have recognized /h/, /ḥ/ and /‘/ as distinct, at least when writing and reading texts carefully.

Although a consistency in spelling certain words with particular letters might be the result of a conservative spelling tradition (that is, “light” was always spelled with an *aleph*, אור, and “skin” always with an *‘ayin*, עור), there are several factors that suggest consistency is not only attributable to a spelling tradition. First, it should be recognized that although Hebrew had a spelling tradition involving the writing of etymological *alephs* (even when these were no longer pronounced, as in ראש “head”), the scribes often did not follow it (and wrote רוש instead). They did this even though this created graphic ambiguity (compounding the already existing phonetic ambiguity) with the word “poor” רוש.⁴³ Thus, one would assume that if the other gutturals were as weak as *aleph*, then the scribes would also not follow the spelling conventions of preceding generations and would have regularly spelled words like מעשה “deed” as משה*. However, words that have an etymological *heh*, *ḥeth*, and/or *‘ayin* root consonant are not routinely misspelled.⁴⁴ Second, while (mis)spellings with *aleph* occur in a number of different permutations these do not occur with *heh*, *ḥeth*, and *‘ayin*. For example, though ראשית “beginning” may be spelled רשית and

41. A. Murtonen, “A Historico-Philological Survey of the Main Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents,” *Abr-Nahrain* 4 (1963–1964): 72.

42. Qimron, *HDSS*, 25, and Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 327.

43. In at least one instance this led to a scribe writing the word for “poor” like the word for “head” ראש (4Q416 2 iii, 2). The word ראש “head” is spelled without *aleph* around thirty-four times in the biblical and nonbiblical scrolls and שארית is spelled without *aleph* around ten times.

44. For example, for *‘ayin*, the closest one comes to a repeated mistake is the form “he did” ויעש and “may he do” יעשה both misspelled in 1QIsa^a as וישה and the forms “he/it/they (will) pass” (עבר) spelled יבר in 1QIsa^a, יאבורו in 1QS, and אברו in 4Q55 (4Isa^a) (for details, see the subsection on *‘ayin*). Compare the frequency of רוש.

רישית, it is never spelled with *heh*, *heth*, or *‘ayin* (as *רהשית, *רחשית, *רעשית, respectively). Similarly, although גוים “peoples” might be written גואים, it is never written *גוהים, *גוחים, or *גועים.

The situation in DSS Hebrew might be compared to that in DSS Aramaic, as described by Muraoka:

Though the weakening of gutturals in Q[umran] A[ramaic] appears to be an indisputable fact, it does not necessarily follow that all the three letters, <ח, ה, א>, carried the same phonetic value everywhere nor that they carried no phonetic value at all. Though the four possible spellings—ברא טבה, ברה טבא, ברא טבא, ברה טבה—may have all sounded in QA exactly the same and meant exactly the same thing, ‘the good son,’ it does not necessarily follow that Afel אקים and Hafel הקים were every bit phonetically identical.⁴⁵

I wonder whether for DSS Hebrew the *‘ayin* was also distinguished, especially in certain texts. In short, my view is that for the writing/reading register of the DSS scribes, *aleph* and *heh* are usually preserved at the beginning of a word and when directly preceded by a full vowel; *‘ayin* is usually preserved, but occasionally is lost at syllable end and where it is directly preceded within a word by a consonant or muttered vowel; *heth* is only rarely lost at syllable end, suggesting in most cases it had not weakened (the dialect of the scribes of 1QIsa^a being a possible exception in this regard).

So, what evidence has been assembled to convince “all Hebraists” that the gutturals had undergone weakening? In what follows, I lay out the evidence presented by Qimron and Kutscher, as well as additional examples I have found. In general, the evidence is based on spelling mistakes. Although an imprecise articulation of the gutturals may have been a contributing factor in some instances, often other circumstances can explain the misspellings. The end result is that the case for the weakening of the gutturals is not so wide-ranging as most assume. It is likely that in the spoken idiom of some of the writers and scribes the gutturals were not clearly distinguished. But, that no distinction was ever made seems highly unlikely. This means that one should not take at face value the kind of summary statements that one often finds in sketches of DSS Hebrew. The situation was more complex than is often presented.

45. Muraoka, GQA, 14.

As a preface to the following analysis, two brief remarks should be made about morphophonemic and lexicophonemic conditioning and about the use of 1QIsa^a in determining guttural weakening. First, although the elision of a guttural will sometimes be cited as evidence of its disappearance from the language, not all examples are equal. For instance, in some cases the loss of *heh* is conditioned by the particular verbal forms from which it disappears (e.g., the infinitives of the *niphal* and *hiphil* when preceded by the *lamedh* preposition).⁴⁶ In other cases, the exchange of gutturals *aleph* and *ayin* is due to confusions between similar words, like the prepositions לָא and עַל, which can be used in the same context with little distinction in meaning.⁴⁷ Even in cases where two words are semantically different (as with אַתָּה “you” and עַתָּה “now”), the similar syntactic slots in which they are used mean that one appears in the MT version of Isaiah and the other appears in 1QIsa^a, though this does not necessarily imply anything about a confusion of gutturals.⁴⁸ Second, 1QIsa^a seems often to replace a word of the MT tradition with another (often commoner, simpler) word. Kutscher

46. Goshen-Gottstein, “Linguistic Structure,” 109.

47. *Ibid.*, 108. See also BDB, sub לָא, note 2 and Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, who write in relation to עַל: “This sense [i.e., ‘on, to, onto’] is shared by ל’ and ע’; from it other senses of the two prepositions come to overlap by analogy. Futile is the tendency to emend the MT in order to eliminate some or all of these senses, although there may be cases in which the prepositions have been confused in the development of the text” (*Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* [Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990], 216). Note the preposition לָא in 1 Sam 31:3 and 2 Sam 6:3 and עַל in the corresponding verses from 1 Chr 10:3 and 13:7, as well as in 4Q51 (4QSam^a) (see Ulrich et al., *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 289, 297). An analogous confusion is found between עַל in 4Q51 (4QSam^a) at 2 Sam 2:6 and in the MT and ל’ in the MT at 1 Chr 17:24 (*ibid.*, 299).

48. Consider, e.g., that עַתָּה appears at 1 Kgs 1:18 in the MT (Leningrad Codex), though other medieval manuscripts, the LXX, Targum, and Syriac attest or presume אַתָּה (this confusion in the MT is perhaps due to dittography); note, too, 1Q8 (1QIsa^b) at Isa 41:8 has וְעַתָּה, while the MT and 1QIsa^a have וְאַתָּה. One also finds in the MT at Gen 26:29 עַתָּה אַתָּה while LXX has σὺν σὺ (in contrast to 1 Kgs 12:4 and 21:7 [= LXX 20:7], where MT and LXX have the same word order); the MT at Isa 37:20 has עַתָּה though the LXX has σὺ δέ. The reverse relationship also exists, as in the MT at Dan 8:26 אַתָּה vs. LXX καὶ σὺν; in the MT at 1 Chr 28:9 אַתָּה vs. LXX καὶ σὺν. Similarly, note the confusion between the MT and LXX at Isa 28:22, where the MT has עַתָּה and the LXX καὶ ὑμεῖς; this suggests that the confusion was not exclusively phonetic, since the Hebrew presumed by the LXX is אַתָּה (in 1QIsa^a, however, the reading וְאַתָּה in this verse may, in fact, reflect phonetic confusion, though a similar contextual confusion is possible). For other examples, see Delitzsch, *Lese- und Schreibfehler*, 123–24.

frequently suggests that this substitution is due, in part, to the weakening of the gutturals.⁴⁹ This may be the case, but other reasons may be more important and the correspondence in sound between the words may only be partial. As Kutscher himself says, the scribe's replacement of one word for another does not presume identical sense: "if the scribe did not understand a word or form he did not hesitate to substitute a more common one which he knew, regardless of whether or not its meaning was appropriate."⁵⁰ Given this fact, it is not surprising that the words (that is, the one introduced by the 1QIsa^a scribes and the one found in the MT), although often exhibiting similar sounds, are hardly ever exact homonyms of each other. Sometimes the words are not even phonetically similar. Consider some of the examples that Kutscher cites: יודיע "he will make known" (1QIsa^a at Isa 42:13) for MT יריע "he will shout"; פתחו "they are open" (at Isa 42:20) for MT פקוּחַ "open"; טוב "good" (at Isa 45:7) for MT שְׁלוֹם "well being"; מטלים "those hammering" (at Isa 50:6) for MT מְרַטִים "those polishing"; וינקו ידים "they clean hands" (at Isa 65:3) for MT וּמְקַטְרִים "they make sacrifices." And, it should be noted, Kutscher himself often remarks on the many possible reasons that a scribe might substitute one word for another, only one of which is the weakening of the gutturals. Given the many reasons one word might be substituted for the other, and given the merely approximate correspondence in sound between the 1QIsa^a word and the MT word, such substitutions provide limited evidence for the weakening of gutturals. In what follows, I first address the phonemes /ʔ/ and /ʕ/, then /h/ and /ħ/.

QUIESCENCE OF ALEPH

The quiescence of the glottal stop (which is distinct from the elision of the graphic symbol *aleph* in the spelling of a word) is a phenomenon that took place repeatedly (or continuously) over the course of centuries. For example, the word ראש, based on comparative evidence (Phoenician *rʕš*, Arabic *raʕs*), is commonly assumed to have begun as **raʕš* then through the quiescence of the glottal stop and compensatory lengthening to have

49. See, e.g., Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 259–60, 273, 289.

50. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 34. On page 30, he writes: "He [i.e., the scribe] was likely—both consciously and subconsciously—to substitute one common word for another, and an unusual one by a word known to him either from current use or because of its frequency in scripture."

become **rāš* before then undergoing the Canaanite Shift and becoming *rōš*. (A similar development might be postulated for some I-*aleph* verbal forms like יֹמַר *yōmar* < **yāmar* < **ya'mar*.)⁵¹ That the word for “head” is found in the Amarna texts (ca. 1350 BCE) with a spelling that presumes the pronunciation *rōš*, implies the antiquity of the quiescing of the glottal stop in a syllable closed by two consonants (as well as the antiquity of the spelling tradition that preserved the *aleph* for centuries).⁵²

After the quiescence of the glottal stop in environments like that found in **raʿš*, there appears to have been a second, later phase when the glottal stop elided at the end of words and resulted in compensatory lengthening, resulting in developments like **maθa'a* > **maša'a* > **maša'* > **mašā* > *māšā* or מָצָא “he found.” At this point the Canaanite Shift no longer affected the /ā/ vowel and, thus, it did not shift to /ō/. Similarly, note the loss of the glottal stop within words at the end of syllables, as in מְצָאתָ “you found.” The loss of the glottal stop after a shewa, as in שְׂרִית/שְׂרִית “remainder,” is perhaps part of this second phase of quiescing or perhaps a third phase.⁵³ That the glottal stop continued in this trajectory during the late Second Temple era and that the *aleph* was frequently not written within words and at the end of words does not seem surprising. Qimron goes so far as to write that “it is doubtful whether intervocalic *alef* was pronounced at all in DSS Hebrew.”⁵⁴ The *aleph*, when it appears intervocalically, he believes is rather “an orthographic device to designate two consecutive vowels,” that is, *aleph* is only a graphic means of indicating

51. See Blau, *Phonology and Morphology*, 87, 240.

52. By the time of the DSS, the writing tradition had begun to change such that the word for “head” was sometimes spelled with a *waw mater* before the *aleph*, sometimes with a *mater* after the *aleph*, and sometimes with only a *waw mater* (the *aleph* dropping out). For a slightly different explanation for the elision of the glottal stop, see Blau, *Phonology and Morphology*, 87–88. For a different explanation of the development of the word “head,” see Elisha Qimron, “ראש and Similar Words” (Hebrew), *Leshonenu* 65 (2003): 243–47.

53. The time when these shifts take place is hard to know. Many other examples can be cited, e.g., תּוֹמָם (Gen 25:24, for expected תּוֹמָמִים, as in Gen 38:27), הַטָּאִים (1 Sam 14:33), לְהִשׁוֹת (2 Kgs 19:25, for expected *לְהִשְׁאוֹת), כְּאֲבִיר (Isa 10:13) (see Andersen and Forbes, *Spelling*, 85–91).

54. Qimron, *HDSS*, 31. He does suggest, however, that the word שְׂאוֹל “Sheol” retained the glottal stop (ibid., 39 and Qimron, *Grammar*, 89, 118). Kutscher suggests a similar loss even for the liturgical register (*Isaiah*, 499). For the spelling of גִּיּוֹם with an *aleph* as גִּיּוֹמֵא, see §4.4, “*Aleph* < *Yodh* and *Yodh* < *Aleph*.”

hiatus.⁵⁵ Although other scholars seem to assume the preservation of an intervocalic glottal stop (even if just a glide), the precise reasons why they believe this are typically not spelled out.⁵⁶ The following will specify where the glottal stop typically is lost and what evidence exists to suggest that the glottal stop was still articulated in some environments.

Among the DSS, *aleph* as a graphic component of a word is not always dropped from words, only sometimes. If the letter is dropped from the spelling of a word, it is typically in the same environments as those described immediately above, in words like ראש (רוש) *rōš* 4Q403 1 i, 1 versus ראש *rōš* 4Q216 I, 4), in words where the glottal stop would have occurred at the end of a syllable (within words ברתנו *bərātānū* “you created us” 4Q495 2, 1 versus בראתנו *bərātānū* 1Q34bis 3 i, 7; and at the end of words הנבי *hannābī* “the prophet” 4Q175 7 versus הנביא *hannābī* 4Q174 1–2 i, 15 and יבו *yābō* “he will come” 4Q266 8 i, 7 versus יבוא *yābō* 4Q268 1, 3),⁵⁷ as well as in places where the glottal stop would have been immediately preceded by a consonant (שו *šāw* “nothingness” 1QH^a XV, 37 versus שוא *šāw* 1QH^a X,30) or a vocal shewa (שרית *šērīt* “a remainder” 1QH^a XXVI, 27 versus ושארית *ūšā’ērīt* 1QH^a XIV, 11; ונצה *wənāšā* “and contempt” 4Q175 28 for *ונאצה **ūnā’āšā*; רויה “what was seen” *rūyā* 11Q19 LXVI, 9 for *ראויה **rā’ūyā*).⁵⁸ In all these environments except the first (רוש), *aleph* is some-

55. Qimron, *HDSS*, 32.

56. Commenting on a form of the word גוי from HazGab 13, Gary A. Rendsburg (“*Hazon Gabriel: A Grammatical Sketch*,” in *Hazon Gabriel: New Readings of the Gabriel Inscription* [ed. Matthias Henze; SBLEJL 29; Atlanta: SBL, 2011], 66) and Bar-Asher (“*Vision of Gabriel*,” 500 n. 54) presume the existence of a pronounced glottal stop. Muraoka also confirms the possible existence of a consonantal glottal stop in the Aramaic of the DSS, though he admits the *aleph* might instead function as a vowel carrier or indicate a glide (*GQA*, 29).

57. Note some other cases where the *aleph* drops from the end of a word, as in נשי in 1QM III, 15 and IV, 1 for *נשיא; הנבי in 1Q4 (1QDeut^a) at Deut 13:4 for MT הנביא; להבי in 4Q394 [4QMMT] 8 iv, 8 for *להביא; contrast the other occurrences of this loss of *aleph* which seem occasioned, in part, by a following *aleph* in 1QS I, 7 and 4Q331 1 i, 7. For similar cases in the MT, also involving a following *aleph*, see R. Gordis, *The Biblical Text in the Making: A Study of the Kethib-Qere* (New York: Ktav, 1937), 95.

58. Some of the examples come from Qimron, *HDSS*, 25. Other examples include ובירות (11Q20 XII, 25) for what would be in the MT ובארות; משרו (4Q386 1 ii, 4) for what would be משרו; שיר (4Q477 2 ii, 8) for שיר; בית שן (4Q522 8, 3) for בית שן. Some cases are ambiguous; [נושיאי] “those bearing” (4Q364 11, 3 at Gen 45:23 for MT נושיאי) might imply an initial pronunciation *nōsīm* corrected to reflect *nōsā’im* (with the first spelling uncorrected), or, alternatively, the spelling with two

times dropped from the orthography of certain words in the MT too (e.g., מִצָּתִי “I found” Num 11:11; הִיָּחֲטִי “he sinned” 2 Kgs 13:6; בְּשׁוֹ “in nothingness” Job 15:31; שְׂרִית “remainder” 1 Chr 12:39; הַנָּוָה “the lovely” Jer 6:2), though the elision is certainly more common and widespread among the scrolls (found in DSS-SP9, DSS-SP1c, and DSS-NSP texts). Note also that some words that routinely lose the glottal stop in the MT routinely lose *aleph* in the DSS: חֲטוֹתֶיהָ *ḥaṭṭōtehā* “her sins” (4Q176 1–2 i, 6) and חֲטֹתֶיכֶם *ḥaṭṭōṭēkem* “your sins” (11Q1 [11QpaleoLev^a] at Lev 26:18) for MT חֲטָאתֵיכֶם; in the MT such loss is restricted to certain common words (other major examples being רְאִשִּׁים < **rā’āšim* “heads” and בּוֹר < **bu’r* “cistern”).⁵⁹ In addition, in the majority of I-*aleph* and II-*aleph* verbs, the *aleph* is preserved, except where the MT shows the loss of the glottal stop and/or the elision of the *aleph* (e.g., וַיֹּמַר “and he said” 4Q200 4, 6 and passim versus MT וַתִּמְרוּ 2 Sam 19:14; וַתִּסָּף “it is gathered” 1QH^a XIII, 16 versus MT וַתִּסָּף Ps 104:29).⁶⁰ Due to the parallels with MT orthography it is my assumption that the orthography of the DSS reflects a phonetic realization of the *aleph* similar to that found in the MT. In other words, the letter represents a historical writing (and not a glottal stop) where it occurs at the end of a syllable (מִצָּאת) or within a word when directly preceded by a consonant (as in שׂוֹא); but the *aleph* does represent a glottal stop when it occurs at the beginning of a syllable. In some words where the glottal stop would have come after a muttered vowel, it sometimes quiesces and the

yodhs might be interpreted as a scribal error of metathesis. The case of זכרתה (4Q24 [4QLev^b] at Lev 2:16) for MT אֲזַכְרָתָהּ is another example; this could reflect the loss of the initial glottal stop or, conceivably, be attributable to sandhi with the preceding definite direct object marker אֵת.

59. The plural forms of חֲטָאת with suffix and the construct plural forms of the same word do not reflect the glottal stop in the MT: חֲטָאתֶיהָ (Isa 40:2), and חֲטָאתֵיכֶם (Lev 26:18 and passim), for what should be **ḥaṭṭā’ōtehā* and **ḥaṭṭā’ōṭēkem*, respectively. In the DSS, the plural of “head” occurs rarely without the *aleph*, according to Accordance: in 4Q171 1 + 3–4 iii, 5 and 4Q328 1, 1; the *aleph* is inserted interlinearly in 11Q5 (11QPs^a) at Ps 139:17. Other words that have lost the glottal stop in the MT include מְאֵתִים, מְלֵאכָה, and a variety of other words, including some where the loss of the glottal stop occurs with the prefixing of a particle as in לְאֵמֶר and לְאֵלֵהִים, but also וַאֲעֲנָה (1 Kgs 11:39). See Joüon-Muraoka §24e–f, and Andersen and Forbes, *Spelling*, 85–91. *Aleph* is sometimes lost in such words in the DSS: מְלֵאכֵי (4Q216 V, 5–8 [three times]); לְאֵמֶר (4Q49 [4QJudg^a] at Judg 6:13); וַיֵּעֲנֶה (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 119:42).

60. See Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:171 on יורבו (similar to וַיִּרְבּוּ [from בָּרַב] in 1 Sam 15:5).

aleph is subsequently not written (e.g., שרית *šērīt*), but it can also be preserved in this same environment, in which case *aleph* is preserved in the orthography (שרית *š'ērīt*). The reason that the *aleph* likely represents a glottal stop in this and other environments is outlined below.

First, the place of the *mater* in words like מאור “light,” שאול “Sheol,” נפלאות “wonders,” הביאותה “you brought” does not vary as it does in environments where the etymological /o/ or /u/ vowel is directly preceded by a consonant and followed by an etymological *aleph* (רוש/ראוש/רואש “head” and יבו/יבאו/יבוא “he came”).⁶¹ This suggests that *aleph* had not quiesced in words like מאור. If it had quiesced, one would expect to encounter frequent examples of misspellings like *מואר* and *מוור*. When letters are used solely as a graphic means of indicating etymology (as historical spellings, like the *aleph* in ראש) or as indicating number (as in the *yodh* of the 3ms suffix on plural nouns, יו-), they frequently are either elided (רוש, יו-) or misplaced (ראוש) in the orthography of DSS-SP9 texts.⁶² Elision of *aleph* happens only extremely rarely with words similar to מאור (e.g., רובן *rā'ūbēn* > *rūbēn*), and the misplacement of the *mater* almost never happens. Rare cases like צבואת (*šəbāwōt* “hosts” 11Q19 LXII, 5 corrected to צבאות) and הטמואת (*haṭṭōmāwōt* “the impurities” 11Q19 LI, 6 corrected to הטמאות) can be explained either as examples of metathesis or as examples of the occasional assimilation of the glottal stop to a neighboring vowel. These do not necessarily imply that the glottal stop always quiesced in this environment since similar assimilation takes place with other consonants (like *heh* and *yodh*) and these consonants usually are preserved in this environment and others (to judge from the orthography).⁶³ The more

61. See §3.5, “Digraphs.” The spellings of the *qal* 3ms imperfect of בוא are found in different texts: בוא (1QS V, 13 and passim), יבאו (1Q8 [1QIsa^b] at Isa 26:2; 4Q73 [4QEzek^a] at Ezek 23:44; 4Q76 [4QXII^a] at Mal 3:1), יבו (4Q266 8 i, 7). In the text 4Q266 (a copy of the Damascus Document), the verb is consistently spelled without the final *aleph*: *qal* infinitive בו (4Q266 6 ii, 4 and 9 ii, 14); *hiphil* infinitive הבי (4Q266 1a-b, 3 and 1c-f, 4).

62. This is so, even though such spellings produce ambiguity, like in יבאו “he came.”

63. Note, תהו (1Q8 [1QIsa^a] at Isa 40:17) for MT תהו; דניל (*dānī'el* > *dānīyēl* “Daniel” (6Q7 [6QpapDan] at Dan 10:12) for MT דניאל. See the subsection “Quiescence of *Heh*” in this section as well as “*Aleph* < *Yodh* and *Yodh* < *Aleph*” (§4.4). Assimilation of *aleph* to *waw* and vice versa is explained in §4.5, “*Aleph* < *Waw* and *Waw* < *Aleph*.” The shifts between these consonants happen in fairly predictable environments and do not imply a free interchange among glides and approximants.

common shift of etymological *yodh* to *aleph* can, by contrast, be explained through dissimilation. Although Qimron asserts that the *aleph* in words like כתיאים “Kittim” marks hiatus or a “glide of unclear character,” the tendency for such *alephs* to appear between /i/ vowels (-īyī- > -īī-) and where a diphthong might have formed between the preceding vowel and the *yodh* consonant (-āyī- > -āī-, as in פתיאים; -ōyī- > -ōī-, as in גויים) suggests that the *aleph* is used to preserve the syllable structure of words and, thus, that it was pronounced in these intervocalic positions.⁶⁴

Second, Qimron notes that elision of *aleph* is especially found in “non-formal manuscripts.” The absence of such spellings from formal texts is due to the “effort made to preserve the historical spelling.”⁶⁵ This suggests to me that some scribes also took care to preserve the historical pronunciation in some contexts; this point is even relevant if the copying of texts was not accompanied by an actual pronunciation of the words since in writing and reading silently we often experience an *innere Aufführung*.⁶⁶

Third, one must note that although the glottal stop was liable to quiesce in certain words and in certain environments in the MT, it was also preserved in the same words/environments according to the Tiberian tradition: שרית (1 Chr 12:39) for שארית (1 Chr 4:43); ותזרני “you girded me” (2 Sam 22:40) for ותאזרני (Ps 18:40).⁶⁷ The preservation and loss of

64. Qimron, *HDSS*, 32. See “Aleph < Yodh and Yodh < Aleph” (§4.4).

65. *Ibid.*, 25.

66. The phrase is Goethe’s, as cited by A. K. Gavrilo, “Techniques of Reading in Classical Antiquity,” *Classical Quarterly* 47 (1997): 69. In this article, Gavrilo demonstrates silent reading was not as uncommon in the ancient world as is often thought. Although Tov suggests that the copying out of scrolls through dictation was rare at the time of the DSS, he does allow for this possibility (*Scribal Practices*, 11). Furthermore, other scholars, like Jonathan Norton, do not agree with Tov’s assessment (“The Question of Scribal Exegesis at Qumran,” in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006* [ed. Anders K. Petersen et al.; STDJ 80; Leiden: Brill, 2009], 151 n. 31).

67. See GKC §23c and f for more examples. Qimron also recognizes this similarity between the DSS and MT (*HDSS*, 25). Bergsträsser’s comment that such misspellings in the MT suggested the disappearance of this phoneme from the “living language” might be taken to imply that the phoneme was preserved in the writing/reading register of the language (*Hebräische Grammatik*, 1:92). I assume that the pronunciation of a glottal stop by the MT vocalizers was not an archaizing tendency by the scribes; Blau remarks that had the Masoretes “restored the laryngeals and pharyngeals, they would have done so in a more uniform and comprehensible way” (*Phonology and Morphology*, 86).

the glottal stop in the MT tradition suggests something similar could have taken place among the DSS.

Fourth, modern Semitic languages provide further examples of how it is possible for the glottal stop to be preserved in some environments within words, even if it is lost in others. For example, although in most modern dialects of Arabic, the glottal stop is generally lost (with the exception of those times when a word with an etymological glottal stop begins an utterance), it is preserved in word-medial position when it occurs between two identical vowels.⁶⁸ In contemporary Israeli Hebrew, similarly, the glottal stop is lost in most environments, but it is optionally preserved “as onglide to a heavily stressed syllable,” as in *ša(ʾ)ul* (“borrowed”), and even where another guttural was etymologically present, as in *giv(ʾ)a*, *gva(ʾ)ot* (“hill”) and *dim(ʾ)a*, *dma(ʾ)ot* (“tear”).⁶⁹ Even in the tradition of Samaritan Hebrew, which is often cited as a Hebrew dialect in which gutturals weakened, the glottal stop is still present at the beginning of syllables, though this is not always from an etymological *aleph*.⁷⁰ This suggests, therefore, that although *aleph* as a glottal stop might have been lost in certain environments in DSS Hebrew, this does not imply its loss in all environments. Similarly, the absence of a glottal stop in the spoken vernacular of some (most?) writers and scribes of the DSS, does not imply that they did not articulate this phoneme when reading texts, especially scriptural texts. The observation of Blau on the pronunciation of II-*aleph* nouns is relevant here: “[I]n vernacular speech the *aleph* of such nouns was elided, so that original **biʾr* became **bēr*, yet in the higher language the ʾ was preserved. On the analogy of biblical forms ... a more elegant pseudo-form was coined for **bēr*, viz., בְּאֵר.”⁷¹

68. Janet C. E. Watson, *The Phonology and Morphology of Arabic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 18.

69. Shmuel Bolozky, “Israeli Hebrew Phonology,” in *Phonologies of Asia and Africa* (ed. Alan S. Kaye; 2 vols.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 288; examples drawn from 297 and 309. See also Christopher Farrar and Yehiel Hayon, “The Perception of the Phoneme *Aleph* (ʾ/) in Modern Hebrew,” *HAR* 4 (1980): 53–78.

70. Ben-Ḥayyim writes: “אלֵף (< אהח״ע) ... appears at the beginning of a syllable: *ʾilla* אלה, *ʾinna* הנה, *ʾikma* תכמה, *ʾirbām* ערבים, *ʾā:rəṣ* ארץ, *ʾā:šən* חשן, *ʾam* עם, *ʾoṣ* עוץ, *ʾor* אור, *ʾūr* אור, ... *yīšrāʾ:ʾəl* ישראל, *kā:ʾən* כהן, *yīšmā:ʾu* ישמעו, *yērēʾi* יראה” (*A Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew: Based on the Recitation of the Law in Comparison with the Tiberian and Other Jewish Traditions* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 2000], 38–39).

71. Blau, *Phonology and Morphology*, 55. See also Blau, *On Pseudo-Corrections*, 28–29.

Finally, that the gutturals in general and the glottal stop in particular are evidenced in traditions later than the DSS (not only the MT, but also Origen's *Secunda*) suggests that the *aleph* was recognized by some Judeans as a glottal stop.⁷²

The parallels between the DSS and the MT suggest that such loss of the glottal stop is a regular tendency in the language, especially the later stages of the classical language. The more frequent elision of *aleph* in the DSS presumably reflects a slow movement toward the total loss of the phoneme in the spoken dialect. This tendency is exemplified in some texts like 1QIsa^a where one sees numerous mistakes relating to *aleph*, as well as in even shorter texts like 4Q175, in whose thirty lines there are at least six mistakes relating to the quiescence of *aleph* (not to mention another three related to the use of the *aleph* as a *mater*).⁷³ Nevertheless, I assume in the DSS that in the reading of texts by most individuals the glottal stop was still pronounced at the beginning of words and within words at the beginning of syllables, often even where a muttered vowel directly precedes the *aleph*. The following paragraphs explain some apparent exceptions to this conclusion.

The absence of *aleph* in מוד/מודה “much” (= MT מָאד) and תר/תור “form” (= MT תֹּאֵר) is perhaps due to analogy with רוש/ראש, if not also with other words (see §5.5, “**quṭl* Nouns”). As with ראש, the spellings without *aleph* are concentrated in nonbiblical manuscripts of the DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c text groups.

The absence of *aleph* in the word מוּזְנִים “scales” (4Q415 9, 11; 4Q418 127, 6; 4Q418 167a + b, 2; 4Q511 30, 5; 1QIsa^a at Isa 40:12, 15 = MT מֵאֲזִינִים) is not entirely clear.⁷⁴ It might reflect the fact that *aleph* was perceived as quiescent (as in ויומר “he said”), might reflect Aramaic influence (where

72. That *aleph* is realized as a glottal stop is the consensus opinion, and is confirmed in the study by Khan (“Tiberian Pronunciation,” 3). That the *Secunda* gives evidence for the preservation of gutturals is underlined by Janssens, *Studies in Hebrew*, 41–43 and Yuditsky, “Weak Consonants,” 239.

73. The mistakes relating to quiescence include: נבי (for נביא twice); וישה corrected to וישא; היש (for היאיש); ואנה (for והנה*); נצה (for נאצה*). Abegg also notes the frequent elision of *aleph* in the phylactery texts (“Linguistic Profile,” 27).

74. The word appears with the *aleph* once (4Q418 207, 4), but six times without it. In all but one instance where it is spelled without an *aleph*, it has a *waw mater*. Note also the spelling without *aleph* or *waw mater* in 1Mas h IV, 9 (= Sir 42:4).

the word does not bear an *aleph* typically), and/or reflect an etymologically more reliable form.⁷⁵

In some rare cases, the *aleph* is lost at the beginning of a syllable, when it would have been preceded by and followed by a full vowel: הרץ “the land” (1QpHab XIII, 1 and 4Q79 [4QXII^d] at Hos 2:2) for MT הָאָרֶץ; והספם “and their assembling” (*niphal* infinitive construct; 1QSa I, 1) for *והאספם; והאיש “the person” (4Q175 22 and perhaps 4Q186 1 i, 6) for what would be in the MT הָאִישׁ.⁷⁶ This is relatively rare in the DSS and occurs at least once in the MT: הִשְׁפּוֹת “the refuse” (Neh 3:13) for *הָאֲשָׁפוֹת (which is attested in Neh 3:14).⁷⁷ Again, the parallel in the MT suggests the loss of *aleph* in this environment is associated with the natural weakness of the phoneme.

In other cases, the *aleph* elides after a full vowel when it would have been followed by a *hatef*-vowel in the MT (that is, by a reduced historical short vowel): הרצות “the lands” (4Q374 2 i, 4) for *הארצות; הנשים “the men” (1QSa I, 27) for *האנשים; הבנים “the stones” (1QH^a XXIII, 28) for *האבנים; הזין “he did (not) listen” (4Q364 22, 2 at Deut 1:45) for MT הָאֲזִין.⁷⁸ The phenomenon is slightly more common in the DSS than in the MT: הַסּוּרִים “those bound” (Qoh 4:14) for *הַאֲסוּרִים and הַרְמִים “the Arameans” (2 Chr 22:5) for *הַאֲרָמִים.⁷⁹ The parallels with the MT suggest again the loss of *aleph* in these environments is a common phenom-

75. The root of the word is apparently יזן, though it was reanalyzed as from אזן (see HALOT). Kutscher (*Isaiah*, 187–88) comments on the forms in 1QIsa^a and suggests they are due to Aramaic influence, though it seems just as likely that they are due to the perception that the nonetymological *aleph* had quiesced.

76. Some of the examples derive from Qimron, *Grammar*, 83. The example of היש in 4Q175 may also be attributable to the shift of *aleph* > *yodh*, discussed in §4.4, “*Aleph* < *Yodh* and *Yodh* < *Aleph*.” The possible example from 4Q186 may be attributable to the reverse-writing in this text. The spelling תוצוו (1QIsa^a at Isa 22:4) for MT תאיצו “do (not) rush” likely has another explanation; see §4.4.

77. Andersen and Forbes, *Spelling*, 86. This is not including cases like תלום (2 Sam 21:12) where the disparity between *qere* and *kethib* presumes confusion between III-*yodh* and III-*aleph* by-forms.

78. Qimron also lists ופרי (1QM VII, 11) for *ופארי (*Grammar*, 83). Note also נוה for MT נְאוֹה in 4Q84 (4QPs^b) at Ps 93:5, which might be construed as the absolute or construct form for “abode” (= MT נוה).

79. See Andersen and Forbes, *Spelling*, 86. As an example of where the *aleph* is lost when it is followed by a *hatef* vowel in the MT, though it is not a historical vowel, see מבלת (1 Kgs 5:25) for *מבלת.

enon among different dialects and is attributable to the natural weakness of the phoneme.

Sometimes the loss of *aleph* is due to confusion over marking the preceding vowel. Thus, a III-*aleph* verb is rarely found marked with final *heh*, as in וירָה “he feared” (4Q381 50, 4) for *וירָא; similarly III-*aleph* words in construct sometimes take a *yodh* in place of an *aleph* (וְחוֹטִי נִפְשָׁכָה) “incurring the penalty of your life” 1QpHab X, 2, quoting Hab 2:10: וְחוֹטֵא (נִפְשָׁךְ), something seen more commonly in III-*waw/yodh* words (see §3.2, “Plene Orthography”). Although a similar tendency is quite common in DSS Aramaic where the root types have truly become confused, this phenomenon in Hebrew is relatively rare. The variations in spelling in the words above are reflective of the loss of the glottal stop at the end of syllables, but also probably of the confusion over how best to represent the final vowel.⁸⁰

Also rare are those cases where *aleph* is introduced erroneously into the text, as in וְנִאֲלָכָה “that we may go” (1QIsa^a at Isa 2:3) for MT וְנִלְכָה and נִאֲכַר “foreign” (4Q372 1, 11 and 15 and 4Q387 3,6) for what is usually נִכַר (= MT נִכָּר).⁸¹ As mentioned above in §3.2, “*Aleph* as Internal *Mater*,” the *aleph* may function as a *mater* in these cases. In some cases the introduction of an *aleph* may be based on parallel by-forms in the MT: יִמָּאֵס “it will melt” (4Q56 [4QIsa^b] at Isa 13:7) for MT יִמָּס, perhaps influenced by וְיִמָּאֵס “it ran (lit., melted)” and יִמָּאֵסוּ “let them run (lit., melt)” in Job 7:5 and Ps 58:8, respectively.⁸² In rare cases, the introduction of a nonetymological *aleph* may suggest another version of a text, as in וְלֹא יִכְנַפּוּ עוֹד וְלֹא יִכְנַף עוֹד מוֹרִיד (1QIsa^a at Isa 30:20) for MT וְלֹא יִכְנַף עוֹד מוֹרִיד “your teacher will never again hide himself.”⁸³ The text in 1QIsa^a presumes “and your fears will never again gather (or, be gathered),” the meaning of כָּנַף in the *qal* or *niphal* being borrowed from Aramaic where the verb in the G-stem and tD-stem means “assemble” and “be assembled.” Sometimes a word which contains an etymological *aleph* will attest this letter in the wrong place,

80. For Aramaic, see Muraoka, *GQA*, 123: “This tendency of verbs with /ʾ/ as their R3 to merge with those with /y/ in the same slot that had started earlier in the history of Aramaic appears to be a *fait accompli* in our idiom.”

81. See Morgenstern, “Notes on the Language of the Qumran Scrolls,” 161–62.

82. These last two biblical verbs are usually parsed as from מָאָס II “to flow” or “err,” i.e., as by-forms of מָסַס. Note the similar addition of *aleph* in the MT וְיָאֵץ (Qoh 12:5), though the root is נָצַץ.

83. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 253–54.

suggesting the quiescence of the letter as well as the scribes' inattention to etymological spelling; for example, תפראת (1QIsa^a at Isa 13:19) for MT תפארת.⁸⁴

To reiterate, the above rare cases where *aleph* is elided do not demonstrate that etymological glottal stops had entirely vanished from the phonemic inventory of most writers and readers of the DSS. It was still usually pronounced at the beginning of words and within words at the beginning of syllables. Only in some environments (e.g., at the end of syllables) had the glottal stop vanished, or could vanish (when preceded by a consonant or muttered vowel).

By way of conclusion, it should be noted that the many parallels between the MT orthography and that of the DSS suggest that the writing of the word ראש without *aleph* in the DSS is something unexpected, even innovative, in the orthography of Hebrew. This innovation is, in part, reflected in the distribution of the spelling ראש.⁸⁵ The spelling without *aleph* appears relatively rarely (at least six times) in the biblical scrolls, in 1QIsa^a at Isa 40:21, 41:26, 48:16; 4Q80 (4QXII^e) at Zech 4:2 (twice); 4Q88 (4QPs^f) at Ps 109:25 (both DSS-SP9 and DSS-NSP [4Q88] texts). But, it is spelled without *aleph* over twenty times in the nonbiblical scrolls (always in the DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts).⁸⁶

QUIESCENCE OF 'AYIN

The loss of the voiced pharyngeal fricative from the spoken and written language of certain scribes and writers is implied where 'ayin is dropped entirely from a word or where the letter is initially not written but then added interlinearly as a correction. Cases where *aleph* is written for etymological 'ayin suggest this same loss, though perhaps also a memory of some guttural consonant. On the other hand, the fact that words with 'ayin are not routinely misspelled and that there are only a few cases where 'ayin is

84. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 57.

85. The spelling without *aleph* is, however, apparently attested in Moabite (see *HALOT*, s.v., and references there); furthermore, note that the *aleph* is lost in similar environments in other words from the MT, like מוקרות from אסר and בור from באר (see Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 1:90). For more on the texts that contain the different spellings of ראש, see footnote 125 in the section "Digraphs" (§3.5).

86. By contrast, the word occurs with *aleph* around fifty times among the non-biblical texts.

written for etymological *aleph* suggest that this phoneme (or some distinct sound associated with the letter) was not universally lost. If *aleph* and *ʿayin* represent indistinguishable sounds, one would expect an equal number of examples where one letter replaces the other. In anticipation of the conclusions, it can be said that *ʿayin* is weakest in the dialect of those writing DSS-SP9 texts, where it tends to elide occasionally at the ends of syllables and when preceded by a consonant or a muttered vowel—the same positions in which *aleph* elides. But, the elision of *ʿayin* is never so common as the elision of *aleph*. And, even in the dialect (or set of dialects) represented by DSS-SP9 texts, the *ʿayin* is still a clear phoneme at the beginning of syllables. In DSS-NSP texts, the *ʿayin* and its associated phoneme are preserved; the handful of spelling errors associated with the *ʿayin* in these texts can be attributed, in part, to the natural weakness of the voiced pharyngeal fricative.

First, it should be admitted that some scholars have identified examples in the biblical Hebrew lexicon that suggest a correspondence between the phonemes represented by *aleph* and *ʿayin*.⁸⁷ The best evidence for this is the roots גָּאַל II (*niphal*: “to be defiled”) and גָּעַל (*niphal*: “to be defiled”). Another example is פְּתָאֵם (“suddenly”) as possibly derived from פְּתַע (“moment”).⁸⁸ Although such alterations of original *ʿayins* to *alephs* may exist, their very rarity in the MT suggests that the tradition that eventually developed into the Tiberian MT preserved very well a distinction between the glottal stop and the voiced pharyngeal fricative.

The total loss of *ʿayin* in the DSS is found clearly in the following cases:

נשנתִי — (1QH^a XIX, 35) for *נשענתִי⁸⁹ “I leaned”⁸⁹

שבע עשרה — (3Q15 [Copper Scroll] I, 4) for *שבע עשרה
“seventeen”⁹⁰

87. See HALOT, *sub* א.

88. See Joüon-Muraoka, §102b. Another example, cited by HALOT, is תֹּאב II (only once, in the *piel* “to desecrate”) and תֹּעֵב (*piel*: “to abhor”), though, as they note (*sub* תֹּאב II), this single example of a root may be due to scribal interference.

89. This is cited by Qimron, *Grammar*, 83. Another example is also cited by him: תִּשְׁתַּעֲשַׁע (1QH^a XII, 8) for *תִּשְׁתַּעֲשַׁע. In this example, there is a space where the *ʿayin* should go; there is a dot above the space, which may be a scribal mark or defect in the leather (Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:229). As Stegemann and Schuller note, “[i]t is unclear whether he [the scribe] ‘forgot’ to write the letter ... or left the space unscripted due to a defect in the leather” (*ibid.*).

90. For this and the following example, see Puech, “Le Rouleau de Cuivre de la Grotte de Qumran (3Q15)” in *Le Rouleau de cuivre de la grotte 3 de Qumran (3Q15)*:

- שלוש עשרה — (3Q15 [Copper Scroll] IX, 2) for *שלוש עשרה “thirteen”
- המערב — (3Q15 [Copper Scroll] XII, 1) for *המערב “the west”⁹¹
- שבו — (4Q216 II, 3) for *שבעו “they were satisfied”⁹²
- ממוד — (4Q266 10 i, 12) for *מעמוד “post, standing”⁹³
- וישה — (1QIsa^a at Isa 5:4) for MT וַיַּעַשׂ “it made”⁹⁴
- יבור — (1QIsa^a at Isa 28:15) for MT יַעֲבֹר *qere* “it will cross”
- וישה — (1QIsa^a at Isa 48:14) for MT יַעֲשֶׂה “he will do”

Expertise—Restauration—Epigraphie, by Daniel Brizemeure, Noël Lacoudre, Emile Puech (2 vols.; STDJ 55; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 1:179, 195. The first is likely due to sandhi and the second to haplography.

91. See Puech, “Rouleau de Cuivre,” 1:204–5. Note that the mistake of דמ for *דמע in IX, 6, read by Milik (“Rouleau de Cuivre,” 293), is no longer read by Puech in this way, but rather as ר(ו)מחצא (Puech, “Rouleau de Cuivre,” 1:194–96). Also, Accordance’s reading אררב (3Q15 XI, 10) for *ארבע is read by Puech (“Rouleau de Cuivre,” 1:200, 203) as “א[ר]ז/אר(?)”.

92. VanderKam and Milik, “216. 4QJubilees^a,” in DJD 13:10. Although this seems to be a likely example of elision, the immediately following words אחר אלהים [ופנו] אחר[ים] suggest perhaps that confusion was not due solely to an aural lapse but rather also to the sense that שבו gives to the passage: “they turn (back) [reading שבו] [and turn away] after other god[s].”

93. Presumably this is a **maqṭul* variant of the word מעמד “standing,” similar to how it is used in 1QH^a XII, 37 (see §5.4, “Waw Marking /u/ Class Vowel in Nouns Where MT Has No /u/ Class Vowel”).

94. Unless this is a mistake for וישה “it yielded,” as in the initial mistake of וישה in 4Q175 9 (see Ezek 36:8 for וישה plus פרי). For this and the other examples from 1QIsa^a, see Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 507. Kutscher only lists the passage from 48:14 on page 507, but lists the passage from 5:4 on page 328 as an example of where 1QIsa^a contains a long form where the MT has a short form. Another example he might have cited on page 507 is וידינו (at Isa 40:14) for MT וַיִּדְעֵנוּ, which he cites on page 516; however, his reading is incorrect and Accordance and Ulrich et al. (*Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 408) read וידיענו with the last three letters slightly damaged. Kutscher also cites (*Isaiah*, 507) משתריים (at Isa 28:20) for MT מִהַשְׁתָּרֵעַ, which can also be explained as due to the replacement of one word with another by the scribe, perhaps due to a different tradition, perhaps also due to confusion with the preceding word מַצֵּעַ “couch” (the latter perhaps calling to the mind of the scribe the more common מַצָּה “strife”). The word in 1QIsa^a is presumably the *hithpael* participle from שרה “those persevering” or “those fighting,” a similar tradition being reflected in the LXX’s μάχεσθαι “to quarrel” (see Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 289 and, below, in the discussion concerning the quiescence of *heh* and *heth*).

Such elision also happens in documentary texts: [לול] (KhQ1 5) for *לעולם “forever.” Another example of *‘ayin* disappearing in pronunciation may be represented in נעו לשכר (1QIsa^a at Isa 29:9) for MT נעו ולא שכר “they staggered, but not from strong drink,” in which case the double *waw* at the end of the first word would indicate the assimilation of *‘ayin* to /ū/, similar to the assimilation of *aleph* in באו *bāwū* “they came” and ראו *rāwū* “they saw.”⁹⁵ Such seems to be the interpretation presumed in the edition of 1QIsa^a in Accordance and in *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*.⁹⁶ Nevertheless, Kutscher suggested reading נעו as the *niphal* of עוה (*na‘āwū*) “they were perverted” and conjectured that the scribe perhaps understood the text to mean something like חטאו לשכר “they sinned in becoming drunk.”⁹⁷ Alternatively, it seems possible to understand this verb as an imperative in line with the more explicitly marked שועו “be blind” that precedes it; in this case, the spelling might be a scribal mistake of metathesis for נועו “be tottering.”⁹⁸

Related to the above examples are the spellings from 1QIsa^a in which the *waw mater* seems to indicate that the *‘ayin* was no longer pronounced: פועלתי “my work” (1QIsa^a at Isa 49:4, MT פִּעַלְתִּי), פועלתמה “their work” (1QIsa^a at Isa 65:7, MT פִּעַלְתֶּם).⁹⁹ These, however, are better explained as words where one /u/ vowel has engendered another, preceding /u/ vowel.¹⁰⁰ Although the example of צעור “Zoar” in 1QIsa^a at Isa 15:5 for MT צַעַר might at first seem to suggest that the displacement of the /o/ or /u/ vowel

95. See the discussion in §4.5, “*Aleph < Waw and Waw < Aleph*.” Alternatively, the double *waw* in נעו could be an example of a *mater* written twice (see §3.1).

96. Ulrich et al, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 384. This is the explicit explanation offered by Qimron (“*Waw* as Marker for a Glide” [Hebrew], in *Homage to Shmuel: Studies in the World of the Bible* [ed. Zipora Talshir et al.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2001], 368).

97. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 271.

98. Note the similar instances where a *mater* is misplaced in the examples cited in “Scribal Mistakes” (§3.1). If one supposes that the spelling reflects the quiescence of *‘ayin*, then interpreting it as an imperative is still possible: the spelling נעו should perhaps be changed to נעיו since we would expect a dissimilation such that *nūwū* would become *nūyū*. All of these suggestions, of course, explain only the possible understanding of one (later) scribe, which depends, presumably, on another (earlier) scribal mistake where ולא was broken apart, the *waw* attached to the preceding verb, the *aleph* dropped, and the *lamedh* attached to the following noun.

99. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 498; Abegg, “Linguistic Profile,” 30.

100. See “*Waw* Marking /u/ Class Vowel in Nouns Where MT Has No /u/ Class Vowel” (§5.4) and “Digraphs” (§3.5).

was, in fact, caused by the near quiescence of *ʿayin*, this place name seems to have known several forms from relatively early times.¹⁰¹ The case of *ואתועדדה* “I will stand up” (4Q382 23, 1) for **ואתעודדה* may reflect the weakness of *ʿayin*, if not also a graphic mistake of metathesis.¹⁰²

In the following words, *ʿayin* was initially forgotten, then added later.

- מַעֲרֵכֶת — “battle line” (1QM V, 3 and VI, 5)
 בַּעֲדַת — “in the congregation of” (1QH^a XV, 37)¹⁰³
 [מ]ע[נָה] — “response” (1QH^a XIX, 31)
 אֶלְמַעֲוֹנָתוֹ — “to his dwelling” (1QH^a XX, 10)
 תִּגְעֵר — “you will rebuke” (1QH^a XXII, 25)¹⁰⁴
 דַּמַּע — “tithe” (3Q15 [Copper Scroll] XI, 4 [once, perhaps twice])¹⁰⁵
 בַּעַץ — “in a tree” (4Q163 23 i, 17)
 לִידַעֲתִיכֶהוּ — “I did not know you (?)” (4Q175 16)¹⁰⁶
 בַּעֲצָה — “with (no) counsel” (4Q261 5a–c, 3 [though the *ʿayin* is very damaged])¹⁰⁷
 דַּעֲיָה — “knowledge” (4Q426 1 i, 4)
 עִם הַרִישָׁנָה — “the first with” (4Q514 1 i, 8 [though the text is very damaged])¹⁰⁸
 הַעֲלֹת — “to lift” (11Q19 XLII, 16)¹⁰⁹

101. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 69–71.

102. See “Scribal Mistakes” (§3.1).

103. See Malachi Martin, *Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Louvain: Publications universitaires, 1958), 481.

104. Qimron, *HDSS*, 25. Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom (DJD 40:273) refer to this *ʿayin* as “quiescent” as does Martin, *Scribal Character*, 486.

105. For the tabulations below, only one instance of this spelling is considered.

106. The reading of the form in 4Q175 is debated. Allegro transliterates *לִידַעֲתִיכֶהוּ* and comments: “The first *yōdh* was written over a previous *ʾāleph*, and the *ʿayin* inserted above the line by the same hand. MT has [at Deut 33:9] “לֹא רִאִיתִי” (DJD 5:59). By contrast, *DSSSE* transliterates *לֹא דַעֲתִיכֶהוּ* and translates “I have not known you.” Presumably, this reading implies an elided initial *yodh* followed by the 2fs suffix. Accordance follows the understanding of Allegro.

107. Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:181.

108. See Baillet, DJD 7:296.

109. There is an erased letter preceding the *heh*, either an *ʿayin* (so, Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 2:180) or another *heh* (so, Lawrence H. Schiffman “Temple Scroll” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Volume 7: Temple Scroll and Related Documents* [ed. James H. Charlesworth; Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011], 104).

- ישעיהו — “Isaiah” (1QIsa^a at Isa 1:1)
 בעיניהם — “in their eyes” (1QIsa^a at Isa 5:21)¹¹⁰
 יעקוב — “Jacob” (1QIsa^a at Isa 9:7 and 17:4)
 לִישָׁק — “to oppress” (4Q82 [4QXII^g] at Hos 12:8)¹¹¹

Another example is less likely attributable to aural confusion: מַעַם “from with” in 11Q5 (11QPs^a) at Ps 121:2. Rather, this mistake is likely due to the similarity in shape between the top parts of the *mem* and *‘ayin*.

In these following words, *aleph* is written for an etymological *‘ayin* and left uncorrected.

- אם — (1QS VIII, 2) for *עַם “with”¹¹²
 מושיא — (4Q365 6a ii + 6c, 3) for *מושיע “one delivering”¹¹³
 שש אסר — (4Q394 [4QMMT] 1–2 iv, 3) for *ששה עסר “sixteen”¹¹⁴
 וכאפר — “and like ashes” (4Q434 7b, 3) for *וכעפר “and like dust”¹¹⁵
 ואתה — (1QIsa^a at Isa 5:5) for MT וְעַתָּה “and now”
 אצית — (1QIsa^a at Isa 25:1) for MT עֲצוֹת “counsels of”¹¹⁶
 ואתה — (1QIsa^a at Isa 28:22) for MT וְעַתָּה “and now”
 ואשא — (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 119:117) for MT וְאַשְׁעָה¹¹⁷

Yadin (*Temple Scroll*, 2:180) explains: “Seemingly the scribe first wrote עַד, then erased *‘ayin* and wrote הָלוֹת, and finally suspended *‘ayin* above the line in correction.”

110. The scribe’s missing of the *‘ayin* in בעיניהם is perhaps due to the similarity with the expression “between them”; understanding the letters as “between them” would make sense with the prepositional phrase of the second colon: נגד פניהם, found in both the MT and 1QIsa^a.

111. See Russel E. Fuller, “82. 4QXII^g,” in DJD 15:286–87.

112. Note the similar mistake of אם for *עַם in 1Mas h VII, 11 (= Sir 44:11).

113. See Tov and White, DJD 13:269. They note (*ibid.*, 271) that Puech has suggested an alternative reading of תושיא, also from ישע.

114. Qimron, *HDSS*, 25. See also Qimron and Strugnell, DJD 10:7. Note, however, that the *aleph* is slightly damaged. The editors note that the marks read as *aleph* do not resemble those of other *‘ayins* in the calendar; nevertheless, they admit that they do resemble “a type of *‘ayin* found in the other columns of the manuscript” (*ibid.*). The loss of *‘ayin* in שש אפר may have been encouraged by sandhi, the multiple syllables presumably being pronounced with a single stress.

115. We would expect the word with *‘ayin* since the following verb is שחק and this verb occurs with כעפר in two passages from the MT (2 Sam 22:43, Ps 18:43). Quite possibly, the two words אפר and עפר had become semantically confused.

116. The meaning of אצית is not clear (Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 221).

117. The spelling ואשא may be attributable to a conscious alteration of the bibli-

Excluded from this list are **וכארום** “they will disgust them” (4Q169 3–4 iii, 4) for ***וכערום**.¹¹⁸ The word **וכארום** is paralleled by the passive participle two lines preceding in 4Q169 3–4 iii, 2 **כאורה** “a disgusting thing.” In Rabbinic Hebrew, the *qal* passive participle of this verb is sometimes found spelled with *aleph*, while the finite forms of the verb are spelled with *‘ayin*. That this is the case suggests that there are perhaps two complementary roots, one with *aleph* and one with *‘ayin*. Confusion between the two, if this is what is happening in 4Q169 3–4 iii, 4, may not be related directly to the phonetic identity of *aleph* and *‘ayin*, but rather a reflection of confusion between the two roots.

In addition, not considered are the examples Kutscher gives of the confusion between the prepositions **אל** and **על**, which do not relate (at least solely) to phonetic confusion.¹¹⁹ Similarly, another example of **ואתה** for MT **ועתה** (at Isa 64:7) is not listed since this mistake seems likely triggered by the following occurrence (three words later) of the second-person masculine singular pronoun. It might be mentioned also that the two examples of **ואתה** for MT **ועתה** listed above might, in part, be due to ditto-graphy, the following words in each verse beginning with *aleph*.¹²⁰

Although Accordance and the *Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance* suggest that the Copper Scroll contains another example of the numeral “ten” written **אסר** (in 3Q15 VIII, 3), the marks are not read in this way by Puech or in *DSSSE*.¹²¹ Additional examples of *aleph* written for *‘ayin* include **עתה**

cal text (so that it implies “I will lift your statutes [חוקיכה]” instead of MT “that I may gaze on your statutes [בְּחִקְיֶךָ]); note that this scroll exhibits other differences from the MT text: **חונני** “show me favor” for MT **חַיֵּי** “make me live,” as in 11Q5 (11QPs^a) at Ps 119:37 and passim. Note also the apparent spelling **נאנש** for ***נענש** in 1QS VI, 27, though the *aleph* is attested only by a slight vertical mark. The word **גדאו** is read for ***גדעו** in 4Q159 2–4, 1 by Accordance and the *Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*; it is read, instead, as **גר או** “foreigner or” in *DSSSE*. The reading **צבעי** in 1QH^a XV, 32 is disputed and unclear (see Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:209–10).

118. Qimron, *Grammar*, 84. Note the discussion on this word in Menahem Kister, “Some Observations on Vocabulary and Style in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Diggers at the Well*, 140–41. Another example may be **זאף** for ***זעף** “grew angry” in 4Q184 2, 6, though it is read as **אף ואף** by Allegro (DJD 5:84).

119. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 507.

120. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 507. Confusingly, Kutscher lists one of these passages, Isa 64:7, under the paragraph in which he lists cases where the MT has *aleph* and 1QIsa^a has *‘ayin*, as though the scroll contained **עתה** for MT **אתה** (*Isaiah*, 506). It does not.

121. Puech, “Rouleau de Cuivre,” 1:192–93.

for *אתה in 4Q223–224 2 v, 3, though the text is very fragmentary and, thus, the word's identification less certain.¹²²

Examples of words where what should have been an 'ayin was written initially as *aleph* or some other letter, but then corrected to 'ayin include the following:

- יאבורו — (1QS I, 16) corrected to יעבורו “they will pass”¹²³
 שר[ו]א — (4Q24 [4QLev^b] at Lev 22:23) corrected to ש[ר]וע
 “extended”¹²⁴
 וואאר — (1QIsa^a at Isa 42:19) for MT עֵוֶר; corrected to וּעוֹר
 “blind”
 אברו — (4Q55 [4QIsa^a] at Isa 23:2) for MT עָבַר; corrected to עברו
 “they crossed”¹²⁵

Not considered are the spellings of the preposition אל (1QS V, 2; VI, 20; VII, 3) corrected to על; ל (1QH^a XI, 29) corrected to על; רות (1QH^a XX, 28) corrected to ערות “nakedness of.”¹²⁶

Examples of 'ayin written for an etymological *aleph* are much rarer, but include the following, two of which were corrected by ancient scribes.

- נרעתה — (1QS VII, 14) corrected to נראתה “it appears”¹²⁷
 ועל — (1QIsa^a at Isa 6:9) for MT וְאֵל “and not”; twice in the same
 verse

122. VanderKam and Milik, “223–224. 4QJubilees^h,” in DJD 13:126.

123. Qimron, *Grammar*, 85 and Elisha Qimron and James H. Charlesworth, “Rule of the Community,” in *Dead Sea Scrolls ... Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, 8.

124. Eugene Ulrich, “24. 4QLev^b,” in *Qumran Cave 4. VII: Genesis to Numbers* (ed. Eugene Ulrich et al.; DJD 12; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 182–83.

125. See Skehan and Ulrich, DJD 15:9.

126. Qimron, *Grammar*, 85. Another example he cites seem less certain to me, וענם (1QS VII, 11) corrected to וּחָנָם. In this case, the correction and reshaping of another earlier mark leaves the earlier mark obscure. As observed above, confusion between אל and על is, in large part, due to confusion in the usage of the two prepositions; a similar situation pertains to ל. In relation to the correction in 1QH^a XI, 29 (ל corrected to על), Stegemann and Schuller note that the original marks might also have been read as ולב, suggesting that the mistake was perhaps visual and not aural (Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:151).

127. Qimron and Charlesworth, “Rule of the Community,” 32.

מנעצײך — (1QIsa^a at Isa 60:14a) as a mistake for MT מְנַאֲצִיךָ
 “those despising you” (at Isa 60:14b)¹²⁸
 על — (4Q99 [4QJob^a] at Job 37:5) for MT אֵל “God”¹²⁹

Other examples, cited by Kutscher, relate mostly to the confusion of the prepositions אֵל and עַל.¹³⁰ In addition, there is the ambiguous case of עַמ (1QIsa^a at Isa 53:9) corrected to עַת, for MT אֶת- (prep.); the *mem* in the scroll is corrected to *taw*, though the ‘*ayin* is not corrected. Qimron lists a passage (4Q491 8–10 i, 8) where the 2ms independent pronoun, וְאַתָּה, is spelled וְעַתָּה; however, Maurice Baillet translates this as “Et maintenant,” which seems to fit the context well.¹³¹ The word צוֹאֵר in the MT at Isa 8:8 is rendered צַעַר (presumably “Zoar”) in 4Q59 (4QIsa^e); here one cannot discount the possibility of phonetic confusion, but the place name also makes sense in the text, which mentions Zoar next in 15:5. Note also ויעוה “it will distort” (4Q109 [4QQoh^a] at Qoh 7:7) for MT ויאבד “it will destroy,” which seems only partially attributable to an aural confusion.¹³²

Other confusions are less common. The significant examples are the following.

על יפות — (1QS VI, 7) for חליפות “substitutes of”¹³³

128. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 506. The word מנעצײך is crossed out in the scroll and appears in the first colon just before מעניך (= MT מְעַנֶּיךָ “those oppressing you”). Thus, מנעצײך would seem to be a mistaken conflation of the two words מעניך and מנאצײך, a mistake perhaps occasioned by the similarity in the sounds represented by *aleph* and ‘*ayin*, but not necessarily their identical articulation. Kutscher’s listing of עתה from Isa 64:7 on page 506 is a mistake, as noted earlier.

129. Note that the spelling עאל (4Q222 1, 4) (with two correction dots over the ‘*ayin* indicating it should be ignored) for intended *אל “God” is perhaps not due primarily to the confusion of sounds, but due to the following word עליון (see VanderKam and Milik, DJD 13:91). Note also הע for הא* in 1Mas h III, 2 (= Sir 41:2).

130. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 506. He also suggests more tentatively the possible correction of עלמנה to אלמנה and of צואה to צועה in 1QIsa^a at Isa 47:8 and 63:1, respectively (*Isaiah*, 508, 536).

131. Qimron, *Grammar*, 83 and Maurice Baillet, DJD 7:23. Other translations, like that of DSSSE, follow Baillet.

132. Note the similar confusion in the same scroll of תעזר (4Q109 [4QQoh^a] at Qoh 7:19) for MT תעז, which is supported by the LXX and seems not related to a weakening of ‘*ayin*’s pronunciation.

133. See Qimron, *Grammar*, 84–85. Compare תתחנג in Sir 37:29, MS Bm, for perhaps *תתענג (Miguel Pérez Fernández, *An Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic*

- ההולה — (4Q365 12a-b ii, 2 at Exod 38:1) for הָעֹלָה “the burnt offering”¹³⁴
- שהה[ר] — (4Q379 22 ii, 13) corrected to שְׁעָה “evil”¹³⁵
- מסלה — (1QIsa^a at Isa 16:1) for MT מִסְלָע “from Sela”¹³⁶
- שעים — (1QIsa^a at Isa 37:30) for MT שְׂחִיס “grain”¹³⁷

Another “doubtful” example where *heth* is written for etymological *‘ayin* is יכחס (1QS VII, 3) for what should be יבעס “he will be angry.”¹³⁸ Kutscher lists an additional example: סחורה “one traded” at Isa 54:11 for MT סַעְרָה “one stormed upon,” though here the word in the scroll makes perfect sense and seems to be a case of the scribe choosing a word more common than the one in the MT tradition, one that is phonetically similar to the MT word, but not identical in sound.¹³⁹ Kutscher lists one example where *‘ayin* is written for an etymological *heh*, עמוסים “loads” for MT הַמָּסִים “brushwood” at Isa 64:1, though this seems again to be a case of the scribe writing a more common word (“loads”) for an obscure word in the MT; note that the LXX, Targums, and Peshitta do not translate הַמָּסִים.¹⁴⁰ The example of מעשבת (1QS IV, 4) corrected to מחשבת “thought of” is likely due to a visual slip; the first word of the line is מעשי “deeds of” and the word immediately following מעשבת is מעשה.¹⁴¹

Kutscher also cites examples of the scribes introducing *‘ayins* into words that do not contain an etymological guttural. His presentation seems

Hebrew [Leiden: Brill, 1999], 11–12), though the same misspelling appears to be found in MS D (with, however, the crucial letter heavily damaged), and despite the correct spelling in the same verse of תענוג.

134. Tov and White note: “Above the unusual second letter of this word the scribe wrote a sign or letter, the nature of which is unclear” (DJD 13:279).

135. One wonders if the mistake was partially visual, the result of the following *heh*.

136. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 112, 507. Kutscher also lists ההם at Isa 9:12 for MT העם, though the word is read as העם in the scroll by Accordance and Ulrich et al., *Qumran Biblical Scrolls*, 349.

137. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 507.

138. Qimron, *Grammar*, 84. He notes that this is more likely a mistake for יכחש “he will deceive.”

139. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 507. Kutscher does not discuss the possibilities relating to why the scribe wrote סחורה, other than a scribal slip for סערה.

140. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 506. Notice that the passive participle of עָמַס “to burden” appears in Isa 46:1; there it is used in reference to false gods, while in Isa 64:1 it would presumably have a generic meaning “loads.”

141. See Qimron, *Grammar*, 84–85.

somewhat misleading. He writes: “As a result of the weakening of the laryngeal-pharyngeals the scribe ... might even add them [that is, laryngeal or pharyngeal consonants] to words which did not have these as consonants at all.”¹⁴² In relation to *‘ayin*, he cites as examples of this נַעַשׂ (at Isa 40:24 for MT נָשַׁף “he blows”), which seems to have begun as עָשׂוּ “they made” and then was partially corrected with initial *nun* and final *peh*, but leaving the *‘ayin*;¹⁴³ מִמַּעֵיכָה “from your womb” (at Isa 39:7) for MT מִמָּךְ “from you”; ותַּעֲלוּ “you exulted” (at Isa 30:12) for MT וְנִלְוּ “what is crooked.”¹⁴⁴ Nevertheless, in his explanation of these specific substitutions, he notes many possible reasons for the chosen word of the scribe, the weakening of the gutturals sometimes being only tangential to the scribe’s choice. In relation to עָשׂוּ (> נַעַשׂ) and תַּעֲלוּ, Kutscher references the scribe’s tendency to replace an obscure word with a more common one, even if the common one does not fit the context.¹⁴⁵ In relation to תַּעֲלוּ he notes as an aside “By the way, this change was rendered easier because of nonpronunciation of the pharyngeals.”¹⁴⁶ With regard to מִמַּעֵיכָה for MT מִמָּךְ, he notes that “the lack of differentiation in the pronunciation of the pharyngeals” made the two different phrases sound “identical.”¹⁴⁷ Although this might be the case, notice that Kutscher has also provided the grounds for a second (and better) reason מִמַּעֵיכָה might replace מִמָּךְ, namely the fact that in Isa 39:7 the phrase in question is preceded by יֵצֵא “to go forth” and that the expression יֵצֵא + מֵן + מַעִים is found in three other passages (Gen 15:4, 2 Sam 7:12, 16:11), while יֵצֵא + מֵן is found in only two other passages (Gen 17:6, 2 Kgs 20:18).¹⁴⁸ As Kutscher himself writes, the scribes’ practice was sometimes to replace one word with another equally common word. And, even if phonetic similarity played a role in the substitution of one word for another, this does not imply identical pronunciation, just as the substitution of פָּתְחוּ “they opened” at Isa 42:20 for MT פָּקְחוּ “open” does not presuppose that *taw* was articulated like *qoph*.

142. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 509.

143. See Ulrich et al., *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 408.

144. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 507.

145. *Ibid.*, 274, referring back to page 34.

146. *Ibid.*, 273. He also notes the possibility that the word the scribe had intended was לָעַז, the weakening of the pharyngeals causing the misplacement of the *‘ayin*.

147. *Ibid.*, 259–60.

148. *Ibid.*, 259.

As a point of comparison, one can refer to the situation in the Aramaic of the DSS as well as the interlinear *ʿayins* in the MT. There are only a few examples of a possible elision of *ʿayin* in the Aramaic of the scrolls: שתא (4Q550 1, 3 and 4Q552 1 i + 2, 7) for *שעתא “the hour”; and שמון (Jer 3ver,1) for *שמעון “Shimeon,” though there are other possible explanations for the form of the name that do not depend on elision of *ʿayin*, namely that it could be an alternative spelling of סמון “Simon.”¹⁴⁹ Muraoka also cites examples where etymological *ʿayin* is represented by *aleph*, as in מארבא (4Q209 23, 4) corrected to מערבא “west” and אסר (4Q201 3, 10) corrected to עסר “ten.”¹⁵⁰ In the MT, one finds three cases of an *ʿayin* suspended above the line perhaps reflecting their omission and subsequent addition in an earlier manuscript (מִיָּר Ps 80:14; רְשָׁעִים Job 38:13 and 15).¹⁵¹ Such possible omissions reflect either the influence of subdialects of Hebrew that did not preserve the *ʿayin* and/or the inherent weakness of the consonant.

Of those Hebrew examples listed in the columns above, there are nine cases where the *ʿayin* is totally lost and an additional seventeen instances where it is initially not written and then added later. Of these twenty-six cases, fifteen derive from 1QIsa^a, 1QH^a, and the Copper Scroll; ten derive from other DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts. Only one comes from a DSS-NSP text (4Q514). There are twelve cases where *aleph* is written for etymological *ʿayin*, four of which have been corrected to *ʿayin*. Four of these eleven words appear in 1QIsa^a; the remaining eight appear in other DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts, with only two in a DSS-NSP text (4Q24 [4QLev^b]; 4Q55 [4QIsa^a]). The remaining ten passages listed attest to an apparent confusion between *ʿayin* and *aleph*, *heh*, and *heth* in two passages from 1QS and four from 1QIsa^a. Again, only one passage is from a DSS-NSP text (4Q379). Considering all these misspellings, most derive from DSS-SP9

149. On שתא, see Émile Puech, *Qumran Grotte 4.XXVII: Textes araméens, deuxième partie: 4Q550–575a, 580–587 et appendices* (DJD 37; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009), 13 and 63. On שמון, see E. Eshel and H. Eshel, “Jericho papDeed of Sale ar,” in *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert* (ed. James Charlesworth et al; DJD 38; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 41.

150. Muraoka, *GQA*, 14. The weakening of *ʿayin* in numerals twelve through nineteen is also found in Judean Aramaic, e.g., תלתיסר and תלתיסר, as cited by Milik, “Rouleau de Cuivre,” in DJD 3:229. The case of יחאבון for יחעבון in 11Q10 VII, 5 is more complicated than simply the quiescence of *ʿayin* and may reflect a complicated development, for which see Muraoka, *GQA*, 6 and the literature cited in 6 n. 34.

151. See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 217. Cf. נְשָׁקָה for *נְשָׁקָה in Amos 8:8.

texts.¹⁵² Cumulatively, twenty-four of the forty-eight instances of misspellings derive from 1QIsa^a, 1QS, and 1QH^a which suggests that the weakening of *‘ayin* was especially prevalent among sectarian scribes, though it should be emphasized that this weakening is by no means as frequent or as pervasive as the quiescence of *aleph* (see below). The weakening of *‘ayin* in a documentary text suggests it was perhaps part of the spoken dialect, certainly part of a less literary register. The numerous cases of confusion in 1QIsa^a, together with the more circumstantial evidence cited by Kutscher, suggests that the *‘ayin* was weakest in the idiolects of this scroll’s scribes.

Several more details should be noticed in relation to the weakening of *‘ayin*. First, in twenty-two out of the twenty-six cases where *‘ayin* is entirely lost, or lost initially and then inserted as a correction, it is in the environment where *aleph* quiesces, that is, where it would close a historically closed syllable (יֵקוּב, יִשְׁעִיהוּ, [מ]ע[נה], מַעֲרֵכַת, מַמּוּד, יְבוּר, יִשָּׁה) or where it is preceded by a consonant or a vocal shewa (according to the MT vocalization) (אֶלְמֵוֹנָתוֹ, מֵרַב, שְׁבַעֲשָׂרָה, שָׁבוּ, נִשְׁנָתִי) (אֶלְמֵוֹנָתוֹ, מֵרַב, שְׁבַעֲשָׂרָה, שָׁבוּ, נִשְׁנָתִי) (אֶלְמֵוֹנָתוֹ, מֵרַב, שְׁבַעֲשָׂרָה, שָׁבוּ, נִשְׁנָתִי). Furthermore, in seven cases where *aleph* replaces an etymological *‘ayin*, *‘ayin* would close a syllable (יֵאָבִירוּ, מוֹשִׁיא) (יֵאָבִירוּ, מוֹשִׁיא) or precede a shewa (וְאֵתָהּ, וְאוֹאֵר, וְכַאֲפֵר) (וְאֵתָהּ, וְאוֹאֵר, וְכַאֲפֵר) and in three cases where *‘ayin* replaces etymological *aleph*, *aleph* would be preceded by a shewa (וְעַל, גִּרְעָתָהּ) (וְעַל, גִּרְעָתָהּ).

The similarity in phonetic environments where *aleph* and *‘ayin* are lost or confused reflects a common weakness in pronunciation, though one should note the limited number of cases where *‘ayin* is lost and the comparative frequency of *aleph*’s loss. With the exception of a few misspellings like יַעֲשֶׂה as יִשָּׁה in 1QIsa^a, words with *‘ayin* are not repeatedly misspelled.¹⁵³ In fact, no single word is misspelled more than three times among the DSS. Second, one should notice that with the exception of אֶצִּית, אֶם, עַל יְפוֹת, and עַל (in 4Q99), *‘ayin* is only lost or confused when it occurs in the middle or at the end of words (including when it is preceded by a morphological affix or enclitic particle). This distribution suggests that the *‘ayin* at the beginning of a word or when it occurs within a word preceded by a full vowel was likely pronounced relatively clearly and distinctly. Third, that the *‘ayin* had not totally quiesced is also suggested by

152. Only three texts (not including the Copper Scroll) do not come from DSS-SP9 or DSS-SP1c texts (4Q24, 4Q99, 4Q379).

153. Particles like עֵתָהּ and עַל should not be considered as misspellings on par with others.

the few examples where one finds ‘*ayin* and *heth* confused (e.g., על יפות and שעיס). Note too the apparent phonetic spelling למעאן in 4Q175 4 (for what would be in the MT למען), in which *aleph* presumably marks a preceding /a/ vowel; if this is so, then this presumes the presence of an epenthetic vowel (as in the MT form of the word), one purpose of which might have been to preserve the pronunciation of ‘*ayin*. Finally, the confusion and interchange of the two consonants *aleph* and ‘*ayin* is not equal. *Aleph* could be written for ‘*ayin*, especially in the specific environments where ‘*ayin* would likely be weakest in pronunciation or even elided. But, ‘*ayin* is less often written for *aleph*; there are just four examples of this (על, ועל [twice], מנעציד, נרעתה), two of which probably were influenced by the frequent interchange of the graphically similar prepositions אל and על and/or the confusion of the words “God” אל and “Most High” עליון. Thus, one should not characterize the two consonants or phonemes as interchangeable.

QUIESCENCE OF *HEH*

The glottal fricative phoneme (*heh*) is dropped in essentially the same environments that the glottal stop (*aleph*) is dropped, though less frequently. It is best to conclude that this is partially attributable to the inherent weakness of this phoneme, reflected in numerous ways in the Tiberian tradition, and partially attributable to the quiescence of this phoneme in certain other environments in the dialect(s) of the scribes and writers. We should also note in passing the various I-*aleph* and I-*heh* words that share similar meanings: אדר *niphal*: “be glorious” versus הדר *niphal*: “be honored”; און versus הון “desire”; און “power, wealth” versus הון “wealth.” These pairs perhaps reflect a natural correspondence between the sounds of the respective phonemes in the minds of early Hebrew speakers; they do not suggest the absence of a distinction between the phonemes.

The following words clearly attest the elision of *heh* where the letter’s loss is most likely reflective of the quiescence of the glottal fricative. The list shows representative examples.

ולהתלך — “and to walk about” (1QS V, 10 = MT *וּלְהִתְהַלֵּךְ)¹⁵⁴

154. Qimron, *Grammar*, 83 and idem, *HDSS*, 25. Many of the other examples are derived from these pages of Qimron’s *Grammar* and *HDSS*. Another case listed by Qimron is הטל הראישון (1QM VIII, 15) as a mistake for הראישון; however,

משא עדה — “a burden of the congregation” (1QSa I, 20)
 להוגיע — “to make weary” (1QpHab X, 11) for *להוגיע
 על אות הראישונה — “upon the first banner” (1QM IV, 9)¹⁵⁵
 על אות השנית — “upon the second banner” (1QM IV, 9)
 שלבתה — “its flame” (1QH^a XVI, 31 = MT *שלהבתה)¹⁵⁶
 ואזינו — “and give ear” (1QIsa^a at Isa 1:10) for MT האזינו¹⁵⁷
 מתלות — “mockeries” (1QIsa^a at Isa 30:10) for MT מהתלות
 לנפה — “to shake” (1QIsa^a at Isa 30:28) for MT להנפה
 ונע — “and Hena” (1QIsa^a at Isa 37:13) for MT הנע
 לשאזות — “to destroy” (1QIsa^a at Isa 37:26) for MT להשאזת
 ולהחיות — “to revive” (1QIsa^a at Isa 57:15 [twice]) for MT ולהחיות
 לשמיע — “to make heard” (1QIsa^a at Isa 58:4) for MT להשמיע
 תומות — “depths” (1QIsa^a at Isa 63:13) for MT תהמות

With one exception where the *heh* as a root consonant would have come at the end of an etymologically closed syllable (מתלות), all these words exhibit the dropping of the *heh* where it would have occurred after a syllable that ends in a consonant or a syllable that ends in a vocal shewa, the latter environment being the same in which the *heh* of the definite article frequently elides in the MT. In three cases, the definite article elides before another guttural (משא עדה, על אות הראישונה, על אות השנית); in the rest of the examples, the *heh* is a root consonant or verbal prefix. The *heh* is initially lost and then added as a correction in identical phonetic environments.¹⁵⁸ Note that all the texts are DSS-SP9, though this same phenomenon appears in DSS-NSP texts too (e.g., לשמיע “to declare” 4Q381 76–77, 10; לשכיל “to teach” 4Q381 80, 1; ולבדל “and to be separated” 4Q258 I, 2).

It should be observed, that in some cases what appears to be the elision of the *heh* really occurs for reasons other than the weakness of the conso-

this phrase can be read not as Qimron does, but rather as a defective *hiphil* infinitive construct (or infinitive absolute used as a construct) from טול “to throw.”

155. Interpreting this and the following example as cases of construct chains (as Accordance does) seems less likely given the consistency with which the ordinal numbers are used in attributive adjectival constructions with preceding nouns in the DSS.

156. See Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:222, who also note that the word looks like שלכתה.

157. For this and the following examples from 1QIsa^a, see Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 506.

158. Before a shewa (והאזינו in 1QIsa^a at Isa 8:9), and at the end of a historically closed syllable (ולטירה in 1QS VI, 22; באיב[ה] in 462 I, 6).

nant. For example, the spelling יופכו “they overthrew” (4Q501 1, 4) for an assumed root הפך does not necessarily imply the weakness of the glottal fricative, since the DSS seems to have known another synonymous verbal root, אפך, also found in RH and Aramaic, which verb (specifically in the Mishnah) takes an /o/ vowel after the prefix in the *qal* imperfect, similar in this sense to אמר. The spelling יהופכו (4Q432 4, 1) is presumably due to confusion between הפך and אפך.¹⁵⁹

In other cases, the *heh* seems to assimilate to a preceding or following vowel, as *aleph* does in forms like דניל (dānī’ēl >) dāniyēl “Daniel” and בוו (bā’ū >) bāwū “they came” (see §§4.4–5, “Aleph < Yodh and Yodh < Aleph” and “Aleph < Waw and Waw < Aleph”). The following represent the most relevant examples:

- לאביו — “to his fathers” (4Q175 15 and passim)
 אלויה — “your God” (4Q219 II, 32 = MT *אֱלֹהֶיךָ)
 וירמסויו — “they will trample him” (4Q368 10 ii, 7)
 תהו — “emptiness” (4Q504 1–2R iii, 3 and 1QIsa^a at Isa 40:17)
 for MT תהו¹⁶⁰
 אלוים — “God” (8Q4 [8QMez] 35) for MT אֱלֹהִים¹⁶¹

The spelling of the word “his father” (אביו) reflects ’ābīyū from an earlier *’ābīhū, as explained in §4.10, “Diphthongs and Triphthongs.” The two misspellings of the word “God” presumably reflect something like *ēlōyekā* and *ēlōyim* (note too *ēlōyē* from HazGab). With regard to the spellings תהו (*tōwū*), the one from 4Q504 might be a case of dittography, since the following word begins with a *waw* (ואסף “and nothing”), though the

159. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 251. For more on this verb in Aramaic, see Matthew Morgenstern, *Studies in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic Based upon Early Eastern Manuscripts* (HSS 62; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 170–71. See also the subsection “Lexicon” in §5.6, “Verbs.”

160. Qimron, *HDSS*, 26. The development is *tōhū* > *tōwū*; the *heh* is a historical writing. Note the lack of spacing in the phrase [הו] תהווב[הו] in 4Q303 1, 5.

161. Qimron, “Diphthongs and Glides,” 273. His other examples are not as convincing. Note also אלי “God of” (HazGab, 68; = MT *אֱלֹהֵי). See Qimron and Yuditsky, “Notes,” 36; Bar-Asher, “On the Language” (2008): 499–500; Rendsburg, “Grammatical Sketch,” 66; Yardeni and Elizur, “Hebrew Prophetic Text,” 68. Bar-Asher and Yardeni and Elizur also find this same spelling in line 84. Note that אלי “gods of” is restricted mostly to the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and is used in reference to divine beings, not as a reference to God.

example from 1QIsa^a is not followed by a *waw* and its spelling, therefore, cannot be explained in this way.¹⁶² I assume, furthermore, that this is not a case of a double *mater*, since this phenomenon is rather rare. The strange form וירמסווי “they will trample him” from 4Q368 presumably began as **wəyirmāsūhū* and then developed to **wəyirmāsūwū* through assimilation; the suffix was then further altered through dissimilation to *wəyirmāsūyū*, the double-*waw* in וירמסווי being due to a visual mistake of dittography or metathesis (for an intended **wəyirmōsūyū*).¹⁶³ These examples are attested not only in DSS-SP9 texts, but also in DSS-NSP (4Q368, 8Q3).

Sometimes *aleph* is written for etymological *heh*.¹⁶⁴ The following represents only some of the examples.

- באמרות — (1QS VI, 26) for *בהמרות “when he disobeys”
 באופיע — (1QS X, 2) for *בהופיע “when [they] shine”
 והנה איש ארור אחד (4Q175 23) for *אחד “Now,
 an accursed person”
 אנבא — (4Q385 2, 7) for *הנבא “prophesy” (*niphāl* imperative)
 יאודה — (4Q504 1–2 iv, 6) for *יהודה “Judah”
 אוגו — (4Q523 1–2, 2) for *הוגו “they thrust away”¹⁶⁵
 אוודו — (1QIsa^a at Isa 12:4) for MT הודו “give thanks”¹⁶⁶
 אילילו — (1QIsa^a at Isa 23:1) for MT הילילו “wail”
 אושיענו — (1QIsa^a at Isa 37:20) for MT הושיענו “deliver us”
 אחשיתי — (1QIsa^a at Isa 42:14) for MT החשיתי “I was quiet”
 אקשיבו — (1QIsa^a at Isa 51:4) for MT הקשיבו “pay attention”
 ארחיבי — (1QIsa^a at Isa 54:2) for MT הרחיבי “broaden”

162. The form תוה (1QIsa^a at Isa 49:4 for MT תהו) is vocalized by Qimron (*HDSS*, 17) as *tō* (and thus perhaps provides further evidence for the quiescence of word-internal *heh*); all the same, this spelling is perhaps to be explained, rather, as a case of haplography since the following word begins with *waw*: ולהבל.

163. Or did the object suffix have the form *-ēhū*, as on the singular, thus leading to **yirmāsūēhū* > **yirmāsūwēhū* > *yirmāsūwēyū*. Note the spelling ויר[מיסהו] “he trampled him” (4Q113 [4QDan^b] at Dan 8:7) for MT וירמסהו; all the letters except *waw* are hard to read in the scroll.

164. Qimron, *Grammar*, 84.

165. The surrounding text around this word is very damaged and Puech notes many alternative understandings (*Qumran Grotte 4.XVIII: Textes hébreux* (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579) [DJD 25; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998], 78).

166. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 506.

אשקִיט — (1QIsa^a at Isa 57:20) for MT הִשְׁקִיט “to be quiet”
 אחזיק — (1QIsa^a at Isa 64:6) for MT הִחֲזִיק “to grasp”
 איות — (4Q85 [4QPs^c] at Ps 50:21) for MT הִיֹּת “to be”¹⁶⁷

These mostly involve possible dittography (אנה) and/or influence from Aramaic’s variation between causative *haphel* and *aphel* stems.¹⁶⁸ It should be emphasized that the assumption that the *aleph/heh* exchange in 1QS and 1QIsa^a listed above is due to analogy with Aramaic *haphel/aphel* is based, in part, on the fact that the use of *aleph* in place of the prefix *heh* for the *hiphil* occurs primarily in 1QS and 1QIsa^a, texts in which one finds other causative stem forms that bear Aramaic traits (see the subsection “Conjugations” in §5.6, “Verbs,” for further details). As Muraoka notes for DSS Aramaic, the variation between *haphel* and *aphel* does not necessarily imply an identical pronunciation for the two letters.¹⁶⁹ On the other hand, the case of יאודה for יהודה does seem like evidence for the confusion of the two phonemes, as does איות for MT הִיֹּת and אנבא for MT הנבא. In some cases, what appears to be a case of *aleph* for *heh*, may be due to a scribal mistake like metathesis, as in עליאה (4Q369 1 ii, 3) (cf. עליהא in 1QIsa^a at Isa 34:11, 37:33, 42:5, 45:12, and 66:10). Most of the examples are again DSS-SP9 texts, though some (4Q523, 4Q85) are DSS-NSP.

In rare cases, *heh* is written for etymological *aleph*. The best examples, cited by Qimron, all derive from 1QS.¹⁷⁰

הנשי — (1QS VIII, 13 for אנשי “men of”)¹⁷¹

167. Note that the *aleph* is very damaged; see Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, Peter Flint, “Psalms,” DJD 16:58.

168. The *haphel* and *aphel* are both present in Biblical Aramaic and the Aramaic of the DSS, and conceivably these variant forms suggested to the scribes of 1QS and 1QIsa^a a similar variation for Hebrew. Note also the possible example of וואסיג (1QIsa^a at Isa 59:14 for MT וְהָסַג “it will be turned back”); the scroll’s word could reflect either “he will turn back” or “I will turn back.” Influence from other Aramaic words include אנה אנוכי at Isa 8:18 for MT אָנֹכִי אֲנִי; אדס at Isa 55:13 for MT אֲדַס. Other reasons for the confusion include a different understanding of the passage (e.g., אסיר “I will turn aside” at Isa 5:5 for MT הִסִּיר “turning aside”).

169. Muraoka, *GQA*, 14.

170. Qimron, *Grammar*, 83–85.

171. Confusion of the two consonants, *aleph* and *heh*, is also found in the MT, especially in names: אָדָרָם in 1 Chr 10:18 for הָדָרָם in 1 Kgs 12:18; הֶהָרָרִי in 1 Chr 11:35 for הָאָרָרִי in 2 Sam 23:33; and הִיָּד in 1 Chr 13:12 for אִיָּד in 2 Sam 6:9. For these,

הברכנו — (1QS X, 6 for אברכנו “I will bless him”)
 הבהרה — (1QS X, 12 for אבחרה “I will choose”)¹⁷²

Although Kutscher lists other instances of this phenomenon in 1QIsa^a, all can be attributed to other factors, or, at the least, to circumstances that might have significantly contributed to the confusion between laryngeals. The factors are: the difficulty of the original words (e.g., הדש “thoroughly [trampling]” the *hiphil* infinitive absolute of דוש followed by *qal* imperfect of דוש, at Isa 28:28 for MT אָדוּשׁ “trample,” which is an unprecedented *qal* infinitive absolute of דוש; הכינכה; דוּשׁ “he established you [with a name],” *hiphil* of בון, at Isa 45:4 for MT אָכַנְךָ “I named you [your name]”; הוררט “Horarat (?)” at Isa 37:38 for MT אָרַרְט “Ararat”); a separate understanding of the word or passage, twice where 1QIsa^a introduces a syntax with infinitives more common to DSS Hebrew (e.g., השיב “[my hand] turned,” *hiphil* infinitive, at Isa 1:25 for MT אָשִׁיבָהּ; העד “make testify,” *hiphil* imperative, at Isa 8:2 for MT אָעִידָהּ; הנשא “to be lifted,” *niphil* infinitive, perhaps due to dittography, at Isa 33:10 for MT אָנְשָׂא), or the influence of Aramaic words (e.g., היכה “alas” at Isa 1:21, 14:12 for MT אִיכָה; הכן “indeed” at Isa 40:7 for MT אָכַן).¹⁷³ Another possible example from another scroll is ויהיר in 4Q381 1, 5 for what should be ויאיר “he will light up,” though ויהיר may also be the *hiphil* of נהר “he will make shine.”¹⁷⁴ In the end, since other factors might have contributed significantly to the confusion, one should

see Alexander Sperber, “Hebrew Based Upon Biblical Passages in Parallel Transmission,” *HUCA* 14 (1939): 161. As for the second example, note that confusion on the part of the Chronicler might have been occasioned by the occurrence of ההררי earlier in 1 Sam 23:33.

172. Note that הבהרה can be explained as a *niphil* infinitive construct used as a finite verb, as Mark S. Smith has tentatively indicated (“The Infinitive Absolute as Predicative Verb in Ben Sira and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey,” in *Diggers at the Well*, 264).

173. For the list of these interchanges, see Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 505. On הוררט, see *ibid.*, 102. The reading of 1QIsa^a at 45:4 is supported by numerous versions (for which see *ibid.*, 247); for the passages with infinitives in Isa 1:25 and 33:10, see the comparable uses of the infinitive in Smith’s “Infinitive Absolute,” 264. The writing of an interlinear *heh* in מִהִיאִיבוּ at Isa 1:24 for MT מִאִוִּיבִי is, as Kutscher suggests, misplaced from the preceding word וּאִנְקָם (= MT וּאִנְקָמָה) (*ibid.*, 505). The Aramaic influence of הִךְ on אִךְ is seen even in the Bible, where it occurs at Dan 10:17 and 1 Chr 13:12. See also Aramaic-like היככה in 4Q223–224 2 iv, 5 and 4Q385 2,3 in contrast to Hebrew איככה in 4Q200 4, 6; 4Q381 31, 6; 4Q388 7, 5 and 4Q453 1.

174. See Schuller, *DJD* 11:95.

not draw from these examples the conclusion that the phoneme /h/ had entirely quiesced, disappeared, or merged totally with the glottal stop.

Additionally, Qimron considers the rare instances of לוהב “flame, blade” spelled להוב in the absolute (in 1QH^a XI, 31 and 4Q169 3–4 ii, 3) as further evidence of the weakness of *heh*.¹⁷⁵ This seems likely and would imply a variation in II-*heh* **quṭl* nouns similar to that found in II-*aleph* nouns like ראש. Newsom notes a similar possible variation in phrases like טוהר טוהר “purity of purities” (4Q403 1 i, 42), מלך הטוהר “the king of purity” (4Q403 1 ii, 26), and ממולח טוהר “one blended purely” (4Q405 19, 4; 20 ii–22, 11; 23 ii, 10; 11Q17 IX, 7, corresponding to מְמֹלַח טוהר in Exod 30:35), though for these scrolls, one must recall the alternation between genuine **quṭl* and **qaṭul* forms, as in קדושי קודש קודש [ים] “holy ones of the holy of holies” (4Q400 1 ii, 6), which seems, in part, stylistic.¹⁷⁶

The glottal fricative represented by *heh* clearly quiesced in some instances, especially after a shewa. Although in the MT the phoneme is lost in this same environment, this loss is primarily restricted to certain words and forms (after the prefix prepositions ב, כ, ל; in the prefix of the *hiphil* imperfect, **yəḥaqtīl* > *yaqtīl*). In the DSS, the loss of *heh* after what would be a shewa seems to be found more frequently (e.g., ויאזינו, ויאזינו; ותומות; ונע; יאודה) and is found in both DSS-SP9 and DSS-NSP texts. In addition, the *heh* is lost in other environments as well, like at the end of a syllable within a word (מתלות, מאפכת and מאפכת); it even sometimes replaces *aleph* at the beginning of a word (הנשי, הברכנו). Some confusions seem restricted to certain texts; for instance, *heh*'s replacement by *aleph* in the prefix of *hiphil* verbs is almost exclusively in 1QS and 1QIsa^a; the spelling of *heh* for *aleph* at the beginning of a word is found primarily in 1QS. Such things do not mean, however, that the glottal fricative disappeared entirely from the language; it was probably preserved in more careful speech, reading, and writing by scribes of most DSS-SP9 texts (not 1QS, 1QIsa^a). It bears mentioning, in relation to this, that words that contain an etymological *heh* as a third root consonant consistently attest this consonant, as in the absolute singular form of “God” אלוה (about twenty times); the verb “to be high” גבה (fifteen times), the abstract noun “height” גובה/גבה (about twenty times), and the adjective “high”

175. Qimron, *HDSS*, 37.

176. In 4Q400 1 ii, 6, the initial word is **qaṭul* and the following words are **quṭl*. See Newsom, *DJD* 11:254, 342. For the phrase of 4Q405 20 ii–22, 11, note the haplography, described above in “Scribal Mistakes” (§3.1).

גבוה/גבה (eighteen times); the verb “to shine” נגה (eight times) and the abstract noun “brightness” נוגה/נגה (eighteen times). Also note that the words (excluding the plural of אלוה) are spelled with *heh* not only when *heh* would be the last consonant of a word, but also when *heh* is followed by suffixed pronouns and morphemes attached to them. The consistency in spelling perhaps provides some small evidence that the scribes pronounced the *heh* as distinct from *aleph*.

QUIESCENCE OF *HETH*

Of the four guttural consonants, there is the least evidence for *heth*'s weakening. Although it is certain that the unvoiced pharyngeal fricative did weaken in certain environments and in certain texts, it seems equally certain that it was usually preserved, even, we may assume, in speech.

The examples from the MT lexicon of a supposed alternation between *heth* and *heh* are dubious.¹⁷⁷ The correspondences asserted for *heth* and *ayin* in the Hebrew lexicon are mostly late and probably influenced from Aramaic.¹⁷⁸

The number of examples where *heth* is elided is rather small: צצחות (1QIsa^a at Isa 58:11 for MT צחצחות “parched land”)¹⁷⁹ and אזתמ (11Q1 [11QpaleoLev^a] at Lev 25:32 for MT אצחזתם “their possession”).¹⁸⁰ Other examples are debateable, like that proposed by Wernberg-Møller: ש(ח)י “he will be thought” (1QS XI, 21) instead of שׁי.¹⁸¹

177. See HALOT, sub ח, which suggests an alternation with *heh* in the roots גבה/גבג. The apparent correspondence between the Hebrew גבג “bald” and Arabic *ʿajbah* “with a high forehead” (see HALOT, sub גבג) I assume is coincidental.

178. See HALOT, sub ח, which lists alternations between לחי “jaw” and לוע “jaw,” the latter occurring at the earliest only in Amoraic texts. Note לוחי in 1QIsa^a at Isa 30:28 for MT לחיי “jaws” as a possible mistaken conflation of the Aramaic and Hebrew words (see Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 250), though it seems easier to assume that the form in 1QIsa^a is another example of a DSS word with a **qatl* base where the MT reflects a **qatl* base. A possible case of this confusion in the MT lexicon is the writing חץ in 1 Sam 17:7 for *עץ.

179. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 221–22, 506. Kutscher actually cites a third example: מת at Isa 10:9 for MT חמת, but this is now read as חמת with a heavily damaged *heth* (see Accordance and Ulrich et al., *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 350).

180. Could this perhaps be caused by visual confusion between the paleo forms of *aleph*, *heth*, and *zayin*?

181. P. Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with*

An initial loss of *heth* and subsequent correction is found more frequently.

- להוכיח — “to reprove” (1QS V, 24)
 ההינינה — “the favor” (1QH^a XIX, 32)¹⁸²
 ההיחדר — “the chamber” (4Q365a 2 ii, 8)
 תשם — “do (not) rejoice” (4Q417 2 i, 10)¹⁸³
 נישת — “copper” (4Q33 [4QDeut^f] at Deut 8:9)
 וההיזיקה — “they will seize” (1QIsa^a at Isa 4:1 for MT וההיזיקוה)¹⁸⁴
 [לה] — “for a ruin” (4Q70 [4QJer^a] at Jer 17:17).¹⁸⁵

These examples do suggest the weakness of *heth*, though sometimes other reasonable explanations present themselves, like a confusion over what the text should say (“do [not] be forlorn” versus “do [not] rejoice”) and haplography due to the similarity in shape between *heh* and *heth* (ההינינה, ההיחדר, וההיזיקה).

I could find only one clear example, in a fragmentary context, where *aleph* is written for etymological *heth*, א[י]ת (4Q82 [4QXII^g] at Hos 2:14 for MT תיית “animals of”).¹⁸⁶ However, examples of *heh* written for etymological *heth* and vice versa are slightly more plentiful. Although these

an Introduction (STDJ 1; Leiden: Brill, 1957), 154. He is followed more recently by *DSSSE*. Qimron and Charlesworth, on the other hand, read as the verb ישב (“Rule of the Community,” 50–51).

182. Stegemann and Schuller note that Scribe C seems to have started an *aleph*, then changed it to a *heth* (Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:241).

183. The final *mem* suggests that the scribe thought initially that the word ended with this letter. Strugnell and Harrington write, “to determine what the scribe initially intended with his תשם is difficult—it may well have simply been a mistake” (DJD 34:181). Despite this, it seems likely to me, based on the context, that the scribe thought the text should read “do not be forlorn (= MT *תשם or *תשם, from שמם) in your mourning (באבלכה).” The two words (i.e., the verb שמם and the noun אבל) occur together in, e.g., Jer 12:11 and Lam 1:4.

184. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 506. This mistake may be due to haplography.

185. The reading סלה לה (4Q416 2 iv, 10) is ambiguous. It may be a case where *heth* is written like a *heh* and thus we should read סלה לה. See Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:124–25.

186. Kutscher also lists an example where *aleph* is written for *heth*, in the phrase תלוהבא לשון אש וחסש להבה in 1QIsa^a at Isa 5:24 for MT תלוהבא לשון אש (Isaiah, 506). For this mistake, Kutscher cites “the weakness of the pharyngeal” and the precedent of the phrase אש להבה “flame of fire” in Isa 4:5 (as well as elsewhere) and other similar

may reflect *heth*'s weakening, one must recognize that all such mistakes may not reflect aural mistakes, but rather visual gaffs, the two letters being so similar in shape.¹⁸⁷ Examples of *heh* written for etymological *heth* are listed here. Notice that almost all of the examples are from 1QS and 1QIsa^a.

- מהשבתם — (1QS III, 15) corrected to מחשבתם “their thoughts”¹⁸⁸
 ישהק — (1QS VII, 14) corrected to ישחק “he will laugh”
 להפצ — (1QS VI, 11) for *להפץ “to the desire of”¹⁸⁹
 הגורה — (1QIsa^a at Isa 3:24) for MT הגֹּרֶה “girdle”
 השקי — (1QIsa^a at Isa 21:4) for MT חֲשֵׁקִי “my desire”
 הרבות — (1QIsa^a at Isa 21:15) for MT חֲרָבוֹת “swords”¹⁹⁰
 נרהב — (1QIsa^a at Isa 30:23) for MT נִרְחָב “broad”
 מהשוכים — (1QIsa^a at Isa 42:16) for MT מְחֹשֶׁךְ “darkness”
 השילה — (4Q59 [4QIsa^e] at Isa 8:6) for MT השִׁלֹּחַ “the Shiloah”

One example proposed from the Vision of Gabriel text is uncertain; Bar-Asher argues that הביב is written for חביב “loved one” in line 64 of the text, though the editors and Yardeni in particular seem to favor the reading חביב.¹⁹¹

expressions (ibid., 221). However, the change in 5:24 seems more likely due to dittography and/or the substitution of a simpler word for an obscure MT word.

187. See Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 231; he notes that such mistakes may also have a phonological component. Cross and Eshel note the graphic confusion of the two letters in many inscriptions from the first century C.E. (Frank Moore Cross and E. Eshel, “1. KhQOstrakon,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part I* [ed. S. J. Pfann et al.; DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000], 497). Similar confusions occur in the MT: יפֶּרָה (Isa 11:1) for *יפּרַח; מְבַחֵלֶת (Prov 20:21) for *מבּהלת; ולחתם *kethib* (Dan 9:24) for *ולחַתֶּם *qere* (Delitzsch, *Lese- und Schreibfehler*, 109); perhaps also וְרֵבִים (Ps 90:10) for *רחבם (cf. רחוב 1QIsa^a at Isa 51:9 for MT רֵהַב).

188. Qimron, *Grammar*, 85. Note that Qimron and Charlesworth seem more hesitant about this correction and write “original ה perhaps corrected to ח” (“Rule of the Community,” 14).

189. Qimron, *Grammar*, 84.

190. For this and the other examples, see Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 506. This mistake may be due to confusion with הרְבוֹת or הרְבוֹת. What Kutscher lists as יהיה is to be read (like the MT) as יחיה (see Accordance and Ulrich et al., *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 344).

191. Bar-Asher, “*Vision of Gabriel*,” 500. Apparently, Yardeni and Elitzur first were unsure which letter should be read, then Yardeni (in a personal conversation) said she thought it was a *heh*, and then later said that she prefers the reading with a *heth* (ibid., 500 n. 55).

There are fewer convincing examples of *heth* written for an etymological *heh*.

וּחִלְחַם — (4Q369 2, 2) for *וּהִלְחַם “to fight”

מִנְחָל — (1QIsa^a at Isa 51:18) for MT מְנַהֵל “one to guide”

לְנִדּוּחַ — “for banishing (their children)” (4Q111 [4QLam] at Lam 1:17) for MT לְנִדְהָ “impure thing”

Other examples are less certain: חִפֵּר “be ashamed” (4Q416 2 iv, 9) corrected to חִפֵּר *hāfēr* “annul” (*hiphil* imperative of פָּרַר) may, as Strugnell and Harrington note, reflect no correction, but simply an unusually formed *heh*.¹⁹² The example of עִיר הַחֶרֶס “the city of the sun” (presumably, Heliopolis) in 1QIsa^a and 4Q56 (4QIsa^b) at Isa 19:18 for MT עִיר הַהֶרֶס “the city of destruction” either reflects the earlier text from which the MT derives through wordplay (between הֶרֶס and חֶרֶס) or the fact that the scribes of 1QIsa^a and 4Q56 failed to recognize the pun and replaced the less common הֶרֶס “destruction” with the more common חֶרֶס “sun.”¹⁹³ Kutscher cites other examples where *heth* is written for etymological *heh*, but these are either no longer read as *heth* (e.g., אֲשִׁיתָחוּ at Isa 5:6 is now read as אֲשִׁיתָהוּ “I will render it”);¹⁹⁴ are due to an obscure word in the MT (כַּחֲדוּשׁ “like the month of” at Isa 25:10 for MT כְּהִדְוֵשׁ “as the threshing of”; תַּפְתָּח “opening” or “you will open” at Isa 30:33 for MT תַּפְתָּחָה “Topheth”; חוֹבְרֵי “conjurers of” at Isa 47:13 for MT *kethib* הִבְרוּ “they astrologize” [*qere* implies הַבְּרִי “those astrologers”]; חוֹזִים “they who see” at Isa 56:10 for MT הַזִּים “those who talk incomprehensibly”); or are the result of confusion between common words (רְחוֹב “Rehob” or “plaza” at Isa 51:9 for MT רְהַב “Rahab”).¹⁹⁵

A weakening of *heth* is implied, according to Qimron, in the single form רְחוּבוֹ “its width” (4Q365 12b iii, 9) for what would otherwise be רוֹחְבוֹ, as in 4Q365a 2 ii, 10.¹⁹⁶ This might be the case, but I think the evidence for the quiescing of *heth* in this kind of environment is weak and the example of רְחוּבוֹ may simply be a visual error, similar to other cases where

192. See Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:124–25. Accordance reads the form as the *hiphil* 3ms perfect of פָּרַר “he annulled.”

193. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 507.

194. Accordance and Ulrich et al. in *Qumran Biblical Scrolls*, 338.

195. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 506. On חֶרֶס, see *ibid.*, 116; on חוֹזִים, see *ibid.*, 235.

196. Qimron, *HDSS*, 37.

a *mater* is put in the wrong place (see the examples listed above in §3.1, “Scribal Mistakes”) or due to the scribe initially thinking he was writing the construct form of the word “width” and then, after adding the suffix, not bothering to correct the spelling.¹⁹⁷ The example of שחוד “bribe” from 1QIsa^a at Isa 5:23 and 33:15 (as an absolute noun) is also exceptional and might be evidence for the weakened *heth* in the dialect of the scribes of 1QIsa^a, though it could also be a mistake perhaps due to influence from Aramaic orthography.

The likelihood that *heth* was not quiescent is perhaps also suggested by the misspelling, erasure, and correction in three texts (if these are not due to visual slips). The word יאכלו “they will eat” (4Q514 1 i, 6) was first spelled with a *heth*, as יאחלו. The word החול “the sand” (4Q225 2 i, 6) was first written הכול. The word + suffix גיחוחים “your pleasing sacrifice-odor” (4Q270 7 i, 18) was first written without the *kaph*. Although *heth* represented a sound distinct from *kaph* at the turn of the era (even spirantized *kaph*), such mistakes suggest that the *heth* was not quiescent. It bears mentioning that the three scrolls represent the three categories of texts, DSS-SP9 (4Q225), DSS-SP1c (4Q270), and DSS-NSP (4Q514).

Like the other gutturals, *heth* could drop at the end of a word or syllable. Likewise, its confusion with *heh* is sometimes at the end of a syllable, though there are also cases where the two letters are confused at the beginning of a syllable too. The inherent weakness of the phoneme, the phonetic similarity with /h/, and *heth*’s graphic similarity to *heh*, all help to explain many of the examples cited above. And, much evidence cited for this variation derives from 1QIsa^a, which implies the peculiarity of this phenomenon to this text and its scribes. That the unvoiced pharyngeal fricative weakened in the dialects (and idiolects) of all or even most scribes seems unlikely. The rarity of the letter’s elision together with the fact that it is sometimes confused with *kaph* suggest that the letter still represented a sound distinct from the glottal stop (*aleph*) or glottal fricative (*heh*).

SUMMARY

If we look at all the evidence for the weakening of gutturals, we come up with the following picture: the gutturals had “weakened,” but they had not

197. For a discussion of this and related forms, see also § 5.5, “**quṭl* Nouns.”

all become weak to the same degree. The most likely environment for a guttural to be pronounced is at the beginning of a word; its loss or mispronunciation is most common in the middle or at the end of a word, especially where it closes a syllable and where it is immediately preceded by a consonant or vocal shewa.

Nor are the gutturals all interchangeable with each other in every text, register, and idiolect. Over all, gutturals are particularly weak in 1QS, 1QIsa^a, and the Copper Scroll (3Q15). Some texts seem to reflect a particular difficulty with certain sounds and letters. For instance, 1QH^a attests numerous cases of misspellings involving *ʿayin*, but comparatively few with *heh* or *ḥeth*. Also, note the frequency with which *heh* is written for *ḥeth* in 1QS and 1QIsa^a. Such distributions may be only coincidental, but perhaps reflect a range of different kinds of guttural weakening in the dialects or idiolects of the scribes and/or in the different registers of the texts.

Aleph was often elided in writing of all kinds, presumably reflecting the loss of the glottal stop in many different environments. This loss was probably frequent in speech as well, though this does not mean that the phoneme was never articulated. When it is missing, it is most often in the middle of a word when it is not preceded by a full vowel (that is, when it is preceded, according to the Tiberian tradition, by a consonant or a vocal shewa) or when it would have come at the end of a syllable. When preceded by a full vowel at the beginning of a syllable, however, the *aleph* is usually retained and presumably represents a glottal stop. When the *aleph* is followed by an /o/ or /u/ vowel it is often retained, even when preceded by a vocal shewa. Occasionally in the writings associated with the sect (especially 1QpHab, 1QSa, 1QH^a) the *aleph* is dropped before a full vowel.

The *ʿayin* is, compared to *aleph* and *heh*, only rarely elided; when it is dropped, it is often in the same environment where these other gutturals are dropped. In contrast to the situation with *aleph*, there are no cases where an individual word with *ʿayin* is misspelled consistently (in more than three separate passages). Its loss is most frequent in 1QS, 1QH^a, 1QIsa^a, and 3Q15 (the Copper Scroll).

The *heh* was often lost too, frequently in environments where it is also lost in the MT, but to an even greater degree. This suggests the loss of the corresponding phoneme, the glottal fricative, in certain environments. Such loss is partially a consequence of the phoneme's inherent weakness, but also the weakening of its pronunciation especially as reflected in 1QIsa^a and 1QS. Its loss is also suggested through a variation in spelling, where *aleph* sometimes replaces *heh*. However, in many cases where such

variation occurs with the *heh* of the *hiphil* prefix, the reason is not necessarily aural confusion, but may be due to analogy with the alternation in Aramaic between *haphel* and *aphel* causative stems; such variation is most obvious in 1QIsa^a and 1QS and coincides with other parallels between *hiphil* and *haphel* forms in these texts. The assimilation of *heh* to a neighboring vowel (like the analogous assimilation of *aleph*, *waw*, and *yodh*) is only an occasional reflex of the phoneme's inherent weakness. In the end, I find it unlikely that the *heh* phoneme was entirely lost in word-medial position in the speech or in the writing/reading registers of most scribes and writers of the DSS. As in the MT, the *heh* could elide in certain positions or be retained.

The *heth* phoneme shows some signs of having weakened. The best evidence again comes from 1QS and 1QIsa^a and reflects the peculiar pronunciation or dialect of its scribes. Confusion with *kaph* in three separate texts suggests that it had not weakened in the dialect(s) of other scribes.

As for Kutscher's characterization of the situation, that the phonemes represented by *aleph* and *'ayin* had fallen together and those represented by *heh* and *heth* had fallen together, the evidence from the entire corpus of scrolls does not reflect this. Most cases in which these groups of consonants are confused reflect either the common weakness of the grouped consonants, the similarity in their sound, or even (in the case of *heh* and *heth*) the similarity in the graphic shape of the respective letters. Notice, as a comparison, the confusions cited in "Scribal Mistakes" (§3.1) between letters representing velar/uvular consonants (*gimmel*, *kaph*, *qoph*); to my knowledge no one has suggested that the scribes of the DSS had lost the distinction between these consonants. This is not to deny, however, that the situation in 1QS and 1QIsa^a does seem to reflect a relatively high degree of confusion between all the gutturals.

The characterization of Goshen-Gottstein, among others, that the phonemes associated with *aleph* and *heh* were often confused does seem to be true, but primarily at the end of words and syllables where the articulation of the two phonemes would be more difficult to make and/or hear. The frequent variations of *aleph* and *heh* at the beginning of words do reflect a weakening of /h/, though many of these examples may also be influenced from Aramaic morphology (*aphel* instead of *haphel* causative stem) and Aramaic words (היכה instead of Hebrew אִיכָה). There is no reason to believe that *heth* and *'ayin* were typically confused. The few instances where one is written for the other suggest the common place of their articulation (the pharynx); that *heth* is confused with *'ayin* may offer

further evidence for the preservation of a sound associated with *‘ayin*, one distinct from that of *aleph* and *heh*.

4.4. ALEPH < YODH AND YODH < ALEPH

In the Hebrew of the DSS, as in the Hebrew of the MT, an etymological *yodh* can shift to *aleph* or the reverse can happen: an etymological *aleph* can shift to a *yodh* or *aleph* + *yodh*.¹⁹⁸ These shifts are parallel to shifts between *aleph* and *waw* discussed below. Since such variations in spelling occur in the MT, scholars have offered various explanations for them over time.¹⁹⁹ Examples of the shift from etymological *yodh* to *aleph* are found in the MT among the plural forms of gentilics and of words whose final etymological root consonant is *yodh*. To understand these shifts fully, especially in relation to the gentilics, it is useful to understand a bit of the history of Hebrew nouns.

EVIDENCE FROM THE MT OF ALEPH < YODH

Based on comparative evidence, it seems that the gentilic nouns at one time had the ending **-iyyu*.²⁰⁰ This was then shortened to *-iy*, which would sound almost identical to /i/.²⁰¹ Thus, for the masculine singular absolute in the MT one finds words like עִבְרִי *‘ibrī* “Hebrew.” For feminine singular

198. Such shifts are distinct from the shifts suggested through the biblical Hebrew lexicon, as in אֲבָל “canal” (< יָבַל “to bring”), a by-form of יִבְּל, as well as אֵשׁ and שֵׁי (see *HALOT*, s.v.). In these cases, the evidence for development (from *yodh* to *aleph* or vice versa) is usually encumbered by ambiguities. E.g., for the word “canal,” note the verb אָבַל “to be dry” and for the particle of existence: Ugaritic *’it* versus Phoenician *yš*. Conceivably, these pairs of words reflect the inherent similarity of the phonemes.

199. For a lucid and insightful study of analogous exchanges in MH, see Yohanan Breuer, “Intervocalic *Alef/Yodh* Interchanges in Mishnaic Hebrew,” *Revue des Études juives* 159 (2000): 63–78.

200. On the Arabic gentilic, for example, see W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* (3rd ed.; 2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896–1898), §249. The class of gentilic nouns is part of a broader group of nouns with the same morphology that are called “relative adjectives” in Arabic grammar and sometimes also in Hebrew grammar (see Blau, *Phonology and Morphology*, 276).

201. Ben-Ḥayyim (*Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew*, 64 n. 89) writes in relation to Tiberian Hebrew: “As is well known, there is no distinction between *-iya* and *-iyya*.” Blau notes that Hebrew יֵ - can mark either *-iyy* or *-iy* (*Phonology and Morphology*, 276).

and masculine plural nouns the etymological *yodh* consonant of the gentilic ending is only rarely preserved (e.g., הַעֲבְרִיָּה *hā'ibrīyā* Deut 15:12, and כִּתְיִים *kittiyīm* “Kittim” Jer 2:10).²⁰² More often, the feminine singular and masculine plural do not show an etymological *yodh* but do exhibit a long /ī/ vowel (e.g., עֲבְרִים *'ibrīm*, כִּתְיִים *kittīm*, and עֲבְרִית *'ibrīt*). The feminine plural, on the other hand, regularly has an etymological consonantal *yodh* (e.g., הַעֲבְרִיֹּת *hā'ibrīyōt*, Exod 1:15).

The reason for the variations in the feminine singular and masculine plural nouns is unclear. Based on the historical form of the gentilic ending, it seems likeliest that words without the consonantal *yodh* have undergone some truncation (that is, *-īyī-* > *-ī-*), while those with the *yodh* preserve a vestige of the etymological form of the ending.²⁰³ Similar cases of truncation are regularly found for other etymological III-*yodh* words (e.g., with participles, **bāniyīm* > *bōnīm* = בְּנִים “they who build” and **bāniyāt* > *bōnōt* = בְּנוֹת).²⁰⁴ Although not denying the etymological development of the affix, Bergsträsser notes that there might not really be a significant phonetic difference between those forms that end יִים - and those that end יִים .-

202. Alternatively, they may represent *'ibriyyā*, *kittiyyīm*. The similar writing of **qaṭīl* base nouns/adjectives like נְקִיִּים must reflect *nəqīyīm* (not **nəqiyyīm*) since there is no reason to believe that such adjectives ended with two consonantal *yodhs*. Similarly, לְוִיִּים should imply *ləwīyīm*. That the MT Hebrew forms like הַעֲבְרִיָּה (Deut 15:12) and כִּתְיִים do not reflect the etymological form of the gentilics, *-īyy*, is something remarked on by Blau (ibid., 276), who notes that the Aramaic gentilic ending, *-āy*, suggests that Hebrew gentilics are characterized by a long vowel followed by a single *yodh*: *-īy*. One wonders, on the other hand, if both forms of masculine plural nouns (gentilics like כִּתְיִים and III-*yodh* **qaṭīl* base nouns/adjectives like נְקִיִּים) could be due to spontaneous gemination, like that found more commonly after /a/ vowels, as in גְּמָלִים, but also after /i/ vowels as in אֶפְרַיִם (see Joüon-Muraoka §18f and §96Bb and Blau, *Phonology and Morphology*, 124, 132), perhaps analogously with *qal* fs participles like הַמְיָה (for more examples, see *HGhS*, 590h).

203. Bauer and Leander consider the MT forms with *-īyī-* and *-īyā* as preservations of earlier, etymological forms; they explain the shorter endings, *-īm* and *-īt*, as the result of truncation of the earlier morpheme (what they and Brockelmann call “haplography”) (*HGhS*, 217f–g).

204. As Brockelmann illustrates, earlier in the development of the Semitic languages, intervocalic /w/ or /y/ often disappeared; he cites verbal forms like **qawama* becoming *qāma* (in Hebrew, the *qal*, 3ms perfect of קָוַם) and similarly **saluyū* becoming *salū* (C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* [2 vols.; Berlin: n.p., 1908–1913; reprinted Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1961], 1:57 §39w).

with י-; in both cases the spelling may simply indicate an ultralong /i/ vowel: *-īm*, and, in any case, he observes, *-īyī-* and *-ī-* are practically identical in their sound.²⁰⁵ It bears mentioning that those gentilics that exhibit the *-īyī-* etymological ending (like כְּתִיִּים) are from a diverse range of texts, some early and some late; there is often not consistency within a given text.²⁰⁶ This implies that for a certain period of time both forms for feminine singular and masculine plural words were optional pronunciations and/or spellings.

In any case, there seems to have been another development that followed the shift from *-īyī-* > *-ī-* (or, alternatively, a simultaneous and parallel development), whereby the *yodh* of *-īyīm* is written as *aleph*, reflecting, presumably, a shift to a glottal stop or glottalized glide, to become *-ī'im*. There are two gentilics that exhibit this shift in the MT; the first is הַהֲגָרִיָּאִים “the Hagarites” in 1 Chr 5:19, 20 and הַהֲגָרִאִים in 1 Chr 5:10, the expected form being הַהֲגָרִים (in Ps 83:7); and the second is הַעֲרָבִיאִים “the Arabians” in 2 Chr 17:11, but more commonly עֲרָבִים in Neh 4:1, 2 Chr 21:16, 22:1 (note עֲרָבִים in 2 Chr 26:7, *kethib* implying עֲרָבִים). These MT forms with *aleph* are usually explained by scholars as reflecting a shift in pronunciation, associated with glide or dissimilation. Bergsträsser, for example, describes the *aleph* in forms like הַהֲגָרִיאִים as representing a “Gleittlaut” that had developed from an earlier *yodh*.²⁰⁷ Bauer and Leander, on the other hand, characterize the *aleph* as resulting from dissimilation, by which they mean a phonetic transformation brought on by the similarity in sound between the *yodh* and the preceding and/or following /i/ vowels.²⁰⁸

205. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 1:102.

206. The simpler ending also occurs in later books. For example, the vocalization reflecting *kittīyīm* occurs in Jer 2:10 and Ezek 27:6, while the vocalization reflecting *kittīm* occurs in six passages in Genesis, Numbers, Isaiah, Daniel, and 1 Chronicles (in Isa 23:12 the *kethib* presumes the vocalization with *yodh*, though the *qere* presumes that without). The vocalization *‘ibrīyā* appears twice, in Deut 15:12 and Jer 34:9, the alternative form does not occur; the plural *‘ibrīyīm* occurs only in Exod 3:18, though the shorter form occurs in Exodus and 1 Samuel. The form פְּלִשְׁתִּים occurs once in Amos 9:7, but everywhere else פְּלִשְׁתִּים אַרְמִיָּה appears in 1 Chr 7:14, while the short plural form (אַרְמִים) appears in 2 Kgs 8:28, 29, 9:15; כּוּשִׁים appears in Amos 9:7, but everywhere else כּוּשִׁים אַדּוּמִים appears in 1 Kgs 11:17, while the shorter form appears in 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles.

207. See, Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 1:93, 1:102–3.

208. Bauer and Leander, *HGS*, 215g. In this paragraph, Bauer and Leander men-

Presumably, both interpretations could be correct.²⁰⁹ In either case, the glottal stop between /i/ vowels helps to distinguish the ultimate and penultimate syllables, which might otherwise have contracted to a simple long /i/ vowel. In this case, we might think of the glottal stop that appears here as a kind of epenthetic consonant, separating the surrounding vowels or breaking up the potential hiatus.²¹⁰

Most nouns, adjectives, and participles that are from etymological III-*yodh* roots exhibit a truncation in the plural and feminine forms, as mentioned above (**bāniyīm* > *bōnīm* = בָּנִים and **bāniyāt* > *bōnōt* = בְּנוֹת). This is the normal development, according to the basic model for III-*yodh* roots; the sequence Vowel + *y* + Vowel contracts to just Vowel. Words of III-*yodh* roots that exhibit a consonantal *yodh* instead of contraction, as in עֹטֵיָה “one who wraps” (Song 1:7), are therefore unexpected.²¹¹ Scholars like Bergsträsser and Bauer and Leander explain such forms as based on analogy to similar words from strong roots.²¹² For example, the above feminine singular participle עֹטֵיָה is formed on analogy to other *qal* feminine singular participles like אֹכֵלָה “one which eats” (Deut 4:24) and שֹׁפֵטָה “one who judges” (Judg 4:4). In the same way, masculine plural III-*yodh* nouns/adjectives from a **qaṭl* or **qiṭl* base like צְבִי “gazelle,” should have gone from **ṣabayīm* to **ṣābīm* = *צָבִים through contraction, but, instead, they formed plurals like הַצְּבִיִּם (2 Sam 2:18) and פְּתִיִּם (Prov 1:22, singular פְּתִי “simple”), as well as פְּתִיִּים (Ps 119:130), on analogy to **qaṭl* and **qiṭl* plurals like מְלָכִים “kings” and סְפָרִים “books.”²¹³ In contrast to the

tion only nouns like הַלְּאִים discussed below, but on page 564 they list the above genitive nouns with *aleph* and refer the reader to page 215 §g.

209. See Blau’s comments on the similar צבאים (*Phonology and Morphology*, 89).

210. The use of glottal stops for epenthesis is found cross-linguistically. Christian Uffmann writes: “Glottal stops are frequently found in the world’s languages.... In addition, they are typically found ... intervocally, as a hiatus breaker.... Glottal stops are found epenthetically in onsets of initial or stress syllables, that is, in prominent positions” (“Intrusive [r] and Optimal Epenthetic Consonants,” *Language Sciences* 29 [2007]: 457). Note also that the glottal stop sometimes appears in Israeli Hebrew in similar contexts, as “onglide to a heavily stressed vowel” (Bolzoky, “Israeli Hebrew Phonology,” 288).

211. Such forms are also occasionally found in the Hebrew of the DSS, as in כְּלִי (4Q83 [4QPs^a] at Ps 69:4 for MT כֶּלֶי).

212. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 1:102 and Bauer and Leander, *HGHs*, 215g.

213. See also Joüon-Muraoka §96Aq. Another example is שְׁפִים (Jer 3:2) and

analogically formed III-*yodh* participles which are rare, these analogically formed segholate plurals are common. Similarly, although some III-*yodh* nouns/adjectives of the **qaṭīl* base, like שָׁנִי “scarlet,” exhibit contraction in the plural (שָׁנִים Prov 31:21), more often such words in the feminine singular and plurals are formed on analogy to the strong root. Thus, נָקִי “innocent” becomes נָקִים (Josh 2:17) as well as נָקִיִּים (Jer 2:34), both vocalized *naqīyīm*, on analogy to adjectives like חָסִיד “pious” which is חָסִידִים in the masculine plural.²¹⁴

Although the participles and **qaṭīl* base nouns/adjectives in the MT do not exhibit a shift from etymological *yodh* to *aleph*, like that found in הָעֲרֵבָאִים, III-*yodh* segholate nouns/adjectives do (that is, those from **qaṭl*, **qītl*, **quṭl* bases). Usually these are plural forms where the vowel preceding the historical *yodh* is /ā/, such that the shift is usually -*āyīm* > -*ā'im* or -*āyōt* > -*ā'ōt*. In the MT, these include the word צְבָאִים “gazelles” (1 Chr 12:9, *kethib* presuming *ṣabā'im*), and צְבָאוֹת (Song 2:7, 3:5); פְּתָאִים “simple” (Ps 116:6, *kethib*); מְנָאוֹת “shares of” (Neh 12:44, cf. מְנִיּוֹת in Neh 12:47, sing. מְנָת *), חֲלָאִים “ornaments” (Song 7:2, sing. חֲלִי; compare the plural forms of חֲלִי “sickness” חֲלָיִם in Deut 28:59 and חֲלָיִים in 2 Chr 21:15); עֲפָאִים “foliage” (Ps 104:12, *kethib*, sing. עֲפִי); בְּלוּאִי “worn out” (Jer 38:12, compare בְּלוּי in Jer 38:11, sing. בְּלוּי *).²¹⁵ Other examples include words from **qaṭal* bases like טְלָאִים “lambs” (Isa 40:11, sing. טְלָה); the odd by-form of צֹאן “flock,” צֹנָאִים (Num 32:24, sing. צֹנָה Ps 8:8); and the **taqīl*

שָׁפִיִּים (Jer 3:21). Perhaps, the inclusion of the *yodh* as a consonant in these words served the purpose of distinguishing such words from other, similarly shaped words, like masculine plural participles from II-*waw/yodh* roots, e.g., קָמִים. The tendency for III-*yodh* **qaṭīl* base adjectives to also include a consonantal *yodh* in the feminine and plural forms may be for similar reasons.

214. Similarly, עָנִי “afflicted” becomes עָנִיִּים (Isa 3:15). See Joüon-Muraoka §88Eb and §96Db. Compare the participles בְּכִיָּה (Lam 1:16) and הַמְיָה (Prov 7:11), which seem to follow the forms of III-*yodh* nouns/adjectives (HGhS, 590h and GKC §75v).

215. See Bauer and Leander, HGhS, 579p'. Forms like צְבָאִים, similar to גֹּזִים, do not, typically, have a *mater yodh* for the long /i/ (see GKC §8k). The form צְבָאִים must reflect the interchange under discussion, *ṣbāyīm* > *ṣbā'im*, which was later “corrected” by the Masoretes to reflect *ṣbāyīm*, perhaps with the *aleph* construed as a *mater*. Bergsträsser also lists מִי יִנְחַמְךָ (Isa 51:19) for מִי יִנְחַמְךָ * (cf. Hebräische Grammatik, 1:102). Note too the spelling חֲלָכָאִים in Ps 10:10, the plural of חֲלָכָה (in Ps 10:8, 14), as well as תִּצְמִינֵנוּ “you go to the right” in the MT at Isa 30:21, for תִּצְמִינֵנוּ (cf. וְצִמְנָה Gen 13:9) or תִּצְמִינֵנוּ (cf. מִימִינֵי 1 Chr 12:2). Perhaps the last example is due to orthographic confusion with תִּצְמִינֵנוּ “you will trust.”

noun in the plural תְּחִלָּאִים “sickness” (Jer 16:4 and 2 Chr 21:19), from the root חלה.²¹⁶ Bergsträsser, again, describes the *aleph* in עֲבָאִים as representing a “Gleitlaut” that developed from an earlier *yodh*, Bauer and Leander characterizing the *aleph* as resulting from dissimilation.²¹⁷ Blau suggests that such words may “represent a combination of dissimilation and glide.”²¹⁸ Notice that in most examples where there is a shift from an etymological *yodh* to *aleph*, the text is exilic or postexilic. This suggests that this shift is one that occurs during the exilic or Second Temple era.

One sees a similar shift also, incidentally, in Aramaic where it happens more regularly. For example, the shift happens in Biblical Aramaic and in DSS Aramaic in the masculine singular participle of II-*waw*/*yodh* roots, which should be realized as **qāyēm*, but are instead קָאֵם. It also occurs in Aramaic gentilics, like כְּשָׂדָאִין “Chaldeans” (Dan 3:8) and יהוּדָאִין “Judeans” (Dan 3:12, *kethib*), which should be *kaśdāyīm* and *yahūdāyīm* (cf. יהוּדָאִים “the Judeans” in Dan 3:8). Similarly, in DSS Aramaic, one finds אַמּוּרָא “the Amorites” in 1Q20 XXI, 21 for what one would expect as **amūriā*; and with similar nouns נְכַרָּאִין “foreigners” in 4Q542 1 i, 5.²¹⁹

EVIDENCE FROM THE DSS OF ALEPH < YODH

In the DSS, the tendency for etymological *yodhs* to appear as *alephs* is more common than it is in the MT. This shift is seen not only with gentilics (כְּתִיאִים “Kittim”) and III-*yodh* segholate nouns/adjectives (פְּתִיאִים “simple”), but also with III-*yodh* nouns/adjectives from a **qaṭīl* base like נְקִי “pure,” and still other III-*yodh* nouns like גּוֹי “nation,” and even the II-*yodh* noun אֵיב “enemy.” It does not appear, however, where no *yodh* appears in the singular form of a noun; for example, forms with *aleph* do not generally occur on masculine plural participles of III-*yodh* verbs (the

216. The *hiphil* participle “those shooting” מוֹרָאִים (2 Sam 11:24) seems like an error due to confusion of III-*aleph* and III-*yodh* roots. Similarly תְּחִלָּאִים (Deut 28:66) is likely due to a III-*aleph* by-form, implied also in the *qere* of תְּחִלָּים (2 Sam 21:12) (see HALOT, s.v.).

217. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 1:93, 1:102–3; and Bauer and Leander, *HGS*, 215g–h. In this paragraph, Bauer and Leander mention specifically תְּחִלָּים/תְּחִלָּאִים and עֲבָאִים/עֲבָאִי.

218. Blau, *Phonology and Morphology*, 89.

219. For these and more examples, see Muraoka, *GQA*, 18.

exception being *qal* passive participles, like [נטוא]ה and שבאים described below).²²⁰

Masculine plural gentilic nouns in the DSS, as in the MT, reveal three possible orthographic forms: with a single *yodh*, with two *yodhs* (the second functioning as *mater*), and with a *yodh* + *aleph* + *yodh* (*mater*).²²¹ Several gentilic nouns in the DSS evidence one or more of these forms. For example, MT כְּתִימִים “Kittim,” and פְּלִשְׁתִּים “Philistines” can be spelled with one *yodh* פְּלִשְׁתִּים (1QIsa^a at Isa 2:6); with two *yodhs* כְּתִיִּים (1QM I, 4, and passim), פְּלִשְׁתִּיִּים (1QIsa^a at Isa 11:14 and 6Q9 32, 1); or with *yodh* + *aleph* + *yodh* (*mater*) כְּתִיִּאִים (1QpHab II, 12 and passim).²²² The same options are found for words that end with an etymological *-iy*, including one example of a noun/adjective of the **qaṭīl* base (נְקִי “innocent”), though not all options are attested for all types of words. The masculine plural **qaṭīl* base noun/adjective נְקִי is spelled נְקִיאִים (4Q266 8 i, 3; 4Q284a 2, 6 = MT נְקִיָּים / נְקִיָּים).²²³ One finds the MT form לְוִיִּים “Levites” as לוֹיִים (1QM XVI, 7 and four other times in nonbiblical texts), לוֹיִים (1QM VII, 15 and at least thirty other times in nonbiblical texts), and לוֹיאִים (4Q491 13, 6 and partially preserved in 4Q285 3, 2).²²⁴ One finds נְכַרְיִאִים “foreigners” (1QIsa^a at Isa 2:6) and נְכַרְיִאִים (5Q6 [5QLam^a] at Lam 5:2).²²⁵

220. Accordance counts 144 examples of masculine plural participles from III-*yodh* roots (including construct forms, but not suffixed forms). Only one contains the double *yodh*, נְלוֹיִים in 1QIsa^a at Isa 56:6. All the rest have just one *yodh*.

221. A fourth possibility, noted by Qimron (“Diphthongs and Glides,” 264 and HDSS, 33), is the spelling of gentilics with three *yodhs*; Qimron lists לוֹיִיִּים in 4Q491 1–3, 17. The same form also apparently occurs in 4Q491 1–3, 9, though it is partially reconstructed: לוֹיִי[י]ים. These seem like *plene* spellings of לוֹיִים and לוֹיִים, each of which would have been pronounced the same: *lāwiyim*. The spelling with three *yodhs* is peculiar to this word and text.

222. Other plural gentilics include כְּנַעֲנִיִּים (PAM 43692 85,1); מְצַרְיִים (4Q22 [4QpaleoExod^m] at Exod 7:18 and passim).

223. The fact that the masculine singular of נְקִי appears in the MT twice with a final *aleph*, נְקִיא (Joel 4:19 and Jon 1:14), may imply that there was confusion about the correct etymology of this word. In the DSS, the word is spelled correctly in the singular twice (11Q19 LXIII, 7 and 8) and once with *aleph* (1QIsa^a at Isa 59:7). If there was confusion over this word’s etymology, then the inclusion of an *aleph* in the plural forms is not necessarily due to a phonetic phenomenon. Note that the other nouns/adjectives from this same **qaṭīl* base (e.g., עֲנִי) do not attest an *aleph* in the plural in the DSS, as does נְקִי.

224. Note also לוֹיִיִּים in 4Q491 1–3, 9 and 17, mentioned in a preceding note.

225. Qimron, “Diphthongs and Glides,” 262. Qimron cites the second instance as

As in the MT, segholate (**qatl*/**qitl*/**qutl* base) nouns/adjectives, like MT פְּתָיִם can be spelled פְּתִיִּים (4Q424 1, 13), and פְּתָאִים (4Q381 1, 2).²²⁶ Other examples are MT שְׂפָיִם “bare places” and שְׂפָיִים (sing. שְׂפִי) spelled שְׂפִיִּים [ש] (1Q8 [1QIsa^b] at Isa 41:18), שְׂפָאִים (1QIsa^a at Isa 41:18 and 49:9), and שְׂפָאִים (4Q70 [4QJer^a] at Jer 14:6) corrected to שְׂפִיִּים.

In DSS Hebrew, other kinds of words exhibit similar endings, with one *yodh*, two *yodhs*, and *aleph* + *yodh* (*mater*). For example, MT גּוֹיִם “peoples” is written גּוֹיִים, גּוֹיִים, and גּוֹאִים.²²⁷ The feminine adjective “dry” is perhaps another example צִיָּאָה (1QIsa^a at Isa 41:18, 53:2), **ṣiyā* > *ṣiyā* (MT) > *ṣī'ā*.²²⁸ A more certain example is אֹיֵב for MT אוֹיֵב “enemy” (4Q98g [4QPs^a] at Ps 89:23); as well as אוֹאֵבִים (4Q88 [4QPs^f] X, 11); and אוֹאֵבִיָּה (4Q434 7b, 3).²²⁹ Another example is עָאָךְ (1QH^a XVI, 37) in an allusion to Isa 50:4 where the MT has יָעָךְ “weary,” though the form in 1QH^a seems to assume the synonymous word in the MT, עָרָךְ “weary.” Note too [ה] נְטוּאָה 4Q51 (4QSam^a) in an addition to 2 Sam 24:16 for what would be in the MT *נְטוּיָה; שְׂבָאִים “those captured” (4Q385a 18 ia–b, 3) for what would be *שְׂבוּיִם (as in Isa 61:1);²³⁰ נְבָאוֹת (1QIsa^a at Isa 60:7) for MT

נְכוּרִיָּאִים though both Accordance and Ulrich et al. (*Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 753) read without the second *yodh*. Note also the anomalous תְּעַנְיּוֹת “humiliations” (4Q511 8, 5 and 121, 2 [with interlinear second *yodh*]).

226. Additionally, one finds spellings with a *waw mater*: פְּתִיִּים (4Q439 1 i + 2, 7) and פּוֹתָאִים (1QH^a V, 13). For the morphology of this word, see “Waw Marking /u/ Class Vowel Where MT Has No /u/ Class Vowel” (§5.4).

227. The spelling גּוֹיִים predominates in most biblical DSS scrolls, though גּוֹיִים is found in 4Q51 (4QSam^a) at 2 Sam 22:44; 4Q78 (4QXIIc) at Joel 4:9, 12; 4Q96 (4QPs^o) at Ps 115:4; 4Q87 (4QPs^c) at Ps 126:2; 11Q5 (11QPs^a) at Ps 126:2, 149:7; and perhaps at Mur88 at Zeph 3:6, while גּוֹאִים is found only in 1QIsa^a, at Isa 2:2, 4, 5:26, 8:23, 10:7, 11:10, 12, 13:4, 14:6, 9, 18, 26, 23:3, 25:7, 29:7, 8, 30:28, 34:1, 2, 36:18, 37:12, 40:15, 17, 41:2, 42:1, 6, 43:9, 45:1, 20, 49:6, 22, 52:10, 15, 54:3, 60:3, 5, 11, 12, 16, 61:6, 9, 11, 62:2, 64:1, 66:12, 18, 19 (twice), 20. For other words where this phenomenon takes place, see Qimron, “Diphthongs and Glides,” 262.

228. Qimron cites this form in “Diphthongs and Glides,” 263 along with עִלְיָאָה (4Q369 1 ii, 3) which might be an example of *-ēhā* becoming *-ē'ā*, but more likely a case of metathesis (see the subsection “Quiescence of *Heh*” in §4.3, “Weakening of Gutturals”).

229. Qimron cites these forms in “Diphthongs and Glides,” 263. Note ωεβη in the Secunda at Ps 35:19 for MT אֹבֵי (Yuditsky, “Weak Consonants,” 234). The Secunda also preserves the same shift in εγγαω at Ps 9:17 for MT הִגְיוֹן (ibid.).

230. It seems less likely that שְׂבָאִים could be interpreted as a plural of שְׂבִי “captive,” since this word always is used in the singular as a collective. See Deborah

נְבִיּוֹת “Nebaioth”; as well as שפּאוֹת־יֶכָה “your lips” (1QIsa^a at Isa 37:29), which reflects *sif’ōtekā*, possibly from an earlier **sifyōtekā*, but probably from an Aramaic-like base **sifwōtekā*.²³¹

The suffixed forms and construct plurals to some of these nouns are also attested with similar variations, גוי (1QM XV, 2 [= MT גוֹי in 2 Chr 32:13, 17]), גויי (1QM XIV, 7), and, perhaps, גואי (4Q491 8–10 i, 5).²³² Sometimes the form with *aleph* is the only one attested, as with פתאי (1QpHab XII, 4; 4Q169 3–4 iii, 5) and פתאיהם (4Q372 6, 4).²³³

For the more commonly occurring words it is worth mentioning that the three possible forms seem to alternate with each other in individual texts: גויים (4 times in 1QM), גויים (3 times in 1QM), and גואים (twice in 1QM). This suggests a free variation between different pronunciations and/or a common pronunciation represented in different spellings.²³⁴ Since, as explained below, I assume a phonetic distinction between forms like מאיות “soldiers” and מאות “hundreds” where the spelling of the first word presumes a pronunciation with *yodh* (*mēyōt*) and the second with *aleph* (*mē’ōt*), I prefer to assume that the different spellings (גויים versus גואים) reflect different pronunciations. Further explanations of the DSS forms are offered below, in a concluding subsection. Note here that the writing of *aleph* for etymological *yodh* is found in texts of all types, that is, from DSS-SP9 (1QM, etc.), DSS-SP1c (4Q270, 4Q434), as well as DSS-NSP (4Q70, 4Q88, 4Q98g, 4Q284a, 4Q372, 4Q381). This suggests the commonness of this phonological development.

Dimant, “An Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Cave 4 (4Q385B = 4Q385 16),” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. George Brooke; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 18.

231. See the discussion below in §4.5, “*Aleph* < *Waw* and *Waw* < *Aleph*.”

232. On this last form, see the discussion below in “Diphthongs and Triphthongs” (§4.10).

233. 4Q418 223, 3 attests פתאיה] with a heavily damaged *aleph*.

234. Qimron characterizes this as the same pronunciation, though his description seems to suggest a slight, insignificant variation in the nature of the glide: “a glide of unclear character may have been produced between the vowels” (*HDSS*, 32). See below for more on this.

EVIDENCE FROM THE MT OF *YODH* < *ALEPH*

The reverse phenomenon, of an etymological *aleph* being written as a *yodh*, is also attested in Hebrew and Aramaic and is presumably precipitated by the inherent weakness of the glottal stop as well as its occasional quiescence word-internally. In the MT, one finds this especially in personal names. For example, the etymologically correct spelling of the name Eliathah (meaning “my God came”), with a consonantal *aleph*, is אֱלִיָּאֲתָה (reflecting *’ēli’ātā*) in 1 Chr 25:4 but the same name is spelled with consonantal *yodh*, אֱלִיָּתָה (reflecting *’ēliyātā*) in 1 Chr 25:27; the name “Daniel” (meaning “God is my judge”) is spelled with an etymological, consonantal *aleph*, דָּנְיָאֵל (reflecting *dānī’ēl*), in Ezek 14:14, 20, 28:3, but it is spelled with consonantal *yodh*, דָּנְיָאֵל (reflecting *dānīyēl*, the *aleph* being a historical spelling) in Ezra 8:2, in the eponymous book, and elsewhere; the name “Doeg” (meaning “one who fears [reverently]”) is spelled with its etymological *aleph* דְּאֵג in 1 Sam 21:8, 22:9, as well as *plene* דְּוֵאֵג in Ps 52:2, but is spelled with *yodh* in place of *aleph*, דְּוֵיג, in 1 Sam 22:18 (twice), 22.²³⁵ Other instances may also exist, for example, the word דְּיָה, a bird of prey, in Deut 14:13 should derive from the root דָּאָה, based on the verb דָּאָה meaning “to glide,” and the noun דְּיָה “bird of prey” in Lev 11:14, though the word דְּיָה may, in fact, reflect Aramaic influence.²³⁶ Another word is also found with a similar variation. The word for “hundreds,” מְאוֹת, when used to refer to soldiers, is found in three instances written with a *yodh* מְאוֹת in the MT (2 Kgs 11:4, 9, 10, the *kethib* reflecting *mēyōt*) and once as מְיֹאוֹת (2 Kgs 11:15). The spelling מְיֹאוֹת presumably reflects the end result of the following historical development: **mi’ōt* > **mē’ōt* > *mēyōt*. Lastly, there is the case of the *hithpael* of אָמַר (perhaps) attesting a similar shift in Isa 61:6: תִּתְיַמְרוּ “you will boast” (spelled in 1QIsa^a תִּתְיֹאמְרוּ).²³⁷ In the case of names like Eliathah and Daniel, the sound of a preceding /i/ vowel

235. For these examples, see Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 1:93. See also Blau, *Phonology and Morphology*, 89. On the etymological *aleph* of דָּאֵג, compare the verb דָּאָג “to be anxious, concerned” and always appearing with *aleph*; the verb occurs seven times in the MT.

236. Bergsträsser also lists *אֲבִיָּקָה, which is vocalized incorrectly (according to him) in the MT as אֲבִיָּקָה (1Chr 6:8, 22:9,19) for אֲבִיָּקָה (Exod 6:24) (*Hebräische Grammatik*, 1:93).

237. Scholars have proposed other roots for this form from time to time (see, BDB, *HALOT*, s.v.).

attracts the *yodh* sound due to the similar articulation of *yodh* and /i/.²³⁸ Thus, $-i'$ became $-iy-$. Similarly /ē/ attracts the *yodh* sound in מְאִיֹת. On the other hand, for words like גִּדְיֹ, the *yodh* may mark the development of a glide. In cases like תְּתִימָרוּ, the shift from glottal stop to /y/ may help preserve the syllabic structure of the word, since *aleph* preceded by a shewa could have quiesced leading to an unrecognizable form: **tit'ammārū* > **tattammārū* (= *תְּתִמָּרוּ).

In Biblical Aramaic one also sees the writing of *yodh* for etymological *aleph*; the word “your sin” is written without its etymological *aleph* דְּיֹטְיֹ, though this may be due to the general trend of reinterpreting III-*aleph* roots as III-*waw/yodh* in Aramaic.²³⁹

The shift of *aleph* > *yodh* is attested in texts from a diverse chronological distribution, though many of the examples appear in late books. It also bears mentioning that the shift /' / > /y/ and the reverse /y/ > /' / are both attested in 1–2 Chronicles.

EVIDENCE FROM THE DSS OF YODH < ALEPH

The phenomenon of *yodh* appearing for etymological *aleph* is slightly more common in the DSS than it is in the MT, but, as in the MT, seems related to the weakness of the *aleph*. The spelling of the infinitive construct of מלא “to fill” in the *piel* suggests this shift: מְלִיאֹת (4Q284 2 i, 3) for what would be in the MT מְלִאוֹת.²⁴⁰ Note also תְּתִיאֹמְרוּ in 1QIsa^a at Isa 61:6 for MT תְּתִימָרוּ, mentioned just above. This development also seems to be reflected in לְבִיּוֹתָיו in 4Q169 3–4 i, 4 in a quotation of Nah 2:13 for MT לְבָאוֹתָיו “its lionesses” (sing. *לְבָאָה), as well as יִמְחִיו “they will clap” in 1Q8 (1QIsa^b) at Isa 55:12 for MT יִמְחִאוּ.²⁴¹ The spelling of “hundreds” as מְאִיֹת (once מִיאֹת) is also found among the DSS in at least nine instances, where the word connotes a group of soldiers or their leaders; the more

238. Blau, *Phonology and Morphology*, 89.

239. Muraoka, *GQA*, 17–18.

240. On this and related forms, see the discussion in the subsection “Infinitives” in §5.6, “Verbs.”

241. The first example from 4Q169 is from Qimron, *HDSS*, 26. Alternatively, לְבִיּוֹתָיו might be construed as the feminine plural of the MT לְבָיָא (Ezek 19:2), where the shift from *aleph* to *yodh* has already taken place (i.e., **lābī'ā* > *lābīyā*, with *aleph* as final *mater*). Qimron (*HDSS*, 26 n. 6 and “*Waw* as Marker for a Glide,” 366) suggests reading יִמְחִו instead of what Accordance and Ulrich et al. (*Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 538) read as יִמְחִיו.

conventional form, **מאות**, occurs commonly to indicate the number.²⁴² That the form with *yodh* consistently denotes groups of soldiers (or their leaders) suggests that we perhaps should distinguish two separate words with distinct pronunciations, one *mē'ot* “hundreds” and the other *mēyōt* “soldiers.”²⁴³ This, in turn, would imply that the *aleph* and *yodh* represent distinct sounds in these environments. Notice that with all but one of the examples above, the *yodh* is followed by a /u/ class vowel.

In the case of the spelling of the name Daniel without the *aleph*, **דניל**, in 6Q7 (6QpapDan) at Dan 10:12 and the spelling of Eliab (**אליאב**), noted by Qimron, as **אליב** in 4Q138 (4QPhyl K) at Deut 11:6 (as well as in 8Q3 [8QPhyl] at Deut 11:6), the *aleph* has assimilated to the preceding /i/ vowel and become a consonant (*dānī'el* > *dānīyēl*; *'ēli'āb* > *'ēliyāb*).²⁴⁴ The shift might seem less obvious in the latter name since in the MT the name is written with a *yodh*, however, the *yodh* is a simple *mater* in the MT form. In the form from the DSS the *yodh* is a consonant, in the same way that the *yodh* is a consonant in **דניאל**. More dramatic is the elision of *aleph* and its apparent assimilation to *yodh* in **הביו** “bring” (1QIsa^a at Isa 16:3 for MT **הביאו**, *kethib* reflecting mp and *qere* fs) and **החטיום** “they made them sin” (4Q522 9 ii, 10 for what would be in the MT without assimilation ***החטיום**).²⁴⁵ Here too the forms from the Bible (or the corresponding forms) contain a *mater yodh* whereas the DSS forms contain a consonantal *yodh*. Presumably, the respective DSS verbs would be vocalized as *hābīyū* and *heḥēbīyūm* (written in the Tiberian tradition as **הביו*** and **החטיום***).²⁴⁶

242. The nine instances of **מאות** and **מאות** (“soldiers”) in the scrolls include the five mentioned by Qimron, 1QM III, 17; IV, 2; 11Q19 XLII, 15; LVII, 4; LVIII, 4 (*HDSS*, 26), as well as 4Q378 3 ii + 4, 7; 4Q491 1–3, 10; 2Q3 (2QExod^b) at Exod 18:21 for MT **מאות**; and 4Q27 (4QNum^b) at Num 31:54 for MT **מאות**. See Dimant, “Two Discourses,” 56.

243. This assumes, of course, that the *yodh* is not simply a graphic way of indicating the distinction in meaning, which is also conceivable (though less likely). Cf. the use of *yodh* in the 3ms pronominal suffix on plural nouns יו- to graphically mark the distinction from the same suffix on singular nouns; see “Pronouns and Particles” (§5.2).

244. Qimron, *HDSS*, 26.

245. On the first form, see Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 515–16.

246. The similarity to the other forms where *aleph* assimilates into a preceding *yodh* suggests that **הביו** would not follow precisely the example of Biblical Aramaic **העדי** where the /i/ vowel and *waw* form a diphthong /iw/. However, **הביו** would be close to the pattern assumed for the 3mp perfect of III-*yodh* verbs in Qumran Aramaic

Qimron also suggests the writing הִיָּה *hīyā* “she” for *הִיאָה in 1QIsa^a at Isa 30:33, 36:21, where the MT has הִיא.²⁴⁷

Other examples include יִשְׁיִיכָה *yaššiyekā* or *yaššiyekā* “he will deceive you” (1QIsa^a at Isa 37:10) for MT יִשְׂאֵף; נְשִׂיָּי *nəšiyē* “leaders of” (11Q19 LVII, 12) for what would be in the MT נְשִׂאֵי; and הַבְּרִיָּה *habbəriyā* “the creation” (11Q19 XXIX, 9) for what would be in the MT *הַבְּרִיאָה; as well as בְּרִיּוֹתוֹ *bəriyōtō* “his creations” (4Q216 V, 9) for what would be in the MT *בְּרִיאָתָיו.²⁴⁸

The same phenomenon is also perhaps found in תּוֹצִי (1QIsa^a at Isa 22:4), in which case one should read תּוֹצִי.²⁴⁹ Although the MT has תְּאִיצוּ “do (not) rush” here and although Accordance and the *Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance* parse תּוֹצִי as from the root אוּץ “to rush, hasten,” the reading תּוֹצִי allows for understanding this as from יָצָא “to go forth.” This would provide the following translation for Isa 22:4: “Therefore, I say, ‘Turn away from me; let me be embittered through weeping, do not speak (lit., bring forth) to comfort me...’” The figurative use of the *hiphil* of יָצָא to mean “speak” is found, for example, in Isa 48:20 (not in 1QIsa^a, but in 1Q8 [1QIsa^b] and 4Q58 [4QIsa^d]), as well as elsewhere (e.g., Jer 15:19). The corresponding form of the verb in the MT would be תּוֹצִיאֵנוּ; if I am correct in this interpretation, it seems to have become *tōšiyū* here, similar to the development of הִבִּיּוּ and הַחֲטִיּוֹם described above. Reading תּוֹצִי as from אוּץ presupposes two rather uncommon orthographic phenomena, the loss of *aleph* between two full vowels and a double *mater* for the final /ū/ vowel; for this reason, the proposed solution of reading תּוֹצִי seems more likely.²⁵⁰

(and other dialects of Aramaic), which attests שְׂרִיּוּ *šarriyū* “they began” (4Q204 4, 3); in this word, it seems more likely that the *aleph* helps to mark a final /ū/ (see Muraoka, *GQA*, 138). On *heḥḥbīyūm*, compare Syriac where a similar phonetic pattern is regularly attested with III-*yodh* verbs in the derived conjugations: *galyūn* “they exiled us” (see Theodor Nöldeke, *Compendious Syriac Grammar* [trans. James A. Crichton; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2001; repr. London: Williams & Norgate, 1904], 145).

247. Qimron, *HDSS*, 26.

248. For the example of נְשִׂיָּי, see the discussion in the subsection below “Explanation of DSS Forms.” Note also the very damaged נְבִיִּים “prophets” in 4Q88 VIII, 14. The pronunciation of the 3ms suffix on plural nouns as /ō/ is discussed in “Diphthongs and Triphthongs” (§4.10).

249. Note that *waw* and *yodh* are, in general, similar in appearance in 1QIsa^a (see Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint, “Introduction to 1QIsa^a,” in *DJD* 32:61).

250. For a discussion of the loss of *aleph*, see the subsection “Quiescence of *Aleph*”

Another possible example of this *yodh* < *aleph* shift relates to להבריך (4Q51 [4QSam^a] at 1 Sam 2:29) for MT להבריִאֲכֶם “for your fattening.” In this scroll, the consonants differ from those of the MT not only in the loss of the *aleph*, but also in the loss of the final *mem*. The scroll’s version of this verse (and others) parallels that of the LXX in several respects and since the LXX has ἐνευλογεῖσθαι it is likely that the Hebrew represents the *hiphil* of ברך (= *lāhabrīk*) “to bless.” However, it is perhaps the case that the MT form was the original or earlier reading and the shift of /ʾ/ > /y/, which would have produced the form *lāhabrīyəkem* (= *להבריכֶם), led to a scribe misunderstanding the verb as the *hiphil* infinitive of ברך.²⁵¹

Notice, finally, that this shift from *aleph* to *yodh* is found in words in DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c (4Q169) texts, as well as DSS-NSP texts (4Q284, 6Q7, 8Q3), again reflecting the widespread nature of this phenomenon.

EXPLANATION OF THE DSS FORMS

Since many of the same words, exhibiting (presumably) the same phenomena (/ʾ/ < /y/ and /y/ < /ʾ/), are observed in the MT, it seems obvious that the same explanations may apply to the forms in the DSS (that is, the development of a glide sound represented by the *aleph*, assimilation, dissimilation). Qimron, however, has offered a slightly different explanation. He suggests, first, that the spelling of the words with and without *aleph*, like כתיים and כתיאים, reflects a common pronunciation *kittiim*, where the “two identical vowels apparently coalesce into one long vowel,” that is, /ī/.²⁵² Qimron makes the further assertion that wherever this *aleph* appears in other nominal or adjectival forms, it is not representing a glottal stop,

in §4.3, “Weakening of Gutturals”; also, for a list of possible double *maters*, see the section “Scribal Mistakes” (§3.1).

251. Cases like היש (*hāyīš* [?]) (4Q175 22 and perhaps 4Q186 1 i, 6) for what would be in the MT היִש may be additional examples (Qimron, “Diphthongs and Glides,” 270). However, these seem to me to be further examples of the elision of *aleph* before a full vowel (see “Weakening of Gutturals” [§4.3]) since *aleph* shifts to *yodh* most often when an /i/ vowel or a consonant immediately precedes the *aleph*.

252. Qimron, “Diphthongs and Glides,” 264. The translation of the Hebrew is mine. He writes on page 260 of his intention to show “that all the examples of the exchange or addition of *aleph*, *waw*, and *yodh* ... are to be interpreted as different writings of a single pronunciation” (my translation). On this idea, see also Y. F. Gumpertz, *Mivta’e Šefatenu: Studies in Historical Phonetics of the Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem: Haraav Kook, 1953), 68.

but either hiatus and/or a glide “of unclear character.”²⁵³ Thus, he seems to say that the spelling גואים reflects the pronunciation: *gōim* or the allophonic alternatives *gō^yim*, *gō^wim*, *gōⁱim*. The same is true for גוים and גויים. In his article on this subject, Qimron cites a tremendous amount of data and examples not only from the scrolls, but also from different traditions of Hebrew.²⁵⁴ His general thesis seems possible, though I am skeptical of the existence of hiatus in DSS Hebrew, and believe a simpler way of understanding these different spellings is to consider them different phonetic realizations for the same ending.²⁵⁵ I prefer to follow the model of Rendsburg who implies that the spelling with *aleph* presupposes a pronunciation with a glottal stop.²⁵⁶ By contrast, the spelling with *yodh* presumes a /y/ sound. A distinction between the two sounds is implied, as noted above, in the distinction in spelling between מאות *mē’ōt* “hundreds” and מאיות *mēyōt* “soldiers.” This does not mean that Qimron is necessarily wrong; כתיים may, in fact, have been sometimes pronounced *kittīm* in the vernacular. Nevertheless, it seems likely to me that the similarity in sound between *-iyī-* and *-ī-* led to some speakers emphasizing the distinct syllables through an intervocalic glottal stop (*-ī’ī-*); similarly, a difficulty perceiving /y/ in the sequences *-āyī-* and *-ōyī-* may have encouraged speakers to distinguish the syllables through a glottal stop (*-ā’ī-*, *-ō’ī-*).

In relation to the writing of *yodh* for etymological *aleph*, Qimron takes issue with the idea that assimilation and dissimilation involving *aleph* and *yodh* could take place simultaneously. Qimron writes in relation to נשי

253. Qimron, *HDSS*, 32.

254. Qimron, “Diphthongs and Glides.” One point of confusion, however, is his insistence that the *yodh* was not pronounced as a consonant, but only possibly as a glide. As Bergsträsser himself says, the ultralong /i/ vowel, *-ī-*, and *-iyī-* “phonetisch fast identisch sind” (*Hebräische Grammatik*, 1:102).

255. Such difference might be explained by the preference of different subdialects of Hebrew for one pronunciation over another, or to a variation in the language of the writers. Recall that the existence of an intervocalic glottal stop is suggested by the consistent spelling of *aleph* + *waw mater* where the *aleph* is preceded by a full vowel (e.g., in words like מאור “light”); there is no hiatus in these kinds of words (see §3.5, “Digraphs”).

256. Rendsburg, commenting on the form גואים from HazGab 13, writes: “One assumes a pronunciation *gō’im*” (“Grammatical Sketch,” 66). See also Bar-Asher, “*Vision of Gabriel*,” 500 n. 54. Muraoka writes in relation to a similar nonetymological *aleph* in DSS Aramaic that it is “consonantal”—though he also refers to it as acting either as a vowel carrier or glide (*GQA*, 29).

“leaders of” (11Q19 LVII, 12) that “it is unlikely that simultaneously $i'ē$ → $iyē$ (in נשיאי) while (according to Kutscher) $iyē$ → $i'ē$.”²⁵⁷ This statement ignores the distinctive distribution of these shifts. Although, it is true that the same text may exhibit some cases where *aleph* assimilates to the preceding /i/ vowel to become *yodh* (e.g., דְּנִיָּאֵל in 1 Chr 3:1; הַבִּיּו in 1QIsa^a at Isa 16:3) and other cases where *yodh* becomes *aleph* through dissimilation or glide (e.g., הַעֲרַבִּיָּאִים in 2 Chr 17:11; שְׂפָאִים in 1QIsa^a at Isa 41:18 and 49:9), the two phenomena do not occur in every possible environment. Rather, the shift of *yodh* > *aleph* occurs especially between /i/ vowels ($-iyī-$ > $-i'ī-$, as in כְּתִיָּאִים) and where a diphthong (especially $āy$ or $ōy$) might have formed between the preceding vowel and the *yodh* consonant ($-āyī-$ > $-ā'i-$, as in פְּתָאִים; $-ōyī-$ > $-ō'i-$, as in גּוֹאִים).²⁵⁸ The production of such a diphthong would have made the division of syllables and, also, the spelling of the words less clear. All this suggests that the *aleph*, as a glottal stop, functions to separate vowels or vowel-consonant combinations and that it works as an epenthetic consonant in these environments.²⁵⁹ The shift *aleph* > *yodh*, on the other hand, is attested primarily where an /i/ vowel directly precedes the *aleph* and another (non-/i/) vowel follows ($-i'ā-$ > $-iyā-$ or $-iye-$, as in שִׁיכָה; $-i'ā-$ > $-iyā-$, as in אֱלִיב; $-i'ē-$ > $-iyē-$, as in דְּנִיל; $-i'ū-$ > $-iyū-$, as in הַחֲטִיּוֹם). The shift *aleph* > *yodh* is not seen as regularly as *yodh* > *aleph* and is perhaps an occasional reflex of the pronunciation of the /i/ vowel together with the weakness of *aleph* and its capacity to quiesce.

Qimron's thesis regarding these endings is tied in with his belief that the *aleph* was never pronounced intervocalically. If this is the case, then forms like אֹאֲבִים “enemies” (4Q88 [4QPs^f] X, 11) and אֹאֲבִיהֶם “their enemies” (4Q434 7b, 3) perhaps reflect a vocalization where the muttered vowel under the original *yodh* has disappeared and the resulting diphthong /ōy/ was simplified to /ō/, as /üy/ apparently becomes /ū/ in the *qal* passive participle גָּלָ “what was revealed” (4Q175 11). In that case, the second *aleph* is part of a digraph marking /ō/: 'ōbīm and 'ōbēhem. Nevertheless,

257. Qimron, *HDSS*, 32. He also writes that the assimilation of /' / to a following /i/ or /e/ vowel occurs “regardless of the preceding vowel” (*ibid.*).

258. The spelling with *aleph* in construct plural forms of these words is probably simply related to the absolute plural spelling.

259. Notice that in the majority of examples *aleph* stands at the beginning of what would be in the MT the accented syllable, the typical phonetic environment for a word-internal glottal stop that functions epenthetically (see Uffmann, “Intrusive [r],” 457).

if the *aleph* in these words was actually pronounced, its use would follow the pattern, described immediately above, wherein an *aleph* helps to break up what might otherwise become a diphthong (*'ōyēb > 'ō'ēb; *'ōyābīm > 'ō'ābīm). The related form אֹבֵיךָ “your enemies” from 1QIsa^a (at Isa 62:8) offers the best evidence for the pronunciation with a reduced diphthong, *'ōyābekā > *'ōybekā > 'ōbekā, though this perhaps just proves the usefulness of *aleph* as an epenthetic glottal stop in the previous forms.²⁶⁰ The usefulness of the *aleph* in this function is especially relevant to the word אֹבֵי; if the word “enemy” in the singular had experienced a reduction of the diphthong *ōy* to *ō*, it would be identical in pronunciation to the word “necromancer” or “ghost,” אֹב (= MT אֹב).

Qimron also argues, in connection with נִשִּׁי, that two *yodhs* written together indicate an /i/ or /e/ vowel; that is, -י- does not indicate a consonant /y/ followed by a vowel (-yī-, -yē-), but just the vowel (-ī-, -ē-).²⁶¹ He cites many examples, but these have better explanations than the loss of intervocalic *yodh*. For example, he cites the fact that *qal* 3ms imperfect forms of I-*yodh* verbs are spelled with a single *yodh*, as in וִירָאוּ “and they will fear” (11Q19 LVI, 11), instead of with two *yodhs* as is common in the MT. But this defective spelling among the nonbiblical DSS is especially prevalent in just one text, 11Q19, where the spelling וִירָאוּ parallels exactly the orthography of the corresponding MT text being quoted or alluded to: 11Q19 LVI, 11 corresponding to Deut 17:13; LXI, 11 to Deut 19:20; LXIV, 6 to Deut 13:12. Furthermore, this same verb does occur with two *yodhs* occasionally (both in DSS-SP9 and DSS-NSP texts): יִרְאוּ (4Q487 5, 5, heavily damaged second *yodh*); יִרְאוּ (11Q11 III, 10); יִרְאוּךְ (1QIsa^a at Isa 25:3); יִרְאוּ (1QIsa^a at Isa 59:19); יִרְאוּ (4Q84 [4QPs^b] at Psa 102:16); יִרְאוּ (4Q85 [4QPs^c] at Psa 52:8).²⁶²

260. Alternatively, the form is the result of the scribe writing *waw* when he intended *yodh*; the word occurs rather commonly without a *waw mater*.

261. Qimron, *HDSS*, 32.

262. *Ibid.* He also cites spellings like כְּתִיִּים “Kittim,” גוֹיִם “peoples,” גוֹי “peoples of,” לוֹיִם “Levites,” עֲשׂוּיִם “those things done” (*qal* pass. ptc.), עֲדִיִּים “ornaments” (MT: עֲדָיִים), הוּי (Mas 1k i, 2; mp ptc. in construct = *הוּיִי), all of which are explainable as the standard (in both the MT and DSS) way of writing this type of word (see “Plene Orthography” [§3.2]). Two *yodhs* as a *mater* for a single vowel, by contrast, are explainable as dittographic errors (e.g., וּבַמְעַשְׂיִיכָה “in your works” 1Qsb III, 27; בַּפְּלִילִיִּים “with judges” 4Q158 9, 5). The correction of the plural of “island” from אִים in 1QIsa^a (at Isa 13:22) to אִים (for MT אִיִּים), Qimron notes, “makes sense only if this word was not pronounced with consonantal *yodh*” (*HDSS*, 33). In other words, the scribe heard

Although Biblical Hebrew does not represent a single dialect and it might be argued that the alternations of *yodh* and *aleph* in the MT are reflective of different dialects or subdialects, this characterization ignores the concentration of forms exhibiting the shift /y/ > /ʔ/ that occur in late texts (many of them in Nehemiah and/or 1–2 Chronicles). It seems that this variation in particular was widespread, the variation continuing and spreading into late Second Temple times and reflected in many of the DSS from all text groups. By contrast, since the shift /ʔ/ > /y/ is one that seems to be attested in texts from the MT that date to different time periods, it seems reasonable to suppose that this shift was one that was a natural reaction to the inherent weakness of the glottal stop, especially when preceded by an /i/ vowel and followed by a vowel of another quality.

4.5. ALEPH < WAW AND WAW < ALEPH

As is the case with *yodh*, so *waw* can interchange with *aleph*. The fundamental linguistic reasons are similar. Such variation is also found in the MT. For example, the feminine plural of *נֹהָה “pasture” should be *נֹוֹת in the absolute and נֹוֹת in the construct due to the same kind of contraction as described above: **nawayāt* > **nawayōt* > **nawōt* > *nəwōt* (plural construct). And, in fact the plural construct is spelled נֹוֹת in Zeph 2:6. Nevertheless, it appears as נָאוֹת in eleven other passages of the MT. The common explanation is that it is the result of dissimilation or glide, that is *nəwōt* > *nəʔōt*, in the same way that עֲרַבִּיִּים “Arabians” (2 Chr 26:7, *kethib*) could also be realized as עֲרַבִּיָּאִים.²⁶³ Another example is רִבְאוֹת “ten thousands” (in Dan 11:12 and Ezra 2:69) for what was earlier perhaps *ribbōwōt*.²⁶⁴

The DSS attest more examples of this kind of variation, as well as the reverse variation where *aleph* shifts to *waw* due to assimilation to a neighboring /o/ or /u/ vowel. This again suggests that these phonetic

²⁶³ *im*, not *iyim*. This is not necessarily true. Perhaps an earlier *-iyi-* had become *-ī-* (as in עֲבָרִים), but then again an initial spelling without a consonantal *yodh* does not prove the loss of intervocalic *yodh*, just as the spellings הַיָּמִים *hayyāmim* “the days” (4Q252 IV, 2) and וצִוָּה *wəšiwwā* “and he commanded” (4Q266 6 i, 9) do not presume that the respective words were initially pronounced without a *yodh* or *waw*.

²⁶³. See Blau, *Phonology and Morphology*, 89.

²⁶⁴. Ibid. This is often explained as a case of dissimilation and/or glide: **ribbōwōt* > *ribbōʔōt*. Nevertheless, this example is perhaps not the best since the singular of the word sometimes also is accompanied by a final *aleph*, and this might have led to confusion as to the basic form of the word.

shifts represent a trend in Second Temple times. Among those cases of *waw* written for etymological *aleph*, we find באו *bāwū* “they came” (4Q398 [4QMMT] 11–13, 2 and 3) for what would be in the MT באו; בוּ *bāwū* “they came” (4Q141 [4QPhyl N] at Deut 32:17) for MT באו; ראוּ *rāwū* “they saw” (1QIsa^a at Isa 66:19) for MT ראו; יבאוּ *yābōwū* “they will come” in 4Q266 10 i, 3 for what would be in the MT יבאוּ.²⁶⁵ Another example may be חטאוּ (1QIsa^a at Isa 27:9), reflecting *ḥetwō* “his sin,” for what would be in the MT חטאוּ, though the MT has חטאתו here.²⁶⁶ In these cases, the *aleph* is often retained as part of a historical spelling, but it was not pronounced. The spelling לשאות “to destroy” (1QIsa^a at Isa 37:26) for MT להשאות (from שאה) reflects, perhaps, a similar phonetic development to *lašwōt*.²⁶⁷ Qimron also suggests the writing הוה *hūwā* “he” in 1QIsa^a at Isa 7:14 for MT הוא.²⁶⁸ Although Kutscher suggests that this is a scribal error due to the preceding Tetragrammaton, the example of היה *hīyā* “she” in 1QIsa^a at Isa 30:33, 36:21 for MT היא suggest that Qimron is right.²⁶⁹ Qimron also suggests that the emergence of a *waw* for etymological *aleph* might help explain certain misspellings that are subsequently corrected according to the historical form of the words: חטמאות *ḥaṭṭōmāwōt* (11Q19 LI, 6) corrected to חטמאות *ḥaṭṭōmā’ōt* “the uncleanness”; צבאות *ṣabāwōt* (11Q19 LXII, 5) corrected to צבאות *ṣabā’ōt* “hosts.”²⁷⁰ The above examples derive mostly from DSS-SP9 texts.

Examples of *aleph* written for etymological *waw* include קואי *qō’ē* “those waiting for” (4Q171 1–2 ii 4) in a quotation of Ps 37:9 for MT קני, the verb from the same or homonymous root (קוה II in BDB) יקאו *yiqqā’ū* “let them be gathered” (4Q7 [4QGen^s] at Gen 1:9) for MT יקוו; and at least six instances of “commandments” spelled with *aleph*, always with a suffix,

265. See Qimron, “Diphthongs and Glides,” 270 and idem, “*Waw* as Marker for a Glide,” 365–66. The pronunciation of ראוּ would presumably make it homophonous with the 3cp perfect of רוה “to be refreshed,” which appears as רוּ in 3Q15 (Copper Scroll) X, 3 (unless רוי is to be read, see Puech, “Rouleau de Cuivre,” 1:197–98).

266. The reading חטאוּ is found in Accordance and in the *Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*, though Ulrich et al. read חטאה (*Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 380).

267. It seems less likely that the spelling represents the reemergence of the last root consonant (*laš’āwōt*).

268. Qimron, *HDSS*, 26.

269. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 184.

270. Qimron, “Diphthongs and Glides,” 271. These words are also mentioned in “Digraphs” (§3.5). Although the explanation of assimilation is likely, alternatively, they could be explained through metathesis (see §3.1, “Scribal Mistakes”).

always among the Phylactery texts: **מצאותי** *miṣ'ōtay* (4Q129 [4QPhyl B] at Deut 5:10, 29; 4Q137 [4QPhyl J] at Deut 5:29; 4Q130 [4QPhyl C] at Deut 11:13), **מצאותו** (4Q140 [4QPhyl M] at Deut 6:2; 4Q128 [4QPhyl A] at Deut 10:13).²⁷¹ We also find **עאון** *'ā'ōn* “iniquity” (1QIsa^a part of additional text to Isa 1:15) for what would be in the MT **עון**; probably **שפאותיכה** *sif'ōtekā* “your lips” (1QIsa^a at Isa 37:29);²⁷² **רבואותם** *ribbō'ōtām* “their ten thousands” (1QM XII, 4); **קסאות** *qasā'ōt* “jars” (3Q15 [Copper Scroll] III, 4) for what would be in the MT **קשות**.²⁷³ For the last word, one wonders if in the mind of the scribes, the *aleph* was viewed as a *mater* for /ā/.²⁷⁴ One wonders if **עדואתיך** in 4Q90 (4QPs^b) at Ps 119:14 for MT **עדותיך** “your decrees,” was supposed to be **עדאותיך** (**'ēd'ōtekā*).²⁷⁵ The examples again primarily derive from DSS-SP9 texts, with one exception, 4Q7 (4QGen⁸), from the DSS-NSP texts; one example is from 3Q15, the Copper Scroll. These shifts seem, all things considered, much less common than the similar shifts involving *yodh* and *aleph*. The shift /' / > /w / suggests an occasional reflex of assimilation due to the inherent weakness of *aleph* (similar

271. Qimron, “Diphthongs and Glides,” 268, 270. Cf. MT **מצותיו** and **מצותי**. The spelling is so frequent one wonders of some confusion with the word **מוצא** “going forth, utterance.”

272. The word appears for MT **שפתתיך** (dual); the plural + suffix would be in the MT **שפתותיכה**. Either **שפאותיכה** corresponds to the word in Rabbinic Hebrew where etymological *yodh* appears in the plural, **שפיות** (Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 369), or to the cognate in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic where etymological *waw* appears in all forms, **סיפוא** (which seems to be Qimron's interpretation, “Diphthongs and Glides,” 269). In either case, the earlier *yodh* or *waw* has shifted to *aleph* in **שפאותיכה**. Kutscher's initial explanation (*Isaiah*, 168) that the *aleph-waw* reflects a digraph is unlikely since this so-called digraph occurs primarily within words that have an etymological *aleph*. Kutscher's second explanation (that it is derived from a form like in Rabbinic Hebrew, **שפיות**) is unlikely given the plural form in 1QM V, 12 **ספות** and in 11Q8 (11QPs^d) at Ps 81:6 **שפות**, reflecting respectively *safāwōt* and *sifwōt* (see Qimron, “Diphthongs and Glides,” 270). Alternatively, **שפות/ספות** might represent a new plural form for the word (*sāfōt*), one based on the form of other III-*waw/yodh* nouns, in which case the etymological development of **שפאותיכה** remains unclear.

273. These examples are drawn from Qimron, “Diphthongs and Glides,” 269.

274. See §3.3 above, “*Aleph* as Internal *Mater*.”

275. See the discussion on this word in “Digraphs” (§3.5). See also **קשוואי** in 11Q19 XXXIII, 13 for what would be in the MT **קשות**. Qimron reads the latter word as **קשוואי** (“Diphthongs and Glides,” 268). Presumably the spelling **קשוואי** reflects an anomalous use of *waw-aleph-waw* to represent /ō/, or a (partially corrected) mistake for **קסאות**.

to the shift /' / > /y /). The shift /w / > /' / appears in places analogous to where *yodh* shifts to *aleph*, that is, between two /ō / vowels and where the diphthong /āw / or /ōw / might otherwise occur; this shift may also reflect assimilation where *waw* initiates a syllable and is followed by an /o / or /u / vowel (that is, שפאותיכה, מצאותי).

4.6. WAW < YODH

Etymological *yodh* is perhaps written as *waw*, especially where the following vowel is an /o / or /u / vowel, as in the MT: נְטוּוֹת “stretched out” (Isa 3:16) where the *qere* presumes נְטוּיּוֹת.²⁷⁶ Among the DSS, Qimron and Yuditsky see this in נטוה, the *qal* fem. sing. ptc. of נטה (4Q137 [4QPhyl J] and 4Q139 [4QPhyl L] at Deut 5:15 for MT נְטוּיּוֹה as well as in HazGab 74).²⁷⁷ Others read נטיה in the phylactery texts and Yardeni and Elizur tentatively read an entirely different word in the HazGab text: אנשים “men.”²⁷⁸ Presumably, the forms proposed by Qimron and Yuditsky would reflect the pronunciation *nəṭūwā*.²⁷⁹ This shift is perhaps also found in הרווה “the saturated” (1QS II, 14) for what would be in the MT הַרְוִיָּה, as well as בנוות “built” (11Q19 XLII, 9); גְדוּוֹתיו “its banks” (1QIsa^a at Isa 8:7) for MT גְדוּתִי, but the scroll’s form reflecting what should be גְדוּתִי* (as in 4Q59 [4QIsa^e], [ג]דוּתִי [י], and like the *kethib* of 1 Chr 12:16, גְדוּתִי); חזוון “vision” (1QIsa^a at Isa 22:1) for MT חֲזוֹן; יבכוון “they will perish” (1QIsa^a at Isa 31:3) for MT יִבְכּוּן; יבכוון “they will weep” (1QIsa^a at Isa 33:7) for MT יִבְכּוּן; דוות “vultures” (1QIsa^a at Isa 34:15) for MT דְּוֹת; ואתון “come (?)” (1QIsa^a at Isa 41:5) for MT וַיָּאֲתוּן “they came.”²⁸⁰ Given the similarity between *waw* and *yodh*, however, it seems simpler to interpret these as the respective words found in the MT, such that, for example, הרווה be read in 1QS as הרויה *hārəwāyā*.²⁸¹

276. Rendsburg cites this form (“Grammatical Sketch,” 66 n. 24). See also עשוות (1 Sam 25:18), cited in Qimron, “Waw as Marker for a Glide,” 363.

277. Qimron, “Waw as Marker for a Glide,” 363 and Qimron and Yuditsky, “Notes,” 36.

278. Yardeni and Elizur, “Hebrew Prophetic Text,” 15.

279. See Qimron and Yuditsky, “Notes,” 36; and Rendsburg, “Grammatical Sketch,” 66.

280. Qimron, “Waw as Marker for a Glide,” 364.

281. See Qimron, “Waw and Yod,” 108.

4.7. ACCENT OR STRESS

Although scholars have addressed the possible place of the stress in words in the DSS, suggesting that it was on the ultimate syllable or that it was on the penultimate, the decisive evidence is elusive.²⁸² To take one example, Ben-Ḥayyim suspects penultimate accentuation due to the frequency of *qal* plural imperfect verb forms with a *waw* between the second and third root consonants (the “so-called pausal forms” like יקטולו).²⁸³ Qimron points out that the Tiberian tradition also has verbal forms with a vowel that would be represented by a *waw* in the DSS, though these same forms are ultimately stressed: וַאֲשַׁקֹּלָהּ “I weighed” (Ezra 8:25), יִהְדָּפְנוּ “he will push him” (Num 35:20), יִשְׁפֹּטוּ “they would judge” (Exod 18:26); תַּעֲבֹרֵי (Ruth 2:8).²⁸⁴ In other words, the *mater* is not assurance of where the accent fell, especially not among the DSS where the *waw* is used to mark any type of /o/ or /u/ vowel. While this is the case, it should also be recognized that the DSS, especially the DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts, show a preference for forms that correspond to pausal forms in the MT, where the accent or stress usually falls on the penultimate syllable.

In addition to forms like יקטולו, the place of the /o/ or /u/ vowel in geminate imperfects correspond to MT pausal forms: יהונכה “he will favor you” (1QS II, 3 and passim) corresponds to pausal וַיְהַנֵּךְ (Num 6:25) and וַיְהַנְּנֵי (Mal 1:9), and is in contrast to contextual וַיְהַנֵּךְ (Gen 43:29, Isa 30:19); also יזומו “they will plot” (4Q171 1–2 ii, 14) stands in contrast to contextual וַיִּזְמוּ (Gen 11:6).²⁸⁵

Note too that where a verb in the MT attests an alternation in the imperfect between /a/ and /o/ theme vowels, the orthography of the scrolls (specifically in the DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts) usually conforms to the theme vowel one sees in pausal forms. Thus, although חפץ “to delight in” takes an /o/ theme vowel in the MT in contextual forms (e.g., אַחֲפֹץ in Ezek 33:11 and passim) and an /a/ vowel in pausal forms (e.g., אַחֲפֹץ in Job 13:3 and passim), the same verb is always without a *waw mater* in the DSS, both in the biblical (five times [where the MT form has shewa or an /a/

282. See Qimron, *HDSS*, 40–42.

283. Ben-Ḥayyim, “Traditions in the Hebrew Language,” 202–3. For more on these forms and their explanation, see §5.7, “*Qal* Imperfect + Suffix.”

284. Qimron, *HDSS*, 41. See also Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 339–40.

285. The form וַיִּזְמוּ (4Q381 45a + b, 2) is ambiguous since in this manuscript we would not expect a short /o/ to be indicated with a *waw mater*.

vowel]) and nonbiblical scrolls (six times), suggesting that the verb always took an /a/ theme vowel in the DSS.²⁸⁶ Since the verb is often in the singular and attested in DSS-SP9 texts, we would have expected to see a *waw mater* if the theme vowel was an /o/ or /u/ vowel. Although there is some variation in the orthography of imperfect verbs, the number of examples for this verb suggests the spelling without *waw* is not incidental. Note also the reverse pattern: **בגד** is attested in context with an /a/ vowel (only **נְבַגְד** Mal 2:10), but in pause with an /o/ vowel (e.g., **תִּבְגְּדוּ** Isa 48:8 and passim); in the DSS the verb is only attested with a *waw mater* where it occurs without affix (in other words, it presumes an /o/ or /u/ vowel): **יבגוד** (1QpHab VIII, 3 and 10); **ותבגוד** (4Q221 16, 5); **נבגוד** (4Q265 3, 2).

Note a similar preference in the imperative forms of the verb **ירש**: **ירש** “possess” (4Q364 24a–c, 4 at Deut 2:31 for MT **רָשׁ**); **ראשו** “possess” (4Q364 26a ii, 3 at Deut 9:23 for MT **רָשׁוּ**), in both cases where the *aleph* is indicating the /ā/ vowel found in the pausal form of the imperative (**רָשׁ**), in contrast to the contextual **רֶשׁ** (Deut 1:21).

In nouns with suffixed pronouns too, one sometimes sees a clear preference for what correspond to MT pausal forms, as with **רעיכה** “your friend” (4Q417 2 ii + 23, 7 and passim), which corresponds to pausal **רֵעֶךָ** (Deut 5:21) and not contextual **רֵעֶךָ** (Deut 5:20) (see §5.2, “Pronouns and Particles”).²⁸⁷ While Qimron stresses that one suspects penultimate accent on verbal forms, he cautions that the orthography seems to presuppose ultimate accent on some words, like the **qu!* nouns in construct, just like in Aramaic and in contrast to the accentuation for these words in the MT.²⁸⁸

Qimron suggests that the patterns often align with what we would expect from Aramaic (and to a certain extent Mishnaic Hebrew) and seem

286. The nonbiblical scrolls that contain this verb are primarily DSS-SP9 texts (five out of six); the biblical scrolls are from DSS-SP9 (1QIsa^a) and DSS-NSP texts (1Q8 [1QIsa^b] and 4Q33 [4QDeut^f]). The only other verb that falls into this category and is attested in the DSS that I could find is **טרף** “to tear.” In the MT, it is attested mostly in context as **יִטְרֹף** (Ps 7:3) or something similar and once in pause as **יִטְרֹף** (Gen 49:27); in the DSS it occurs once as **יטרפו** (1QH^a XIII, 16). Since the other *qal* 3mp imperfect verbs with /o/ or /u/ theme vowel (and no suffix) in 1QH^a commonly attest a *waw mater* to mark the theme vowel, it is assumed that the theme vowel of **יטרפו** is /a/. For a more complete list of these types of verbs, see Jan Joosten, “The Function of the Semitic D stem: Biblical Hebrew Materials for a Comparative-Historical Approach,” *Orientalia* 67 (1998): 210–12.

287. Qimron, “Studies in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 83.

288. Qimron, *HDSS*, 42.

to imply a form of Hebrew that is earlier than that reflected in contextual forms in the MT.²⁸⁹ While it is also conceivable that the preference among the writers and scribes of the DSS for what are pausal forms in the MT is an artificial and secondary process engendered by mimicking what were perceived to be older, more archaic forms, this makes less sense given the form of **qut!* nouns in construct. That is, why would scribes and writers choose to mimic archaic-looking verbal forms and nouns + suffixes but not other nominal forms? It seems simpler to suggest that at least for the scribes and writers of the DSS-SP9 texts the accent was similar to the accentuation in Aramaic.²⁹⁰ All the same, one is left to wonder about the preference for verb forms that parallel pausal forms in the MT, but which do not seem to appear there for reasons of accent or stress (e.g., יחפץ, ראש, יבגוד, ראש).

4.8. VOWEL REDUCTION

It is often assumed that propretonic short vowels in open syllables reduced to a muttered vowel in Hebrew sometime in the last half of the first millennium B.C.E.²⁹¹ Although it is not obviously evidenced in the DSS, it seems that there is some slight evidence for the reduction of (at least some of) these vowels. The evidence involves the forms described in “Digraphs” (§3.5), specifically the fact that where a word has a full vowel followed by an *aleph* and then an /o/ or /u/ class vowel (e.g., -ā’ō- or -ā’ū-), the *aleph* is usually preserved along with a *waw mater* following it (e.g., מאור “light”), whereas when the *aleph* + /o/ or /u/ vowel is preceded by a shewa, then the *aleph* rarely elides, as in רובן for ראובן “Reuben.” Furthermore, it seems that the loss of *aleph* occasionally happens in places where it is preceded by a shewa that developed from an earlier short vowel in an open syllable (e.g., שרית for שארית “remainder”).

The so-called “Rule of the Shewa,” by which is meant the shift from **qat-* to **qit-*, is difficult to perceive through the DSS orthography, though the spelling of לעפים “to weary ones” in 1QH^a XV, 13 may be evidence of

289. Qimron, “Studies in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 88–89.

290. See *ibid.*

291. See Gogel, *Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew*, 33. On the evidence for a similar reduction in DSS Aramaic, see Muraoka, *GQA*, 31–33. Muraoka notes that most evidence points to the reduction of pretonic short vowels, though perhaps the process was not yet complete.

it. This spelling can be understood as the *lamedh* preposition followed by a defective writing for **יעפים** $yā'ēfīm$ where the $yā$ - syllable has coalesced with the preceding shewa of the *lamedh* preposition to form $lī$ -. Thus $*lāyā'ēfīm$ has become $lī'ēfīm$ and the etymological *yodh* consonant has been elided. Complicating this assumption, of course, is that the word could also be derived from the synonymous **יעי**, in which case one must suppose that the medial *yodh* has dropped out.²⁹² All things being equal, this seems less likely.

4.9. /ā/ < /ā/ < PROTO-SEMITIC /a/

The phonetic shift of Proto-Semitic /a/ to /ā/ (= IPA [ɔ]) (the sound in American English “all”) is one that is well documented in the history of the Hebrew language. By the time the Masoretes invented their system of vowel notation, short /a/ vowels in etymologically open (tonic and pre-tonic) syllables had shifted to /ā/. Thus, when they pronounced words like **דָּבָר** “word,” what they heard and spoke was *dābār*. Because this /ā/ sound had merged (or become phonemically indistinct) with the sound of the etymological short /o/ (found, for example, in *ḥokmā* “wisdom”), when the Masoretes pointed words like “wisdom,” they used the same symbol (*qamets*) to indicate the etymological short /o/ sound in the first syllable and the etymological /ā/ (< /a/) sound in the second: **חֻכְמָה** “wisdom,” reflecting the pronunciation *ḥākmā* (or the allophonic *ḥokmā*). Furthermore, this shift (or a similar one) is known from other languages, such as Phoenician and Aramaic.

That the shift of all etymological short /a/ vowels in open syllables had taken place in Hebrew by the time of the DSS is less clear. Harviainen, in his review of the topic, suggests that the Proto-Semitic /a/ (which had become /ā/ in the early/mid-first millennium B.C.E.) became /ā/ only in the 700s C.E., as revealed in Palestinian vocalized texts and in the Tiberian punctuation which dates in its earliest manuscripts to the mid 800s.²⁹³ Additional evidence is derived from Syriac where the *utsatsa* sign (“probably derived from the Greek” *omicron*) indicated etymological /ā/ (< /a/) by

292. On the possible explanations of the word and relevant literature, see Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:202.

293. Tapani Harviainen, *On the Vocalism of the Closed Unstressed Syllables in Hebrew: A Study Based on Evidence Provided by the Transcriptions of St. Jerome and Palestinian Punctuations* (SO 48; Helsinki: Finish Oriental Society, 1977), 108.

“probably” the 700s, if not in the mid-600s when Jacob of Edessa invented the symbol.²⁹⁴ Other evidence includes the relative absence of the back-pronunciation of historical /a/ (that is, as an /â/, /o/, or /u/ vowel) in the LXX, in Origen’s *Secunda* (where *omicron/omega* appear where MT has *qamets gadol* in only 0.86 percent of occurrences), and the fact that those instances where MT *qamets gadol* is transcribed with an “o” in Jerome are not reliable (that is, are mistakes or quotations from another source) or occur due to the vowel’s preceding a *resh*, which results, Harviainen says, in “o” due to a “tendency to provide vowels with labial timbres.”²⁹⁵

Morag and Meyer, on the other hand, suppose that the shift from /ā/ to /â/ had already taken place in late Second Temple times and is reflected in the DSS.²⁹⁶ Meyer’s examples are, at the least, ambiguous, as Kutscher demonstrates.²⁹⁷ To give just one instance that is also cited by Harviainen and Morag, כבושים appears in 1QIsa^a at Isa 5:17 for MT כְּבִשִׁים “lambs.”²⁹⁸ Kutscher believes that the form in 1QIsa^a reflects a variant tradition which reads not “lambs,” but “those subdued” (that is, the *qal* passive participle of כָּבַשׁ, *kabūšim*, akin in sense to the LXX translation of this word διηρασμένοι “those seized”).²⁹⁹ Morag argues, to the contrary, that the context is pastoral and that the LXX word is more likely based on a misunderstanding of a manuscript where the Proto-Semitic /a/ vowel had become /o/ and indicated with a *waw mater*. The words of Isa 5:17a, however, do not necessarily have to be construed as references

294. Ibid.

295. Ibid., 105–6.

296. Rudolf Meyer, “Bemerkungen zu der hebräischen Aussprachetradition von Chirbet Qumrân,” *ZAW* 70 (1958): 39–48; Harviainen, *On the Vocalism of the Closed Unstressed Syllables in Hebrew*, 105; Shelomo Morag, “Review of E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*” (Hebrew), *Kirjath Sepher* 36 (1960): 29–31; and idem, *The Hebrew Language Tradition of the Yemenite Jews* (Hebrew; Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1963), 104.

297. Meyer, “Bemerkungen zu der hebräischen Aussprachetradition,” 41 and Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 473–74. Kutscher notes, for example, that all the examples (from 1QIsa^a) Meyer adduces as proof of this shift are not due to “a phonological development, but, generally ... a result of variant exegesis” (ibid., 473).

298. Meyer, “Bemerkungen zu der hebräischen Aussprachetradition,” 41; Harviainen, *On the Vocalism of the Closed Unstressed Syllables in Hebrew*, 105; Morag, “Review of ... *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*,” 29–30; idem, *Hebrew ... of the Yemenite Jews*, 104.

299. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 247.

to pasturage and feeding. Instead of reading “the lambs will feed (ורעו) as (in) their pasture (כדברם)” (following the MT), or “those subdued will feed...” (following the LXX), it is possible to read “those subdued have done wrong (ורעו) as they said (they would do) (כדברם).” The people who are subdued are those addressed in the preceding or following verses who ignore or are indifferent to the threat of exile and divine punishment. Since the preceding lines do not mention any pastoral imagery, it would be natural for a reader to interpret the graphically and even phonetically ambiguous letters ורעו as referring to wrongdoing and not feeding. Thus, it is not necessary to argue that the letters כבושים must be interpreted as “lambs” based on the context.

Qimron, in his *HDSS*, lists forms in which the “*Waw* sometimes appears where the Tiberian tradition has *qamets*, *patach*, or *seghol*.”³⁰⁰ (The examples are cited and critiqued in “*Waw* Marking /u/ Class Vowel in Nouns Where MT Has No /u/ Class Vowel” [§5.4].) Qimron goes on to summarize briefly the views of Meyer and Kutscher outlined above and says that since the *waw* can appear in places where the MT has *patach*, or *seghol*, Kutscher’s explanation seems more convincing. In other words, if the phonological shift from /ā/ to /â/ in all environments had taken place, the words that have *qamets* in the MT would be the only ones that attest a *waw*; since *waw* also appears in places where the MT contains *patach*, *seghol*, or *shewa*, there must be another reason for the presence of *waw*. Since the appearance of a /u/ class vowel can be explained as due to the presence of a following (sometimes preceding) bilabial, *lamedh*, *nun*, or *resh*, or a following /u/ vowel, it makes sense to prefer these explanations rather than a general and universal shift of /ā/ > /â/. In addition, it must be observed that if the proposed shift of /ā/ > /â/ had really taken hold, it is surprising that it is so rarely reflected in the writing of the DSS; one might expect a plethora of words attesting a *waw mater* where the corresponding MT word has a *qamets gadol*.

4.10. DIPHTHONGS AND TRIPHTHONGS

In the above pages, I have already treated a number of examples of phonetic shifts in DSS Hebrew. The following list summarizes most of the transformations that involve vowels.

300. Qimron, *HDSS*, 39.

- C'ō- > -Cyō-, as in לְבוֹיָתוֹ “its lionesses” (4Q169 3–4 i, 4 at Nah 2:13)
- Cwō > -C'ō, as in מִצְוֹתַי “my commandments” (4Q129 [4QPhyl B] at Deut 5:10)
- ə'ō > -əyō, as in מְלִיאֹת “fulfilling” (4Q284 2 i, 3)
- ə'ū > -əyū, as in יִמְחוּ “they will clap” in 1Q8 (1QIsa^b) at Isa 55:12
- ā'ū > -āwū, as in בָּאוּ “they came” (4Q398 [4QMMT] 11–13, 2 and 3)
- ē'ō > -ēyō-, as in מַאֲיוֹת “soldiers” (11Q19 XLII, 15)
- ī'ā- > -īyā- or -īye-, as in שִׁיבָה “he will deceive you” (1QIsa^a at Isa 37:10)
- ī'ā- > -īyā-, as in אֱלִיָּב “Eliab” (4Q138 [4QPhyl K] at Deut 11:6)
- ī'ē- > -īyē-, as in דָּנִיֵּל “Daniel” (6Q7 [6QpapDan] at Dan 10:12)
- ī'ū- > -īyū-, as in הִחֲטִיִּים “they made them sin” (4Q522 9 ii, 10)
- ō'ū > -ōwū, as in יָבֹאוּ “they will come” (4Q266 10 i, 3)
- ū'ā > -ūwā, as in הוּהוּ “he” (1QIsa^a at Isa 7:14)
- ōhū > -ōwū, as in תְּהוּוּ “emptiness” (4Q504 1–2R iii, 3)
- ūhū > -ūwū > -ūyū as in וִירְמֹסוּוֹ “they will trample him” (4Q368 10 ii, 7)
- āwō- > -ā'ō-, as in עָוֹן “iniquity” (1QIsa^a part of additional text to Isa 1:15)
- ōwē > -ō'ē, as in קוֹאֵי “those hoping for” (4Q171 1–2 ii, 4)
- ōwō- > -ō'ō-, as in רְבֹאוֹתֵם “their ten thousands” (1QM XII, 4)
- āyī- > -ā'ī-, as in פְּתָאִים “simple” (4Q381 1, 2)
- āyē > -ā'ē, as in פְּתָאִים “simple of” (1QpHab XII, 4) and עָאָף “weary” (1QH^a XVI, 37)
- āyō- > -ā'ō-, as in נְבֵאִיּוֹת “Nebaioth” (1QIsa^a at Isa 60:7)
- īyī- > -ī'ī-, as in כְּתִיָּאִים “Kittim” (1QpHab II, 12 and passim)
- īyā > -ī'ā, as in צִיָּאָה “dry” (1QIsa^a at Isa 41:18)
- ōyī- > -ō'ī-, as in גּוֹאִים “peoples” (1QM XII, 14 and passim)
- ōyē- > -ō'ē-, as in אֹיְבֵי “enemy” (4Q98g [4QPs^x] at Ps 89:23)
- ūyā > -ū'ā, as in נְטוּאָ [ה] “stretched” (4Q51 [4QSam^a] in an addition to 2 Sam 24:16)

In addition to these shifts, note the following shifts:

- ihū* > -*iyū*, as in אביו “his father” (4Q225 2 ii, 4)
- āw* > -*ō*, as in עלו “over him” (1QpHab VIII, 7)
- ūy* > -*ū*, as in ראו “it is right” (4Q394 [4QMMT] 3–7 i, 15)
- ūy* > -*ū’ī*, as in ראוי “it is right” (4Q394 [4QMMT] 3–7 ii, 1 and 13)
- wū* > -*ū*, as in יהו “may they be” (4Q448 II, 7)

The shift -*ihū* > -*iyū* is associated especially with the 3ms pronominal suffix on short nouns like אב “father,” אח “brother,” פה “mouth,” and 1cs perfect verb forms (e.g., קטלתי), in each case where an /i/ vowel comes immediately before the suffix. In the nonbiblical DSS, one commonly finds the 3ms suffix written הו- on such short nouns, where one typically finds in the MT the simple ו-.³⁰¹ Thus, one finds פיהו (4Q159 1 ii, 5) instead of פיו, the form that is more common in the MT (e.g., Exod 4:15); similarly אביהו (4Q416 2 iii, 16) instead of אביו (e.g., Gen 9:22). Of course, neither the DSS nor the MT is consistent and one finds פיו in the DSS (4Q381 1, 3) and פיהו in the MT (Exod 4:15 [the same verse where one finds פיו]), similarly אביו in the DSS (4Q416 2 iv, 1) and אביהו in the MT (1 Kgs 5:15). In the biblical scrolls (many of which are DSS-NSP texts and reflect the MT orthography) the distribution is not surprisingly reversed, ו- is more common than הו- on nouns.³⁰²

301. The development of the standard MT form is assumed to be **’ābīhū* > **’ābīū* > *’ābīw* = אביו. The form אביו occurs in the MT 220 times and אביהו seven times; אחיו occurs 113 times and אחיהו four times; פיו occurs fifty-five times, while פיהו occurs twenty-two times (concentrated in Job, Proverbs, Qohelet, and Lamentations). Among the nonbiblical scrolls, אביו occurs at least four times and אביהו twenty-six times; אחיו occurs two times and אחיהו thirteen times; פיו occurs once (perhaps twice) and פיהו at least thirty times.

302. I.e., according to my search of Accordance, אביו occurs eleven times and אביהו once; אחיו occurs at least fourteen times and אחיהו three times; פיו occurs ten times and פיהו eight times. Note, however, the frequency of the הו- form of the suffix even in the Genizah manuscripts of Ben Sira. The form פיהו occurs in Ben Sira 9:18 (Ms A); 14:1 (Ms A); 39:31 (Mas); 48:12 (Ms B) vs. פיו in 15:5 (Ms A); 39:17 (Ms B); 39:31 (corrected from פיהו) (Ms B). Similarly, רואיהו in 37:24 (Ms D) vs. ראיו in 37:24 (Ms C). The word for “father,” however, always appears in the same way with the suffix: אביו in 3:11 (Ms A), 3:16 [twice] (Ms A); 44:22 (Ms B).

Curiously, the suffixes on 1cs perfect verbs do not follow the distributional pattern of nouns; in the nonbiblical DSS, the suffix ל - seems to be slightly more common on 1cs perfect verbs (4Q364 21a–k, 3; 4Q388a 7 ii, 5 [defectively ל -]; 4Q522 9 ii, 11) than לה - (4Q175 16; 11Q19 LIX, 18). In the biblical scrolls, on the other hand, the suffix לה - is slightly more common than ל -, even where the MT has ל -.³⁰³ The presence of both types of 3ms suffix on short nouns and verbs among the DSS should be kept in mind, since previous scholars have made a point of claiming that they do not exist or are attested only in peripheral texts.³⁰⁴ Although not all words are found in all text groups, some are. The word פִּיהו , for example, is found in all text types, including DSS-NSP texts (e.g., 4Q372 1, 20 and 4Q381 69, 9); this suggests the possible widespread nature of this orthographic and/or morphological tendency. Notice, however, that the biblical scrolls, though attesting all forms, slightly prefer nouns with ל -.

In any case, the dominance of forms like אֲבִיהו in nonbiblical scrolls suggests that where אֲבִי occurs, it is due to the elision of *heh*.³⁰⁵ If such is the case, then we might suppose a pronunciation like that for the Tiberian tradition, *ʾabīw* (אֲבִי), where the vowel and final consonant form a diphthong. Nevertheless, it is sometimes asserted that the Hebrew suffix was

303. According to Accordance, the suffix לה - occurs eighteen times in the biblical DSS, in all but three cases (1 Sam 1:22, Isa 45:13, 51:23) where the MT has ל -, and even among these three exceptions, in one case the verb in the scroll has no parallel in the MT (1 Sam 1:22) and in another (Isa 51:23) the MT has a 3fs suffix. The suffix ל - appears fifteen times in the biblical scrolls, all but once (1 Sam 16:7) where the MT has ל -.

304. Qimron states categorically “Contracted forms like אֲבִי are not attested” (*HDSS*, 60) and Morag is more specific and mentions that they do not appear in “GQH [= General Qumran Hebrew]” (“Qumran Hebrew,” 157). In truth, אֲבִי is attested at least four times in the nonbiblical scrolls and eleven times in the biblical scrolls. In relation to the nonbiblical scrolls, it bears mentioning that of the four sure instances of this spelling (4Q175 15; 4Q225 2 ii, 4; 4Q416 2 iv, 1; 11Q19 LXIV, 2), two occur in texts that also evidence אֲבִיהו (4Q416 2 iii, 16; 11Q19 LXIV, 3 and *passim*). Furthermore, although the appearance of אֲבִי may be explained as part of a quotation of or allusion to various biblical texts (respectively, Deut 33:9, Deut 21:18, Gen 2:24, and Gen 22:7), 4Q225 and 4Q416 do not follow precisely the biblical text; also note that all these texts bear other traits that link them with “GQH” (e.g., the spelling of the pronoun הוּאֵה 4Q225 2 i, 4; 4Q416 1, 16, and the *yqwʾl* + suffix pattern, הַשׁוֹפְכָנו 11Q19 LII, 12]).

305. Note the similar constriction in Aramaic: אָרוּי “his brothers” (1Q20 XXI, 34) instead of אָרוּהִי “over him” (11Q18 8, 3; 9, 4) instead of עָלוּהִי (the *heh* being preserved in all other cases). See Muraoka, *GQA*, 40.

pronounced in the DSS, as in Samaritan Hebrew, *-iyyū* or *-īyū*.³⁰⁶ Support for this supposition is found partly in similar cases where intervocalic *heh* seems to assimilate to a preceding or following vowel, as in תהוו *tōwū* (< **tōhū*) “emptiness” (4Q504 1–2R iii, 3 and 1QIsa^a at Isa 40:17), as well as in וירמסויו *wəyirmāsūyū* (< **wəyirmāsūwū* < **wəyirmāsūhū*) or *wəyirmōsūyū* (< **wəyirmōsūwū* < **wəyirmōsūhū*) “they will trample him” (4Q368 10 ii, 7), in the latter word where *waw* has, in turn, dissimilated to *yodh*.³⁰⁷ Such a tendency for assimilation also seems to be evidenced in the Babylonian tradition where the corresponding form for “his father” is *’ābīwū*.³⁰⁸ In the case of DSS אביו, this would mean that the *heh* would assimilate to the preceding /i/ vowel and become /y/: *’ābīyū*; this assimilation of *heh* is similar to the assimilation of *aleph* in words like הביו *hābīyū* “bring” (1QIsa^a at Isa 16:3) and החטיום *heḥēṭīyūm* “they caused them to sin” (4Q522 9 ii, 10).³⁰⁹ As for the DSS spelling אביהו, while it is entirely possible that the suffix was also pronounced *-īyū*, it seems more likely that the cases where the suffix is spelled with a *heh* reflect a pronunciation *-īhū* in the writing/reading register. At the least, it seems inconsistent to argue for a historical spelling with a vernacular pronunciation for אביהו = *’ābīyū* in a manuscript like 4Q221 that attests numerous other phonetically-inspired spellings like רובן *rūbēn* “Reuben” (4, 9 = MT רובן), ימו *yāmō* “his days” (3, 5 = MT ימיו), בנו *bānō* “his sons” (5, 2 = MT בניו).

These last examples from 4Q221 evidence the contraction *-āw > -ō*; such a contraction is commonly assumed for DSS Hebrew based, in part, on the frequent spelling *l-* for the 3ms suffix on prepositions and plural nouns which normally take the suffix *יו* in the MT.³¹⁰ Thus, for example, although the preposition + 3ms suffix עליו appears fairly commonly among all the DSS written in its familiar MT fashion, the spelling עלו (presuming *’ālō*) appears at least eight times among the nonbiblical scrolls (in

306. See Qimron, *HDSS*, 60; Joosten, “Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek,” 356.

307. See the subsection “Quiescence of *Heh*” in §4.3, “Weakening of Gutturals.”

308. See Israel Yeivin, *The Hebrew Language Tradition as Reflected in Babylonian Vocalization* (Text and Studies 12; 2 vols.; Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1985), 775.

309. Cf. also Qumran Aramaic שריו *šarriyū* “they began” (4Q204 4, 3) (Muraoka, *GQA*, 138). See the subsection “Quiescence of *Aleph*” in §4.3, “Weakening of Gutturals.”

310. Since the *yodh* in the MT form is only a historical spelling or, alternatively, a graphic means for distinguishing the singular from the plural nouns, it is not pronounced (see Andersen and Forbes, *Spelling*, 62).

contrast to just twice in the MT 1 Sam 2:10 and 2 Sam 20:8).³¹¹ Another example is the word “face” plus the 3ms suffix, spelled פנו twice (4Q374 2 ii, 8; 4Q405 15 ii–16, 4) and as part of a prepositional phrase לפנו at least eight times (e.g., 4Q266 2 ii, 2).³¹² The 3ms suffix on plural nouns is written ַ- most frequently in DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts.³¹³ Nevertheless, the same suffix is also attested in numerous DSS-NSP texts.³¹⁴ The strongest evidence for the contraction to /ō/ comes from 1QIsa^a where the

311. In 1QpHab VIII, 7; 4Q161 8–10, 11; 4Q221 7, 10; 4Q266 6 ii, 2; 8 i, 3 and 5; 4Q270 6 ii, 7; 6 v, 15. Note also אלו “to him/it” in 1QpHab VIII, 5 (twice) at Hab 2:5 for MT אָלוֹי; 4Q398 (4QMMT) 14–17 i, 7. All of these are DSS-SP9 or DSS-SP1c texts.

312. Also in 4Q266 2 ii, 4; 4Q392 1, 4, 5, and 9; 4Q398 (4QMMT) 14–17 ii, 4 and 7; 4Q405 20 ii–22, 7. All of these are DSS-SP9 or DSS-SP1c texts. The appearance of the 3ms ַ- suffix on explicitly singular III-*yodh* nouns is comparatively rare: שדו “his field” in 4Q396 (4QMMT) 1–2, iv, 7 and עושו “his maker” (4Q299 3a ii–b, 7 and 8, cf. העשו Job 40:19).

313. The following are from DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts: אבותו “his fathers” (4Q365 26a–b, 8); אחו “his brothers” (4Q266 5 ii, 4); אלומותו “its sheaves” (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 126:6); אלמנותו “his palaces” (1QIsa^a at Isa 13:22); אפדותו “his ephods” (4Q365 12b iii, 5); גבולותו “its borders” (1QIsa^a at Isa 28:25) for MT גְּבֻלָּתוֹ “its branches” (4Q262 B, 1 and 2); חוקותו “his statutes” (4Q138 [4QPhyl K] at Deut 11:1); ימו “his days” (4Q221 3, 5; 4Q270 6 iv, 14; iv, 19); יתדותו “its pegs” (1QIsa^a at Isa 33:20); מבינותו “his understandings” (4Q417 29 i, 7); מעשו “his works” (1QS VI, 17; 1QSa I, 18 and 22; 4Q261 1a–b, 3; 4Q299 3c, 6); מצוותו, מצאותו, מצוותו “his commandments” (1QpHab V, 5; 4Q266 2 i, 4; 4Q128 [4QPhyl A] at Deut 10:13; 4Q138 [4QPhyl K] at Deut 11:1; 4Q140 [4QPhyl M] at Deut 6:2); משלחותו “his sendings” (4Q405 23 i, 13); משפטו “his judgments” (4Q138 [4QPhyl K] at Deut 11:1); סוסו “his horses” (1QpHab III, 6 in a quotation of Hab 1:8 for MT סוּסָיו “his horses” (1QS III, 7 and 8); פרשו “his horses” or “horsemen” (1QpHab III, 7, though note the identical spelling of the preceding verb פרשו “they crossed” or “set out”); צדקותו “his righteous acts” (1QS XI, 3); קירותו “its walls” (4Q403 1 i, 43; 4Q404 5, 6); רחמו “his compassion” (4Q434 1 i, 7); תבואותו “its produce” (4Q266 6 iii, 8); תעדתו “his assemblies” (4Q255 2, 6); תשבחותו “his praises” (11Q17 X, 5).

314. The following are from DSS-NSP texts: אחו “his brothers” (11Q1 [11QpaleoLev^a] at Lev 21:10) for MT אָחָיו “his enemies” (4Q376 1 iii, 2); בריותו “his creatures” (4Q216 V, 9); מלאכו “his angels” (4Q93 [4QPs^l] at Ps 104:4) for MT מְלֹאכָיו; מעשו “his works” (4Q216 V, 3); מצותו “his commandments” (4Q32 [4QDeut^e] at Deut 8:2) for MT מִצְוָתוֹ; idem (4Q98 [4QPs^q] at Ps 112:1) for MT מִצְוֹתָיו “his legs” (4Q114 [4QDan^c] at Dan 10:6) for MT מְרַגְלָתָיו “its settings” (4Q468b 1, 2); נעלו “his sandals” (4Q56 [4QIsa^b] at Isa 5:27) for MT נְעָלָיו “his young women” (2Q16 [2QRuth^a] at Ruth 2:22) for MT נְעֻרֹתָיו רעו “his friends” (4Q472 1, 4). Note also מעלותו “its upper rooms” (Mur88 at Amos 9:6 for MT מַעְלֹתָיו). Some examples are, of course, ambiguous, as בימו “in his day(s)” (4Q388a 7 ii, 4).

spelling of the 3ms suffix on singular nouns sometimes occurs spelled יי-, as in ידיו נטויה “his hand stretched out” (1QIsa^a at Isa 5:25, 9:11, 16, 20, 10:4, 14:27, for MT יָדָיו נְטוּיָה); ריקה נפשיו; (יָדוֹ נְטוּיָה נִפְשׁוֹ); ריקה נפשיו “his throat is empty” (at Isa 29:8 for MT רִיקָה נִפְשׁוֹ); אסרחדן בניו “Esarhaddon, his son” (at Isa 37:38 for MT אֶסְרַחְדָּן בְּנָיו); אסר חדן בנו “on his head” (at Isa 59:17 for MT אֶסְרַחְדָּן בְּנָיו).³¹⁵ These examples suggest that when יי- appears on plural nouns it is also representing the /ō/ vowel.

However, complicating the assumption that יי- represents /ō/ in forms like עלו is the fact that the MT occasionally attests the 3ms suffix on prepositions like על and on plural nouns without a *yodh*, as in עלו “over it” (2 Sam 20:8) and צבא “his hosts” (Ps 148:2). Also, in very rare cases, the MT evidences יי- when the context and the vowels reflect יי- (see, for example, עינו “his eye” Qoh 4:8; שפתיו “his lip” Prov 16:27).³¹⁶ Furthermore, it seems peculiar that the DSS-SP9 texts and DSS-NSP texts should both attest so many examples of the defective spelling. We might expect a peculiar (phonetically inspired) orthography from the former group of texts, but not so with the latter. Given this distribution, it might seem easiest to understand the writing of יי- for the 3ms on plural nouns and suffixes as a simple graphic alternative to יי-. The writing יי- seems to have been the standard writing in preexilic inscriptions and, presumably, this spelling continued down to the time of the DSS, together with the later innovation of writing יי-.³¹⁷ Thus, the defective spelling of יי- is not conclusive. We should, however, remember the concentration of this defective spelling in the DSS-SP9 texts, especially with the prepositions (which never occur in DSS-NSP texts) and the frequency with which the spelling is found in some texts that attest other phonetically-inspired spellings, like 1QpHab, 1QS, 4Q417, 4Q221, the Phylactery texts, 1QIsa^a.

There is another factor too that, initially at least, complicates the theory that the 3ms suffix on plural nouns was -ō. Notice that the diphthong /āw/ was preserved in some words in the final syllable, even in texts that seem to attest to the contraction of the diphthong in the suffix; as Ben-Ḥayyim notes, the word “nothingness” (= MT שׁוֹן) is spelled with two *waws* שׁוּוּ = šāw in 1QpHab X, 10 and 11, though the same text seems

315. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 447 for these examples. This would make the 3ms suffix on singular and plural nouns identical; the same pronunciation is found in Samaritan Hebrew. See Ben-Ḥayyim, *Studies in the Traditions*, 79–82.

316. See Andersen and Forbes, *Spelling*, 62.

317. See Gogel, *Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew*, 159–60.

to witness the shift $-āw > -ō$ in, among other places, the word סוסו “his horses” (1QpHab III, 6).³¹⁸ Also, as explained above in “*Aleph* as Internal *Mater*” (§3.3), it seems that the diphthong $-āw$ sometimes appears in words like עישאו “Esau” (4Q223–224 2 ii, 4, 12; 2 iii, 12; 2 iv, 18; 4Q364 3 ii, 7 for what would be in the MT עשו) where *aleph* is used as a *mater* for /ā/.³¹⁹ Although the disparity in the preservation of historical /āw/ in these words versus its contraction in the pronoun is puzzling, the peculiar orthography of the above words (שוו, עישאו) may actually offer support for the contraction to /ō/. The fact that the scribes wrote a double *waw* in שוו and introduced *aleph* in עישאו suggests that the *waw* in each word could have been interpreted in the wrong way (namely as /ō/).

Thus, although some of the same words are spelled in the same way in both DSS-SP9 and DSS-NSP texts (e.g., אחו “his brothers”), it seems possible that in some texts (1QIsa^a, 1QS, 1QpHab, 4Q221, 4Q266, 4Q270) the writing of the suffix without *yodh* reflects the contraction of the diphthong to /ō/ while in other texts (e.g., 4Q32, 4Q56, 4Q114) it reflects an older spelling of the uncontracted diphthong /āw/, as sometimes happens in the MT.

One might still wonder why the writers and copyists of the DSS-NSP were so inconsistent in the writing of the suffix. It bears mentioning, therefore, that the suffix without *yodh* appears most commonly on words with the feminine plural ending $-ōt$.³²⁰ In the lists provided in the footnotes above, there are around twenty examples of words ending in $-ōt$ that take the suffix ו-, while just ten examples of nouns that would take the absolute plural ending $-īm$ (if they did not have a suffix). Observe that the feminine plural ending is clearly marked for plurality in most instances through a *waw mater* (that is, וות-). There is less reason, therefore, to use the expanded 3ms orthography וי-. Similarly, in nouns that do not end in the feminine plural morpheme $-ōt$, the plurality of the noun is usually apparent from the morphology of the noun (e.g., III-*heh* nouns פננו, מעשו, מבעשו, which in the singular would be *פנהו, מעשהו), or from how the noun is used (e.g., רחמו “his compassion”).³²¹

318. Ben-Ḥayyim, *Studies in the Traditions*, 80–81.

319. Other spellings of the name “Esau” seem more ambiguous: עשיו (4Q252 IV, 1), עישוי (4Q215 1–3, 7), עשו (1Q18 1–2, 2, 3; 4Q222 1, 2).

320. Abegg implies that the forms without *yodh* represent 70 percent of the instances of nouns ending in $-ōt$ + 3ms suffix (“Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 333).

321. Alternatively, the use of ו- was perhaps on analogy to the 3mp suffix ׁ- and

The resolution of $-ūy > -ū$ is found in ראו “seen” (4Q394 [4QMMT] 3–7 i, 15) as well as גלו in 4Q175 11.³²² This also appears in the MT in צפו “watched” (Job 15:22) and הַעֲשֵׂה “the one made” (Job 41:25), as well as in the Samaritan tradition where the diphthong sometimes shifts to /o/.³²³ In 4QMMT, the preservation of the *yodh* was effected by the insertion of a glottal stop and the shift of /y/ to /ī/: ראוֹי “seen” (4Q394 [4QMMT] 3–7 ii, 1 and 13), presumably reflecting $rā'ū'ī$. Qimron views the latter case in light of Samaritan Hebrew, which often transforms the diphthong into two separate syllables with a /w/ glide, as in צפואי as *sabbuwwi*; in light of this, it seems easiest to understand the form in 4QMMT as having an epenthetic glottal stop.³²⁴ Nevertheless, there is no reason to assume that all words ending in a similar way would have resolved this diphthong; recall that 4QMMT exhibits numerous idiosyncracies not shared with other texts.³²⁵

The shift of $ōy > ō$ asserted by Qimron seems unlikely or, at least, extremely rare.³²⁶ He claims that this shift is evidenced explicitly in one form, הוה in 1QIsa^a at Isa 1:24 for MT הוי. He suggests that cases like מבוֹאי “entrance” (the singular absolute, = MT מְבוֹא) in 4Q405 23 i, 9 and גוֹאי “peoples of” in 4Q491 8–10 i, 5 may evidence the resolution of this diphthong through a suffixed /i/ vowel, which kind of resolution of diphthongs occurs in RH.³²⁷ It seems possible, however, that הוה is, as Kutscher has suggested, another word like הוּא, הוֹה, or an abbreviated version of the interjection in Amos 5:16 הוֹ-הוֹ.³²⁸ The example of מבוֹאי

מה- (instead of יהם- or יהמה-) on nouns with the plural $-ōt$ ending; the short forms of the 3mp suffix are much more common on nouns ending in $-ōt$ in the DSS than the longer forms, as in the MT.

322. Qimron, *HDSS*, 34.

323. Ben-Ḥayyim, *Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew*, 202.

324. For the Samaritan Hebrew example, see Qimron, *HDSS*, 34.

325. For example, Qimron (*HDSS*, 35) suggests שקוי “strong drink” in 1QH^a XIII, 36 and 37 (MT abs. שְׁקוֹי) implies the pronunciation *šiqquwi*. It seems easier to assume a pronunciation akin to that of the MT form: *šiqqūy*. The parallel text in 4Q429 3, 7 and 9 preserves שקוי for the first attestation and שקוֹי for the second (see Schuller, *DJD* 29:187–89). The second spelling might represent *šiqqūyi* “my drink.”

326. Qimron, *HDSS*, 35.

327. See *ibid.* and his summary of the issue. Moshe Bar-Asher has a similar understanding of the form מבוֹאי in 4Q405 (“Two Phenomena in Qumran Hebrew: Synchronic and Diachronic Aspects” [Hebrew], *Meghillot* 1 [2003]: 173).

328. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 229.

is perhaps only a mistake influenced by the preceding use of the plural construct of מְבוֹאֵי (that is, מְבוֹאֵי) in the immediately preceding line, more or less directly above the word in question, as well as by the preceding and following words which are both masculine plural nouns in construct (פְּתָחַי ... וְשַׁעְרַי), not to mention the occurrence of similar phrases such as לְפִתְחֵי מְבוֹאֵי ... עִם כּוֹל מוֹצְאֵי “for the doors of the entrances of ... with all the exits of...” (11Q17 X, 7–8) in other parts of the same work.³²⁹ As for גּוֹאֵי in 4Q491 8–10 i, 5, Qimron asserts that it should be considered not the plural construct (as evidenced in the parallel construction in 1QM XIV, 7, גּוֹיִי), but rather the singular construct since the preceding verb is in the singular (where the parallel passages in 1QM has a plural verb). However, the simplest explanation to the disparities between these passages, I believe, is to see the singular verb as a mistake and the word גּוֹאֵי reflecting *gō`ē* “peoples of.” On the other hand, if Qimron is right, *aleph* is a glide or epenthetic consonant between two vowels, just as one sees an *aleph*, functioning as a glide or epenthetic consonant, interpose itself after the /u/ vowel and before the *yodh* in the passive participle רְאוּאֵי in 4Q394 [4QMMT] 3–7 ii, 1 and 13.³³⁰ Another example of this phonetic shift may be אוֹבֵיךְ “your enemies” from 1QIsa^a (at Isa 62:8, = *’ōbekā* [?]), though the spelling might simply reflect an ancient misreading of *waw* for *yodh* = *אֵיבֵיךְ.³³¹

The shortening of *-wū* to *-ū* is found only in the 3mp imperfect of יהוּ: יהוּ “may they be” (4Q448 II, 7). Note the similar form in the Mishnah and other Rabbinic writings for the third plural imperfect (יְהוּאֵי).³³² These forms presumably derive from Aramaic, where the earlier form, *yihwū*, is found in an Egyptian Aramaic text from around the fifth or fourth centuries B.C.E.: יהוּוּ (ATNS 26, 6).³³³ Qimron draws attention to

329. Newsom, on the other hand, observes that the word could also be read מְבוֹאוּ and the last *waw* explained as dittography, though she prefers what she calls the “simplest” solution which is to read מְבוֹאֵי and understand the spelling as “a combined historical/phonetic orthography” (DJD 11:359).

330. Qimron cites the parallel with Samaritan Hebrew *guwwi* (HDSS, 35).

331. See the discussion of this word and related forms in the subsection “Explanation of the DSS Forms” in §4.4, “*Aleph* < *Yodh* and *Yodh* < *Aleph*.”

332. By contrast, sometimes it was written *plene*, as found in a Bar Kokhba-era text (שִׁיְהוּוּ 5/6 Hēv 44 16). Note that the form under discussion is distinct from the 3ms shortened imperfect in Eccl 11:3 יְהוּאֵי.

333. See J. B. Segal, *Aramaic Texts from North Saqqāra with Some Fragments in Phoenician* (Texts from Excavations 6; London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983), 41, text 26, 6.

the same phenomenon attested in the MT with the root **חווה** where a 3mp imperfect or *waw*-consecutive imperfect is spelled with a single *waw* in the written tradition **וַיַּחְוֶה** (Gen 27:29), **וַיַּחְוֶהוּ** (Gen 43:28), and **וַיַּחְוֶהוּ** (1 Kgs 9:9).³³⁴ In these cases, one wonders if such shortening is not due to a phonetic rule, but rather due to confusion over the root consonants.

334. Qimron, "Diphthongs and Glides," 269.

MORPHOLOGY

5.1. PROTHETIC ALEPH

In rare cases, an *aleph* appears prefixed to a noun that often appears without it; the nouns that sometimes attest this *aleph* begin with a consonant + shewa. Presumably, the *aleph* functions to break up a word-initial consonant cluster. In the MT the *aleph* is usually followed by a *seghol* (less often *hiriq*), as in אֶתְמוֹל, אֶתְמוֹל, אֶתְמוֹל, “yesterday,” which occur eight times, versus תְּמוֹל, which occurs twenty-three times, and אַזְרוּעַ “arm,” which occurs twice, whereas זְרוּעַ occurs sixty-eight times.¹ Often, it seems, that the *aleph* appears before nouns that are themselves preceded by a preposition or other particle.²

Qimron finds this *aleph* in four words.³ A fifth example is אֶתְמוֹל “yesterday” (4Q251 8, 4 [versus תְּמוֹל in 4Q366 1, 2]). In three of the five cases, the *aleph* is followed by what would be a consonant + shewa in the MT (אֶזְרוּעַ “arm” in 11Q19 XX, 16 and passim; אֶשְׂאוֹל “Sheol” in 11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 141:7; and אֶתְמוֹל). In one case the prothetic *aleph* appears before the word בֵּית “house,” as אֶבִּית (1QpHab XI, 6).⁴ Although the word

1. See Joüon-Muraoka §17a. They feel that the *aleph* was probably not pronounced, though it is difficult to be certain.

2. This happens for אֶתְמוֹל in six of the eight occurrences (1 Sam 10:11, 14:21, 19:7, 2 Sam 5:2, Isa 30:33, Mic 2:8) and for אֶזְרוּעַ in both its occurrences (Jer 32:31 and Job 31:22). Where אֶתְמוֹל is not preceded directly by a particle, the *aleph* separates two *taws* (אֶתְמוֹל is preceded by זֹאת in 1 Sam 4:7) or stands after a noun in a formulaic phrase (כִּיּוֹם in Ps 90:4).

3. Qimron, *HDSS*, 39.

4. This is also found in the Aramaic of the DSS, 4Q197 4 i, 16, as well as in a Hebrew letter from the Bar Kochba era (Mur. 42, 4), in addition to throughout the Tosefta (e.g., *t. Erub.* 8:13; *t. Sotah* 2:3) and Babylonian Talmud (*b. B. Qam.* 63a; *b. Bek.* 7b).

“house” does not begin with a consonant + shewa, it is best to understand this construction as deriving from an earlier *בבית*, to which the *aleph* was prefixed.⁵ The vocalization of *אבדני* “forms of” in 1QM V, 6 is unclear.⁶ In addition, as in the MT, the words are often preceded by a particle or a word in construct with it. The word *אזרוע* is frequently preceded by the definite article (4Q524 6–13, 6; 11Q19 XX, 16; 11Q20 IV, 26; V, 3), or another particle (*כיא* in 4Q171 1–2 ii, 23 and *ב* in 11Q15 4, 1 [in a broken context]), while *אשׂאול* is preceded by *לפי*, and *אתמול* by *מן*. The word *אבדני* is not preceded by a particle and may, in fact, be due to dittography from the preceding phrase: *אבני הפץ* “desirous stones.” The word *אבית* seems to have become its own frozen expression and was used in any position. The words largely derive from DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts.

Qimron asserts that the word “Sheol” was always pronounced as “*es’ol*” (even where no prothetic *aleph* is present) based on the fact that we would otherwise expect the spelling of the word (*שאול*) to have varied, as is the case with *ראש* “head” (spelled *ראש*, *רואש*, *רואש*, *רוש*) or *מאד* “much” (spelled *מאד*, *מאדה*, *מאוד*, *מאודה*, *מואדה*, *מוד*, *מודה*).⁷ The many words that are consistently spelled with the sequence *aleph* + *waw mater*, where an /o/ or /u/ class vowel follows the *aleph* and the preceding vowel is a full vowel or muttered vowel suggest that this is not the case. The word *שאול*, “Sheol” in its consistent placement of the *waw mater*, simply follows the spelling convention outlined in “Digraphs” (§3.5). The variation in spelling for words like *ראש* and *מאד* is due to the lack of a vowel preceding the /o/ vowel. The parallel that Qimron makes to the Samaritan Hebrew oral tradition where prothetic *aleph* appears, though it is often unmarked in the written tradition, seems unlikely given the few examples we have from the DSS and the parallel alternative forms one finds in the MT that presume truly distinct pronunciations (*אֶתְמוֹל* versus *תְּמוֹל*).

5. See Pérez Fernández, *Introductory Grammar*, 160; Muraoka, *GQA*, 21; E. Y. Kutscher, “Canaanite, Hebrew, Phoenician, Aramaic, Mishnaic Hebrew, Punic” (Hebrew), *Leshonenu* 33 (1969): 108; Ben-Ḥayyim, “Traditions in the Hebrew Language,” 205.

6. The regular form of the word, which is always plural and either in construct with a following word or followed by a possessive suffix, is without an initial *aleph* *בדני* (e.g., 1QM V, 9).

7. See Qimron, *HDSS*, 39. The word *שאול* occurs at least twenty times in the nonbiblical scrolls and over fifty times in the biblical scrolls.

In addition to these DSS words, there are words that habitually attest an initial *aleph*. Whether this is for the same phonetic purpose of breaking up an initial consonant cluster or whether the *aleph* functions as a nominal prefix (like *mem* and *taw*) is hard to determine. In either case, the Hebrew of the DSS attests words with this initial *aleph* among the non-biblical texts. Most are known from the MT: אַגְרוּף “fist” (4Q230 1, 3 and 4Q271 5 i, 3); אֶזְכְּרָה “memorial” (11Q19 VIII, 10); אֶזְרָח “native” (1QSa I, 6 and passim); אֶכְזֹרִי “cruel” (1QS IV, 9 and passim); אֶפְרוּחַ “young one” (4Q392 6–9, 5 and twice in 11Q19 LXV, 3); אֶצְבֵּעַ “finger” (1QS XI, 2); אֶשְׁמֹרֶה/אֶשְׁמֹר “watch” (1QS X, 2; 4Q260 II, 1; 4Q437 2 i, 16); אֶתְנִים “wages” (4Q166 II, 18), for what would be אֶתְנָן in the MT (see the discussion in “Phonemic Inventory” [§4.1]); though some are not found in the MT like אֶמְצֵעַ “middle” (11Q19 XXX, 9), a word found frequently in RH. The biblical texts evidence other words also found in the MT, like אֶבְנֵי “girdle” (4Q11 [4QpaleoGen–Exod¹] at Exod 28:40).

5.2. PRONOUNS AND PARTICLES

The Hebrew pronouns of the DSS largely overlap with the pronouns found in the MT. The common relative pronouns are identical (אֲשֶׁר, שׁ, זֶה), as are the interrogative/indefinite pronouns (אֵי “where,” מִי “who,” מַה “what”).⁸ Various other related pronouns and particles are also found that have parallels in the MT, like אֵי־זֶה “which” in 4Q268 1, 2 (= MT אֵי־זֶה); אֵיהַ “where” in 4Q364 9a–b, 11 (quoting Gen 38:21, where the MT has אֵיהַ); אֵיךְ “how” in 1QH^a VII, 34 and passim (= MT אֵיךְ); אֵיכַה “how” in 1QH^a VII, 27 and passim (= MT אֵיכַה); אֵיכַכַּה “how” in 4Q453 1 (= MT אֵיכַכַּה); אֵנַה “to where” in 4Q177 10–11, 9 (quoting Ps 13:3, where the MT has אֵנַה); אֵיפַה “where” in 1Q27 1 i, 11 and 4Q467 1 + 2, 3 (= MT אֵיפַה); מַתִּי “when” in 4Q385 2, 9 and passim (= MT מַתִּי). One finds Aramaic forms for some of these particles in 1QIsa^a הֵיכַה “how?” (e.g., 1QIsa^a at Isa 1:21; compare הֵיכַכַּה “how?” 4Q223–224 2 iv, 5 and passim) and הֵכַן “indeed” (1QIsa^a at Isa 40:7).

Like the above pronouns, the prepositions are almost identical to their analogs in the MT, even where suffixes are added. One exception is הַמֵּן

8. The relative שׁ is spelled שׂא in 4QMMT (4Q394 3–7 i, 5, 29; 3–7 ii, 14; 4Q396 1–2 i, 3).

“from” (4Q386 1 ii, 4); the construction is common with suffixes in RH, but occurs here alone without suffixes.⁹

DEMONSTRATIVE

The demonstrative pronouns in the Hebrew of the DSS are largely identical to those in the MT. The range of simple (that is, without affix) singular pronouns found in the MT (masc.: זֶה, fem.: זֹה, זוּ, זֹאת; masc./fem.: זוּ)¹⁰ seem mostly to be attested in the DSS. Although the orthography prevents us from being certain whether זוּ or זוּ existed in 4Q381 31, 1 and 44, 2, the quotation or allusion to Ps 9:16 ([בְּרִשְׁתָּהּ זוּ טָמְנוּ] = MT ברשת זו טמנו) in the former passage suggests that this is the demonstrative זוּ (corresponding to MT זוּ) used as a relative.¹¹

The consonants זֶה usually reflect what corresponds to MT זֶה, though the feminine זֹה (= MT זֹה) is attested in 4Q109 (4Q^{Qoh}^a) at Qoh 5:15. The feminine זֹאת is attested in various spellings including זֹאת (1QH^a XII, 30); זֹאת (1QS IX, 20); זֹאות (11Q19 VIII, 10); זֹות (1QH^a XX, 35).¹² In addition, the DSS contain another demonstrative in 4Q371 1a–b, 8, read as זִן or זִן, corresponding to Aramaic זִן or זִן. The sequence of rare demonstratives in the MT that include a prefixed *heh* and *lamedh*, הֵלֵּז, הֵלֵּזָה, הֵלֵּזוּ, are only partially attested in the biblical scrolls: הֵלֵּז [ה] (4Q113 [4Q^{Dan}^b] at Dan 8:16); הֵלֵּזוּ [ה] (Mas 1d at Ezek 36:35). As in the MT, the third-person independent pronouns also function as demonstratives, often with the prefixed definite article: הַהוּא, הַהיא, הַהיא, הַהיא, הַהמה.

In the MT, there are two plural demonstratives, אֵלֶּה and אֵלֵּה, the latter being the more common. In the DSS, there are just two clear attestations of אֵל, only in biblical scrolls, in each case where the MT has אֵלֵּה (4Q129 [4Q^{Phyl} B] at Deut 5:22 and 5Q1 [5Q^{Deut}] at Deut 7:17). By contrast, in three places where the MT has אֵלֵּה, the DSS text has אֵלה

9. See Moshe Bar-Asher, “המן (= מן) in a Fragment from Qumran” (Hebrew), *Leshonenu* 55 (1990): 75.

10. The form זֹאתָה from Jer 26:6 is excluded.

11. The second passage reads כי ארץ זו הגברת “for you strengthened this land.”

12. Note also the spelling זֹת in a phylactery (XHev/Se 5 2, 4, 5 at Exod 13:5, 10, 14). The spelling זֹאת is, overall, the most common spelling, though זֹאות in the non-biblical scrolls is more common than זֹאת. The spelling זֹאות is less common in both the biblical and nonbiblical scrolls.

(11Q1 [11QpaleoLev^a] at Lev 18:27; 4Q33 [4QDeut^f] at Deut 7:22; 4Q38a [4QDeut^{k2}] at Deut 19:11).

PERSONAL PRONOUNS

As many summaries of DSS Hebrew note, the orthographic representation of the independent personal pronouns and pronominal suffixes and/or their phonetic realization are distinct from those of the MT. The independent pronouns are described by both Qimron and Abegg, so I limit my comments to the most important features. The references to relative frequencies concern the nonbiblical manuscripts (unless otherwise indicated), since biblical manuscripts tend to mimic the biblical text. The pronunciation of the suffixes with MT-like short forms and alternative long forms ending with a *heh mater* are discussed together at the end of this section, in the subsection titled “General Comments.”

FIRST PERSON

The first-person singular independent pronoun is usually אֲנִי; where אֲנוּכִי and אֲנוּכִי occur in nonbiblical texts the antecedent is God.¹³ The plural pronouns אֲנִי and אֲנַחְנוּ occur with about the same frequency, though the occurrences of the latter are concentrated in 4QMMT. The suffixed versions of these pronouns are as they occur in the MT, with at least one exception for the plural: אֲנַחְתֵּינָא (4Q381 46a + b, 4), which is similar to the Aramaic pronominal suffix.

SECOND PERSON

The second-person masculine singular independent pronoun is almost always אַתָּה, while the 2fs is not attested among the nonbiblical scrolls and appears as אַת among the biblical scrolls and אַתִּי in 1QIsa^a (at Isa 51:9, 10, 12). The form אַתִּי occurs, as Kutscher notes, in some passages of the MT, as a *kethib*, and is more common in Aramaic.¹⁴ The 2mp in the scrolls is אַתֶּם and אַתְּמָה, the former occurring slightly more often than the latter

13. See Qimron, *HDSS*, 57 and Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 330.

14. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 208. For a listing of the forms of the 2fs pronoun with the *kethib* form אַתִּי, see GKC §32h.

in both the biblical and nonbiblical scrolls. The two pronouns occur in the same texts (e.g., 1QM XVII, 2 and 8; 4Q185 1–2 i, 9 and 1–2 ii, 7).

As mentioned above in “*Plene Orthography*” (§3.2), the 2ms pronominal suffix is often written with a *heh mater* (כה-).¹⁵ In some instances, however, the suffix appears without the *heh*, even where preceding forms have the *heh*, as in 1QM XIX, 3: תן ידכה בעורף אויביך “set your hand on the neck of your enemies.”¹⁶ Qimron argues that the spelling of certain singular forms with a *yodh mater* between the noun and suffix indicates that the suffix was usually articulated with penultimate accent.¹⁷ Many of the examples are debateable, as perhaps reflecting plural forms (e.g., מותריכה “your excess” or “your excesses” 4Q417 2 i, 17) or dittography (בעוזביכה “when you abandon” in 4Q460 9 i, 8, right before אלוהיכה “your God”). Nevertheless, some forms certainly reflect singulars, as with רעיכה “your friend” (4Q417 2 ii + 23, 7; 4Q525 14 ii, 21; 4Q129 [4QPhyl B] at Deut 5:20, for MT רעך) and the alternative spellings of the singular ריעיכה (11Q19 LIV, 20), רעך (4Q41 [4QDeutⁿ] and 4Q134 [4QPhyl G] at Deut 5:20). In other words, it seems that the standard form for “your friend” in the DSS-SP9 texts was similar to (if not identical with) the pausal form found in the MT רעך (Deut 5:21). Note also the same spelling in 4Q41, which is DSS-NSP. It stands to reason that many of the 2ms pronouns (especially in DSS-SP9 texts) were articulated in a similar way (perhaps sometimes as *-akā* for prepositions, compare pausal אהתכה in MT at Exod 29:35) even if this is not always revealed in the spelling of words.¹⁸ This does not imply, however, that the 2ms pronoun could not be articulated as *-akā*, especially for the scribes writing/reading the DSS-NSP texts. Notice also that the 2ms suffix on *qal* imperfect verbs tends to follow the pattern *yq̄t̄wlkh* (rather than *yq̄wt̄lkh*), suggesting the absence of a vowel under the last root consonant.

The 2fs suffix is often simply (ך-), like the simple form of the masculine suffix. In around thirty instances, however, the suffix is כי-, akin to

15. On the history of the suffix, see Richard C. Steiner, “From Proto-Hebrew to Mishnaic Hebrew: The History of ך- and כה-,” *HAR* 3 (1979): 157–74.

16. Note that although this passage seems to echo some of the language of Gen 49:8 where the suffix is spelled without *heh*, the inconsistency in spelling of the suffix is not always connected with a biblical text: e.g., מידכה versus ממשלותך in 4Q369 3, 3–4 and מדבריך vs. בבריתכה in 3Q382 104, 1.

17. Qimron, “Studies in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 79–92.

18. *Ibid.*, 88.

the corresponding Aramaic suffix, attested in Imperial and DSS Aramaic.¹⁹ That the pronunciation of the suffix when spelled כִּי- was something similar to that preserved in Biblical Aramaic (-ēkī) is implied in the spellings וּגְאֲלִיכִי *wəgō'ālēkī* “and your redeemer” (4Q176 8–11, 7) and מֵאֲתִיכִי *mē'ittēkī* “from you” (4Q176 8–11, 12). Since the suffix (or at least the consonants corresponding to it) is also found in the Hebrew portions of the MT (2 Kgs 4:3, 7, Jer 11:15, Ps 103:4–7 [six times], 116:7 [twice], 19, 137:6), it might be argued that this represents an early form of the Hebrew suffix and this is possible, since etymologically the Hebrew suffix was -ki.²⁰ All the same, the occurrences in the MT come primarily from later texts, when Aramaic was in ascendancy, and it is conceivable that they are due to Aramaic influence too. Some of the occurrences of the suffix in the DSS might be attributable to the presence of the suffix in the common (original?) Hebrew text; for example, the suffix כִּי- appears in 4Q84 (4QPs^b) at Ps 116:19 in the same place where it occurs in the MT (כִּי [בְּתוֹכִי] “in your midst” for MT בְּתוֹכִי). This cannot explain, however, the concentration of occurrences of this suffix in 1QIsa^a (twenty-one occurrences); together with other factors, this concentration points to Aramaic influence.²¹

The second-person plural pronominal suffix is restricted to the masculine and is either כִּם- or כִּמָּה-, the latter appearing most commonly in 11Q19 and 11Q20. Again, there is variation from one line to the next; the form without *heh* appears once in 1QM X, 3 and the form with *heh* appears twice in the very next line. Abegg lists variant forms as כִּהִם- and יִכִּהִמָּה- (on masculine plural nouns), though these are probably just due to scribal mistake.²² The first one appears in 4Q427 7 ii, 16; the scribe wrote רַחֲמִיכָה “your mercy” and then added a final *mem* and cancellation dots to indicate רַחֲמִים. The second example occurs in 11Q19 XLVIII, 10 in אֱלֹהֵיכִהִמָּה “your God,” where the scribe seems to have become confused between the forms אֱלֹהֵיכָה in line 7 and אֱלֹהֵיכִמָּה in line 8.

19. See Muraoka, *GQA*, 43–44. The Aramaic suffix, according to Muraoka, was, in the era of the DSS, “in a state of transition” and was losing this final vowel and is attested a few times written simply ܟܝ- (*GQA*, 43).

20. See *HGhS*, 255 k'.

21. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 210–12 and Abegg, “Linguistic Profile,” 41.

22. See Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 333.

THIRD PERSON

The third-person masculine and feminine singular independent pronouns have the forms they do in the MT, הוּא and הִיא; they also occur with a final *heh mater* הוּאָה, הִיאָה. The forms with a final *heh* are less frequent than the forms without *heh* and seem to be concentrated in certain texts, most prominently 1QS. Here again, there is much variation within individual texts, even from line to line (e.g., 4Q266 6 i, 8 and 11). The *qere perpetuum* of the 3fs suffix הוּאָה, attested in the Torah books of the MT, is also presumed in the editions of two DSS and one slightly later text from Masada: Mas1b (MasLev^b) at Lev 10:17 and 11:6; 4Q26 (4QLev^d) at Lev 17:11; and 8Q3 (8QPhyl) at Deut 11:10 (in each case where the MT has the *qere perpetuum*). Of these, only the word in Mas1b at Lev 10:17 is clearly legible in the photograph, though it is written interlinearly and is, thus, smaller than the other words. This scroll is particularly close to the textual tradition evidenced in the MT, but the reading of the pronoun is still suspect. The cause of this *qere perpetuum* in the MT is, according to Joüon-Muraoka, “a certain late recension of the Pentateuch,” the scribes of which, unable to distinguish the *waw* from a *yodh*, copied the pronoun as though it were (almost) always *waw*.²³ Given the similarity between *waws* and *yodhs* in Mas1b, one wonders if we are justified in seeing here the earliest evidence of this *qere perpetuum* phenomenon.

The plural independent pronouns are as they appear in the MT, with the masculine showing two possible forms: הֵם, הֵמָּה and the feminine just one הֵנָּה. For the masculine, the forms with *heh* are slightly more frequent than the forms without, but both occur together in individual texts (e.g., 1QH^a X, 25 and 31). The feminine occurs extremely rarely.

The third-person pronominal suffixes are also attested with some regularity. For the 3ms, the forms follow, more or less, the paradigms found in the MT, where the suffix is ו- on singular nouns except etymological III-*waw/yodh* words where the suffix is וְ- (הוּ שְׂדֵהוּ “his field” 4Q158 10–12,

23. Joüon-Muraoka §39Ac. They note that in the MT there are eleven exceptions where the 3fs pronoun is spelled with a *yodh*. For another opinion, that הוּאָה in the MT Pentateuch reflects either *hū* or *hīw*, see Steven E. Fassberg, “The *Kethiv/Qere* הוּאָה, Diachrony, and Dialectology,” in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew* (ed. Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé and Ziony Zevit; LSAWS 8; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbaruns, 2012), 171–80.

7 and passim).²⁴ If the word מעשהו “his deed” in 1QIsa^a at Isa 5:19 (for MT מעֶשֶׂהוּ) is read correctly, then this suggests a pronunciation of the suffix akin to that of the MT, *-ēhū*.²⁵ On plural nouns the suffix is usually יוֹ-, though occasionally it is written defectively, מעשו “his works” (1QS VI, 17) and מצוותו “his commandments” (4Q266 2 i, 4), as observed above in “Diphthongs and Triphthongs” (§4.10), where we have postulated the contraction *-āw > -ō* in many of these forms. In that same section, we have also addressed the shift *-ihū > -iyū* associated with the 3ms suffix on short nouns like פה, אח, אב.

In some relatively rare cases the 3ms pronominal suffix on plural nouns appears as it does in Aramaic, וְהִי-. The exact number of instances and where they occur is debated. Qimron, along with many other scholars, sees the Aramaic וְהִי- suffix in certain Hebrew words among the nonbiblical scrolls (e.g., ועיניוהי “and his eyes” 1QS V, 5; עלוהי “over him” 1QpHab XII, 11); nevertheless, Abegg, as well as some earlier scholars, read these as יהו (עליהו; ועיניהו).²⁶ Abegg, however, does recognize this Aramaic suffix as occurring some sixteen times in 1QIsa^a (e.g., מעשוהי “his works” at Isa 10:12 for MT מעֶשֶׂהוּ).²⁷

A similar kind of ambiguity pertains to the spelling ה- for the 3ms suffix on singular nouns in various passages like בה בדרשה “by him when he examines” (4Q266 8 i, 2, for an expected בו בדרשו which occurs in CD XV, 11).²⁸ It is conceivable that the *heh* represents the old Hebrew

24. Note, however, the exceptional form שדו “his field” in 4Q396 (4QMMT) 1–2, iv, 7 and עושו “his maker” (4Q299 3a ii–b, 7 and 8).

25. Note the apparent anomaly of משניו “his second” (4Q405 11, 3) for what would be in the MT מְשֵׁנִיָּהוּ.

26. Qimron, *HDSS*, 61. Qimron notes that this Aramaic suffix also occurs once in the MT תַּגְמֹלוּהִי (Ps 116:12). In addition, e.g., Qimron and Charlesworth (“Rule of the Community,” passim) mostly follow Qimron, as does *DSSSE* and Joosten (“Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek,” 359). Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 332–33.

27. Abegg, “Linguistic Profile,” 41; Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 211.

28. See Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 30, who lists several cases. Gregory L. Doudna evaluates these and considers the words above to exhibit examples of the 3ms suffix, together with אפה (4Q266 2 ii, 21) and דעתה (8 i, 6); the case of לחללה (5 ii, 6) is ambiguous (4Q *Peshet Nahum: A Critical Edition* [JSPSup 35; London: Sheffield Academic, 2001], 133 n. 163). Doudna finds other possible examples of this suffix in חירה “its hole” (4Q169 3–4 i, 6 in a quotation of Nah 2:13), [ח]ילה (3–4 iii, 10), and [מ]לחמתה (3–4 iii, 11) (*ibid.*, 134–35, 524–25). The form of טרפה in 4Q169 3–4 i, 6 and 9 less likely contains the 3ms suffix (*ibid.*, 154–55).

suffix *-ō*, seen approximately fifty times in the MT, but it is also possible it represents the Aramaic 3ms suffix *-ēh*. Cases like בּוּה (4Q128 [4QPhylA] at Exod 12:43, 44; in 4Q140 [4QPhyl M] at Exod 13:3) for MT בּוּ “in it,” in addition to cases like רַעַה (4Q22 [4QpaleoExod^m] at Exod 32:17) for MT רַעַה “his friend” and כֹּלָה (1QIsa^a at Isa 15:3; 1Q8 [1QIsa^b] at Isa 16:7) for MT כֹּלָה “all of it” suggest that the ה- suffix in nonbiblical scrolls reflects Hebrew *-ō*.²⁹

The 3fs pronoun is usually, as in the MT, represented by a single *heh*, as in בַּה “in it” (1QS IV, 6 = MT בָּה) and כְּמוֹה “like it” (1QM I, 12 = MT כְּמוֹה). Occasionally, however, the 3fs suffix is represented by an initial *heh* and a following *mater* (either *heh* or *aleph*) when the corresponding form of the MT pronoun presupposes *-hā*, as in כְּמוֹהַה “like it” (1QM XVIII, 10); חַטֹּאתֶיהָ “her sins” (4Q176 1–2 i, 6), quoting Isa 40:2, for MT חַטֹּאתֶיהָ; וּמֵאַצִּילֶיהָ “and from its sides” (4Q176 1–2 i, 10), quoting Isa 41:9, for MT וּמֵאַצִּילֶיהָ; וְיִתְּנָהּ “he will (not) give her” (4Q271 3, 9, compare וְיִתְּנָהּ 1 Kgs 14:8); עֲלֶיהָ (1QIsa^a at Isa 34:11, and passim).³⁰ In rare cases, the combination הֶה- is used in 1QIsa^a even where we would expect, based on the paradigm in the MT, just ה- (= *-āh*), as in כִּתְּבֶהָ “write it” (1QIsa^a at Isa 30:8) for MT כִּתְּבֶהָ; and בַּהַה “in it” (at Isa 34:10, 11, 62:4, 66:10) for MT בָּה. This is presumably related to the use of הֶה- to mark word-final /ā/ in this text (הֶהֶה 1QIsa^a at Isa 5:1, 12:2 for MT הֶיָה and וְהֶיָה, respectively), as well as very rarely in a few other texts, like דְּעָהָ “knowledge” (1QS VII, 4 = MT דְּעָהָ); עֲתָהָ “now” (4Q175 11, quoting Num 24:17, for MT עֲתָהָ); חוֹפָהָ “canopy” (4Q321a V, 7 = MT חֲפָהָ).³¹ Alternatively, the suffix in 1QIsa^a could be due to analogy with the Aramaic 3fs suffix *-ahā*

29. Note also רַעַה (4Q258 II, 2 and perhaps 3) for רַעֲהוֹ* (found in lines 4 and 5); דּוֹקוּה (4Q321a V, 5) for דּוֹקוֹ* (found in IV, 8 and V, 8); לֹוה (4Q138 [4QPhyl K] at Deut 10:18) for MT לֹו; עֲלֶמָה (4Q52 [4QSam^b] at 1 Sam 20:38) for MT הַנְּעָר, but reflecting a tradition also found in certain Septuagint texts which contain *παῖδαρλου ἀποστῶ* (see Ulrich et al., *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 280); אוֹתוֹה (1QIsa^a at Isa 36:21) for MT אוֹתוֹ; חִיקוּה (1QIsa^a at Isa 40:11) for MT חִיקוּ; כּוֹחוֹה (1QIsa^a at Isa 63:1) for MT כּוֹחוֹ. A similar use of וּ- as a digraph to mark /ō/ is found occasionally, as in לֹוּ (1QIsa^a at Isa 57:18) for MT לוֹ and עֲמוּוּ (1QIsa^a at Isa 63:11) for MT עָמוּ; see §3.5, “Digraphs.” See also Ian Young, “Observations on the Third Masculine Singular Pronominal Suffix *-h* in Hebrew Biblical Texts,” *HS* 42 (2001): 225–42.

30. Note the reverse sequence of letters in עֲלִיָּהָ “upon it” (4Q369 1 ii, 3) due to metathesis.

31. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 185; and “Digraphs” above (§3.5). Note also the examples of וְהִיאָה (1QIsa^a at Isa 65:10) and הִיאָה (2Q13 [2QJer] at Jer 48:27) in each case

(as in Onkelos) or due to the retention of a historical vowel between the noun and suffix.³²

The third-person masculine plural pronominal suffixes are either ם- or מה- on verbs and singular nouns, while הם- and להמה- appear on plural nouns. Both sets of pronouns appear on monosyllabic and bisyllabic prepositions. In each case, the form with a final *heh mater* is less common than its partner form. Again, both forms occur in individual texts (בם and במה in 4Q265 4 i, 8 and 4 i, 10, respectively; להם and להמה in 1QM VIII, 2 and IX, 6, respectively).³³ On plural nouns that bear an *-ōt* ending in the DSS, the suffixes without initial *heh* (ם-, מה-) seem to alternate with suffixes with initial *heh* (יהם-, יהמה-), just as in the MT, with certain words and/or texts showing an affinity for one set of pronouns over another.³⁴

for MT הַיָּה, which suggests an analogous use of אֵה- (if the letters יֵה do not represent the 3fs independent pronoun).

32. See Qimron, “Studies in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 83–85 for other possible examples of words that retain a historical vowel.

33. Qimron points out that on verbal forms that end in a high vowel (/i/ or /u/, e.g., קטלו and קטלתי), only the short form of the suffix is found; he asserts “such consistency implies that our texts reflect a living language” (“History of Early Hebrew,” 355). There are, e.g., fourteen examples of the 1cs perfect verb with the 3mp suffix and twenty-two cases of the 3cp perfect with the 3mp suffix. Although Qimron is right that there are no exceptions to this rule, it should be remembered that of the around 450 instances where the 3mp suffix occurs on all finite verbs (i.e., not only 1cs and 3cp), the long form (מה-) occurs only ten times: 1QH^a V, 27 and 29; 4Q174 4, 6; 4Q292 2, 3; 4Q416 2 iii, 17; 11Q13 II, 6; 11Q19 XXVI, 12; LV, 21; LXIV, 11 (corrected) and 14. Thus, it would seem that the short form is dominant on all finite verb forms, no matter the final vowel.

34. Steiner suggests that for Tiberian Hebrew the suffixed pronouns had allomorphs, one for words ending in a vowel *-hū*, *-hā*, ... *-hem*, etc., and one used for words ending in a consonant, *-āh* ... *-ām*, etc. (“Ancient Hebrew,” 153–54). The same held for plural nouns. But, at some point (presumably in the Iron Age) the suffix *-ehem* (made up of the resolved diphthong from the earlier oblique dual ending, *-ē-*, plus the 3mp *-hem*) was “reanalyzed” as a complete suffix and thus was used on certain words that ended in a consonant, like the word for daughters בְּנוֹתֵיהֶם. This happened only with some nouns; the word for fathers, e.g., still took the *-ām* suffix (i.e., אֲבֹתָם). For the alternation in the form of the suffixes, note, e.g., מחשבותם (1QH^a V, 26; X, 19; XII, 15, 20; 4Q430 1, 2 [partially preserved]; Jer 6:19, Ps 56:6, Lam 3:60, 61) but (ה)מחשבותיהמה (1QIsa^a and MT at Isa 59:7, 65:2, 66:18); עצמותמה (1Q34bis 3 i, 3; 11Q19 LL, 4; Ezek 32:27, Mic 3:2) but עצמותיהם (Num 24:8, 1 Sam 31:13, Mic 3:3). For more on the variation in these pronouns on feminine plural nouns, see Moshe Bar-Asher, “The Language of Qumran: Between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew (A Study

According to Qimron, the same *-ām* suffix occurs with *waw* as םו-, but his examples are ambiguous.³⁵ If these are cases of the 3mp suffix, it is possible to interpret the *waw* as caused by the following *mem*, akin to the *waw* that appears in other words where MT forms have only a *qamets*. The spelling םעליהום in 4Q176 20, 3 is probably due to Aramaic influence, as is [על]יהן “over them” (4Q277 1 ii, 7) and אביהן “their father” (4Q17 [4QExod–Lev^f] at Exod 40:15).³⁶

That the pronunciation of these suffixes is similar to that in the MT is suggested occasionally by the *plene* orthography in certain words: םשביא “their captivity” (4Q385a 18 i a–b, 7), the *aleph* marking a preceding /ā/, for what would be in the MT *שְׁבִיָּם; and ויחביאם “he hid them” (4Q382 1, 2 in a quotation or allusion to 1 Kgs 18:4 וַיִּחְבֵּי־אֱלֹהִים).

The 3fp suffix occurs rarely, usually as הן-, though some four times as ן-.³⁷ It occurs once as הון- ועליהון (1QS III, 25), corresponding to the masculine Aramaic-influenced form עליהום (note the similar mistake in Aramaic of בינהון “between them” 11Q10 XXXVI, 2, corrected to בינהן). In several cases, the 3fp suffix has the form of the 3mp suffix.

GENERAL COMMENTS

As demonstrated above, the various second- and third-person pronouns almost all occur with and without a final *heh mater*. One question pertaining to the forms, especially אתמה/הוא, היא/היא, then, concerns whether they reflect a common underlying pronunciation with final *-ā*, sometimes represented graphically, sometimes not, or whether they represent two different pronunciations, one with final *-ā*, and one without. There is no definitive answer to this, but two factors suggest the existence of alternative pronunciations. First, the fact that one can find

in Morphology), *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 137–49 and idem, “Qumran Hebrew Between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew: A Morphological Study,” in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran* (ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz; FAT² 35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 3–17.

35. See the discussion in “*Waw* Marking /u/ Class Vowel in Nouns Where MT Has No /u/ Class Vowel” (§5.4). According to Qimron, these occur in רוחום (1QS IX, 14); הונ(ו)ם (1QS V, 20); בואום (1QSa I, 4).

36. The Aramaic of the DSS attests both the older form of the suffix with *mem*, םמנהם “some of them” (4Q112 [4QDan^a] at Dan 2:41) for MT מְנַהֵן, as well as the more recent form with *nun*, עמהון “with them” (1Q20 XXII, 1).

37. Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 334.

varying realizations of pronouns in the MT (e.g., פִּיּוֹ and פִּיּוֹ in Exod 4:15 and הֵם and הֵמָּה in Gen 42:35), which reflect different pronunciations, suggests that the DSS could also have preserved a similar variation in pronouns.³⁸ A similar assumption is made by Muraoka for similar Aramaic pronouns that exhibit long and short forms.³⁹ Second, one finds the 3ms independent pronoun spelled הוּ (3Q15 [Copper Scroll] XI, 9 and 4Q266 11, 9), which implies a pronunciation without a final *-ā*.⁴⁰

Another question pertains to the historicity of the forms. Do they represent true Hebrew forms, that is, forms derived from earlier Semitic bases? Do they represent Aramaic influences? Or, are they entirely artificial? Morgenstern has recently written on the independent pronouns and concludes that there are clear historical bases for the long forms peculiar to the Hebrew DSS (and the Samaritan Hebrew oral tradition).⁴¹ Nevertheless, others have suggested that they are the result of archaizing analogy; that is, the endings of historically legitimate forms like the pronoun *'attā*, the nominal suffix *-kā*, and the verbal suffix *-tā* were used as the model for other pronouns.⁴² It is hard to be sure which explanation is right. Possibly, both are correct; that is, some forms are due to historical preservation (e.g., הוּאֵה), while others are the result of analogy (e.g., the suffixed הֵמָּה-).

Aramaic influence on the pronouns is implied in aberrant forms like אַבְתִּינַא “our fathers” (4Q381 46a + b, 4); עֲלֵיהוּם “over them” (4Q176 20, 3);

38. Morgenstern, on the other hand, suggests that they could have been pronounced the same (“The System of Independent Pronouns at Qumran and the History of Hebrew in the Second Temple Period” [Hebrew], in *Sha'arey Lashon: Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic and Jewish Languages Presented to Moshe Bar Asher, vol. 2: Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic* [ed. A. Maman et al.; Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 2007], 50, 53).

39. He writes: “When faced with mixed data in a single author, even in a single document, one needs to remember that a living language allows coexistence of alternative forms, particularly when a given feature is in a state of fluidity or transition, in the process of changing from an old form to a new alternative” (GQA, 43). Much the same must be true of certain dead languages, as the alternative forms of פִּהּ from the MT cited above demonstrate.

40. Muraoka makes a similar point, citing הוּ in Mur 42 4 (“Hebrew,” 1:342).

41. Morgenstern, “System of Independent Pronouns,” 51, 53.

42. See, e.g., Frank Moore Cross, “Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies,” in vol. 1 of *The Madrid Qumran Congress, Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 4; Fassberg, “Preference for Lengthened Forms,” 229–31 and 234–36.

יהן[על] “over them” (4Q277 1 ii, 7); אביהן “their father” (4Q17 [4QExod–Lev^f] at Exod 40:15); the 2fs suffix כִּי- (in 1QIsa^a); the 3ms suffix on plural nouns וְהִי- (in 1QIsa^a). Ambiguity surrounds some other cases of וְהִי- in the nonbiblical scrolls. All things considered, therefore, the conclusion to be drawn is that Aramaic did occasionally influence the pronominal suffixes, though this is a relatively rare phenomenon. These occur in both the DSS-SP9 texts and in at least one DSS-NSP text (4Q381).

5.3. NOUNS

LEXICON

Qimron's *HDSS* contains lists of nouns categorized according to whether they occur in LBH, RH, or in no other Hebrew tradition. His *Grammar* contains lists of nominal bases and the words that correspond to them. Additional nouns, not found in Qimron's lists, that appear in the scrolls include אַרְרָה “curse” (4Q410 1, 4 and passim); בְּקִיעַ “fissure” (4Q385 6, 4); גְּדַפֵּן “blasphemer” (4Q387 2 ii, 8 and passim); גֶּשֶׁר “bridge” (4Q521 7 + 5 ii, 12); דֹּוֹן “misery” (4Q385 4, 1); הַגְּוִי “meditation” (4Q417 1 i, 16 and passim); זִידָה “insolence” (1Q29 13, 4); חֶלְמָה “cement” (4Q277 1 ii, 4); חֶרְבָן “desolation” (4Q390 1, 8); יוֹד “*yodh*” as reference to יהוה (4Q511 10, 12);⁴³ מְאֻפְלָה “darkness” (4Q216 V, 10); מְגַע “(unclean) touching” (4Q274 1 i, 8 and passim); מְשִׁיכָה “drawing” (4Q251 1–2, 4); נִצְפָה “caperbush” (4Q386 1 ii, 5); עוֹר “chaff” (4Q433 1, 3);⁴⁴ עֵילוֹל “child” (4Q169 3–4 iv, 2);⁴⁵ עֵבֶשׁוּ “now” (4Q225 2 ii, 7); צַעַר “pain” (4Q491c 11 i, 16); קְשׁוֹת “cucumber” (4Q274 3 i, 9); רַחֵשׁ “worm” (4Q266 6 i, 8 and in a parallel

43. Unless this is due to metathesis and one should read יָדוּ “his hand” (*DSSSE*); see Baillet, *DJD* 7:227.

44. See Kister, “Three Unknown Hebrew Words,” 36–37.

45. The noun is also found in 4Q169 3–4 iv, 4; 1QH^a XV, 24; 1QIsa^a at Isa 13:16 (see Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 381). This word is actually in Qimron's list, but Strugnell (“Notes en marge,” 208) and, more recently, Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom (*DJD* 40:207 n. 7) read as though these were attestations of the MT word עֵילוֹל, where the *qamets* has shifted to /o/ due to the following *lamedh*. However, as Qimron observes (“Waw and Yod,” 110), the initial reading of Allegro (עֵילוֹלִיָּה and עֵילוֹלִיָּו) seems more likely. The base of the noun (**qīṭul*/**qīṭāl* [?]) is found in Biblical Hebrew words from II-*waw*/*yodh* and geminate roots like נִיחֹוֹחַ “appeasement” (from נוּחַ) and נִיצוֹץ “spark” (from נָצַץ) and even with strong roots as in קִיטוֹר “fog” or “smoke.” These words are usually spelled with a *yodh mater* and a *waw mater* in the DSS, as they often are in the MT

passage 4Q272 1 i, 16); רעדודיה “trembling” or “its trembling” (4Q377 2 ii, 9); שטמה “animosity” (1QM XIV, 9); שדך “ease” (4Q386 1 ii, 7).⁴⁶ These words are otherwise unknown from earlier Hebrew, but related to other nouns and/or verbs in the MT (מְאַרְה/אַרַר “to curse”/“curse”; דָּוָה/דָּוָה “be sick”/“illness”; זָדוֹן/זָדוֹן “insolent”/“insolence”; חֲרָבָה/חָרַב “desolation”; מְאִפְלִיָּה “darkness”), in RH (בְּקִיעַ “fissure”; גִּדְפָן “blasphemer,” גִּשְׁר “bridge”; חֲלָמָה “cement”; יוֹד “yodh”; מְגַע “touching”; מְשִׁיכָה “drawing”; נְצַפְפָּה “caperbush”; עַכְשָׁיו “now”; קִישוּת “cucumber”), and/or in Aramaic (גִּשְׁר “beam” [TAD A2.2, 15 and passim]; דוּוּנָא “misery” [Tg. Neb. Jerm 8:18]; חֲרָבָן “desolation” [4Q210 1 ii, 14 and 4Q531 18,2]; עוּר “chaff” [MT at Dan 2:35]; צַעַר “pain” [4Q530 1 i, 2]; רַחַשׁ “worm” [Tg. Onq. Exod 16:20]; שְׂדֵדָה “to be at ease” [Tg. Neb. Isa 14:7]). In other cases, the definition of the word is more conjectural or previously unknown: אוֹט (4Q416 2 ii, 12 and passim); בַּדְנִי (1QM V, 9 and passim); דוּק “new moon” or “full moon” (4Q321 II, 3 and passim); מְלוּשׁ (4Q439 1 i + 2, 2); פַּעֲנָה (4Q381 31, 7); and תּוּזִי (4Q386 1 ii, 5).⁴⁷

In some cases, it is hard to decide whether a word is a previously unknown noun or an infinitive construct of a known verb used in a nominal manner, as in לוּז “turning aside” (4Q424 1, 8).⁴⁸ In other cases, the relationship between an apparently new word and a previously known word is unclear. For example, פֶּאֲרָה seems to mean “glory” in several passages (e.g., 1QH^a XVI, 23 and passim) and is presumably connected to the word for “headdress” in the MT and RH פֶּאֲרָה, but is commonly assumed to

(something unusual given the tendency in the MT for just one word-internal *mater* per word, as noted above).

46. More examples can be found in *DCH*, many of them only conjectural.

47. On the word אוֹט, see Tzvi Novick, “The Meaning and Etymology of אוֹט,” *JBL* 127 (2008): 339–43 and *ThWQ*, cols. 1:84–86; on בַּדְנִי, see *ThWQ*, cols. 1:366–70; on דוּק, see *ThWQ*, cols. 1:659–65; on מְלוּשׁ, see M. Weinfeld and D. Seely, “Lament of a Leader,” in *DJD* 29:340 and Kister, “Three Unknown Hebrew Words,” 35–36; on תּוּזִי, see Dimant, *DJD* 30:64. For more recent lexical studies, see Bar-Asher, “Qumran Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew,” 287–317; “Grammatical and Lexical Phenomena in a Dead Sea Scroll (4Q374)” (Hebrew), *Meghillot* 4 (2006): 153–67; and Kister, “Some Observations,” 137–65; idem, “Lexical and Linguistic Gleanings from the Dead Sea Scrolls” (Hebrew), *Leshonenu* 67 (2004): 27–44; idem, “Some Lexical Features of the Writings from Qumran” (Hebrew) in *Qumran Scrolls and Their World*, 2:561–69.

48. Note, e.g., נוּחַ in the phrase קוּל נוּחַ (in 1QM VIII, 7 and 14). Is this the same word that appears in 2 Chr 6:41 (לְנוּחָךְ), the parallel passage to which in Psalms (132:8) contains לְמִגְוִיחָךְ?

be otherwise unknown. All the same, there is a graphically identical word פִּאָרָה “branch” (= MT פִּאָרָה) that occurs in the DSS and the MT. Could “glory” and “branch” actually be two meanings for the same word, the sense “glory” deriving metaphorically from the sense “branch,” similar to how words associated with height can connote pride and/or majesty (e.g., גִּאֲוָה “majesty, pride” [compare גָּאָה to rise up] and גְּבוּהָ “high, exalted, proud”), and similar to how tree imagery can connote pride, as with “cedars” and “oaks” in Isa 2:13?⁴⁹ Note also אִשִּׁישׁ “man, adult” in 1QpHab VI, 11 and the ten (or more) times in 4Q502, what is labeled a “Ritual of Marriage.” In both texts the word occurs in the context of נַעֲרִים “youth,” and in 1QpHab in the context of זִקְנִים “elders” and נָשִׁים “women.” It is undeniable that this word indicates a human person in the DSS. But, the existence of the word in the MT does not seem as well established. A word graphically identical to the DSS word, אִשִּׁישִׁי, occurs in Isa 16:7; although HALOT defines it as the plural construct of the word “man,” the NRSV, JPS and others translate it with the more traditional “raisin cakes of.”

In still other cases, it is hard to know if a word with a clear Aramaic parallel should be considered an accidental slip of the scribe/writer or a reflection of a genuine Hebrew usage. In addition to some of the words listed above, note הַטְּלָלִים “the shadows” (4Q107 [4Qcant^b] at Song 2:17) for MT הַצֵּלָלִים כִּידָן “javelin” (e.g., 1QM V, 7); מוֹזָנִים “scales” (e.g., 4Q415 9, 11); מַתְקָל “stumbling” (4Q525 14 ii, 26).

ETYMOLOGICAL BASES

General features related to etymological bases and their variety in the DSS are brought up in the next few paragraphs. Further analysis of nouns and their bases are brought up in the following sections, especially as these relate to words containing a /u/ vowel: “Waw Marking /u/ Class Vowel in Nouns Where MT Has No /u/ Class Vowel” (§5.4) and “**quṭl* Nouns” (§5.5).

The DSS evidence nominal bases not present in the MT or only rarely found there, for example: פְּרוּשׁ “interpretation” (**qittūl*), כֹּל “all” (**qəṭāl*),

49. Note how the two words seem to occur in similar contexts: “the planting (מַטְעָה) of their trees is according to the level of the sun ... to the bough (פִּאָרָה) of honor” (1QH^a XVI, 22–23) vs. “for all times his majesty, his glory (פִּאָרָתוֹ), belongs to the eternal plantation (מַטְעָה)” (4Q418 81 + 81a, 13).

אלוהות “divinity” (**qitālūt*).⁵⁰ Additional examples of these nominal patterns proposed by different scholars include **qittūl*: גבול “creating” (1QS X, 25);⁵¹ גדול “greatness” (4Q427 7 i, 15), הגוי “meditation” (4Q417 1 i, 17),⁵² זמון “designation” (4Q371 7, 4); **qaṭāl*: זמן “time” (4Q282b 1, 2); words ending in *-ūt*: ארמלות “widowhood” (4Q176 8–11, 6), הכרות “look of” (1QIsa^a at Isa 3:9) for MT הַפְּרָת. It goes without saying that the identification of most of these forms is difficult and ambiguous, the etymology being determined in part through other Hebrew traditions (MT: זָמַן, פָּרַח; RH: פְּרוּשׁ, זָמַן, פְּרוּשׁ, זָמַן, פְּרוּשׁ) if not also Aramaic (זָמַן, פְּרוּשׁ).

In many cases, a word of one base pattern in the DSS corresponds to a word of the same root, but of a different base pattern in the MT. Many examples of this will be cited in the discussion of words that appear to have a **quṭl* base in the DSS, but a **qaṭl* or **qitl* base in the MT (see the discussion in §5.4, “Waw Marking /u/ Class Vowel in Nouns Where MT Has No /u/ Class Vowel”). In addition, there are cases of what is a **qitl* noun in the MT appearing as either a **qaṭil* noun or a **qaṭul* noun, like נגיעים “blemishes, plagues” (1QH^a XVI, 28) and נגועים (4Q422 III, 6) versus MT נְגַעִים.⁵³

Sometimes the differences between an MT and DSS word can be subtle, as in the example of the apparent gentilic ending on עוֹעִיִּים ‘*iw’iyim* “distortion” (1QIsa^a at Isa 19:14; 1QH^a XIV, 26; XV, 8) for MT עוֹעִיִּים.⁵⁴ In addition, as noted below, the word עילול “child” is found in the nonbiblical DSS more regularly (1QH^a XV, 24; 4Q169 3–4 iv, 2 and 4) than the corresponding MT words עֵלִיל/עֵלִיל “child” (e.g., 4Q385a 17a–e ii, 8).⁵⁵ Furthermore, one finds מבנית “structure” in the DSS (occurring at least twelve times in the nonbiblical scrolls), where one might have expected מבנה “structure” (occurring three times in the nonbiblical scrolls), בנין “structure” (once), or בניה “structure” (four times), which correspond respectively to MT מְבִנָּה,

50. Qimron, *HDSS*, 65–66 and idem, *Grammar*, 263 (**qaṭāl*), 267 (**qittūl*), 275 (**qatūt* and other forms with the *-ūt* ending). Note also nouns of the **qaṭilat* base, like משיחה “anointing” (1QM IX, 8 and 4Q375 1 i, 9) and רחיצה “washing” (4Q262 1, 3). On DSS nouns with **qittūl* and **qaṭilat* bases, see Moshe Bar-Asher, “Qumran Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew” (Hebrew), *Meghillot* 8–9 (2010): 299–310.

51. Kister, “Some Observations,” 157.

52. See Strugnell and Harrington, *DJD* 34:165.

53. For these examples, see Qimron, *HDSS*, 66.

54. See Kister, “Some Observations,” 161.

55. In the biblical scrolls, עילול occurs in 1QIsa^a at Isa 13:16, though עֵלִיל occurs in the other attestations (4Q56 [4QIsa^b] at Isa 13:16; 11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 137:9; note too Mur88 at Mic 2:9 and Nah 3:10).

בִּינָה, or בִּינָה. In other cases, the new word occurs in the DSS more rarely than the etymologically related words also found in the MT; thus, מְבִינָה “understanding” (occurring five times in the nonbiblical scrolls [four of which are in 4QInstruction: 4Q417 and 4Q418]), where one might expect בִּינָה “understanding” (in at least eighty clear cases among the nonbiblical scrolls) or תְּבוּנָה “understanding” (five times), which correspond to MT בִּינָה or תְּבוּנָה. The coexistence of so many synonyms sometimes seems to have led to confusion. Thus, in 4Q286 1 ii, 6 the scribe first wrote מְבִינָה, then erased the *mem* (this mistake may also have been caused by dittography, the preceding and following words being מְקוּר “source”).⁵⁶

The existence of *heh*-preformative nouns in the DSS is suggested by the word הִנָּף, “waving,” which occurs repeatedly in two calendrical texts, 4Q320 and 4Q321, as well as in 4Q513 3–4, 2 and 11Q19 XI, 10. In every case it is followed by the word “sheaf” (עוֹמֵר or עֹמֵר). The word presumably derives from the *hiphil* infinitive absolute of נוּף “to wave,” which, although it does not occur in the MT, is reminiscent of the infinitive construct in Lev 23:12 אֶת־הָעֹמֵר הִנִּיפְכֶם “your waving of the sheaf.” The consistent spelling of the DSS word without *mater* suggests an /e/ vowel after the *nun*, instead of an /i/ vowel, and thus understanding the word as derived from the infinitive absolute, not the construct, something also suggested by the vocalization of the word הִנָּף in RH, which according to Jastrow, refers to the waving ceremony on the second day of Passover. The synonym הִנִּיפָה in the phrase בְּיוֹם הַנִּיפַת הָעוֹמֵר “in the day of the waving of the sheaf” (11Q19 XVIII, 10) is best construed as an independent word, in this case, derived from the *hiphil* infinitive construct. Other cases of what seem to be nouns with a *heh*-preformative are best construed as infinitives construct used as nouns; examples of such infinitives are described

56. Note too possible confusion with מְבִינָה since תְּבוּנָה occurs three words before. In other cases the combination of the *min* preposition plus the word בִּינָה could conceivably be construed as the word מְבִינָה, as in 1QH^a XXIII, 12: [לְמַ]שְׂמִיעַ מְבִינָה “to declare to creature(s) his understanding,” instead of “to declare to creature(s) from his understanding.” That the latter translation is the intended meaning seems clear from the context of the Hodayot where understanding or knowledge is often the means through which something is done (as in 1QH^a VII, 25: וְאֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי ... (בְּבִינָתְךָ)). That some of this was intentional seems implied by the word play elsewhere among the scrolls, even in the way a common word like “children,” בְּנִים, can be “misread” as a plural participle, “those who know,” as seems reflected in ... וְעַתָּה מְבִין “Now, maven...” (4Q525 14 ii, 18, alluding to Prov 5:7) (see Kister, “Some Observations,” 158).

in “Verbs” (§5.6). The words **הקרב** “offering of” (in 11Q19 XLIII, 10) and **החרם** “the destruction” (1QM IX, 7) are listed by Qimron as independent *heh*-preformative words, but these have other possible explanations (e.g., a defective spelling of the *hiphil* infinitive construct and the definite form of the noun “destruction,” found in the MT **חָרַם**).⁵⁷

GENDER AND NUMBER

Some words that have a feminine form in the MT sometimes have a masculine form in the DSS, words like this being concentrated in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.⁵⁸ Thus, the word **ברך** corresponds to the word **ברכה** “blessing” in the other DSS and to **בִּרְכָה** in the MT; the masculine formed word occurs at least nine times in the scrolls of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q403, 4Q404, 4Q405). These nouns are more rarely found in other scrolls; note, for example, the masculine plural **מפלגיו** “its divisions” in 4Q405 23 i, 7 (compare MT **מִפְּלִגּוֹת** 2 Chr 35:12), as well as with different suffixes in 1QS (IV, 15 and 16), 1QM (X, 12), and 1QH^a (XVI, 22 and XX, 26); the singular occurs as **מפלג** in 4Q503 1–6 iii, 7 and 15–16, 11. By contrast, the occurrence of feminine by-forms to masculine nouns from the MT occurs regularly throughout the scrolls.⁵⁹ These generally correspond to feminine words or forms in RH: **לחה** “moisture” (e.g., 4Q274 3 ii, 5 and 4Q394 [4QMMT] 8 iv, 8 and *passim*; RH **לְחָה** versus MT **לֶחֶם**), **מטעת** “planting” (1QS VIII, 5 and *passim*; RH **מִטְעָת** versus MT **מִטְעָע**). At the same time, the masculine words corresponding to those in the MT also occur, sometimes with less frequency than the feminine words (e.g., **מטע** at least seven times in the nonbiblical scrolls versus **מטעת** at least eleven times; and **לח** at least three times in the nonbiblical scrolls versus **לחה** at least five times).

The actual gender of specific nouns is generally the same as it is in the MT. Even in cases where the gender of a noun varies in the MT, this variation is also usually found in the DSS. For example, **עצם** “bone” is identifiable as masculine and feminine in different passages in the MT and DSS (based on agreement with verb forms, adjectives, and pronouns); **רוח** “spirit” in both the MT and DSS is usually feminine and only sometimes

57. Qimron, *HDSS*, 107. The alternative interpretations are found, e.g., in Accordance.

58. Qimron, *HDSS*, 68–69.

59. *Ibid.*, 69.

masculine. In rare cases there is a slight discrepancy in the distribution; although דרך “path” is more often masculine in the MT, it seems to be more often feminine in the DSS.⁶⁰

The DSS sometimes attest to alternative plural forms not evidenced in the MT. Qimron cites the masculine plural form of רוּחַ “spirit,” which occurs only in the construct and with pronominal suffixes (רוּחֵי, רוּחָיו).⁶¹ Note also the plurals for the word “lip” ספּוֹת: שפּוּת (1QM V, 12), שפּוֹת (11Q8 [11QPs^d] at Ps 81:6), and שפּאוֹתֵיכָה (1QIsa^a at Isa 37:29).⁶²

Although in the preceding pages distinctions between the pronunciation/morphology in the DSS and that in the MT has been emphasized, it bears mentioning that the words in the DSS sometimes exhibit forms quite close to what we find in the MT. Interestingly, the spelling of certain DSS segholate nouns that contain *aleph* suggests a pronunciation and morphology akin to that found in the MT, even though this pronunciation/morphology is sometimes unexpected from an etymological point of view. Thus, we find חטא “sin” written חט in 11Q19 LVII, 10 and חטא in 11Q19 LXIV, 9, reflecting presumably a pronunciation like that in MT, חטא. Similarly, שׁו “emptiness” in 1QH^a XV, 37 reflects the pronunciation of MT שׁוּאָ and גַי “valley of” (4Q371 1a–b, 4 and passim) reflects MT גַיָּא. In addition, as I have already mentioned, the spelling of many other words in the DSS suggests similar correspondences with MT words: פתאים “simple” and פתאים; חטאתיכם “your sins” and חטאתיכם. Such examples should remind us that the forms of words in the DSS are not always terribly far from those in the MT.

5.4. WAW MARKING /U/ CLASS VOWEL IN NOUNS WHERE MT HAS NO /U/ CLASS VOWEL

Among the DSS, there are numerous instances of words that are attested (sometimes once, sometimes multiple times) with a *waw mater* where the

60. The feminine gender of the singular דרך is implied by a feminine verb (1QS VIII, 25; XI, 17; 1QH^a XII, 32), a pronoun (1QH^a XII, 19; 11Q19 LVI, 18), an accompanying numeral (4Q473 2, 3); only once is the plural feminine (4Q381 31, 3). The masculine gender of the singular is evidenced only when it is followed by a participle or asyndetic relative clause (1QH^a VII, 31; 11Q19 XXXI, 6); the plural appears as masculine with a following verb twice (1QS III, 6; 1QH^a XV, 34).

61. Qimron, *HDSS*, 67.

62. See the note on this word in “*Aleph < Waw and Waw < Aleph*” (§4.5).

corresponding MT word has no /o/ or /u/ class vowel. The reasons for such *waw maters* could be many. Some of the likelier phonetic and morphological causes that have been proposed include: (1) words from the same root, but with a different base pattern (e.g., a word has a **quṭl* pattern in the DSS and a **qatḷ* pattern in the MT); (2) assimilation to consonants, that is, the surrounding consonants cause an /i/ or /a/ vowel to be pronounced as an /o/ or /u/ vowel; (3) the preservation of a historical /u/ vowel that had shifted to /i/ in the MT tradition; (4) vowel assimilation. In addition, the *waw* may reflect an /ō/ vowel derived from a Proto-Semitic /ā/ (through the “Canaanite Shift” /ā/ > /ō/), the /ā/ in the corresponding MT word having been preserved in the Tiberian tradition often due to influence from Aramaic (in which language Proto-Semitic /ā/ does not shift to /ō/). It seems less likely, as explained in the section “/ā/ < /ā/ < Proto-Semitic /a/” (§4.9), that Proto-Semitic /a/ had universally shifted to /ā/ or /o/ in the Hebrew of the DSS. As should be apparent from the examples below, it is often difficult to be certain which of the causes to prefer in the case of individual words.

DIFFERENT BASES

Kutscher helpfully observes that a variation between **quṭl* and **qatḷ*/**qitḷ* bases is evidenced not only between the Tiberian and Babylonian vocalization traditions (e.g., Tiberian *ḥesed* versus Babylonian *ḥōsad*), but even within the MT (e.g., חֶסֶד “lack” versus חֶסֶד and סְבֵל “burden” versus סְבֵל).⁶³ That we should find this same variation between the Tiberian tradition and the DSS should not surprise us. The following words, drawn from Qimron’s lists in *HDSS*, appear to be of (or incorporate) the **quṭl* pattern, though the corresponding MT words are (or do) not: לוֹהַב “blade” (1QM V, 7 and passim) versus MT לְהַב (**qatḷ*); שְׁלֵהוֹבַת “blade” (1QM VI, 3) versus MT שְׁלֵהַבַּת (**šaqṭalt*); פּוֹתִי “simple” (1QSa I, 19 and passim) versus MT פְּתִי (**qatḷ*/**qitḷ*); תּוֹחַת “under” (1QS VII, 13) and תַּחוֹת (1QIsa^a at Isa 3:24 [twice]) versus MT תַּחַת (**qatḷ*); מוֹעֵל “treachery” (4Q270 6 iv, 18 and passim) versus MT מַעֵל (**qatḷ*); בּוֹרְכִים “knees” (4Q491 8–10 i, 4 and 1QIsa^a at Isa 45:23, 66:12) versus MT בְּרָךְ (**qitḷ*).⁶⁴ Additional exam-

63. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 460. He cites numerous other traditions that evidence a similar variation.

64. See Qimron, *HDSS*, 65, and Qimron’s lists of words where he implies by his vocalization that these nouns have a **quṭl* base (ibid., 98–115). He also lists with a

ples include the proper names **חופר** and **החופרי** (4Q27 [4QNum^b] at Num 26:32) for MT **חָפַר** and **הַחֲפָרִי**; **פּוּשְׁתִּים** “linen” (11Q2 [11QLev^b] at Lev 13:59) for MT **הַפְּשָׁתִּים**; **קוּשִׁי** “stubbornness” (1QS IV, 11; 1QM XIV, 7 and the parallel passage in 4Q491 8–10 i, 5), which corresponds to RH **קוּשִׁי** and the **qat̥l* base noun in the MT, **קָשִׁי**.⁶⁵ Examples of feminine-marked nouns spelled with a *waw* and thus presumably from a **quṭlat* base, though the corresponding MT words come from a **qitlat* (or other) base, include **רוּקְמָה** “embroidered work” (e.g., 1QM V, 6 and passim) versus MT **רִקְמָה**; **עוֹשְׂרוֹת** “tens (of soldiers)” (1QM II, 17 and passim) versus MT **עֲשָׂרֹת** (**qitalāt*); **תּוֹפְלָה** “unseemliness” (4Q230 1, 2 and 4Q525 14 ii, 28) versus MT **תִּפְלָה** (**qitlat*).

One might also include some examples from 1QIsa^a, though they only occur there, like **גּוֹפֵן** “vine” (at Isa 34:4) for MT **גִּפְּן** (**qat̥l*); **לוּחִי** “jaws of” (Isa 30:28) for MT **לֶחִי** (sing. **לְחִי**, **qat̥l*); **קוּבְרֶךְ** “your grave” (at Isa 14:19) for MT **קִבְרֶךָ**; **רוּגַע** “moment” (at Isa 54:7) for MT **רִגַע** (perhaps **qat̥l*); **שִׁבִי** “captivity” (at Isa 49:25) for MT **שְׁבִי** (**qat̥l*/**qit̥l*).⁶⁶ Kutscher also points to words from other bases that diverge from corresponding words in the MT, like **מוֹר** “bitter” (at Isa 38:15) for MT **מָר** (**qall*); **אוֹט** “gently” (at Isa 8:6) for MT **אָט** (**qall*);⁶⁷ **אִיקְדָּח** “jewel” (at Isa 54:12) for MT **אִקְדָּח**

question mark “arranging” **עוֹרֵךְ** in 1QM VII, 3, though this is parsed by Accordance as a *qal* participle; and also with a question mark “uncircumcision” **עָרוֹל** in 1QH^a X, 20. In other cases, the readings he follows are debated; he reads, e.g., **וּלְקוֹלֵיָהָמָה** and **וּלְקוֹלֵיָהָמָה** (4Q491 8–10 i, 9, though Baillet (DJD 7:21) and others (e.g., DSSSE) read **וּלְקוֹלֵיָהָמָה**); Qimron reads **פְּחוּז** “wantonness” in 4Q184 1, 2, though others read **פְּחִין** “traps” (Strugnell, “Notes en marge,” 264; DSSSE). The reverse relationship also exists. Words that are of the **quṭl* base in the MT appear to be of different bases in the DSS, as in MT **חֲמָר** versus **חָמַר** in 1QS XI, 22 and passim (presumably akin to RH **חֲמָר**).

65. Confusingly, 1QS VI, 26 and 4Q393 (4QMMT) 1 ii – 2, 4 attest the phrase **בְּקִשֵׁי עוֹרֵךְ** (partially preserved in 4QMMT), where the word **קִשֵׁי** might correspond to the MT **qat̥l* base noun (**קָשִׁי**), the **quṭl* base noun **קוּשִׁי** spelled defectively, or the adjective **קִשָּׁה** spelled with a final *yodh mater* instead of a *heh mater* (like the first word in the phrase **מַעֲנֵי לְשׁוֹן** 4Q171 3–10 iv, 27, which is in the singular; see §3.2, “Plene Orthography”). Given the well-known MT expression **עַם־קִשְׁוֵה־עֵרְוָה** (Exod 32:9 and passim), the last interpretation seems the likeliest.

66. According to Kutscher, the /o/ or /u/ vowel in **קוּבְרֶךְ** and **שִׁבִי** is due to a following *beth* or *resh* (Isaiah, 496–98). The /o/ or /u/ vowel presumed in **לוּחִי** is perhaps due to the preceding *lamedh*, though Kutscher sees the form as reflective of Aramaic influence where the cognate word is **לוּעֵ** (Isaiah, 250).

67. Though, one wonders if this is related to another word, **אוֹט**, which is found in 4QInstruction (4Q415 18, 2 and passim in that work).

(**aqṭal*); רוּנָה “cry” (at Isa 14:7 and passim) for MT רִנָּה (**qillat*);⁶⁸ as well as the proper name חֲזֻקִיָּה (at Isa 36:15 and passim) for MT חֲזֻקִיָּהוּ.⁶⁹

In general, the words that attest a *waw mater* (and that often appear to be of a **quṭl* or **qull* base) are found in DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts.⁷⁰ The corresponding words from DSS-NSP texts often are written in a manner akin to how they appear in the MT. However, it bears mentioning that within the DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts, there is not uniformity; a word like “simple” is sometimes spelled with a *waw* and sometimes without, even in the same scroll (פּוֹתָאִים in 1QH^a V, 13 and פּוֹתָאִים in 1QH^a X, 11); this word is found without a *mater* in many DSS-SP9 (1Q14, 4Q266) and DSS-SP1c (4Q169, 4Q424) texts. Since alternative forms of certain words appear in the MT within individual texts (see the examples cited below like מַחְמֹד versus מַחְמוֹד “treasure” in Lamentations), I assume that alternative spellings in the DSS also reflect different pronunciations for the same basic word. The defective spelling in DSS-NSP texts reflects the lack of a /u/ or /o/ vowel, something inferred from the *plene* spelling of **quṭl* nouns in this same group of texts.

In the DSS, words with **maqṭal* bases seem to have variants with **maqṭul* or **maqṭāl* bases. Such variation is also found in the MT (e.g., מְבַחֵר “choice” in Isa 37:24 versus מְבַחֹר “choice” in the parallel to this verse at 2 Kgs 19:23).⁷¹ Examples from the DSS include: מַחְמוֹדֵינוּ “our desirable (places)” (1QIsa^a at Isa 64:10) for MT מַחְמֵדֵינוּ;⁷² מַשְׁלוֹחַ “act (lit.,

68. Kutscher notes, however, that it is not uncommon for words with a masculine **qull* base to have a semantically similar feminine form of the **qillat* type, the /i/ vowel being due to attenuation or dissimilation; he lists the examples of אִמְרָה and אִמְרָה, בָּץ and אִמְרָה, זִקְנָה and זִקְנָה, יִשְׂרָה and יִשְׂרָה (*Isaiah*, 458). Since the root רִנָּה attests a **qull* base noun רִנָּה in the MT, it is conceivable that the more etymologically true form of the feminine is actually preserved in 1QIsa^a as רוּנָה.

69. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 477–78. He notes that some examples, like נוֹגַע in Isa 53:8 for MT נוֹגַע might be due to different words, e.g., a participle. Another example of what seems to be a different word is צוֹר (in 1QIsa^a at Isa 5:28) for MT צָר.

70. For instance, פּוֹתָאִים appears only in DSS-SP9 (1QSa, 1QH^a, 4Q418, 4Q301, 11Q5) and DSS-SP1c texts (4Q439).

71. In the MT, note also מַחְמֹד “treasure” (twelve times, at least two of which are in Lamentations [1:10, 2:4]) vs. מַחְמוֹד “treasure” (at least once in Lamentations [1:7]); מִשְׁקָל “weight” (many times, twice in Ezekiel [4:16, 5:1]) vs. מִשְׁקוֹל “weight” (once in Ezekiel [1:7]), מְבַלְּל “perfection” (once in Proverbs) vs. מְבַלְּלוֹ “perfection” (twice in Ezekiel).

72. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 378.

outstretching of [hand])” (1QM I, 1; 4Q260 I, 1; 4Q418 87, 13; 89, 2; 159 i, 5) though elsewhere משלח appears (1QS IX, 23; X, 13; 4Q403 1 i, 36); ממוד “post, standing” (4Q266 10 i, 12) appears for *מעמוד, which is presumably equivalent to MT מעמדם; מסחורכה “your merchandise” (4Q418 103 ii, 6 and three other times in the same scroll) for what would be (without suffix) in the MT *מסחר; מדרוך “space” (4Q223–224 1 i, 2) appears in an apparent allusion to Deut 2:5, where the MT has the construct form מדרך;⁷³ as well as the geminate noun משוסה “plunder” (11Q19 LIX, 8 and 1QIsa^a at Isa 42:22) for MT משטה. Note also the possible variation between *muqtal and *muqtāl bases in מרדוף “chase” (1QM IX, 6) and מרדף (1QM III, 2, 9; VII, 13), presumably equivalent to the MT hapax מרדף, unless the MT form is to be construed as an error and מרדוף/מרדף in 1QM should be considered as another example of the variation between *maqtal and *maqṭul/*maqṭāl bases. In some cases, the variants in the MT (משלוח/משלח) have slightly different meanings, according to the dictionaries (“act, undertaking” for משלח versus “contribution, jurisdiction” for משלוח), though the corresponding variants in the DSS do not seem to have different meanings (משלוח/משלח both usually followed by “hand” [כף/יד] = “act”).

ASSIMILATION TO CONSONANTS

The development of an /o/ or /u/ vowel might have been triggered by surrounding consonants. Kutscher lists instances from 1QIsa^a in which he believes a following bilabial (/b/, /m/, /p/) or *resh* causes the shift from an /i/, /e/, or /a/ vowel to an /o/ or /u/ vowel. In addition to the nouns, קוברך, רוגע, שיבי, listed above as examples of different nominal bases, note שובנא “Shebna” (at Isa 36:3, 11 [with interlinear *waw*], 22, 37:2) for MT שבנא; מהורסיד “those tearing you down” (at Isa 49:17) for MT מהרסיד, *piel* participle from הרס; כורכבות “camels” (at Isa 66:20) for MT כרכבות; and the place name הוררט (at Isa 37:38) for MT אררט.⁷⁴ Other possible examples

73. Note the spelling without a *mater* in 4Q392 2, 4: מדרך.

74. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 496. He lists other words more tentatively, like הנומה at Isa 41:27 for MT הנם (*hinnē* + 3mp suffix). He also lists as a single possible example of a preceding bilabial affecting the following vowel מיכמר at Isa 51:20 for MT מכמר, though he notes the LXX reads the Hebrew as a *hophal* participle (ibid., 478). See also Kutscher’s discussion of ניכחה (at Isa 57:2) for MT נכחה (ibid., 476). Note a second occurrence of הוררט in 4Q252 I, 10.

are **משואם** *miššōm* “from there” (6Q4 [6QpapKgs] at 2 Kgs 7:8) for MT **מִשָּׁם**; **זלעפופות** “rages” (1QH^a XIII, 32 and 4Q501 1, 6 for what would be in the MT **זִלְעָפוֹת**); **חורטומים** “magicians” (4Q365 2, 3 for what would be in the MT **חֲרָטְמִים**).⁷⁵ A similar shift is evidenced in the MT with a preceding or following guttural or *qoph*.⁷⁶

Qimron suggests that this shift is triggered not only by the bilabials and *resh*, but also by *lamedh* and *nun*.⁷⁷ As he mentions, most of the examples are ambiguous and allow for varying explanations.⁷⁸ He lists words that have a *waw mater* where a *qamets* appears in the MT. The best examples are the words **אגנות** “bowls,” (4Q158 4, 5), rather than as in the MT **אֲגָנוֹת**;⁷⁹ and **חנום** “for nothing” (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 119:161) for MT **חָנָם**.⁸⁰ More uncertain is the supposed 3mp pronominal suffix spelled **ום**- for what would be in the MT **ם**- in several words. In the end, I think it is unlikely that these should be interpreted as 3mp suffixes. For example, the suffix on “spirit” **רוחום** (1QS IX, 14) is parsed (I think correctly) as 3ms by Accordance (the *mem* being a 3mp pronoun added as a correction); this

75. It is less likely that the letters **משואם** might represent “their burden” *massāwām* for what would be in the MT ***משָׂאָם** (as in Num 4:27); in the context, such a reading would lead to the translation: “they bore their burden” or “they uttered their oracle.”

76. GKC (§10h) list all kinds of words from the MT where *hatef-qamets* appears before (and sometimes after) a guttural or an emphatic consonant (especially *qoph*), **אֲשָׁקוּטָה** (Isa 18:4), even in places that never exhibited an etymological /u/ vowel, **לְקַחָהּ** (Gen 2:23); **הַחֲדֹלְתִי** (Jud 9:9, 11, 13); **נִבְהֵל** (Prov 28:22); **אֲלִקְטָהּ** (Ruth 2:2). See *HGhS*, 208t, which lists **אֲשָׁקָהּ** (1 Kgs 19:20) and **אֲפִשְׁעָהּ** (Isa 27:4) though these are not attested in the Leningrad Codex, as well as *HGhS*, 357v, which lists **יְתַאָּרְהוּ** (Isa 44:13). See also Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 1:126. Other possible examples have other explanations, like **נִגְאָלוּ** (Isa 59:3 and Lam 4:14), which might be attributable to a confusion between *pual* and *niphal* stems (see *HGhS*, 356v). Furthermore, Bauer and Leander (*HGhS*, 211j) note that after the consonants /m/, /n/, /l/, /r/, the sibilants (/z/, /ʒ/, /s/, /š/), and /q/ a vocal shewa is sometimes found where one would expect a silent shewa (e.g., **הַצְפִּינוּ** [Exod 2:3]); rarely the simple shewa is replaced by a *hatef-qamets* (**לְקַחָהּ** [Gen 2:23]).

77. Qimron, *HDSS*, 40.

78. *Ibid.* and the references cited there.

79. Alternatively, the spelling in the DSS could reflect a different base; cf. Arabic *ʾijjānat* (*HALOT*).

80. Though here one wonders if the DSS spelling is affected by the alternative adverbial ending *-ōm*, found on MT words like **הָלָם** and **עִירָם**. Note also **שומה** “destruction” (11Q19 LIX, 4 = MT **שָׂמָה**); **חורגול** “cricket” (11Q19 XLVIII, 3 = MT **חֲרָגָל**); **יורדן**; **יורדן** “Jordan” (4Q379 12, 6 = MT **יַרְדֵּן**) (Qimron, *HDSS*, 39).

parallels the more obvious רצונו “his will” in the next line. In addition, the parsing as a 3ms suffix matches Qimron’s own understanding of the same form רוחו “his spirit” earlier in the same text (1QS V, 21).⁸¹ Perhaps a better example is provided by לדברים “to speak them” (4Q267 9 v, 12) where the parallel term in the next line is [כ]משפטם “[according] to their rule” and the corresponding CD text has לדברים (CD A, XIV, 8). Even here, however, there is the possibility that this is a mistake on the part of the corrector (as though the corrector thought it should read “for *him* to speak” and did not supply cancellation dots or marks around the *mem*).⁸²

Other examples are also ambiguous. The word עולם (1QH^a XIX, 30 for what would be in the MT עולם “forever”) may be due to dittography, since the word that immediately precedes it is שלום; note the similar case of dittography between adjacent words: זהב טהור (4Q365a 2 ii, 7) for *זהב טהור “pure gold.”⁸³

In other examples in which a *waw* appears where the corresponding Tiberian word has a *patach* or *qamets*, the bilabial or *nun* occurs before the relevant vowel: “the nettle” הסרפוד (1QIsa^a at Isa 55:13) for MT הסרפד; and the names “Ephah” עיפו and “Sheba” שבאו (both in 1QIsa^a at Isa 60:6) for MT עיפה and שבא;⁸⁴ as well as תמנו (4Q522 9 i + 10, 13) for MT תמנה.

Examples where Proto-Semitic /a/ seems to have developed into a /u/ class vowel before an etymological *aleph* are perhaps due to a similar shift, or due to other causes. The words נו “raw” in 4Q11 (4QpaleoGen-Exod¹) at Exod 12:9 (= MT נא) and תו “chamber” (4Q365a 2 i, 10, twice) (= MT תא) perhaps developed as hypercorrect pronunciations in analogy to the negative particle לא, as if the scribes assumed that since the negative particle was written לא (*lā*) in Aramaic and לו (*lō*) in Hebrew, then, נא (*nā*) should be pronounced *nō* and תא (*tā*) should be changed *tō*.⁸⁵ Cases

81. Ibid., 27. Furthermore, the word בבואים (1QSa I, 4) is read בבואים (as a mistake for בבואם) by DSSSE and Accordance. The remaining example with the 3mp pronoun that Qimron lists is הונום (1QS V, 20) corrected to הונם, though the erased *waw* is hard to perceive in the photograph (see James H. Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Rule of the Community: Photographic Multi-Language Edition* [Philadelphia: American Interfaith Institute, 1996]).

82. Note the corrector’s imprecision in correcting another word in the same line: ההגיגי for *ההגיגי.

83. See “Scribal Mistakes” (§3.1).

84. Kutscher suggests possible influence from Nabatean where a *waw* often follows Arabic names (*Isaiah*, 123).

85. The word “chamber” is written also תא (4Q365a 3, 5), תאו (11Q19 XXXVIII,

like the construct plural רואשי (1QSa I, 14), ראשי (4Q286 17a, 2) and the plural with suffix רואשיהמה (1QIsa^a at Isa 51:11 for MT ראשם), for what would ordinarily be in the MT, respectively, ראשי and ראשיהם, are presumably attributable to the influence of the vowel of the singular form, as seems likely to be the case in the MT at Isa 15:2 ראשיו.⁸⁶

Given the ambiguity of most of the examples, one hesitates to say with certainty whether or not the sound shift /a/ > /o/ (or /u/) in the vicinity of bilabials, *lamedh*, *nun*, *resh* really affected specific words. Nevertheless, it should be recognized that a similar phenomenon affects /a/ vowels in Aramaic of various kinds, in Rabbinic Hebrew, and even in the Palestinian pronunciation evidenced by Jerome.⁸⁷ As explained in the section “/ā/ < /ā/ < Proto-Semitic /a/” (§4.9), it seems less likely that all /a/ vowels had shifted to /ā/ or /o/. It is preferable to isolate such a shift to the environment of bilabials and /l/, /n/, and /r/.

The examples that Qimron cites and those from the above paragraphs are from DSS-SP9 texts, with two exceptions (4Q379, 4Q381 = DSS-NSP texts). This implies that if /a/ vowels did indeed shift in some phonetic contexts, this was a feature isolated primarily to some of these texts and the dialect(s) of their scribes.

PRESERVATION OF A HISTORICAL /U/ VOWEL

Kutscher notes also that the expected development of /u/ > /i/ did not take place in some words from 1QIsa^a of the **quṭṭūl* base pattern (perhaps,

15, twice; XL, 10), and in the plural תאים (11Q19 XXXVIII, 15). Alternatively, these are words with different bases: נ נāw (akin to ראשי/ש šāw; the root is נא, according to HALOT); תו tāw (note Aramaic תנא in Tg. Ezek 40:7; תנא in 40:12). Qimron suggests תא/תו represents ta^wu or something similar, from an earlier diphthong au (HDSS, 34). In a more recent article, he suggests that the word may be derived from a root תאי (Elisha Qimron, “Studies in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls” [Hebrew], *Hebrew Linguistics* 33–35 [1992]: 83; this is the English title offered in the English contents page, though the actual Hebrew title to the article might be translated: “Accentuation in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls”). Conceivably too the defective spelling תאן “its chambers” four times in the MT of Ezekiel has influenced the spelling in the scrolls.

86. Qimron, *Grammar*, 257 n. 45. Contrast these with יומי “days of” in 1QS II, 19; III, 5; ימי (1QIsa^a at Isa 38:10) for an intended ימי; and בימי “in days of” (1QIsa^a at Isa 1:1), which likely reflect Aramaic influence (see Abegg, “Linguistic Profile,” 41).

87. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 496–97, and the references he cites. There is little evidence for historical /i/ vowels developing into /u/ or /o/ vowels.

quṭṭāl*). Words of this base shifted to **qittūl* in the Tiberian tradition, as in עזוז “strong” and למוד “taught.”⁸⁸ In 1QIsa^a, the /u/ is retained in only four words: עוזוז (at Isa 43:17) for MT עוזוז; גודפים (at Isa 43:28) for MT גודפים “revilings”; רוקחיד (at Isa 57:9) for MT רִקְחִיד “your perfumes”; קובציד (at Isa 57:13) for MT קבוֹצִיד “your collections”; in other cases, the orthography presumes a pronunciation parallel to that of the Tiberian tradition: שלומים “vengeance” (at Isa 34:8), as well as five others.⁸⁹ The only other possible example I am aware of is עוברתמה “their pregnancy” (4Q418 211, 3).⁹⁰ In all likelihood the preservation (or secondary development) of a /u/ vowel in **quṭṭūl*/quṭṭāl* base patterns is primarily a feature of 1QIsa^a. Alternatively, these examples might be explained as due to vowel assimilation.

VOWEL ASSIMILATION

A /u/ vowel is sometimes responsible for the appearance of another /u/ class vowel where none existed before. This might be a contributing factor in the MT form לקחה “was taken” (Gen 2:23) from an earlier **luqahā*, as well as in סבלו “his burden” (Isa 9:3 and passim), a **quṭl* base noun, from an earlier **sublō*.⁹¹ The same tendency is evidenced in *hophal* forms of I-guttural roots: החרבה “it is laid waste” (Ezek 26:2, in pause), יחרם “will be forfeited” (Ezra 10:8), מאַחזים “fastened” (2 Chr 9:18), as well as in certain spellings of names in the LXX בעז = Βοοζ and מלך = Μολοχ. In these cases, it is an initial /u/ or /o/ vowel that occasions the appearance in the

88. See *HGhS*, 480–81.

89. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 475. Kutscher (*Isaiah*, 474, 477) also suggests that the *waw* in the word “desert” ישומון in 1QIsa^a at Isa 43:19, 20 (MT ישׁימון) may reflect a similar shift, as may the *waw* in “cry” רונה at Isa 14:7 (MT רנה), and eight other times. The word “desert” is spelled in its only other occurrence with a *yodh* in 4Q88 (4QP^s^f) at Ps 107:4, and “cry” is otherwise written defectively with no *mater* (see the discussion of this word in the subsection “Different Bases” [§5.4]). Kutscher also mentions other examples, like שולח for MT שלח, though the etymologies of these words are less clear evidence for this phenomenon since their etymologies are more obscure.

90. Strugnell and Harrington, *DJD* 34:430–31. The corresponding word in RH is masculine, עבור. The words listed in Qimron’s *Grammar* under this base (**quṭṭūl*) do not occur with the *waw* after the initial consonant; for example, גדון is found in four passages among the nonbiblical scrolls.

91. See *GKC* §10h for further examples, though some of these, like וסעדה (1 Kgs 13:7), are not found in the Leningrad Codex.

next syllable of another (nonetymological) /u/ or /o/ vowel. Usually a guttural separates both vowels, but not always. That something similar takes place in words from the DSS seems likely. For example, in **quṭl* base nouns one sometimes encounters a *waw mater* between the second and third radicals in construct forms, as in **ישור** “uprightness of” in 1QS XI, 2 for what would be in the MT **ישׁר**. As explained below in “**quṭl* Nouns” (§5.5), the assumption for these kinds of nouns is of a development through epenthesis *quṭl* > *qoṭl* > *qōṭol*.

In other cases, a /u/ class vowel appears in the DSS where the MT vowel is shewa and the following vowel is a /u/ class vowel. Such a development is found in certain MT Hebrew forms which contained an initial etymological /u/ vowel (e.g., **קָרַבְבְּכֶם** “[as] you approach” [Deut 20:2] from **qurbukumū* or **qurubkumū*); as well as in noun and verbal forms where the initial /u/ class vowel is clearly not etymological: **יְחַנֵּךְ** “he will favor you” (Gen 43:29, Isa 30:19; versus **יְחַנֵּךְ** in Num 6:25 which is closer to the etymological *yaḥunnakā*).⁹² Qimron has noted some examples of DSS nouns of the **quṭulat* base where, although the etymological first /u/ was lost, another /u/ class vowel in this initial syllable emerged due to the presence of a guttural followed by a /u/ class vowel: **אוּחזת** “possession of” (1QS XI, 7); **כוהנו[ת]** “priesthoods” (4Q400 1 ii, 19); **כוהנתנו** “our priesthood” (4Q400 2, 6); **בפיעלת** “deeds of” (4Q426 1 ii, 4); **פועלתי** “my work” (1QIsa^a at Isa 49:4); **פועלתם** “their work” (1QIsa^a at Isa 65:7), corresponding respectively to the MT nouns **אֲחֻזָּה**, **כְּהֹנָה**, **כְּהֹנֵי**.⁹³ The development might be characterized as **pu‘ulā* > **pə‘ulā* > **pə‘ullā* > *pu‘ullā*. One reason that these are best interpreted as reflecting the secondary development of another /u/ class vowel and not the misplacement of a *mater* due to the quiescence of the middle guttural consonant (that is, **pə‘ullā* > **pullā*) is that such displacement of the *mater* is extremely rare and restricted to places where there is no preceding vowel, even in cases where the guttural is *aleph* and the preceding vowel shewa.⁹⁴ The development of a secondary /u/ class vowel seems to be concentrated in DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts.

92. Note also LXX Σόδομα for **סְדֹם** and Σολομών for **שְׁלֹמֹה**.

93. Qimron, “Work Concerning Divine Providence,” 199. Alternatively, it may be that these words in the DSS derive from a different base, e.g., **quṭlat*.

94. See “Digraphs” (§3.5).

CANAANITE SHIFT: /ā/ > /ō/

DSS words occasionally attest the Canaanite Shift (/ā/ > /ō/) where the MT does not. This is possibly the case for the word רחמן “merciful” (4Q381 10–11, 3 and 47, 1 instead of MT רַחֲמָנִי), though the vowel represented by the *waw* may also be explained as due to the *nun*.⁹⁵ Note three other examples perhaps reflecting the same Canaanite Shift: אנושי “men of” (1QSa I, 2 and passim, and 1QH^a XXII, 27) for what would be in the MT presumably אַנְשֵׁי;⁹⁶ שבועי “weeks of” (4Q403 1 i, 27 and passim in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice) for what might be in the MT שְׁבוּעַי;⁹⁷ and אבירום

95. The Biblical Hebrew word is probably an Aramaic loanword. There are very few other words in Biblical Hebrew that attest this /-ān/, whereas most have /-ōn/ (see *HGS*, 498–500).

96. The plural for “man” in the MT (אִישׁ) is typically אִנְשֵׁים in the absolute, which is probably connected to the Aramaic word for “man,” vocalized in Biblical Aramaic in the MT אִנְשָׁא in the singular and אִנְשָׁאִים in the plural (in which case the final *mem* is due to Hebrew influence), and vocalized in Syriac *nāšā* in the singular and *nāšīn* in the plural (in both cases the *aleph* is silent). I.e., the plural form of “man” in Hebrew is perhaps borrowed from Aramaic where the Proto-Semitic /ā/ vowel has not shifted to /ō/ (through the Canaanite Shift). Hebrew, of course, preserves its own word from Proto-Semitic **unāš*, אִנְשָׁא, which, however, does not have an explicitly marked plural form. Qimron’s assertions that the word in question should be read אִנְשֵׁי in the DSS is not followed by most editions (see Qimron, *HDSS*, 66; idem, “Waw and Yod,” 106; versus *DSSSE*, Accordance, Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck [“Rule of the Congregation,” 110], and Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom [DJD 40:274]). Stegemann and Schuller assert that the word in question is not the plural of Hebrew אִנְשָׁא, but a by-form of the plural construct of “man,” אִנְשֵׁי, which is rendered in Job 34:10 (in the MT) אִנְשֵׁי (Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:274). One suspects in 1QS and 1QH^a a phonetic play with the passive participle אִנְשָׁא “sickened,” which also appears in 1QS VII, 12 and 1QH^a XIII, 30 and XVI, 29, among other places.

97. The construct form of the masculine plural form does not occur in the MT, but both the masculine and feminine absolute forms occur with a *qamets*, שְׁבֻעַת, שְׁבֻעֵים, as does a suffixed feminine plural form, שְׁבֻעַתְכֶם. That these contain examples of what was perceived to be an etymological Proto-Semitic /ā/ is suggested by the fact that this *qamets* does not reduce in the MT in the plural forms as well as by the Aramaic cognate in the plural: שְׁבוּעֵין and שְׁבוּעֵיא (see Jastrow, s.v.). This is most likely not a true etymological /ā/, but one that developed to distinguish the word “weeks” from the word “oath,” which in Hebrew (and Aramaic) has an initial shewa: sing. שְׁבֻעָה, pl. שְׁבֻעֹת; Aram. sing. שְׁבוּעָה. Alternatively, as Newsom observes, the first *waw* of שְׁבוּעֵי might represent the assimilation of the following /u/ vowel (DJD 11:266). Still another possibility is the emergence of an /o/ or /u/ vowel due to the influence of the following *beth*.

(4Q27 [4QNum^b] at Num 16:1) for MT אַבִּירִים “Abiram.” By contrast, some words that appear to have an /ō/ vowel from the Canaanite Shift in the MT are rendered without a *waw mater* in the DSS and, thus, presuppose a possible retention of the Proto-Semitic /ā/ or influence from Aramaic, as in כִּידִן “javelin” (attested five times only in 1QM) versus MT כִּידוֹן (written *plene* seven times and defective once).⁹⁸

There are many other proper nouns that exhibit a *waw mater* in 1QIsa^a which can be explained by one or more of the above phonetic phenomena, if not by still other causes. The names include סוּדָם (at Isa 1:9 and passim) for MT סוּדָם; רוּמְלִיָּהוּ (at Isa 7:1 and passim) for MT רִמְלִיָּהוּ; הַשּׁוֹלַח (at Isa 8:6) for MT הַשְּׁלַח; עוֹרְעָרוּ (at Isa 17:2) for MT עֲרֵעֵר; תּוֹרְתָן (at Isa 20:1) for MT תִּרְתָּן; דּוּדָנִים (at Isa 21:13) for MT דִּדְנִים; קוֹר (at Isa 22:6) for MT קִיר; אַרְוֹאֵל (at Isa 29:1) for MT אַרְיֵאֵל; שְׂרָאוּצֵר (at Isa 37:38) for MT שְׂרָאֲצָר; אֶסְר־חֲדָן (at Isa 37:38) for MT אֶסְר־חֲדָן.⁹⁹ Additional examples are וְתוֹרְצָה (4Q27 [4QNum^b] at Num 27:1) for MT וְתִרְצָה and הָעוֹדוֹן [לְמִי] (4Q364 9a–b, 10) for MT הָעֲדֻלְמִי. In relation to these names, note the similar examples of names with /u/ and /o/ vowels in the LXX where the MT has a muttered vowel or *patach* (and no etymological /u/ and /o/ vowel): Ὁχοζίας for אֲחֻזִּיָּהּ, Ὀρνα for אֲרֻנָּן, Γοδολίας for גְּדֻלִּיָּהּ, Μοολι for מִחְלִי, Μερόβ for מְרַב, Ὀδολλαμίτου for הָעֲדֻלְמִי, Γοθολία for עֲתֻלִּיָּהּ, Σοφονίας for צַפְנִיָּהּ, Τοχός for תַּחַשׁ, and θολμαί/ for תַּלְמִי.¹⁰⁰

5.5. *QUTL NOUNS

As Kutscher describes in relation to 1QIsa^a, **qutl* base nouns (like MT קִדְשׁ “holiness, sanctuary”) may appear in one of three orthographic forms in the DSS: (1) as they typically do in the MT, either defective קטל or *plene* קוטל; (2) as they typically do in Biblical Aramaic, with a *waw mater* after the second root consonant קטול (e.g., Biblical Aramaic קשׁט); (3) with a *waw mater* after the first and second root consonants קוטול.¹⁰¹ He writes that these forms presume three possible pronunciations, *qoʔel*, *qoʔol*, and *qoʔol*, though the last one, he feels, is perhaps the more common, his opin-

98. See Qimron, *Grammar*, 47–48.

99. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 96–122.

100. Clemens Könnecke, *Die Behandlung der hebräischen Namen in der Septuaginta* (Programm des Koeniglichen und Groening'schen Gymnasiums zu Stargard in Pommern 124; Stargard: Gymnasium, 1885), 20, 25.

101. Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 502. On the Aramaic forms, see *ibid.*, 201–3.

ion being informed by transliterations of names in the LXX, like *Μολοχ* for MT מִלֹּחַ (as in 2 Kgs 23:10).¹⁰² Qimron seems more confident that this type of noun was consistently pronounced *qotol* in the absolute and *qōṭol* in the construct; the slightly different pronunciation for the construct is based on his observation that absolute nouns only exhibit the קוטל pattern, while construct nouns are spelled in all three ways.¹⁰³

Although I think Qimron's thesis is right (even for the writing/reading register of the scribes and writers), the evidence is not as transparent as one might initially think. First, in many cases, the nouns that are listed by him as being **quṭl* nouns with a *waw mater* after the second radical may, in fact, not be **quṭl* nouns. For example, Qimron notes that there are six examples of the **quṭl* noun גְּדֹל "greatness" spelled גדול in the construct state.¹⁰⁴ He does not list the exact passages, but one of them surely is in 1QH^a VI, 34 where we find the phrase כגדול כוחך "according to the greatness of your strength."¹⁰⁵ Due to the orthography, however, one might understand the first word as the adjective גְּדוֹל "great" used as a substantive, similar to its use in Exod 15:16: בְּגִדְלֵי זְרוּעֶיךָ "by the power of your arm."¹⁰⁶ Since this seems to be the only time in the MT that גְּדוֹל is used in this particular way, perhaps we should consider such a usage in the DSS unlikely.¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, several factors might encourage the reading of the letters as the adjective in 1QH^a VI, 34. First, the passage from Exodus must have been known to the writers of the DSS and could have influenced their use of the adjective. Second, the consonants גדול seem to suggest a similar abstract meaning in another Hodayot text from Cave 4, הָבוּ גְדוֹל לְאֱלֹהֵינוּ "ascribe greatness to our God" (4Q427 7 i, 15).¹⁰⁸ Third, the word

102. Ibid., 502.

103. Qimron, *HDSS*, 37.

104. Ibid., 38.

105. Indeed, the first word is parsed according to Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom as the abstract noun (גְּדֹל) in construct (DJD 40:338).

106. This is the understanding of the word גדול in 1QH^a VI, 34 as reflected in the *Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance* (see 1:171, listed under 1QH^a VI, 23).

107. Qimron seems to imply that such forms as גְּדֹל in Exod 15:16 are also examples of this same phenomenon, that is, the construct state of an abstract noun (in the case of Exod 15:16, גְּדֹל). He writes "This kind of differentiation of the construct state from the absolute ... is attested in the Tiberian tradition as well, e.g., ... קִדְשׁ / קִדְשׁ" (*HDSS*, 37). Nevertheless, as far as I know, in the MT קִדְשׁ is usually parsed as the construct form of the adjective קִדְוֶשׁ, not the noun קִדְשׁ.

108. The word in 4Q427 is interpreted as the abstract noun גְּדוֹל by Schuller (DJD

גדול occurs as an adjective in construct with an abstract noun at the end of the very same line, in the phrase “(the Lord) ... full of mercies” (1QH^a VI, 34-35).¹⁰⁹ It seems conceivable, at the least, that the writers and scribes of 1QH^a had the adjective in mind in the phrase כגדול כוחך and perhaps also in similar phrases.

Analogous ambiguities exist with other words. Sometimes the morphological ambiguity is connected to a question of orthography. For example, in 1QS IV, 11, a word for “heaviness” is transliterated either as כובוד or כיבוד.¹¹⁰ Do the letters reflect a **quṭl* noun כבֹּד or a **qittūl* noun כִּיבּוּד (like that found in RH)?¹¹¹

Nevertheless, the rare instances of nouns with two *waw* *mater*s make explicit that words of the **quṭl* base pattern at least sometimes have an epenthetic /u/ class vowel, in addition to the /u/ class vowel they usually carry. Qimron’s proposal for the pronunciation of the absolute/construct as *qoṭol/qōṭol* (at least for some scribes and writers of the DSS-SP9 texts) seems very sensible.

The nouns easiest to interpret as **quṭl* nouns (in construct) with a *waw mater* between second and third radicals are: אמוץ “strength of” (1QM XIV, 7; 1QH^a X,10); ארוך “length of” (1QM VI, 15; 4Q416 2 iii, 19); חזוק “strength of” (1QS X, 26; 1QM XIV, 6; 1QH^a X, 9; XVI, 36); חסור “lack

29:104), though the corresponding word in RH (גִּדּוּל) has a different connotation (Jastrow: “rearing, growth”). Note also that it is conceivable that phrases from the Bible like גִּדּוּל-כֶּחַ in Nah 1:3 influenced the writer of 1QH^a; in this biblical text the adjective is used as a substantive referring to God, “one great (in) power,” though such a usage does not seem likely for the passage from 1QH^a.

109. This expression is similar to גִּדּוּל-כֶּחַ in Nah 1:3, cited in the preceding footnote, and וּגְדַל-חֶסֶד “one (i.e., God) full of mercy” in Ps 145:8.

110. See, e.g., Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 81 and Henoah Yalon, *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Philological Essays* (Hebrew; Jerusalem: Shrine of the Book and Kiryat Sepher, 1971), 73.

111. The difficulty of interpreting this word is still reflected in contemporary resources. As with גדול in 1QH^a VI, 34, the *Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance* parses as the adjective (כבוד) (as do Qimron and Charlesworth, “Rule of the Community,” 16), while Accordance reads it as the RH noun (כיבוד). The latter noun is not found in other DSS in an unbroken context (cf. [כי]בוד in 4Q487 24, 20) and this reading is further complicated by the fact that the initial /i/ vowel in these kinds of words is almost never written with a *mater* in the DSS (though, see HazGab 24 and Bar-Asher’s comment on קִיטוּט [“*Vision of Gabriel*,” 509–15]). A similar problem exists with חזוק “strength” (1QS X, 26 and passim) since there also occurs a RH word חִיזוּק. The easiest interpretation of the word in 1QS IV, 11 is as כבֹּד, as Kutscher suggests (*Isaiah*, 502).

of” (11Q19 LIX, 3); ישור “uprightness of” (1QS XI, 2); כבוד “heaviness of” (4Q169 3–4 ii, 4, but not 1QIsa^a at 21:15 where the word could easily be interpreted as “glory of”); כפור “ransom of” (4Q414 8, 4); להוב “blade (of)” (1QH^a X, 28; XI, 31; 4Q169 3–4 ii, 3); עצום “might of” (1QM XI, 5); ערול “uncircumcised of” (1QH^a X, 20); קדוש “holiness of” (4Q418 81 + 81a, 4); קצור “shortness of” (1QS IV, 10); רחוב “breadth (of)” (1QS IV, 9; 1QH^a XVII, 27; 4Q365 12b iii, 9; 4Q487 15, 3; 11Q19 XXXVIII, 12); שחוד “bribe” (1QIsa^a at Isa 5:23, 33:15); שפול “lowness of” (1QS IV, 9); תחות “under” (1QIsa^a at Isa 3:24).¹¹² Those examples where two *waw* *maters* appear include אוהיל “tent of” (1QIsa^a at Isa 16:5); ישור “uprightness of” (1QH^a XIV, 13, following Qimron); כובוד “heaviness of” (1QS IV, 11); פועל “work of” (1QIsa^a at Isa 59:6); שוחוד “bribe” (1QIsa^a at Isa 45:13).¹¹³ All these forms with *waw* after the second root consonant occur in DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts, suggesting a common orthographic tendency, if not also a common pronunciation, for the writers/scribes of these texts.

112. Many of the examples come from Qimron, *HDSS*, 38. The word כפור in the fragmentary 4Q414 8,4, is more likely כִּפֵּר than כְּפֹר given the relative frequency of the former and rarity of the latter (especially as a singular noun). Of the nouns listed above, the *waw* appears after the first root consonant only in the following distributions (sometimes where the word bears a pronominal suffix): אומץ occurs four times in the biblical and nonbiblical scrolls (e.g., 4Q298 3–4 ii, 6; 4Q491 8–10 i, 4); אורך over ten times (e.g., 4Q426 1 i, 1; 4Q461 4, 3); חווק seven times (e.g., 4Q301 2b, 3; 4Q491 8–10 i, 4); ישר five times (e.g., 1QS III, 8; 4Q184 1, 17); כופר at least three times (e.g., 1QH^a VII, 37; 4Q219 II, 20); ליהוב three times (1QM V, 7 and 10; VI, 2); עוצם once (4Q169 3–4 iii, 11); קודש many times (throughout the scrolls); קוצר once (1QS VI, 26); רחוב around eighteen times (e.g., 1QM V, 13; 4Q254a 1–2, 3); שוחוד at least eight times (e.g., 1QH^a VI, 31; 4Q437 9, 1); תחות once (1QS VII, 13). The instances of these words with *waw* after the first root consonant are primarily, but not exclusively, in texts of the DSS-SP9 group.

113. The readings of these five words are not universally agreed upon. Note the disagreement over כובוד in footnote 110, above. Accordance reads אוהיל, though Ulrich et al. read as Kutscher did אוהיל (Biblical Qumran Scrolls, 361). Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom read ישיר (DJD 40:182). As for the words with interlinear *waws*, although the non-erasure or non-dotting of the other *waw* may be a case of scribal lapse or inattention, I assume that the scribes intended to write two *waw* *maters* to indicate two separate vowels (see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 221). Of the nouns with two *waw* *maters* and not listed in the preceding footnote, the *waw* appears after the first root consonant only in the following distributions (sometimes where the word bears a pronominal suffix): אוהיל seven times (e.g., 11Q19 XVII, 9); פועל five times (e.g., 1QIsa^a at Isa 41:24; 11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 143:5).

The forms with a *waw* after the second root consonant (including those with a *waw* after the first consonant) are, as Qimron points out, almost always in the construct state and hardly ever found with a following possessive suffix. The only words to occur in the absolute are להוב (1QH^a XI, 31; 4Q169 3–4 ii, 3) and שחוד/שוחוד in 1QIsa^a (at Isa 5:23, 33:15, 45:13).¹¹⁴ The only word to occur with a suffix is רחובו (4Q365 12b iii, 9). The presence of the *waw* in these forms is due to the guttural which is so weak it is not pronounced, thus an earlier **lohob* has become *lōb* and the *mater* could just as easily be placed before the *heh*.¹¹⁵ That this is the case for roots with a middle *heth* seems less likely given that *heth* is the least weak of the gutturals; nevertheless, it is conceivable that in the dialect of the 1QIsa^a scribes, it was so weak as to elide. All the same, שחוד/שוחוד and רחובו may also be due to scribal mistakes and/or influence from Aramaic orthography/pronunciation (the latter especially relevant to שחוד in 1QIsa^a, where Aramaic influence is seen in numerous ways).¹¹⁶

**quṭl* nouns probably also had a /u/ class epenthetic vowel in DSS Aramaic, where spellings such as קשט, קושט, קשוט, קשוט “truth” reflect, presumably, the presence of two vowels, though the exact phonetic realization, as in Hebrew, is not explicit (that is, *quṭul*, *quṭol*, *qoṭol*, and *qoṭul*).¹¹⁷ This seems to be a halfway point in the Aramaic development of **quṭl* nouns, which would lead to pronunciations like **qəṭol* in Biblical Aramaic and other Aramaic dialects. Muraoka notes that there were no hard and fast rules for writing such nouns in Aramaic texts, with the result that in the same text a single word is not uncommonly spelled in two different ways, often in the same state (e.g., קשוט in 1Q20 III, 13 and קושט in 1Q20 II, 18).¹¹⁸ That is, there is no distinction in spelling between nouns in the absolute and construct states. Muraoka adds that the realization of **quṭl* nouns in the Hebrew of the DSS is “more likely influenced by a contemporary Aramaic idiom rather than the other way round.”¹¹⁹

The Hebrew II-*aleph* word מאד “much” deserves special attention. Based on its Akkadian cognates (*ma'dû* and *mu'dû*), it would seem to be

114. Qimron, *HDSS*, 37.

115. *Ibid.*, 26.

116. Although it seems unlikely that a scribe would indicate a single vowel with two *maters*, as in **šōd*, note the spelling נוֹאֹנִם in 1QIsa^a at Isa 37:34.

117. Muraoka, *GQA*, 69. He admits the evidence for this is tenuous.

118. *Ibid.*, 67.

119. *Ibid.*, 69, n. 290.

of the **qat̥l* or **quṭl* pattern. In the MT, however, it is vocalized as מָאֵד; in the scrolls it appears in a wide variety of ways: מֵאֵד, מֵאֵדָה, מֵאֵדוֹד, מֵאֵדוּדָה, מֵאֵדוּדָה, מֵאֵדוּדָה, מֵאֵדוּדָה, מֵאֵדוּדָה.¹²⁰ The forms without an *aleph* suggest that this word (at least sometimes) had a single vowel (that is, no epenthetic vowel), presumably due to the quiescence of the *aleph*. In these cases the word might have been pronounced *mōd* (its development being analogous to רֹשׁ רֹשׁ “head”). The MT form of the word is best explained as a late, secondary form, one based on the Aramaic form of **quṭl* nouns in the Common Era (that is, **mu’d* or **ma’d* > **mōd* > *mə’ōd*). This would parallel, therefore, Blau’s supposition for the development of the MT word בְּאֵר “well” from an earlier **bi’r* (that is, **bi’r* > **bēr* > *bə’ēr*).¹²¹ That such a development is likely for מֵאֵד is bolstered by the fact that in other cases where the *aleph* precedes an /o/ or /u/ class vowel and is preceded itself by a full vowel or shewa (that is, in the sequence -V’ō-), the *aleph* is usually preserved (שְׁאוֹל *šə’ōl* “Sheol”; מֵאֵדוֹר *mā’ōr* “light”) and, where there is a *waw mater*, it almost never comes before the *aleph*.¹²² Thus, if the word had been pronounced regularly *mə’ōd*, we would not expect it to be written מֵאֵד. This implies that the word was probably pronounced *mōd*, the *aleph* being (as in the case of רֹשׁ) a historical spelling where it appears.

In a similar way, the word “utterance” was likely pronounced among those writing and reading the DSS like a noun of the **quṭl* base. It most often occurs among the biblical DSS, where it is written נֵאֵם over twenty-five times (some examples are difficult to read); however, it occurs sixteen times as נֵאֵם, primarily in 1QIsa^a, but also in other DSS-SP9 texts like 2Q13 (2QJer) and 4Q27 (4QNum^b). In addition, it occurs with this spell-

120. The unusual spellings derive mostly from DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts. The forms with a *waw* before the *aleph* (nonbiblical 9; biblical 21) are overall more common than those with *waw* after the *aleph* (8/2). Perhaps due to the conservatism associated with biblical texts, there are no examples of the word lacking an *aleph* in the biblical texts; there are twelve examples of the word without *aleph* in the nonbiblical scrolls.

121. Blau, *Phonology and Morphology*, 55. The relevant passage is quoted above in the subsection “Quiescence of *Aleph*” in §4.3, “Weakening of Gutturals.” The word מֵאֵד in the MT has a slightly different morphology than other II-*aleph* **quṭl* nouns like בְּאֵר “stench”; when suffixes attach to מֵאֵד, the word retains its secondary vowels (מֵאֵדוֹד, מֵאֵדוּדָה), while בְּאֵר reflects its etymological vowels (בְּאֵר, בְּאֵר). The dominance of the secondary vowels in מֵאֵד is due presumably to the word’s frequency as an unsuffixed adverb with these same vowels. See *HGHs*, 580r.

122. For examples, see the discussion in “Digraphs” (§3.5).

ing in two nonbiblical scrolls (4Q175 10 and 4Q177 10–11, 2). It is only rarely spelled with a *waw* between the second and third root consonants: נאום (4Q175 9; 1QIsa^a at Isa 1:24, 41:14) for MT נאם and נואום (1QIsa^a at Isa 37:34) for MT נאם. Where it is spelled with *waw* in this position it is, as it always is, in construct with a following word; this makes it parallel to other **quṭl* base nouns that also exhibit fluctuation and variation in the number and placement of *waw* *maters* (see the discussion above). The word seems to have been understood in the MT tradition as a *qal* passive participle or as a **quṭūl*/**qitūl* base noun (akin to MT כְּרוּב “cherub” and לְבוּשׁ “clothing”). As with מְאֹד “much,” if the word “utterance” was pronounced *nəʿum* or *nəʿūm*, we would not expect it to be spelled so frequently נואם. Thus, it seems likeliest that this word was pronounced as *nūm* among the scribes of the DSS-SP9 texts.

Another word deserving comment is the noun תאר “form.” Although the etymology of the word is not agreed upon, the form of the word in the MT (תֹּאֵר) and among many DSS (תאור, תואר, תאר) suggests it was understood as a **quṭl* noun.¹²³ The word, like מְאֹד, was sometimes spelled without an *aleph*, תור and תר, which suggests that in these cases the word was spoken without an epenthetic vowel: *tōr*.¹²⁴ Here too the pronunciation *tōr* may have been on analogy to ראש (*rōš*), if not also to other similar words like תור “turn, row” (= MT תֹּוֹר) and תור “turtle dove” (= MT תֹּוֹר), not to mention תורה “law” (= MT תּוֹרָה).¹²⁵

The presence of an epenthetic vowel for **quṭl* nouns suggests the existence of an epenthetic vowel (presumably /a/ or /e/) for the other segholate bases (**qaṭl*/**qitl*), though the orthography does not usually help us ascertain this. Note, however, למעאן “so that” in 4Q175 4 (for what would be in the MT לְמַעַן), in which *aleph* may mark a preceding /a/ epenthetic vowel

123. Joüon-Muraoka characterize it as from ראה (§88Lv), while *HALOT* suggest perhaps it is from the verb תאר “to sketch,” which itself may be related to תור “to spy.”

124. The spelling תאר or תואר occurs in 4Q525 2 iii, 4; 14 i, 12; 11Q19 LXIII, 11; 1QIsa^a at Isa 52:14, 53:2 (תאור); 1Q8 (1QIsa^b) at Isa 53:2; 4Q9 (4QGenⁱ) at Gen 41:18; 5Q6 (5QLam^a) at Lam 4:8; the spelling תור in 4Q426 1 i, 9; 11Q5 (11QPs^a) XXVIII, 9; and תר in 11Q5 (11QPs^a) XXI, 11; 1Q8 (1QIsa^b) at Isa 52:14. Note the spelling תור in the Masada text to Sir 43:18 (Mas 1h VI, 12).

125. In 11Q5 (11QPs^a) XXI, 11 (= Sir 51:14) the word has a 3fs pronominal suffix, making it (presumably) identical in sound to the word “Torah” (Reymond, *New Idioms within Old*, 31 and references there). In relation to these nouns, note also נאוד (= MT נאד “skin-bottle”) in 4Q89 (4QPs^b) at Ps 119:83 and 11Q5 (11QPs^a) at Ps 119:83; צאן (4Q251 10, 6), צואן (4Q177 5–6, 15), צאון (11Q19 XLIII, 15), and צון (4Q266 11, 13).

(though caution is in order since this text exhibits many unusual spellings related to *aleph*).

5.6. VERBS

LEXICON

It sometimes happens that a verb unattested in the MT is found in the DSS. The number of verbs not found in the MT seems smaller than the number of nouns. An example is the verb תלש "to tear" (4Q238 1), which is attested rather frequently in RH. In some cases, there is a shift in distribution, as with the verb צנע "to be humble" which appears once in the MT (Mic 6:8), though at least twelve times in the nonbiblical scrolls. A similar pattern is attested for חרת "to engrave." In BDB, it is suggested that the single occurrence of the passive participle of this verb (חרות in Exod 32:16) may be a scribal mistake (due to influence from Aramaic חרת "to engrave" which is cognate with Hebrew חרש "to engrave, plow"). Nevertheless, there are at least fifteen occurrences of חרת "to engrave" in the nonbiblical scrolls, often as a passive participle, but also as a finite verb (1QM XII, 3 and 4Q400 1 i, 15). (The Hebrew realization of this etymological root, חרש, also occurs in the nonbiblical scrolls, though it is always used in the sense of "to plow"; the related noun חרש "engraver" occurs six times.)¹²⁶

Some words from LBH are attested more commonly than those from SBH. For example, זעק "to cry out" occurs once in the Pentateuch but six times in Nehemiah and 1–2 Chronicles and exclusively in the nonbiblical scrolls (at least fourteen times); the synonymous צעק "to cry out" occurs over fifteen times in the Pentateuch, but only twice in Nehemiah and 1–2 Chronicles and never in the nonbiblical scrolls.¹²⁷ Even where a MT text attests צעק, the DSS corresponding to it might attest זעק, as throughout 1QIsa^a at Isa 33:7, 42:2, 46:7, 65:14 (but not at Isa 19:20 where both the MT and the scroll have צעק) and in 4Q365 6a i, 4 at Exod 14:15 and 6a ii + 6c, 10 at Exod 15:25.

Sometimes, as in the MT, there exist pairs of roots that express the same idea. For example, both בוז and בזה mean "to despise"; both דכא and דכה mean "to crush"; both חקה and חקק mean "to engrave." The DSS pre-

126. For more on this word and its cognates, see *ThWQ*, cols. 1:1077–79.

127. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 34.

some other pairs not found in the MT, like הפך “to turn, change” and אפך; although the latter root is not attested clearly it can be assumed based on forms like יופך (4Q422 III, 7) and ויופכו (4Q501 1, 4) since the imperfect of הפך ordinarily takes an /a/ vowel with the prefix in the MT and presumably also in the DSS (e.g., יהפכו), while the root אפך in the Mishnah takes an /o/ vowel with the prefix.¹²⁸

LACK OF CONFUSION BETWEEN III-WAW/YODH AND III-ALEPH VERBS

Most classes of verbs have a morphology identical to that found in the MT. This applies, also, to III-waw/yodh and III-aleph verbs. Although a confusion between these verb (and root) types is common in Aramaic, such is not found in the Hebrew of the scrolls.¹²⁹ To judge from the orthography, the two root types are almost always distinguished in verbs. Notice, for example, that in the approximately fifty easily readable 3cp perfect verb forms that are from III-aleph roots in the nonbiblical scrolls listed by Accordance, only one has a form reminiscent of a III-waw/yodh root (מלו “they fulfilled” in 4Q401 22, 2). By contrast, in the three clear examples of the 3mp perfect of III-aleph roots in the Aramaic DSS, two have patterns characteristic of III-waw/yodh roots (אטמיו in 4Q531 1, 1 and חטו in 4Q550 5 + 5a, 2). Cases like מלו reflect quiescence of aleph, not confusion of verb types: *millā’ū* > *millū*. Although the quiescence of aleph makes these forms look like analogous forms from III-waw/yodh roots, the same is not true for second person verb forms like ברתנו “you created us” (4Q504 1–2 Riii, 4), which is distinct from עשיתם “you made them” (4Q504 1–2 Rii, 18). Even in 1QIsa^a, where we might expect to see the confusion of verb types (given the Aramaic influence on other words and forms), III-aleph and III-waw/yodh verbs are usually distinct. This might not be obvious at first blush since III-waw/yodh verb forms that end with a vowel are sometimes marked with a final aleph mater (ונלוא “he will join” 1QIsa^a at Isa 14:1 for MT וּנְלֹאֵה; הטא “stretch” at Isa 37:17 for MT הִטָּה) and III-aleph verb forms are sometimes marked with a final heh mater (חוטֵה “who sins” at Isa 1:4 for MT חֻטָּא; יקרה “he is called” at Isa 54:5 for MT יִקְרָא).¹³⁰ Nevertheless, where these verb types are clearly distinguishable through the

128. Note also מפִּיכַת and מאפִּכַת (1QIsa^a at Isa 1:7 and 13:19 for MT מִהִפְכַת “overthrown by”) (ibid., 506).

129. See Muraoka, *GQA*, 23–24.

130. Note also: יקרה “he is called” (1QIsa^a at Isa 56:7) for MT יִקְרָא; ימלה “he will

orthography, there is little evidence of confusion: קראתי “I called” (1QIsa^a at Isa 30:7) and with elision of *aleph* וקרתי “I will call” (at Isa 22:20 for MT וְקָרָאתִי; see also Isa 42:6 and 51:2), but never *קריתי. Similarly, III-*waw/yodh* verbs are written normally (e.g., עשיתי at Isa 10:11) and not like III-*aleph* verbs (*עשאתי or *עשתי).¹³¹ In other places where there appears to be confusion between root types, the spelling really reflects a similar (if not identical) pronunciation, also reflected in the MT tradition: תנשינה “they will be lifted” (at Isa 66:12 for MT תִּנְשָׂאנָה; cf. 1Q8 [1QIsa^b] at Isa 60:4); והוציתי “I was found” (1QIsa^a at Isa 65:1) for MT נִמְצָאתִי “I will bring forth” (at Isa 65:9) for MT וְהוֹצֵאתִי.¹³² These same tendencies are found throughout the Hebrew scrolls and this knowledge helps the reconstruction of some verbs: the reading [פ]דיתנו (*DSSSE*) seems more likely than [ב]ריתנו (Accordance) in 1QM XIII, 9.¹³³

CONJUGATIONS

To the degree that the consonantal text allows us to determine it, the scrolls evidence the stems we typically associate with Tiberian Hebrew (including those associated with weak roots like the *polel*, *polal*, *hithpolel*, *pilpel*, and *hithpalpel*). Most of the rarer stems (e.g., the “*nithpael*” as in וְנִכְפַּר “it will be absolved” of Deut 21:8) are not attested in the nonbiblical DSS, though at least one may be. The DSS perhaps evidence a stem associated with

(not) fulfill” (at Isa 65:20) for MT וּמְלֵא; ונטא “he will stretch” (at Isa 34:11) for MT וְנָטָה; ויבנא “he built” (at Isa 5:2) for MT וַיִּבֶן.

131. Kutscher (*Isaiah*, 164) remarks on the spelling להפלה (1QIsa^a at Isa 29:14) for MT הפליא; if the III-*aleph* verbs were really patterning themselves after III-*waw/yodh*, then we would have expected to see *להפלוח.

132. There are two cases that potentially do reflect confusion with III-*waw/yodh* roots in 1QIsa^a, ימחאו “they will clap” 1QIsa^a at Isa 55:12 for MT יִמְחָאוּ and תקרוא “you (mp) will be called” at Isa 61:6 for MT תִּקְרָאוּ. But, these can also be explained, respectively, as quiescence of *aleph* after a muttered vowel and assimilation of *aleph* to a following /u/ vowel (see §3.5, “Digraphs”).

133. Other mistakes involving III-*aleph* verbs do not reflect confusion between roots, but reflect the phonetic development of /ʔ/ > /y/, as in ישייכה (1QIsa^a at Isa 37:10); see “*Aleph < Yodh* and *Yodh < Aleph*” (§4.4). Still other misspellings of III-*aleph* verbs can be explained as due to haplography: יוצי איש (4Q159 2–4, 8; see *DSSSE* and cf. Allegro’s reading יוצו in DJD 5:8) for *יוציא איש; הוצי את (4Q408 3+3a, 7) for *אתא הוציא. Thus, שנאתה [in 4Q462 1, 18 is better read not as “she was hated” = *ni|snātā* (a III-*yodh* pausal form) but as שנאתה “she changed” = *šānātā*.

LBH and RH called the *nuphal*. The stem's presence in LBH is remarked on tersely by Joüon-Muraoka in relation to נולדו "were born" (1 Chr 3:5, 20:8).¹³⁴ In RH, it appears, apparently, in more verbs.¹³⁵ That DSS Hebrew contained something similar hinges on the reading of two different words: לניכנעים "to those humbled" as a *niphal* (1QS X, 26) versus לנוכנעים as a *nuphal* and וניקפו "they will be cut down" as a *niphal* (4Q161 8–10, 6) versus וניקפו as a *nuphal*.¹³⁶

The *qal* passive was probably long forgotten by the time of the late Second Temple period, though it is attested, as it is in the MT, with verbs that appear to be *pual* or *hophal* but which do not occur in the corresponding active stems (*piel* or *hiphil*) and which have meanings that seem to be simply the passive of the *qal* stem. In the MT, the common examples for this conjugation in the perfect are לקח "to be taken" and ילד "to be born" and in the imperfect יקה and יתן "it will be given."¹³⁷ In the DSS, the orthography of certain words suggests that some words were pronounced as *qal* passives/*puals*/*hophals*. For example, one finds, in the biblical scrolls, the perfect: יולד "he was born" (1QIsa^a at Isa 9:5 for MT ילד); לוקח "he was taken" (1QIsa^a at Isa 52:5 and 53:8 for MT לקח and לקח); the imperfect: תושד "you will be destroyed" (1QIsa^a at Isa 33:1 for MT תושד); and the participle מורט "was made smooth" (4Q56 [4QIsa^b] at Isa 18:7 for MT מורט); note also יתק "it will be broken" (Mas 1b [Mas Lev^b] at Lev 11:35 for MT יתק); יתן "it will be given" (Mas 1b [Mas Lev^b] at Lev 11:38 for MT יתן). In the nonbiblical scrolls, one finds only the imperfect יושדו "(which) will be destroyed" (1QH^a XXV, 8).

134. Joüon-Muraoka §60h.

135. See Henoah (Hanoah) Yalon, *Introduction to the Vocalization of the Mishna* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1964), 152–59; and Menahem Moreshet, "On the Nuf'al Stem in Post-Biblical Hebrew" (Hebrew), in *Studies in Hebrew and Semitic Languages Dedicated to the Memory of Prof. Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher* (ed. Gad B. Sarfatti et al.; Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1980), 126–39.

136. See "Plene Orthography" (§3.2) and also Qimron, *Grammar*, 53–54 and 177.

137. The original pronunciation of these forms would have been **quṭil* and **yuqṭal* (the /i/ of the perfect shifting to /a/ to match the imperfect and/or on analogy to the other passive stems with /a/ vowels like the *pual* and *hophal*); these forms experienced spontaneous gemination of the middle root consonant in order to preserve the distinctive short /u/ vowel in the initial syllable, leading to the perfect looking and sounding identical to the *pual* perfect and the imperfect looking and sounding like the *hophal* imperfect (see Joüon-Muraoka §58a; Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 373–76; Bauer and Leander, *HGHs*, 285–88).

The status of some verbs in the MT is debated, and subsequently also for the DSS, for example, יכתו “they will be crushed” (1QM XVIII, 2 for what would be in the MT יכתו, as in Jer 46:5 and Mic 1:7) and similarly יוכת (1QIsa^a at Isa 24:12 for MT יכת).¹³⁸ Due to the unpredictable orthography of some scrolls, in particular 1QIsa^a, where short /u/ vowels are sometimes represented by *waw mater* and sometimes not, one is left to wonder about the pronunciation of some words. For example, note זרו “they were (not) pressed out” (1QIsa^a at Isa 1:6) for MT זרו; תאכלו “you will be eaten” (1QIsa^a at Isa 1:20) for MT תאכלו.¹³⁹

The fact that the *qal* passive was no longer understood as such is reflected in various alterations in the biblical scrolls, especially 1QIsa^a. For example, the third-person plural form of the verb sometimes replaces the singular *qal* passive; presumably the plural is indicating an impersonal construction, as is common in Aramaic: עבדו “(which) was done (lit., they did = MT עבדו)” (1QIsa^a at Isa 14:3) for MT עבד;¹⁴⁰ יקחו “can it be taken (lit., can they take)” (1QIsa^a at Isa 49:24) for MT יקח.¹⁴¹ Sometimes the 3ms is used with an impersonal sense: ישיר “it will be sung (lit., he will sing)” (1QIsa^a at Isa 26:1) for MT יושר. Alternatively, the passive was turned into an active: ילדה “she bore” (4Q1 [4QGen–Exod^a] at Gen 35:26) for MT ילד “was born.” In other cases the spelling suggests a *niphal*, as in ילקח “it will be taken” (1QIsa^a at Isa 49:25) for MT יקח, or makes explicit a *pual* conjugation, as in ממורט and ממרט “was made smooth” (1QIsa^a at Isa 18:2 and 7, respectively), for MT מורט.¹⁴²

The peculiar distribution of some MT verbs in certain stems is sometimes reflected (at least partially) in the DSS. So, for example, the verb בין in the MT means “to understand” in both the *qal* and *hiphil*, and is used with and without direct objects in both stems with this meaning. In the DSS, the verb also occurs in both stems with the meaning “to understand,” though with this meaning it almost always takes the *beth* prepo-

138. Note also the possible example of תוגע “do (not) be touched” (4Q417 1 i, 23) (as suggested by Qimron, cited in Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:167).

139. See also אסרו (1QIsa^a at Isa 22:3), הרג (at Isa 27:7), עזב (at Isa 32:14).

140. The verb in the scroll has the sense “to do” as in Aramaic. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 401–2.

141. This shift is seen consistently with MT קרא “it is called” in 1QIsa^a, where it is realized as יקראו (at Isa 48:8), וקראו (at Isa 58:12, 61:3, and 62:2); only once is it found קרא (at Isa 65:1). Kutscher notes a similar shift from the *niphal* of קרא to the *qal* 3mp (*Isaiah*, 402).

142. See *ibid.*, 344 and 364.

sition (whether *qal* or *hiphil*), while in the *hiphil* where it takes a direct object it typically means “to teach.” The exceptions to this rule (that is, where the verb means “to understand” and takes a direct object) are from DSS-SP1c (4Q424 3, 2) and DSS-NSP (4Q372 3, 3) texts. As in the MT, the morphology of the imperfect forms of the verb (e.g., יבין) does not allow us to decide whether they were construed as *qal* or *hiphil*.

Some verbs attest stems in the DSS that are not attested for these same verbs in the MT. Often, these are easiest to identify when the verbal stem has an extra consonant that makes its identification clear, as in the *hithpael* stem. In the DSS the following verbs occur in the *hithpael* (though in the MT they do not): אחר “to delay” (1QS I, 14 and passim); בהל “to rush, be dismayed” (4Q215 1–3, 5); יסר “to chasten” (1QS III, 6 and passim); רשע “to be evil” (4Q491 8–10 i, 7); שלם “to complete” (4Q385 2, 3 and passim). In many cases, these verbs in the *hithpael* have a passive meaning and, as Qimron notes, there seems little distinction from the *niphal*.¹⁴³ In a similar way, Qimron and Menahem Moreshet have both noted instances where what is often attested in SBH in the MT as a *qal* (e.g., זגח “to reject,” לעג “to mock”) appears in LBH, Ben Sira, the DSS (and often RH) as a *hiphil* הונחתני “you did [not] reject me” 1QH^a XVII, 7; ילעיגו “they will mock” 1QpHab IV, 2).¹⁴⁴ In these examples, the later *hiphil* form has the same meaning as the earlier *qal*. In other cases, a verb appears in the *hiphil* for the first time in the DSS, with a causative sense, distinct from the sense conveyed by the *qal*: for example, עשה occurs in the MT only in the *qal* and *niphal* (and once, perhaps, in the *pual*), but appears in the *hiphil* “to cause to do” in the DSS (4Q440 3 i, 21 and 4Q470 1, 4), as it does in RH.¹⁴⁵ Another case is perhaps found in הוגירני “he made me fear” (4Q111 [4QLam^a] at Lam 1:12) for MT הוגה “he made suffer”; the verb יגר occurs only in the *qal* in the MT.¹⁴⁶ The same happens with the *niphal*:

143. Qimron, *HDSS*, 49. Note, however, the apparent variation between the two stems with the root חבא “to hide” in Gen 3:8 and 10. See Joel Baden, “Hithpael and Niphal in Biblical Hebrew: Semantic and Morphological Overlap,” *VT* 60 (2010): 36.

144. Qimron, *HDSS*, 49, and M. Moreshet, “The Hiphil in Mishnaic Hebrew as Equivalent to the Qal” (Hebrew), *Bar-Ilan* 13 (1976): 253–57.

145. See Moshe Bar-Asher, “Two Phenomena in Qumran Hebrew,” 176–180; idem, “Qumran Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew,” 292–93. In other cases, a verb might have a slightly different nuance: שטם “to have animosity toward” occurs only in the *qal* in the MT, but in both the *qal* (4Q174 4, 4) and *hiphil* “to accuse” (4Q225 2 i, 10) in the DSS.

146. See Cross, *DJD* 16:235.

פִּשַׁט appears in the MT most commonly in the *qal* and *hiphil* meaning usually “to strip off (something)” or, in the *qal*, “to raid,” but in the DSS it occurs (together with the *qal* and *hiphil*) in the *niphal* meaning “to be spread out” (1QM VIII, 6; XVII, 10), a stem and meaning that also occur in RH. In other cases, the lack of a prefix or *mater* suggests a different stem. For example, יָלְלוּ “they wailed” (4Q387 A, 4 and 4Q422 G, 1) seems to suggest a *piel* form for the root לָלַל, as is found in RH (parallel to Aramaic in the D-stem), instead of the MT *hiphil*.

In some cases, a given expression in the MT will exhibit one stem and the equivalent expression in the DSS will exhibit a different stem; Fassberg notes in relation to the *pual* participle in אוֹזֵן מְגֻלִּי *məgullē ’ozon* “those with uncovered ears” (1QM X, 11) that one might have expected the *qal*, *גְּלוּי אוֹזֵן, given the similar expression גְּלוּי עֵינַיִם “one with uncovered eye” in Num 24:4 and 16.¹⁴⁷

Two texts, 1QS and 1QIsa^a, exhibit features in the *hiphil* that reflect influence from Aramaic. As noted above (in the subsection “Quiescence of *Heh*” in §4.3, “Weakening of Gutturals”), these texts attest verbal forms in which an *aleph* appears for the *heh* of the *hiphil* prefix and this is thought to parallel the alternation in Aramaic between *haphel* and *aphel* stems (both of which are causative stems). Alone, the presence of an *aleph* for *heh* could easily be interpreted as a phonetic confusion. However, both texts exhibit other verbal forms that seem closer to Aramaic causative stems than Hebrew. Specifically, some *hiphil* imperfects and participles bear a prefixed *heh* just as in Aramaic: וַיִּהְיֶינָא “and he will establish” (1QS III, 9); וְאִהְיֶינָא “and I hid” (1QIsa^a at Isa 57:17) for MT הִסְתַּיֵּר “hiding”; מְהַסִּיר “is removing” (1QIsa^a at Isa 3:1) for MT מְסִיר “waving” (1QIsa^a at Isa 19:16) for MT מְנִיף.¹⁴⁸ That similar forms are almost unknown from other texts suggests this is a feature peculiar to 1QS and 1QIsa^a and underlines well the peculiar Aramaic influence found in some DSS.¹⁴⁹

147. Steven E. Fassberg, “The Movement from *Qal* to *Pi*‘*el* in Hebrew and the Disappearance of the *Qal* Internal Passive,” *HS* 42 (2001): 243–55.

148. See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 198. Some readings are disputed: יְהִיבִינְהוּ “he will teach him” (1QS VI, 15) is often read now וַיְבִינְהוּ; note also יְהוּדִיעַ “will make me know” (1QIsa^a in an addition to Isa 38:20) or יְהוּדִיעַ.

149. I know of only יְהִסִּירְךָ “he will remove you” (4Q60 [4QIsa^f] at Isa 22:19) for MT יְהָרֵסְךָ “he will destroy you.”

PERFECT AND WAW-CONSECUTIVE PERFECT

Apart from the characteristic *plene* spelling of second-person masculine singular/plural perfect forms, the perfect forms for most verbs are identical to their counterparts in the MT. As mentioned above (in §3.2, “*Plene Orthography*”), the 2ms perfect is characterized by a *heh mater* in most cases in the DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts, though only infrequently in the DSS-NSP texts. The 2fs perfect ends with תִּי- instead of the expected ת- in 1QIsa^a (eighteen times), in 1QIsa^b (once), and in 4Q72 (4QJer^c) (once), though no other time.¹⁵⁰ This ending is also preserved in some *kethib* forms of the 2fs perfect in the MT (similar to the preservation of *kethib* versions of the 2fs independent pronoun אַתָּה), as well as in Samaritan Hebrew.¹⁵¹ Although it is possible, as Ben-Ḥayyim argues, that these forms in the MT and in Samaritan Hebrew are derived from the etymological forms of the 2fs perfect, it is likeliest that, as Kutscher argues, the forms in 1QIsa^a are attributable to Aramaic influence, as well as the forms in the MT (since they occur in later books).¹⁵²

The 2mp perfect occurs approximately eighty times in the nonbiblical scrolls and around 275 times in the biblical scrolls. It is marked תַּמָּה- in approximately 60 percent of its occurrences in the nonbiblical scrolls and in 20 percent of the biblical scrolls (and תַּם- in the other cases). Most texts seem consistent in using one or the other form (11Q19 and 11Q20 contain at least twenty instances of the long form and no instances of the short), though the two types do occur in close proximity to each other in two texts: 4Q365 32, 8 and 4Q418 55, 8. The 2fp occurs once marked in the biblical scrolls תַּן- and once תַּנָּה-; it does not occur in the nonbiblical scrolls.

As in the MT, one sometimes finds anomalous forms for the 3fs perfect: זַנַּת “(who) acted the prostitute” (4Q394 [4QMMT] 3–7 i, 12) and וְקַבְרָת “it will be buried” (4Q418 127, 2).¹⁵³ In these two cases, one sus-

150. Abegg, “Linguistic Profile,” 31.

151. For a listing of the forms of the 2fs perfect with the *kethib* ending תִּי-, see GKC §44h.

152. Ben-Ḥayyim, *Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew*, 104; Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 188–90; and Abegg, “Linguistic Profile,” 41. Ben-Ḥayyim also observes that for Samaritan Hebrew the preservation of this ending is due to the identical ending (תִּי-) on 2fs perfects in Aramaic (*ibid.*).

153. It is, of course, possible to interpret these words in other ways, but these seem likely cases of the 3fs perfect. The form זַנַּת might be the feminine singular par-

pects influence from Aramaic. Some forms that are relatively rare in the MT are more common in the DSS and/or show a different distribution. For example, the *hiphil* second- and first-person perfect forms of בוא often bear an \bar{o} connecting vowel in the DSS, as in הביאותה “you brought” (1QH^a XIV, 15) (versus הבאתי “I brought” 4Q389 2, 6), though in the Bible it is more common not to find the connecting vowel for this verb (e.g., הִבֵּאתִי Gen 31:39) and where it appears it is on a verb form that also bears an object suffix (e.g., וְהִבֵּיאוֹתֶיךָ Ezek 38:16).¹⁵⁴ In the DSS, the forms with the connecting vowel do not generally have an object suffix. A similar distribution of second-/first-person forms occurs between the MT and the DSS with the *hiphil* perfect of נוף, which always appears (four times, only in the second-person) in the DSS with an \bar{o} / connecting vowel (e.g., הניפותה “you waved” in 1QH^a XV, 10), while the same verb appears without the connecting vowel in five of its six occurrences (in the second- and first-person) in the MT (e.g., הִנִּפֹתָ in Exod 20:25).

IMPERFECT AND WAW-CONSECUTIVE IMPERFECT

The following paragraphs address the prefix-conjugations as found in the DSS. For comments on the form of the *qal* imperfect and imperative with suffix, see the following sections: “*Qal* Imperfect + Suffix” and “*Qal* Imperative + Suffix.” In the former, the tendency for plural imperfects to exhibit a theme vowel is addressed.

ticiples, like פָּרַת (from פרה) in Gen 49:22. The form קברת might also be a participle (see Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:359).

154. The forms where a *mater* clearly marks the \bar{o} / connecting vowel appear in 1QH^a XIV, 15; XXI, 10; 4Q438 3, 3; 11Q19 XVIII, 13; LIX, 11; LXIII, 12; 1QIsa^a at Isa 37:26 for MT הִבֵּאתִיָּהּ, 43:23 for MT הִבֵּאתָ, 48:15 for MT הִבֵּיאתִיו, 56:7 for MT הִבֵּיאתִים; 1Q8 (1QIsa^b) at Isa 43:23 for MT הִבֵּאתָ; 4Q11 (4QpaleoGen–Exod^l) at Exod 26:33 for MT הִבֵּאתָ. Forms with defective orthography and/or with no \bar{o} / connecting vowel appear in 4Q176 15, 2; 4Q389 2, 6; as well as commonly among the biblical scrolls: 1Q8 (1QIsa^b) at Isa 56:7; 4Q1 (4QGen–Exod^a) at Gen 39:17, Exod 6:8; 4Q22 (4QpaleoExod^m) at Exod 26:11; 4Q24 (4QLev^b) at Lev 23:10; 4Q26c (4QLevⁱ = XLev^c) at Lev 26:36; 4Q58 (4QIsa^d) at Isa 48:15; 4Q61 (4QIsa^g) at Isa 43:23; 11Q1 (11QpaleoLev^a) at Lev 26:25. Note also Mas 1d at Ezek 36:24 and 37:12; Mur 1 at Exod 6:8; Mur 88 at Joel 4:5 and at Hag 1:8, 9. In the MT, the forms with an \bar{o} / connecting vowel occur sixteen times, while the forms without the connecting vowel number sixty-two.

The theme vowel of certain verbs in the imperfect (and imperative) is /a/ in the MT but an /o/ or /u/ class vowel in 1QIsa^a (e.g., תזריענו “you will plant it” at Isa 17:10; אפעולה “I will do” at Isa 43:13; ישכובו “they will lie down” at Isa 43:17; יואכולם “he will eat them” at Isa 51:8 and passim).¹⁵⁵ Outside of 1QIsa^a, this phenomenon is found more rarely: ישכוב “he will lie down” (1QS VII, 10, but otherwise without a *waw mater*); ישחוקו “they will laugh” (1QpHab IV, 6) corrected to ישחקו (perhaps reflecting misplacement of the final *mater*; see §3.1, “Scribal Mistakes”).¹⁵⁶ That the unexpected forms are mostly restricted to 1QIsa^a suggests this is a feature especially of this scroll’s scribes, perhaps related to influence from Aramaic, where the cognates to some of these verbs (that is, זרע, בחר, אכל, פעל, שכב) often take an /o/ or /u/ theme vowel.¹⁵⁷

As in the MT, some stative verbs show an /o/ or /u/ theme vowel, as with תשכון “she will dwell” (4Q184 1, 7 and passim [always with a *waw mater* in the nonbiblical scrolls], = MT תִּשְׁכֹּן Jer 33:16) and יבול “it withers” (1QH^a XVI, 27 and passim, for what would be in the MT יבול). At least some verbs that show both /a/ and an /o/ theme vowel in the MT, on the other hand, do not exhibit such alternation, presumably, in the DSS (specifically in the DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts; see יחפץ, יבגוד, and §4.7, “Accent or Stress”).

Abegg, in his “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls” article, offers specifics for the number of verbal forms with and without *maters*; although these give the general sense of the distribution, they do not precisely reflect the evidence and should be used with caution. For example, he writes that the *qal* 2mp imperfect of strong verbs attests only the so-called pausal

155. For the full list, see Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 341–42; other verbs include נגש, חרב, שפל, חפר, בחר.

156. Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 340 and 350. He also lists a biblical precedent: *qere* אֶסְלַח and *kethib* אֶסְלוּחַ in Jer 5:7. The reading of [יש]מועו in 4Q491 1–3, 13, also listed by Abegg, is read [יש]מיעו by Accordance.

157. An /o/ theme vowel is found for זרע, אכל, פעל in Palestinian Aramaic (שכב has an /a/ vowel), and for all the same verbs in Syriac (where שכב also sometimes takes an /a/ vowel). The verbs חפר and שפל do not take an /o/ or /u/ vowel. Of course, other reasons can be found for the appearance of the /o/ or /u/ theme vowel for some of these verbs. E.g., אכל apparently originally took a /u/ theme vowel in the imperfect of the basic stem and developed its /a/ vowel based on dissimilation (or, analogy to other I-*aleph* verbs); Kutscher takes the spelling of אכל above as evidence for the lack of dissimilation in the idiolect of the scribe of 1QIsa^a (*Isaiah*, 476–77).

form.¹⁵⁸ This expresses the dominance of the pausal form among DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts, but not the fact that in DSS-NSP texts the plural imperfect forms do not appear with *maters*: [תש]רפון “you will burn” and [תש]מרר “you will keep” (4Q368 2, 5 and 9, respectively); ירמסו “they will trample” (4Q381 46a + b, 8). Curiously, among the DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts, the pausal forms for 3mp imperfects are not as ubiquitous as the 2mp forms, but still represent the majority of forms.¹⁵⁹ For more on what appear to be pausal forms of the plural imperfect in the DSS, see the sections “Accent or Stress” (§4.7) and “*Qal* Imperfect + Suffix” (§5.7).

Abegg’s counting of *waw*-consecutive imperfects in his corpus suggests that this construction is approximately half as common in the DSS as it is in the MT; conversely, the perfect verb form is used much more commonly than in the MT.¹⁶⁰ Verb types and conjugations that attest a short form in the *waw*-consecutive imperfect in the MT (that is, especially II-*waw/yodh*, III-*waw/yodh*, and *hiphil* verbs) generally show a similar shortened form in the DSS (for specifics, see below). That the short (that is, etymological jussive/preterite) forms dominated the *waw*-consecutive paradigm is revealed by an analysis of the verb forms from II-*yodh* and III-*waw/yodh* roots as well as *hiphil* verbs. The II-*yodh* and *hiphil* forms very rarely attest a *yodh mater* (and when they do it is often influenced by other factors, like a word-final *aleph*: ויוציא “he brought forth” in 11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 136:11 for MT ויוציא), though the corresponding imperfect forms do. III-*waw/yodh* verbs exhibit a similar consistency between short *waw*-consecutive imperfect forms and long (non-*waw*-consecutive) imperfects; where there are exceptions, these are isolated to specific texts like the very brief 1Q7 (1QS^{am}) which exhibits the long form of the imperfect three times (ויכה at 2 Sam 23:10, 12 for MT ויך and ויעש at 23:10 for MT ויעש) and 1QIsa^a which frequently (but not always) shows the long form of the imperfect for common roots, like ויבנא (at Isa 5:2) for MT ויבן, ויעשה (at Isa 5:2) for MT ויעש, and ותהיה (at Isa 29:11, 13) for MT ותהי. The *waw mater* attested in II-*waw waw*-consecutive imperfect forms probably represents a short /o/, as explained above in §3.4, “Etymological Short /u/ Marked with *Waw*.”

Another characteristic feature of the imperfect in the DSS is the frequency of the pseudo-cohortative forms, where the final ה ending typi-

158. Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 339.

159. Ibid.

160. Ibid., 338.

cal of the first-person volitive forms is used in contexts in which a volitive notion does not seem likely. Such forms are also present in LBH in great numbers. The pseudo-cohortative appears to function as a regular imperfect (ואשלחה “and I will send” 4Q216 II, 12), and also as a *waw*-consecutive imperfect (ואשחקה “I laughed” 11Q5 [11QPs^a] XXI, 15); the regular first common imperfect forms are used throughout the scrolls with just about as much regularity as the cohortative and pseudo-cohortative forms.¹⁶¹ It is interesting to observe that with the increasing use of the cohortative form as a *waw*-consecutive imperfect, the *waw*-consecutive imperfect paradigm begins to look uniformly volitive in form (in other words, it is marked by forms that have the same shape as jussives and true cohortatives). In relation to this, as well as other observations, Qimron asserts that the *waw*-consecutive paradigm “was repatterned after the cohortative-jussive paradigm.”¹⁶² This pseudo-cohortative is dominant in DSS-SP9 texts, but appears also in DSS-NSP texts (e.g., 4Q258 IX, 7, 9).

Abegg counts only eight short (non-*waw*-consecutive) imperfect forms (for the II-*waw/yodh* roots, III-*waw/yodh* roots, and *hiphil* forms) out of a total of 600 (not including those preceded by a regular *waw* conjunction or the negative אַל): for example, יעל “will go up” (1QH^a XVI, 26).¹⁶³ He notes that these do not seem to carry a jussive or volitional sense (not to mention a preterite sense). Together with the fact that some long forms do carry a volitional sense, he argues that the short forms may have “lost the sense of command in Q[umran] H[ebrew].”¹⁶⁴ It should be pointed out, however, that the short form is regular after the negative particle אַל; and this construction does sometimes carry a sense of command (in effect the negative form of the imperative), something especially evident in the context of a wisdom instruction, as in אל תתאו “do not desire” (4Q416 2 iii, 8 = 4Q418 9 + 9a-c, 7); אל תשת “do not drink” (4Q417 2 ii + 23, 24); אל [אַל] תאמר “do not reject (or, exchange [?])” (4Q418 8, 6);¹⁶⁵ אל תחשך “do not darken/obscure” (4Q418 95, 3); אל תמשל *al tamšēl* “do not let rule” (4Q424 1, 10); אל תשלט *al tašlēt* “do not give power to” (11Q5 [11QPs^a]

161. For specific statistics, see Abegg, “Linguistic Profile,” 32 and “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 336–37.

162. Qimron, *HDSS*, 46.

163. Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 336.

164. *Ibid.*

165. See the discussion in “*Aleph* as Internal *Mater*” (§3.3).

XIX, 15).¹⁶⁶ Thus, although the short form ceased to be used to express a positive jussive notion, it was used by convention with the negative אַל; in only some cases, however, can the construction be construed as a negative command.¹⁶⁷ Abegg also notes that short imperfects after *waw* may, in a significant minority of instances (20 percent), represent the simple imperfect.¹⁶⁸ He cites as an example וְתַעַשׂ “and you will make” (1QM XI, 9).¹⁶⁹ These, together with examples like יַעַל “will go up” (1QH^a XVI, 26) and וְאֶשְׁלַחָה “and I will send” (4Q216 II, 12), cited just above, suggest that there was a significant amount of confusion among the scribes regarding the proper forms to be used.

The forms of the *qal* imperfect of I-*aleph* verbs are generally the same as the forms attested in the MT. Thus, the forms of אָכַל “to eat,” אָמַר “to say,” אָבַד “to perish” often attest a *waw mater* after the prefix element, probably reflecting /ō/.¹⁷⁰ In not a few instances, the *aleph* is dropped from the spelling not only in the 1cs (as in the MT), but also in the other forms of the imperfect (e.g., יִבְדּוּ “they will perish” in 4Q88 X, 12). As in the MT, the same vowel is attested in some other verbs occasionally: וְתוֹסַף “it is gathered” (1QH^a XIII, 16, spelled without *aleph* as is also found in the MT at Ps 104:29); וְיִיחֶזֶק “he will seize” (1QIsa^a at Isa 5:29) corrected to וְיִיחֶזֶק for MT וְיִאֲחֶזֶק. In some cases, I-*aleph* verbs that never attest a *holem* after the *aleph* in the MT attest a *waw mater* after, or in place of, the *aleph*, reflecting presumably an /o/ or /u/ vowel. For example, יֹרְבוּ “they lie in wait” (1QH^a XIII, 12) derives from אָרַב and is similar (in the loss of the *aleph*) to the spelling of the same verb in the MT, וְיִרְבּוּ (1 Sam 15:5).¹⁷¹ In other cases, in 1QIsa^a, verbs that regularly take such an initial /o/ vowel, attest forms

166. Abegg notes that the short form of the imperfect occurs after אַל in 70 percent of the examples from his corpus (“Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 336).

167. Qimron describes the use of the short imperfect form with אַל as a “‘fossilized’ use”; see Elisha Qimron, “Consecutive and Conjunctive Imperfect: The Form of the Imperfect with *Waw* in Biblical Hebrew,” *JQR* 76 (1986–1987), 150 n. 4.

168. Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 338.

169. Other examples include יִשְׁמַע וְיַעַשׂ (11Q19 LVI, 8) and יִשְׁמֹר וְיַעַשׂ (11Q19 LIX, 16).

170. The verb אָבַד implies the quiescence of *aleph* but does not give an indication of its vowel in תְּבִיחַ (11Q1 [11QpaleoLev^a] at Lev 26:21). The verb אָפַה is not attested in the *qal* imperfect with a *waw mater* or where *aleph* is elided.

171. Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:171. See also וְיֹפְכוּ “they overturned” (4Q501 1, 4) from the root אָפַךְ, a by-form of הִפְךָ. See the discussion of this verb in the subsection “Quiescence of *Heh*” in §4.3, “Weakening of Gutturals.”

that presume an initial /e/ or /a/ vowel: תאכולנו “it will eat him” (1QIsa^a at Isa 31:8).¹⁷²

As mentioned above in “Phonemic Inventory” (§4.1), I-*nun* verbs sometimes do not attest assimilation of their first consonant.

The singular *waw*-consecutive imperfect forms for II-*waw* roots often have a *waw mater* (e.g., ויקום “he arose” in 4Q160 1, 3), as mentioned above in “Etymological Short /u/ Marked with *Waw*” (§3.4). It is assumed that these are cases where the *waw* is marking what would be a *qamets hatuf* in the MT. That is, it is assumed these are not cases of the regular imperfect (*ויקום). This assumption is bolstered by the fact that other *waw*-consecutive imperfect forms have the form of volitives (e.g., ואשחקה “I laughed” 11Q5 [11QPs^a] XXI, 15) as well as by the fact that the II-*yodh* verbs and *hiphil* verbs (without suffix) are almost always written defectively (e.g., ותשם “you set” in 1QH^a IX, 30; ותצל *wattaṣṣēl* “you delivered” 1QH^a XIII, 15); they hardly ever occur with a corresponding *yodh mater* where they occur as *waw*-consecutives.¹⁷³ If all the middle weak roots had simple imperfect forms, we would expect *waw maters* on the II-*waw* roots and *yodh maters* on the II-*yodh* roots.

The pronunciation of 3fp/2fp imperfects of II-*waw/yodh* roots corresponds to that of the MT, as implied by the spelling תבואינה (4Q268 1, 1 and similarly 4Q381 31, 3 [נא-] = MT תבואינה). Where the alternative forms for II-*waw/yodh* roots occur in the MT, like תבאנה and תשבנה, the corresponding biblical scrolls are fragmentary or (in 1QIsa^a) have the form תבואינה (e.g., 1QIsa^a at Isa 47:9). There is only one exception: תבאנה (1Q8 [1QIsa^b] at Isa 47:9).

172. According to Kutscher, the root in 1QIsa^a is like אהז in the MT where it appears as either יאהז or יאהז (Isaiah, 467–77). Note, however, יואכולם “he will eat them” at Isa 51:8, cited above.

173. Out of the eleven occurrences of שים (parsed as a singular *waw*-consecutive verb form by Accordance) among the nonbiblical scrolls, none occurred with a *yodh mater*; of the twelve examples of the same verb in the biblical scrolls, only one had a *yodh* (ות[ים] in 4Q13 [4QExod^b] at Exod 2:3 for MT ותשם), where, not surprisingly, the text does not closely follow the MT version. Similar distributions are found for other II-*yodh* verbs like בין, as well as *hiphil waw*-consecutives for roots like קום and בן. The regular imperfects (according to Accordance) preceded by *waw* are, in fact, rare (only two clear examples); in one instance the form may just as likely be a *waw*-consecutive וישם (4Q464 5 ii, 2).

The forms of III-*aleph* verbs are generally similar to those of the MT, as described in the preceding subsection “Lack of Confusion between III-*Waw/Yodh* and III-*Aleph* Verbs” (§5.6).

Geminate verbs in the *qal* and other stems generally appear as they do in the MT, with some slight distinctions. Thus, for the *qal*, the geminates usually seem to have the theme vowel associated with the same verb in the MT. For example, one finds ירועו “they will break” (1QH^a XII, 34; 4Q511 3, 7; and 20 ii, 3), as one would expect from MT ירעו. Often, DSS-NSP texts exhibit forms without the *waw mater* (זמו “they will devise” in 4Q381 45a + b, 2; יחן “he will [not] pity” in 4Q386 1 iii, 1), while DSS-SP9 texts exhibit forms with the *mater* (זומו in 4Q171 1–2 ii, 14; ותחון in 4Q504 1–2R v, 11). The pronunciation of the singular forms was probably the same in both corpora and analogous to that of the MT (חן Deut 28:50); the pronunciation of the plural forms in the DSS-SP9 seems to follow the historical form of the verbs (*זמו, analogous to יסבו), while the defective writing in the DSS-NSP texts is ambiguous and could alternatively represent forms where the gemination has been lost and the etymological /u/ theme vowel has reduced, as is sometimes evidenced in the MT (e.g., זמו Gen 11:6).¹⁷⁴ Occasionally, one finds verbs that seem to evidence an /a/ theme vowel, based on defective orthography, where the MT verb has /o/ or /u/. Thus, one finds ויחגו “and they will totter” (4Q418b 1, 4), quoting Ps 107:27 for MT ויחגו; and נחגה “let us celebrate” (4Q504 5 ii, 4).¹⁷⁵ In other cases, the form of a geminate verb in a DSS-SP9 text may be influenced from the model of the MT: ישלובה *yšollūkā* “they will plunder you” (1QpHab VIII, 15 and IX, 3) appears in a quote of Hab 2:8 (for MT ישלובו) instead of *ישלובה.

The paragogic *nun*, according to Accordance, appears clearly on around twenty-five imperfect plural forms, both third- and second-person, among the nonbiblical scrolls.¹⁷⁶ Note that in some biblical scrolls, where the MT has a paragogic *nun*, the DSS does not (e.g., ישכרו “they will be

174. The form זמו derives from *זמו (see GKC §67dd).

175. Note that 4Q504 is a DSS-SP9 text and we would expect a *plene* writing, admitting again, that there are occasional examples of defective writing for *qal* imperfect verbs that take an /o/ or /u/ theme vowel. On the passage from 4Q418b, see Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:499. Note that 4Q88 (4QPs^f) at Ps 107:27 attests יחגו.

176. Abegg’s statistics for this form are low (“Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 336).

drunk” in 1QIsa^a at Isa 49:26) and vice versa (e.g., יבשרון “they will tell” in 1Q8 [1QIsa^b] at Isa 60:6). The same suffix is found four times on the 2fs imperfect among the biblical scrolls.

The energetic *nun*, which appears between the verbal form and object suffix, occurs rather frequently, as evidenced by the examples in “*Qal* Imperfect + Suffix” (§5.7). At least twice the energetic *nun* does not assimilate to the following suffixal consonant among the biblical scrolls: יכבדנני “he will honor me” (4Q85 [4QPs^c] at Ps 50:23) for MT יִכְבְּדֵנִי and ונכנהו “and let us strike him” (4Q70 [4QJer^a] at Jer 18:18) for MT וְנִכְהוּ.

IMPERATIVES

As with imperfects, the imperatives in the *qal* often exhibit forms akin to the pausal forms in the MT, though these are not always in places we would expect pause to occur.¹⁷⁷ So, for example, we find the masculine plural occasionally written *plene*: עמודו “stand” in 4Q491c 11 ii, 13, which is like MT pausal עֲמֹדוּ (Nah 2:9) and unlike contextual עֲמְדוּ (also Nah 2:9). The feminine singular is much more uncommon and is found written *plene* only in the biblical scrolls: עבורי “cross” (4Q57 [4QIsa^c] at Isa 23:10) for MT עֲבֹרִי.¹⁷⁸ Note too the spelling of the mp imperative “possess” ראשו (4Q364 26a ii, 3 at Deut 9:23 for MT רָשׁוּ), where the *aleph* is explicitly indicating the unreduced pausal /ā/ vowel of the imperative seen in Deut 2:24 and 31 רָשׁ (= ראש in 4Q364 24a–c, 4) (see §3.3, “*Aleph* as Internal *Mater*”). For examples of the *qal* imperative with suffixes, see §5.8, “*Qal* Imperative + Suffix.”

In the *hiphil*, the imperative, as in the MT, does not typically have a *mater* (העמד “make stand” 4Q160 3–4 ii, 3), unless it has an ending (either a plural morpheme, a paragogic *heh*, or an object suffix): הוסיפו “increase” 4Q298 3–4 ii, 6; הקשיבה “pay attention” 4Q177 14, 4; הודיענו “make us know” 4Q266 1a–b, 19).

The long imperative (that is, the form with paragogic *heh*) in the MT is often used in contexts where the person uttering the imperative expects the

177. Ibid., 339.

178. In only one instance, the *mater* is after the first root consonant: עוברי (1QIsa^a at Isa 23:6) for MT עֲבֹרוּ. Other examples include: עבורי (4Q57 [4QIsa^c] at Isa 23:10) for MT עֲבֹרִי; idem (at 23:12) for MT עֲבֹרִי; אמירי (1QIsa^a at Isa 40:9) for MT אֲמַרִי; עבורי (at Isa 47:2) for MT עֲבֹרִי; חשופי (at Isa 47:2) for MT חֲשֹׁפִי; עמודי (at Isa 47:12) for MT עֲמֹדִי; שכנוי (2Q13 [2QJer] at Jer 48:28) for MT שְׁכְנֵנוּ.

action of the verb to be directed towards him or her; the long imperative in the DSS is not used as consistently in this way.¹⁷⁹ For example, one finds קומה גבור “arise, hero” (1QM XII, 10).¹⁸⁰ In some cases, the long imperative seems to be associated with certain passages, as in the many cases of שמעה ישראל “hear, Israel” in versions of Deut 5:1 (4Q41 [4QDeutⁿ], 4Q42 [4QDeut^o], 4Q134 [4QPhyl G], 4Q137 [4Q Phyl J], XQ3 [XQPhyl 3], for MT שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל), but in only one version of Deut 6:4 (4Q135 [4QPhyl H]).¹⁸¹ The vocalization of the long imperative is not known, but certain forms written *plene* suggest that these were often vocalized akin to MT pausal forms: זכורה זכֹרָה “remember” (4Q508 2, 2) and thus implying שמחה סַמְחָה “rejoice” (4Q416 4, 3, compare סִלְחָה in the MT at Dan 9:19). On the other hand, the confused form [ע]ֹמְדָה or ‘āmōdā “stand” (4Q137 [4QPhyl J] at Deut 5:31) suggests that the contextual form may have been known too.

INFINITIVES

In the *qal*, the infinitive construct for most strong roots is written with a *waw mater* after the second root consonant, unless it bears a suffix, in which case the *waw mater* appears after the first consonant (in line with the vocalization in the MT). In a select few cases where the infinitive construct has a suffix, the *waw mater* appears after the second consonant (e.g., לתפושם “to seize them” 1QpHab IV, 7).¹⁸² This variation presumes a distinction between **qutl*/**qotl*- and **qaṭul*-/**qaṭol*- pronunciations. Although a similar syllabic variation occurs with infinitives in the MT, there the syl-

179. For this tendency in the MT, see Steven E. Fassberg, “The Lengthened Imperative קִטְלָה in Biblical Hebrew,” *HS* 40 (1999): 7–13.

180. This passage echoes Judg 5:12 (in the MT ברק ושבָה שביד יהודה). See also 4Q88 X, 7–8 (שְׂמַחָה יְהוּדָה... שְׂמַחָה שְׂמַחְתְּכָה וְגִילָה גִילָךְ); 4Q416 4, 3 (אֵתָה מְבִיזִי) שְׂמַחָה בְּנַחֲלַת אֵמֶת (זְכוּרָה... מוֹעֵד רַחֲמִידִי); 4Q508 2, 2 (זְכוּרָה... מוֹעֵד רַחֲמִידִי). Fassberg suggests that where the long imperative appears, but where it does not indicate an action directed toward the speaker, this often (especially in Psalms) involves an action directed towards the speaker and his people (*ibid.*, 13). Such an interpretation is also possible in many passages from the DSS.

181. Note also שמעה ישראל in 1QM X, 3. Notice that these include both DSS-SP9 and DSS-NSP texts.

182. Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 339. I count five instances of this in the DSS: לתפושם (1QpHab IV, 7); ללכודני (4Q437 2 i, 2); לפקודכה (4Q504 1–2R v, 16); בקרובכמה (11Q19 LXI, 14); [נתושם] (4Q70 [4QJer^a] at Jer 12:14).

lable containing the historic /u/ vowel is always followed by two consonants (e.g., אָכְלָם “their eating” in Lev 22:16; אָכְלָךְ “your eating” in Gen 2:17). In the examples from the DSS, where an /o/ or /u/ vowel occurs after the second root consonant, sometimes only one consonant follows the /o/ or /u/ vowel, as with לתפושם. This suggests a variation in the place of the vowel for the *qal* infinitive construct + suffix similar to that found in the *qal* imperfect + suffix and the *qal* imperative + suffix, as discussed below.

Although certain verbs in the MT are written with an /a/ vowel in the infinitive construct (the primary example being שָׁכַב “to lie down”), where the vowel matches the theme vowel of the imperfect, the same infinitives construct in the DSS usually attest a *waw mater*, which implies an /o/ or /u/ vowel: שׁוּב (4Q160 7, 4; 4Q223–224 2 v, 3; 4Q51 [4QSam^a] at 2 Sam 11:11). Note also שְׁלוּח in 1QIsa^a at Isa 58:9 for MT שָׁלַח.

The final *-ā* on *qal* infinitives is relatively rare among the nonbiblical scrolls. Thus, one does find רִאֵה “to fear” (4Q158 6, 5 and 4Q364 28a–b, 7) and אֶהְבֶּתְכָה “your loving” (4Q504 1–2R ii, 9) but one does not find a clear example of *קִרְאָה “to call,” *קִרְבָּה “to approach,” *שִׁנְאָה “to hate.”¹⁸³ Instead, one finds forms like לְאַהֲבֵה “to love” (1QS I, 9). The feminine *-t* ending, however, is rather common, as in the MT, especially on certain III-*aleph* verbs (קִרְאָת “to call”), on some I-*yodh* verbs (e.g., דַּעַת “to know,” צֵאת “to go forth,” and so on), as well as on some I-*nun* verbs (e.g., גִּשְׁת “to draw near”).

For I-*nun* verbs, the loss of a *nun* in the infinitive construct is regularly found in most places where it is found in the MT; where a particular verb preserves a *nun* in the MT, it preserves it in the DSS (e.g., the *qal* infinitives construct of נִגַּע “to touch” and נָפַל “to fall”).

A number of what are apparently *qal* infinitives occur with a preformative *mem*, making them look like Aramaic infinitives. Accordance parses the following as infinitives construct: מְשׁוּב (1QS III, 1; 1QM I, 13; III, 6; 4Q403 1 i, 23); מְשִׁיב (4Q257 III, 2); מְתִיר (1QS III, 3; 4Q521 2 ii + 4, 8); מְוִיחֵו (1QpHab V, 1); מְמוּד (4Q266 10 i, 12). Different readings are found for some of these, like מְשׁוּב for מְשִׁיב and מְתוּר for מְתִיר. Based on the presence of other features of the language that seem close to Aramaic in 1QS (e.g., the *aleph* marking the causative stem), one might want simply to explain these as due to Aramaic influence. Nevertheless, the real situation may be more complex. The MT evidences some exam-

183. For examples from the MT, see GKC §45d.

ples of *mem*-preformative nouns that function like infinitives (that is, verbal nouns), for example the word מִשָּׂא “bearing” (in Num 4:24, 2 Chr 20:25).¹⁸⁴ It is perhaps easier to understand such forms not as infinitives *per se* (that is, productive forms derived from the verb based on Aramaic morphology), but rather as *mem*-preformative nouns that have developed a verbal notion. Although perhaps such forms are loosely based on Aramaic influence, they are not simply mistakes for true Hebrew forms (as though the scribe wrote מִשָּׂא but intended שָׂאת); nor do they represent a genuine way of creating an infinitive construct in Hebrew. The words from the DSS can be construed similarly. Thus, the word מִמּוּד I have listed above as an example of a noun “post, standing” with a **maqṭul* base in the DSS and a **maqṭal* base in the MT.¹⁸⁵ The word מִשׁוּב “return” is morphologically analogous to מְבוֹא and perhaps so is מִתּוּר “going around.” The word מוֹכִיחוֹ is perhaps a *mem*-preformative noun, analogous to תּוֹכַחָה, though I think it is easier to interpret this as a participle: “you have formed him for his rebuker (1QpHab V, 1, quoting Hab 1:12 = MT לְהוֹכִיחַ).”¹⁸⁶

The infinitive construct forms of the III-*aleph* verb מִלֵּא “to fill” are peculiar: מִלֵּא (4Q491 1–3, 15), מְלוּא (1QSa I, 12; 4Q383 B, 1 and passim); מִילֵּאת (1QS VI, 17); מוֹלֵאת (1QS VI, 18, 21 [twice]; VIII, 26); מִילוּאת (1QSa I, 10; partially preserved in 4Q512 21–22, 2; 27,1); מִלֵּאות (4Q284 2 i, 3); and מוֹלוּת (4Q511 63–64 iii, 2). Based on orthography alone, these might represent a combination of *qal*, *piel*, and *pual* infinitives. In the MT, the *qal* infinitive construct of this verb occurs as מְלֵאת and מִלֵּאות; the forms from the DSS like מוֹלֵאת (1QS VII, 20, 22), מִלֵּאות (4Q258 VII, 2; 4Q259 II, 3, 5; 4Q367 1a–b, 6, 8; 11Q1 [11QpaleoLev^a] at Lev 25:30), and מוֹלוּת (KhQ1 8) correspond to these MT forms, the placement of the *waw* varying (as we would expect) due to the quiescence of the *aleph* and the lack of a preceding vowel.¹⁸⁷ The instances of the infinitive construct

184. Grammars and dictionaries categorize מִשָּׂא differently. Thus, e.g., BDB describes it as a “n. verb,” while Joüon-Muraoka describe it as an “infinitive” (§49e). The distinction is misleading since the infinitive really is a verbal noun.

185. See “Waw Marking /u/ Class Vowel in Nouns Where MT Has No /u/ Class Vowel” (§5.4).

186. Cf. “How will he hold up before the one reproving him (מוֹכִיחַ בוֹ)” (1QH^a XX, 31). Note also the substitution of a noun for an MT infinitive in 1QIsa^a at Isa 38:9 (Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 321).

187. See “Digraphs” (§3.5) and the subsection “Quiescence of *Aleph*” in §4.3, “Weakening of Gutturals.”

like מלא and מלוא are also easily explained as *qal*, due to analogy to the strong root; in fact, this is the form we would expect based on the etymology of the word (like ברא “to create” in Gen 5:1). The form from 4Q284, מליאות, is likely *piel mallayōt*, its *yodh* developing due to a phonetic process similar to the one that results in תתיאמרו in 1QIsa^a at Isa 61:6 for MT תתימרו “you will boast,” and לביותיו in 4Q169 3–4 i, 4 at Nah 2:13 for MT לבאותיו “its lionesses.”¹⁸⁸ The other forms (מולות, מולאת, מילאת) have various explanations. They could be *piel*, the /o/ vowel presumed by the *waw* being due to influence of a following /o/ or /u/ vowel or the *lamedh*; they could be *qal*, by analogy to other *qal* infinitives construct (of intransitive verbs) where, when a feminine suffix is added, an /o/ vowel appears under the first root consonant (e.g., MT לטמאה “to be unclean,” לקרבה “to approach”).¹⁸⁹ Alternatively, they could be *pual*.¹⁹⁰ The form

188. See the discussion of these and similar forms in “*Aleph < Yodh and Yodh < Aleph*” (§4.4). In 4Q284 2 i, 3, the *piel* fits perfectly, with the meaning of completing an amount of time (as in the MT at Gen 29:27, 2 Chr 36:21, and elsewhere): “when (he) completes for himself seven [days].” See BDB, s.v., *piel*, def. 3. In this case, the *lamedh* prepositional phrase לו expresses a dative of interest. The use of the *lamedh* here is akin to its appearance in Lev 25:30.

189. Earlier scholars proposed reading these as מילאת and מילואת and interpreting the *yodh* as replacing a shewa (see Qimron, “Waw and Yod,” 108). By contrast, Qimron (*HDSS*, 110 and 117) and Yeivin (*Hebrew Language Tradition*, 669–70) suggest that these are akin to the pronunciation of the infinitive construct of this word in the Babylonian tradition, though its pronunciation with a /u/ vowel there is also anomalous and perhaps is to be explained on analogy to forms like the infinitive of טמא: *ṭum’āh* and *ṭum’at* (see Yeivin, *Hebrew Language Tradition*, 670). Qimron, more recently, characterizes the notion of this and related forms ([י] וענות 4Q437 2 i, 7; ברובות 1QSa I, 19; [גולו] 4Q300 3, 5) as intransitive (“ענות and Its Kindred Forms” [Hebrew], *Leshonenu* 67 [2004]: 21–26.).

190. Although the *pual* of this root is only attested once in the MT, for which BDB offers the definition “filled, i.e. set with jewels,” a passive notion of the *piel* “to complete [an amount of time]” does not seem impossible for the DSS passages. Thus, e.g., the relevant part of 1QS VII, 20–21 can be translated “when two years (of) days have been completed by him...,” the *lamedh* indicating the agent of the verb. Although these phrases from the Community Rule (and even 4Q284) seem to be based on Lev 25:30 (or a similar text), where the infinitive is in the *qal* (עַד־מְלֹאת לוֹ שָׁנָה תִּמְיָמָה), the phrase in the MT is confusing due to the ambiguous role of the *lamedh* phrase. Does the pronoun refer back to “dwelling-house” (“until a year elapses for it”), or is it referring to the generic “person” of the preceding verse (“until a year elapses for him”)? Notice that in 1QS and 1QSa the forms of מלא that are not followed by the prepositional phrase לו are easily interpreted as *qal*; it is only when they are followed by the

מִלוֹאֵת is better read מוֹלוֹאֵת (as Licht and Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck do in 1QSa I, 10).¹⁹¹ In this case, it can be construed as another example like מוֹלֵאֵת.

In the *hiphil*, the infinitive construct sometimes does not have a *yodh mater*, especially after the negative particle אִין and after the *lamedh* preposition, even with II-*waw/yodh* roots (e.g., לְהוֹכֵחַ “to reprove” 4Q302 3 ii, 7; לְהִשָּׁב “to bring back” 4Q368 10 ii, 5; בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ “when he delivered” 6Q15 3, 2).¹⁹² This is in contrast to the tendency in the MT for such defective orthography to appear on forms with a suffix. As mentioned above in “*Plene Orthography*” (§3.2), this means that the infinitives construct in the DSS sometimes look like infinitives absolute. Given the occasional tendency for the infinitives construct not to have a *mater* in the MT, it is easiest to understand these forms in the DSS as infinitives construct. Nevertheless, there is ambiguity; van Peursen interprets three similarly defective *hiphil* infinitives in Ben Sira manuscripts as infinitives absolute.¹⁹³

As in the MT, there are also occasional examples of infinitives construct of derived stems in the DSS that exhibit Aramaic-like forms. In Biblical Aramaic, the causative stem infinitives often have a form like הִקְטִילָה; such forms for the infinitive are found very rarely in DSS Hebrew in words that function nominally in their respective contexts: הוֹרִיָּה “teaching” (4Q491c 11 i, 16); הִזְזִיָּה “sprinkling” (4Q512 1–6, 6).¹⁹⁴ Similarly, as in the MT, there are examples of infinitives from derived stems in the DSS that

lamedh preposition that they have unexpected forms. This might suggest that their form (with *waw*) is reflective of some variable other than simple phonology. Perhaps, the writers of 1QS were not totally familiar with the idiom of Lev 25:30 and used a different stem (*pual*) for the verb in order to create what was for them a more sensible text, while also preserving the allusion to the biblical verse.

191. Jacob Licht, *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea*, 1QS, 1QSa, 1Qsb, Text, Introduction and Commentary (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1965), 257; Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck, “Rule of the Congregation,” 112.

192. Abegg, “Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 341, 349. He estimates that for his more limited corpus, 86 percent of strong roots have *plene* forms and 90 percent of II-*waw/yodh* roots. Of course, note that the *plene* form also occurs very frequently with the *lamedh* preposition (Qimron, *HDSS*, 47).

193. See van Peursen, *Verbal System*, 278–79.

194. Three out of the four Aramaic-influenced infinitives in the MT (e.g., הִנְתָּהּ in Est 2:18) also function nominally (see Joüon-Muraoka §88Lb).

exhibit the final *-ūt* ending, as in להערי[בו]ת “to the setting of” (4Q394 [4QMMT] 3–7 i, 18); ההשתחוות “the prostrating” (4Q271 5 i, 15).¹⁹⁵

PARTICIPLES

The feminine singular participle in some derived stems is marked by the ה- morpheme more often than it is in the MT (excluding from consideration III-*waw/yodh* verbs, where this is the expected morpheme). For example, in the *piel*, the fem. sing. participle appears four times with the ה- morpheme (twice with the verb שכל “to be bereaved” (משכלה) in 4Q169 3–4 ii, 3; 4Q285 8, 8; 4Q405 23 i, 7; 11Q14 1 ii, 11. In the MT, only two *piel* fem. sing. participles appear with this morpheme (in Exod 22:17 and 23:26). In the *niphal*, the fem. sing. participles in the DSS seem to show a greater preference for this same ending (ה-) rather than the alternative (ת-) (excluding III-*waw/yodh* roots and II-*waw/yodh* roots); according to my count of the Accordance search of nonbiblical scrolls, there are thirty clear examples of the fem. sing. *niphal* participle with the ה- ending (e.g., נשברה 1QS VIII, 3) and fourteen with the ת- ending (e.g., נשברת 1QH^a XV, 5). By contrast, in the MT from Genesis through Deuteronomy, there are no examples of the participle with the ה- ending and eleven with the ת- ending, while in the book of Isaiah there are two examples with the ה- ending and thirteen with the ת- ending. In the *hiphil*, however, the ת- ending is dominant both in the DSS and in the MT.

5.7. QAL IMPERFECT + SUFFIX

Among the DSS (specifically among the DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts), one often finds *qal* verbal forms that appear to have the /o/ or /u/ theme vowel preserved, though in the Tiberian tradition such theme vowels are preserved only in pause. Thus, we find יכתבו *yiktōbū* “they will write” (1QM IV, 13) where we might otherwise expect יכתבו *yiktābū*.¹⁹⁶ These *qal* imperfect forms are often referred to as “so-called pausal forms” due

195. The two MT examples are להשמעות Ezek 24:26 and התחברות Dan 11:23 (see Joüon-Muraoka §88Mj).

196. The presence of a *waw mater* to mark an /o/ or /u/ vowel in these verbal forms is similar to the use of *waw* in other nominal and verbal forms in the DSS where corresponding forms in the MT usually have no *mater* (e.g., חוק vs. MT חק is similar to יכתבו vs. pausal יכתבו). Texts of the DSS-NSP category sometimes do not exhibit

to the fact that they look like MT pausal forms but do not always occur in places we would expect pausal forms to appear. The reason for the *waw mater* (and the associated vowel) is hard to know. Scholars have proposed that it is due to the penultimate accent in this dialect of Hebrew;¹⁹⁷ due to the presence of a shewa colored by the original vowel (in essence a *hatef-gamets*, similar to the vowel one often sees in the MT in the first syllable of the plural form of חֳדָשִׁים “months” as well as in some verbal forms like אֲשַׁקֹּטָה “I will be quiet” [Isa 18:4]);¹⁹⁸ due to a tendency to use archaic forms;¹⁹⁹ the result of a preservation of the etymological unaccented /o/ or /u/ vowel as in the Babylonian tradition;²⁰⁰ or the result of writing what was perceived to be the correct verbal form.²⁰¹ For me, the last two opin-

this *mater*, even where the verb form occurs in pause (e.g., יִשְׁפֹּטוּ 1Q8 [1QIsa^b] at Isa 51:5 for MT יִשְׁפֹּטוּ).

197. Qimron offers a slightly different summary of the scholarship in *HDSS*, 50–51. The explanation for penultimate stress is often associated with Ben-Hayyim (“Traditions in the Hebrew Language,” 202–3; and “Tradition of the Samaritans,” 225–26); see also Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 330–40 and references there as well as Morag, “Qumran Hebrew,” 155.

198. Kutscher (*Isaiah*, 335 n. 2, 339–40) cites other forms from the MT like וְאֲשַׁקֹּלָהָ (Ezra 8:25), as well as forms with what seems to be a long vowel יִשְׁפֹּטוּ (Exod 18:26), תִּעְבְּרוּי (Ruth 2:8) and other evidence (e.g., the Secunda’s *εφφολου* [for MT יִפְלִי Ps 18:39] and *ουιερογος* [for MT וַיִּחַרְגוּי Ps 18:46]). He believes that forms with a *hatef* vowel may be regarded as “remnants of an early stage” in the development of these forms, though for 1QIsa^a the *waw* probably does not represent a *hatef* vowel, but rather an accented short /o/. See also Goshen-Gottstein, “Linguistic Structure,” 123–24 and the references there.

199. Steven E. Fassberg suggests the possibility that the long forms of the imperfect are due to the scribes’ preference for archaic, literary forms (“The Preference for Lengthened Forms in Qumran Hebrew” [Hebrew], *Meghillot* 1 [2003]: 235).

200. Israel Yeivin sees the DSS verbal forms as akin to Babylonian verbal forms that preserve the /o/ or /u/ theme vowel and are accented on the last syllable (“The Verbal Forms יְקוּטְלוּ, יְקוּטְלוּ in DSS in Comparison to the Babylonian Vocalization” [Hebrew], in *Bible and Jewish History: Studies in Bible and Jewish History Dedicated to the Memory of Jacob Liver* [ed. Benjamin Uffenheimer; Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, 1971], 256–76). Qimron sees them as older verbal forms (“Nature of DSS Hebrew,” 243).

201. Einar Brønno argues that the writing of the verbal forms with a *waw* after the second root consonant is reflective of what the scribes *thought* they were speaking (i.e., *yiqtālū*), when in reality they were saying something more abbreviated (i.e., *yiqtālū*), as in English we might write “I will” but pronounce the words “I’ll” (“The Isaiah Scroll DSIa and the Greek Transliterations of Hebrew,” *ZDMG* 106 [1956]: 255). Skehan and

ions seem most convincing. But whatever the cause, the phenomenon seems to be quite well-attested in DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts, though it is not found in all texts or in all *qal* verbal forms (e.g., ידרשו “they will seek” 4Q418 103 ii, 5). Further illustrations of the preference among the DSS for pausal forms in verbal and nominal morphology are offered in “Accent or Stress” (§4.7).

The “pausal” forms of the *qal* imperfect verb are attested in the DSS even where corresponding verbal forms in pause in the MT do not usually evidence a theme vowel (again almost exclusively in DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts). For example, the *qal* 2ms imperfect with pronominal object suffix appears with a *waw mater*: תעזובני “you do [not] abandon me” (1QH^a XXII, 37) versus MT pausal תַעֲזֹבֵנִי (Ps 71:9).²⁰² Scholars have applied to these forms the same or similar explanations as those listed above for כתובו.²⁰³ Again, the most convincing explanation is that these forms preserve the etymological theme vowel and/or represent what the scribes thought they were speaking.

In other cases, a *mater* does not appear between the second and third root consonants, but rather, between the first and second root consonants: ידורשהו “he will examine him” (1QS VI:14). These forms are more or less peculiar to DSS Hebrew. *Qal* verbal forms with a *mater* in this position only occur with object suffixes.²⁰⁴ These forms have also elicited the attention of scholars who have explained them as reflecting a helping vowel,

Ulrich, for their part, note simply: “the imperfect verbal forms such as ידרשו... are interpreted as orthographic” (“Isaiah,” in DJD 15:46).

202. Very rarely one finds in the MT a *qal* imperfect + suffix where the /o/ or /u/ vowel is preserved in pause: יהִדְפְּנוּ (Num 35:20 for an intended *יהִדְפְּנוּ, as in Jos 23:5), אֶצְרְנָה (Isa 27:3, versus תִּצְרְנֵי in Ps 140:2); יִקְבְּנָה (Isa 62:2); תִּשְׁמוֹרֵם (Prov 14:3, versus יִשְׁמְרֵי in Job 29:2); see Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 335 n. 2, 339–40. On the other hand, one regularly finds an /o/ vowel after the second root consonant in these kinds of verbs in the Babylonian tradition (see Yeivin, *Hebrew Language Tradition*, 451, 469–71).

203. Scholars often note in relation to these forms the preservation of a similar vowel in verbs from the Secunda and Jerome, as well as Babylonian Hebrew. For example, Kutscher cites *εμωσσημ* (for MT אֶמְחַצֵּם Ps 18:39) and *εσοασημ* (for MT אֶשְׁחַקֵּם Ps 18:43), as well as one example from Jerome: *iesbuleni* for MT יִזְבְּלֵנִי at Gen 30:20 (*Isaiah*, 336 n. 3). Note, however, the verbs that exhibit an /o/ vowel in the Secunda have an /a/ theme vowel in the imperfect in the MT, while the verbs with a corresponding vowel in the imperfect in the DSS overwhelmingly have an /o/ or /u/ theme vowel in the MT.

204. The form יהופכו in 4Q432 4, 1 is parsed as *qal* in Accordance, presumably

akin to the /i/ and /â/ vowels that occur in similar (but not identical) Babylonian and Samaritan forms (e.g., Babylonian: *tišim*^u versus MT תִּשְׁמְעוּ “you will hear,” and Samaritan: *yērāššū* versus MT יִרְחֲצוּ “they will wash”), as well as the /e/ vowel in two forms from the Secunda (συειεσαμου [for MT וַיִּשְׂמְחוּ “and they will rejoice” Ps 35:27] and ιαερσου [for MT יִקְרְצוּ “they will wink” Ps 35:19]), and an /o/ vowel at least once in the MT (הִיחַבְרְךָ “will he join you?” Ps 94:20).²⁰⁵ Alternatively, these forms may be explained as the result of vowel assimilation (similar to how פעולה “work” becomes פועלה).²⁰⁶ Or, the two different forms, *yqṭwl* + suffix and *yqwtl* + suffix, can be understood simply as alternative forms to each other, similar to how there are alternative forms for *qal* imperative + suffix and *qal* infinitive construct + suffix in the DSS (שומרני *šomrēnī* “guard me” 11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 140:5 for MT שְׁמֹרֵנִי versus שמורני *šmorēnī* “guard me” 11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 141:9 for MT שְׁמֹרֵנִי and למושחני *lamošhēnī* “to

based on the parallel word in 1QH^a X, 19 יהפוכו; the *waw* in יהפוכו is due to confusion with the root (found in RH) אפך (see the subsection “Lexicon” in §5.6, “Verbs”).

205. Ben-Hayyim notes the parallel to the Babylonian tradition (“Studies in the Traditions,” 87–88) and the Samaritan forms (*Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew*, 109, 128); the Samaritan transcription should have a macron over the /â/ vowel. See also Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 336–37. On the forms from the Secunda, see Einar Brønno, *Studien über hebräische Morphologie und Vokalismus auf Grundlage der mercatischen Fragmente der zweiten Kolumn der Hexapla des Origenes* (Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft / Brockhaus, 1943), 32–35 and Janssens, *Studies in Hebrew*, 1982), 159. On the form יִחַבְרְךָ from Ps 94:20, see Yeivin, “Verbal Forms,” 261. In addition, the forms תִּעְבְּדֶם (Ex 20:5, 23:24, Deut 5:9, all in pause) and נִעְבְּדֶם (Deut 13:3, in pause), which in their context cannot be construed as *hophals*, may also evidence this /o/ vowel between the first and second root consonants, as if they should have been *תִּעְבְּדֶם and *נִעְבְּדֶם. According to this explanation, the unexpected /o/ vowel after the prefix in these biblical forms (-תִּ and -נִ) may be an auxiliary vowel, similar to the analysis of the initial /o/ vowel as auxiliary (though from an etymological /u/) in infinitive forms like קִרְבְּכֶם “(as) you approach” (Deut 20:2) and מֵאַסְכֶם “(because of) your rejecting” (Isa 30:12) (Yeivin, “Verbal Forms,” 265; Joüon-Muraoka §63b and §65c). One sees a similar movement of an /o/ vowel toward the prefix of an imperfect verb in the contextual MT form יִחַנֶּךָ “he will show you favor” (Gen 43:29 and Isa 30:19); cf. וַיַּחַנֶּךָ (Num 6:25) (see GKC §67n).

206. Kutscher seems to imply that the /o/ or /u/ vowel in the DSS forms (e.g., וידורשהו) is due to assimilation when he compares the vowel in *yqwtl* + suffix to the initial vowel of עומרה (*Isaiah*, 337 n. 2 [top note]). Thus, the forms like *yqwtl* + suffix may have emerged through assimilation, *yiqṭolēnī* > *yqoṭolēnī* > *yqoṭlēnī*. On פועלה, see “Waw Marking /u/ Class Vowel in Nouns Where MT Has No /u/ Class Vowel” (§5.4).

anoint me” 11Q5 [11QPs^a] XXVIII, 8 versus ללכודני *lilkōdēnī* “to capture me” 4Q437 2 i, 2). A similar alternation of vowel placement in the imperative appears in the Babylonian tradition (*wāduqreni* “pierce me” 1 Sam 31:4 [for what would be in the MT *וְדַקְרַנִּי, though the MT has a *waw*-consec. perfect here] versus *māšokeni* “pull me” Song 1:4 [compare MT [מְשִׁכֵנִי]).²⁰⁷ Alternation of vowel placement in the infinitive occurs in both the Babylonian and Tiberian traditions (*lišmorākā* and לְשַׁמְרֵךָ “to guard you” Ps 91:11 versus *šukbākā* and בְּשִׁכְבְּךָ “when you lie down” Deut 6:7).

In the following list, I summarize the variety of possible *qal* imperfect verb forms with suffix that diverge from the Tiberian model. Excluded from consideration are those forms whose first root consonant is not attested and/or those whose suffix is not attested.

1. *Mater* between second and third root consonant
 - 1.1. imperfect (stem) forms that end in consonant
 - 1.2. *waw*-consec. imperfect (stem) forms that end in consonant
 - 1.3. imperfect (stem) forms that end in vowel (defective and *plene* 3mp morpheme)
 - 1.4. *waw*-consec. imperfect (stem) forms that end in vowel (defective and *plene* 3mp morpheme)

2. *Mater* between first and second root consonant
 - 2.1. imperfect (stem) forms that end in consonant
 - 2.2. *waw*-consec. imperfect (stem) forms that end in consonant
 - 2.3. imperfect (stem) forms that end in vowel (defective and *plene* 3mp morpheme)

207. Yeivin, “Verbal Forms,” 274–75. He notices that other Hebrew traditions do not use an /o/ or /u/ helping vowel in verbs and the fact that the *waw* after the first root consonant in the imperfect appears only in *qal* forms with suffixes. See also Qimron, *HDSS*, 52–53. More examples of *qal* ms imperative + suffix in the DSS are found in “*Qal* Imperative + Suffix” (§5.8). Most examples of *qal* infinitives + suffix in the DSS have the *waw mater* after the first root consonant; I could find only five examples where the *waw* follows the second root consonant; see the subsection “Infinitives” in §5.6, “Verbs.” The examples from the Babylonian tradition are drawn from Yeivin, *Hebrew Language Tradition*, 480 and 489.

2.4. *waw*-consec. imperfect (stem) forms that end in vowel
(defective and *plene* 3mp morpheme)

1. *Mater* between second and third root consonant

1.1. imperfect (stem) forms that end in consonant

תשמורכה "he will guard you" (1QS II, 3)

תעזובנו "do (not) abandon us" (1QH^a XXII, 37)

אעזובכה "I will (not) abandon you" (4Q382 9, 7)

תטושני "do (not) forsake us" (4Q504 7, 10)

יטושנה "he will (not) forsake it" (4Q525 2 ii + 3, 5) (+
energetic *nun*)

תזריענו "you will plant it" (1QIsa^a at Isa 17:10) (+ energetic
nun) for MT תזרענו

אצורנה "I will guard it" (1QIsa^a at Isa 27:3) (+ energetic
nun) for MT אצרנה

תאכולנו "you will eat it" (1QIsa^a at Isa 31:8) (+ energetic
nun) for MT תאכלנו

אעזובם "I will abandon them" (1QIsa^a at Isa 41:17) for
MT אעזבם

ואצורכה "I will guard you" (1QIsa^a at Isa 42:6) for MT
ואצרך

ויערוכהה "he will arrange it" (1QIsa^a at Isa 44:7) for MT
ויערך

ויצורהו "he formed him" (1QIsa^a at Isa 44:12) for MT
יצרהו

ואצורכה "I will guard you" (1QIsa^a at Isa 49:8) for MT
ואצרך

יאכולם "he will eat them" (1QIsa^a at Isa 50:9) for MT
יאכלם

יקובנו "he will indicate it" (1QIsa^a at Isa 62:2) (+ energetic
nun) for MT יקבנו

יצנפך "he will turn you round" (4Q60 [4QIsa^f] at Isa
22:18) for MT יצנףך

ואצורך [ו] "I will guard you" (4Q62 [4QIsa^h] at Isa 42:6) for
MT ואצרך

תעזובני "you will (not) abandon me" (4Q83 [4QPs^a] at Ps
38:22) for MT תעזבני

1.2. *waw*-consec. imperfect (stem) forms that end in consonant

וּישְׁמֹרֶהוּ “he will guard him” (1QH^a XXI, 27)

וַיִּלְכְּדֶהָ “he captured it” (1QIsa^a at Isa 20:1) for MT

וַיִּתְפּוֹשֵׁם “he seized them” (1QIsa^a at Isa 36:1) for MT
וַיִּתְפּוֹשֵׁם

וַיִּפְרֹשֶׂהָ “he spread it out” (1QIsa^a at Isa 37:14) for MT
וַיִּפְרֹשֶׂהוּ

וַיִּרְמָסֶהוּ “he trampled it” (4Q113 [4QDan^b] at Dan 8:7), damaged, for MT
וַיִּרְמָסֶהוּ

וַיִּכְתְּבֵם “he wrote them” (4Q135 [4QPhyl H] at Deut 5:22), extremely damaged for MT
וַיִּכְתְּבֵם

1.3. imperfect (stem) forms that end in vowel (defective and *plene* 3mp morpheme)²⁰⁸

יִדְרֹשׁוּ “they will examine him” (1QS VI, 17)

יִפְקֹדוּ “they will appoint him” (1QS VI, 21)

יִכְתֹּבוּ “they will write him” (1QS VI, 22)

יִחְשׁוּבֵנִי “they consider me” (1QH^a XI, 7)

יַעֲבֹדוּכִי “they will serve you” (1QIsa^a at Isa 60:12) for MT
יַעֲבֹדוּךְ

יֵאָכְלוּהָ “they will eat it” (1QIsa^a at Isa 62:9) for MT
יֵאָכְלוּהוּ

יִזְכֹּרוּכָה “they will remember you” (1QIsa^a at Isa 64:4) for
MT
יִזְכְּרוּךְ

1.4. *waw*-consec. imperfect (stem) forms that end in vowel (defective and *plene* 3mp morpheme)

None.

2. *Mater* between first and second root consonant

2.1. imperfect (stem) forms that end in consonant

יִדְרֹשׁוּ “he will examine him” (1QS VI, 14)

יִשׁוֹפֵטֵנִי “he will judge me” (1QS X, 13)

יִתְדְרֹשׁוּ [ת] “you will examine him” (1QSb III, 20)

יִשׁוֹפֵטֵנּוּ “he will judge him” (1QpHab XII, 5) (+ energetic
nun)

208. Note the similar forms with paragogic *nun*: תְּכַרְתֹּתוּן “you will cut down” 11Q19 II, 7; תַּעֲבֹדוּן “you will serve” 11Q19 LIV, 14.

- אֲדוֹרְשָׁכָה “I will seek you” (1QH^a XII, 7)
- יַעֲוֹבְרָנָה “he will (not) cross it” (1QH^a XIV, 24) (+ energetic *nun*)
- יַעֲוֹשְׁקֵנוּ “he will oppress him” (1Q27 1 i, 10) (+ energetic *nun*)
- יִסּוּמְכֵנוּ “he will (not) support him” (4Q161 8–10, 18) (+ energetic *nun*)
- תְּשׁוּטְפֵנִי [ת] “it will wash me away” (4Q437 2 i, 10) (+ energetic *nun*)
- אֲחֹרְתֵם “I will engrave them” (4Q511 63–64 ii, 3)
- יַעֲזוּבְנָה “he will (not) abandon it” (4Q525 2 ii + 3, 5) (+ energetic *nun*)
- אֲדוֹרְשָׁנָה “I will seek it” (11Q5 [11QPs^a] XXI, 12) (+ energetic *nun*)
- תְּשׁוּפְכֵנוּ “you will pour it out” (11Q19 LII, 12) (+ energetic *nun*)
- תְּשׁוּפְכֵנוּ “you will pour it out” (11Q19 LIII, 5) (+ energetic *nun*)
- אֲדוֹרְשָׁנִי “I will seek it” (11Q19 LIII, 11) (+ energetic *nun*)
- תְּקוּבְרֵמָה “you will bury them” (11Q19 LXIV, 11)
- יַעֲוֹבְרָנָה “he will not cross it” (1QIsa^a at Isa 35:8) (+ energetic *nun*) for MT יַעֲבֹרְנֵנוּ²⁰⁹
- יַעֲוֹדְךָ “he will hold you” (1QIsa^a at Isa 22:17) for MT יַעֲוֹדְךָ (*qal* ptc.)²¹⁰
- תְּעוּבְדֵם “you will (not) serve them” (1Q13 [1QPhyl] and 4Q41 [4QDeutⁿ] at Deut 5:9) for MT תְּעַבְדֵם²¹¹
- תְּעוּבְדֵמָה “you will (not) serve them” (4Q129 [4QPhyl B] and 4Q137 [4QPhyl J] at Deut 5:9) for MT תְּעַבְדֵם

209. I assume that only one *mater* was intended in this form; i.e., this is a partially corrected form. Kutscher notes that the interlinear *mater* seems to have been written by another scribe (*Isaiah*, 340).

210. Burrows first read a *waw* as the initial letter, while Accordance and Ulrich et al. (*Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 370) see a *yodh*. There are no other examples of an /o/ vowel between first and second root consonants of III-*waw/yodh* verbs.

211. Although the parsing of the MT form is debatable, it seems at least possible that the forms in the MT are examples of the *yqwtl* + suffix form. See Joüon-Muraoka §63b and §65c.

- ישומרכה “he will protect you” (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 121:7) for MT **יִשְׁמְרֶךָ**
- 2.2. *waw*-consec. imperfect (stem) forms that end in consonant
- ויכותבם “he wrote them” (4Q41 [4QDeut^a] at Deut 5:22) for MT **וַיִּכְתְּבֵם**
- ותחושבהו “you have thought of them” (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 144:3) for MT **וַתַּחֲשְׁבֵהוּ**
- 2.3. imperfect (stem) forms that end in vowel
- יעבדוכה “they will serve you” (1QSb V, 28)
- ויעבדוני “they will serve me” (4Q365 2, 7 at Exod 8:16) for MT **וַיַּעֲבֹדֵנִי**
- ויסקלוני “they will stone me” (4Q365 7 i, 3 at Exod 17:4) for MT **וַיִּסְקְלוּנִי**
- ידורשוהו “they will (not) seek him” (4Q423 9, 2)
- ידורשום “they will (not) seek them” (4Q475 1, 2)
- יעוזבוהו “they will abandon him” (11Q19 LVII, 7)
- ידורשוה “they will seek it” (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 119:2) for MT **יִדְרְשׁוּהוּ**
- יעזרני “they will help me” (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 119:175) for MT **יַעֲזְרֵנִי** (not the expected ***יַעֲזְרֵנִי**)
- 2.4. *waw*-consec. imperfect (stem) forms that end in vowel (defective and *plene* 3mp morpheme)
- וישומעוני “they heard me” (1QH^a XII, 25)

There are eight conclusions to draw. First, most of the verb forms (both *yqtwl* + suffix and *yqwʔl* + suffix) derive from DSS-SP9 texts. For *yqwʔl* + suffix this is not surprising since this feature is one that marks the texts as DSS-SP9; the dominance of DSS-SP9 texts in the *yqtwl* + suffix category may partially reflect the tendency for *plene* spelling in these texts (note the many examples from biblical scrolls where a *waw* appears for a MT *qamets-hatuf* or *hatef-qamets*). The examples of *yqwʔl* + suffix that come from DSS-NSP texts (that is, 1Q13, 4Q41) parallel the verbal forms attested in the MT with a *qamets-hatuf* between first and second root consonants (e.g., **תַּעֲבֹדֵם** Deut 5:9). Such distribution suggests that the MT forms like **תַּעֲבֹדֵם** are not related to the *yqwʔl* + suffix forms and have another explanation (that is, the *qamets* under the *ʿayin* represents a secondary vowel, like that after *heh* in **צְהוּרִים** “noon” Isa 58:10 and 59:10, spelled *plene* צְהוּרִים in

1QIsa^a).²¹² Second, the total number of *yq̄t̄wl* + suffix forms is thirty-one, while the number of *yq̄w̄t̄l* + suffix forms is thirty-four (including the four examples from Deut 5:9). In other words, all things being equal, it seems just as likely that a verb would have a *mater* after the first root consonant as after the second. These may be contrasted with the approximately sixty-five *qal* verbal forms from strong, I-*nun*, and I-guttural roots with an /o/ or /u/ theme vowel that attest a suffix and which have no *mater* marking their theme vowel in the DSS.²¹³ Many of these are the same verbs that attest *waw* *maters*, like *יִדְרֹשׁוּכָה* (1QH^a XII, 16), *יִשְׁפֹּטְנוּ* (1QpHab X, 5), and *יִעֲזְבוּם* (4Q171 1–2 ii, 14). These may represent defective spellings of either the *yq̄t̄wl* + suffix or *yq̄w̄t̄l* + suffix patterns or yet another pattern with a muttered vowel under the second root consonant, parallel to the common pronunciation in the MT. Third, almost all the examples are of verbs from strong roots, I-*nun* roots (only for *yq̄t̄wl* + suffix), and I-guttural roots.²¹⁴ The main exception for *yq̄t̄wl* + suffix forms is *תִּזְרִיעֵנוּ* (1QIsa^a at Isa 17:10), which is best understood in light of other III-guttural verbs which take an /o/ or /u/ theme vowel in 1QIsa^a.²¹⁵ The main exceptions for *yq̄w̄t̄l* + suffix forms are the III-guttural verb attested in 1QH^a XII, 25 *וְיִשׁוּמְעוּנִי* and the apparent III-*waw/yodh* verb attested in 1QIsa^a at Isa 22:17 *יְעוֹטֵךְ*. It seems

212. It seems less likely that the MT has inherited such verbal forms from a tradition like that exhibited by the DSS-SP9 texts. But, is it conceivable that the biblical *תַּעֲבֹדָם* was so well-known that it influenced the DSS forms?

213. Tigchelaar, without mentioning specifics, suggests that the various *qal* imperfect + suffix forms occur in roughly equal distribution. He writes: “The *yiq̄tolu* forms (or spellings?) are extremely common in 1QIsa^a, though there are a few *yiq̄t̄lu* ones, but in other texts the cases of either form/spelling are rare, but more or less equally distributed. The same goes for the *yiq̄t̄leni/ȳq̄t̄leni* form” (“Assessing Emanuel Tov’s ‘Qumran Scribal Practice,’” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* [ed. Sarianna Metso, et al; STDJ 92; Leiden: Brill, 2010], 193).

214. I-*yodh*, II-guttural, III-guttural, etymological III-*waw/yodh* roots are not attested with a *waw mater*. As a sample, note the following verbs that take object suffixes without a *waw mater* in biblical and nonbiblical scrolls: *בָּחַר*, *בָּלַע*, *גָּאֵל*, *זָבַח*, *זָרַע*, *שָׁמַע*, *שָׁלַח*, *שָׁכַח*, *שָׁאֵל*, *שָׁנֵא*, *פָּרַע*, *מָשַׁח*, *נָצַח*, *נָחַל*, *לָקַח*, *טָבַע*, *יָדַע*, *זָרַע*. Geminate roots are, of course, excluded from consideration since a /u/ class vowel after the first root consonant is characteristic of the *qal* geminate paradigm and, therefore, the appearance of *waw maters* in these forms is not surprising. Note finally that no other conjugation except for the *pual* regularly evidences a *waw mater* between the first and second root consonants.

215. See, Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 341–42, though he does not list this specific form. See also the subsection “Imperfect and *Waw-Consecutive Imperfect*” in §5.6, “Verbs.”

possible that the verb form **וישומעוני** is due to its being conceived (here at least) as a *yiqṭōl* imperfect.²¹⁶ With regard to **יעוטך**, the easiest explanation is a confusion between an initial *waw* and *yodh*, exacerbated, perhaps, by variant traditions (e.g., although the MT has a participle, **יְעֹטְךָ**, the scrolls 1Q8 [1QIsa^b] and 4Q56 [4QIsa^b] have what seems to be a *waw* + imperfect: **יְעֹטְךָ** and **יְעֹטְךָ**, respectively); in other words, **יעוטך** might be a mixture of the imperfect and participle forms. The consistency with which one sees *yiqṭōl* imperfections suggests the *waw mater* in *yqwṭl* + suffix forms is related to the theme vowel. Fourth, the presence or absence of an energetic *nun* does not seem to affect the form. The energetic *nun* occurs on most verb types with suffixes. Fifth, the presence of a long vowel at the end of the verbal form (like the 3mp affix *-ū*) does not affect the form. Sixth, any type of suffix (3ms, 3fs, and so on) seems capable of being used with any verb form.²¹⁷ Seventh, there seems to be no connection between the type of consonant (aside from gutturals and *waws/yodhs*) that appears in the middle of the word and the preference for the form of the verb; that is, the middle consonant might be a labial, a liquid, or a dental. Finally, since there is no good evidence for imperfect + suffix forms spelled with *waw maters* after both first and second root consonants (as is found, for example, with some **quṭl* nouns), it is likeliest that there was only one vowel between the root consonants (that is, *yiqṭōlēni* and *yaqoṭlēni*). This finds support in the form **יְהִיבְרָךְ** from Ps 94:20, as well as in other evidence from the MT and Babylonian tradition for *yqṭwl* + suffix forms.

Based on the above analysis, some statements by previous scholars should be reevaluated. Tov's listing of thirty-four instances of "*y^equṭlenu*" is the same as my own; his specific listings are more puzzling, however.²¹⁸

216. Note the possible reading of **יש[מועו]** in 4Q491 1–3, 13, though Accordance reads **יש[מיעו]**.

217. Note, however, there are seven instances of *yqṭwlkh* forms, while only two (likely) instances of *yqwṭlkh* (**אדורשכה** 1QH^a XII, 7; **ישומרכה** 11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 121:7). One wonders if the frequency of *yqṭwlkh* forms is related to the tendency, found in the MT, for the 2ms suffix to have no connecting vowel between the verb form and the suffix (except primarily in pause): **ישְמֹרְךָ** (Ps 121:7, pronounced *yīšmorkā*) as opposed to pausal **ישְמֹרְךָ** (Num 6:24). Arguing against this interpretation, of course, is the fact that **ישומרכה** from 11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 121:7 is not in pause and, in fact, one would expect a *waw mater* between the second and third root consonants, based on the MT form **ישְמֹרְךָ**. Furthermore, as stated earlier, the *qal* verb forms in the DSS seem to prefer pausal forms.

218. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 339–343.

He finds thirteen instances of *yqwtl* + suffix in 1QIsa^a, but I find only one.²¹⁹ The statement by Morag that the “most usual of all patterns” for the *qal* imperfect + suffix is *yqwtl* + suffix must be revised.²²⁰

Although Yeivin and Qimron’s comparison to the alternation seen in *qal* imperatives + suffixes and infinitives construct + suffix in the DSS and other traditions is correct, it should be qualified slightly.²²¹ For example, the DSS seems to be the only tradition that sees so much variation. Variation in *qal* imperatives + suffix takes place very rarely in the MT (involving “long imperatives” in the *kethib* like מְלוֹכָה “rule” in Judg 9:8 and צָרֹפָה “refine” in Ps 26:2), though it is more common in the Babylonian tradition (*waduqreni* versus *māšokeni*, cited above).²²² Alternative forms for infinitives + suffix in the MT are restricted by certain phonological principles (an /o/ vowel appears after the second root consonant only when there is no vowel that comes between the verbal root and the suffix, for example, בָּשַׁפְּכָה *bāšofkakā* “when you pour out” Ezek 9:8 versus אָמַרְתָּ *’āmorkā* “you said” Ezek 35:10).²²³ A similar pattern holds for infinitives + suffix in the Babylonian tradition.²²⁴ In the Samaritan tradition, the alternate forms of the infinitive + suffix are based, in part, on the presence or absence of

219. Note that Kutscher, in commenting on the form יעיבורנו from 1QIsa^a at Is 35:8, says that such forms as *yqwtl* for MT *yqtl* are “not found in the Isa. Scr., but do appear in other Qumran scrolls” (*Isaiah*, 340). Similarly, Abegg says the form above with two *waws* is the only one that contains a *waw* between the first and second consonants (“Linguistic Profile,” 32). E. Tigchelaar in his review of Tov’s book (“Review of Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*,” *DSD* 14 [2007]: 368–372) does not mention the discrepancy in Tov’s chart.

220. Morag, “Qumran Hebrew,” 155.

221. Qimron (*HDSS*, 52) writes: “DSS Hebrew, like other Hebrew traditions, has two possibilities for the infinitive and imperative with suffixes: קוטלני alongside קטולני (imperative), and לקוטלני alongside לקטולני (infinitive)... The corresponding doublets in the imperfect with suffixes (יקוטלני / יקטולני) are an analogical extension of this behavior.”

222. On the imperative with suffix, see §5.8, “*Qal* Imperative + Suffix.”

223. See Muraoka, “Hebrew,” 1:343.

224. In the Babylonian tradition an /o/ vowel typically occurs after the second consonant in *qal* infinitives with a second-person suffix, with a muttered vowel (sometimes) appearing after the third root consonant: *lirdopakā* in 1 Sam 25:29 (= MT לִרְדֹּפְךָ) (see Yeivin, *Hebrew Language Tradition*, 489). By contrast, a vowel typically occurs after the first root consonant with other suffixes (e.g., *bāzukurenu* in Ps 137:1 [= MT בָּזְכְּרֵנוּ; *ibid.*, 488]).

an affixed preposition.²²⁵ Criticisms like these do not make one question the validity of Qimron's general observation on the possible interrelatedness of the forms in DSS Hebrew, but it does make one wonder about the precise relationships of these forms to those in the other traditions.

Kutscher's suggestion of vowel assimilation may be possible, though in the other cases where a /u/ develops in front of another /u/ vowel, the /u/ that develops secondarily stands at the beginning of the word (e.g., פועלה "work"), where another vowel once stood. By contrast, there is no etymological vowel after the first root consonant in *qal* imperfects.²²⁶

The suggestion that the /o/ vowel in *yqwtl* + suffix forms is a helping vowel seems the weakest to me, though perhaps this too is possible. Note יעזרני (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 119:175) for MT יַעְזְרֵנִי, though this verb is ordinarily pronounced without a helping vowel in the MT, יַעְזְרֵנִי (2 Chr 28:23) and יַעְזְרֶכֶם (Deut 32:38).

Another explanation for the *yqwtl* + suffix forms may be that they are based on analogy to the pausal form of geminate verbs with suffixes, where one sometimes finds an /o/ or /u/ vowel between the first and second root consonants: יחונכה "he will favor you" (1QS II, 3 and passim), corresponding to MT pausal וַיְחַנְּךָ (Num 6:25), וַיְחַנְּנִי (Mal 1:9), and similar forms like וַיְחַנְּנִי (2 Sam 12:22); [ה] יסבוכ [ה] "they will surround you" (4Q460 7, 8), corresponding to similar MT forms like וַיְסַבְּוּהוּ (Job 40:22) and וַיְסַבְּבֵנִי (Ps 49:6).²²⁷ Conceivably, the development of *yqwtl* + suffix forms was due to several simultaneous factors, including one or more of the above explanations.

5.8. QAL IMPERATIVE + SUFFIX

The distribution of the *qal* imperative + suffix is somewhat similar to that of the *qal* imperfect + suffix. As mentioned above, the forms seem, at least

225. See Ben-Ḥayyim, *Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew*, 207–8. In general, however, it is hard for me to get a sense of the distribution of the forms based on Ben-Ḥayyim's descriptions.

226. In a similar way, where the theme vowel shifts forward in geminate and other verbs to the prefix, it replaces a historical vowel: וַיְחַנְּךָ (Gen 43:29, Isa 30:19) derives from a form akin to the pausal וַיְחַנְּךָ; and וַיִּשְׁרָם "he directed them" (2 Chr 32:30) from *וַיִּשְׁרָם.

227. The /o/ or /u/ vowel between first and second root consonants in geminate verbs is also found in cases where there is no suffix: יזמו (4Q171 1–2 ii, 14); ישונו (4Q266 9 iii, 4 and 4Q418 188, 7); ירועו (1QH^a XII, 34; 4Q511 3, 7; and 20 ii, 3).

superficially, to be related to each other. Just as in the case of the imperfect, when suffixes are attached to the *qal* imperative, a *waw* sometimes appears after the second root consonant (three times), sometimes after the first (five times). This distribution presumes two different pronunciations: *qoṭlēnī* and *qoṭōlēnī*, paralleling the two different pronunciations for the imperfect + suffix.

Qal ms imperatives with suffix

נקובני “designate me” (4Q364 4b–e ii, 5)

עובדם “serve them” (4Q416 2 iii, 17)

דורשם “seek them” (4Q418 103 ii, 4)

זכורני “remember me” (11Q5 XXIV, 10)

כתבהא “write it” (1QIsa^a at Isa 30:8) for MT כתבה

עוזרני “aid me” (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 119:86) for MT עזרני

שומרני “guard me” (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 140:5) for MT שמרני

שמורני “guard me” (11Q5 [11QPs^a] at Ps 141:9) for MT שמרני

Note that we are again concerned with roots that are strong, I-*nun* or I-guttural. All the verbs have *yiqtol* imperfections. The MT contains very rare comparable examples of the *qtl* + suffix pattern (mentioned above, of the *kethib* מְלוֹכָה and צְרוּפָה), though the Babylonian tradition attests more examples.²²⁸ However, the DSS and Babylonian traditions are not identical in relation to these forms. The *qal* imperative + suffix in the Babylonian tradition has an /o/ or /u/ vowel after the second root consonant regularly, and has a similar vowel after the first root consonant only where the form is accented penultimately (e.g., *wəduqreni* 1 Sam 31:4 [= MT וְדַקְרַנִּי “pierce me”]).²²⁹ The DSS forms listed above do not attest this same limitation (e.g., עובדם ‘*obdēm*). The variation in the DSS forms is exemplified in the exact same verb form exhibiting a *waw* after the first root consonant in one passage of a scroll and a *waw* after the second root consonant in another passage from the same scroll (שמורני versus שומרני).

The *qal* feminine singular imperatives do not occur with suffixes. Similarly, there are no clear instances of the *qal* masculine plural imperative + suffix; the closest we come is דורש[והו] “examine him” in 1QSa II, 10,

228. See Yeivin, *Hebrew Language Tradition*, 480.

229. *Ibid.*

though others reconstruct [יהו]דורש²³⁰ All the texts listed above are DSS-SP9 texts, except one that is DSS-SP1c (4Q508).

5.9. ADVERBIAL *HEH*

As many have observed, what is often called the directional *heh* in Biblical Hebrew appears on words in the DSS, in which the *heh* does not necessarily imply a direction. In truth, even in the MT the *heh* does not always imply a direction, as in Jer 52:23, where the *heh* of רִוְחָה implies where the pomegranates are, not a motion associated with them: “The pomegranates were ninety-six on (its [the Bronze Sea’s]) side(s) (רִוְחָה).”²³¹ In at least one case, there is not even a locational sense לָנוּ קוּמָה עֲזָרָתָהּ לָנוּ “rise up as a help to us” (Ps 44:27); and, in another passage, it is used on what appears to be a compound preposition, לְמַעַלָּה רֵאשׁ “beyond (the) top” (Ezra 9:6).²³²

The *heh* in the DSS functions in a way akin to its use in these biblical examples, in what might be called simply an adverbial way, as in IQM XII, 13: “Zion, rejoice much (מֵאֲדָה)” and in 11Q5 (11QPs^a) XXII, 12 “above all the world” (לְכֹל תֵּבֵל).” As in the MT, in the DSS the *heh* is often affixed to adverbs or to substantives used as adverbs (מֵאֲדָה “much,” מֵעֵלָּה “above,” סְבִיבָה “around”), but the number of substantives to which it attaches is fewer than in LBH or SBH.²³³ At the same time, these adverbial words with the *heh* occur quite frequently in the DSS. Since “long forms” of the adverbs (like מֵאֲדָה) are one defining feature of DSS-SP9 texts, it is not surprising that the occurrences of such adverbs are predominantly among these texts, though there are exceptions (e.g.,

230. See Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck “Rule of the Congregation,” 116.

231. Although the consonants could be interpreted as the word “side” plus the 3fs suffix, the MT clearly has this as the so-called directive *heh*. Despite BHS’s comment on this word “crp”, the versions suggest that the best interpretation of this *heh* is not as a pronominal suffix, but as the directive *heh* used in its locative sense. Another example is from Jer 13:7 “from where (שָׁמָּה) I hid it.” A metaphorical sense of location is found in Ps 120:1: לִי בְצָרָתָהּ לִי “in my distress.”

232. See GKC §90h. Note also the use of the *heh* in one repeated temporal phrase: מֵיָמִים יָמִימָה “from year to year (lit., days to days).” It also occurs with other common nouns, but these are sometimes the subjects of their phrases (see Judg 14:18 בְּטָרָם “before the sun came up”) or part of prepositional phrases (GKC §90f–g). Muraoka notes that in the Aramaic of the DSS the analogous ending is not simply locative, but more broadly “adverbial” (GQA 92, n. 542).

233. Joosten, “Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek,” 357.

הַחֶה in 4Q22 [4QpaleoExod^m] at Exod 12:38). Joosten has observed that the way the *heh* in the DSS functions suggests a development from its use in BH and LBH.²³⁴

234. Ibid.

CONCLUSIONS

The preceding analysis has documented a number of characteristics of the DSS, both among the nonbiblical scrolls, as well as among the biblical scrolls. If one were to extract a general observation from the many phenomena found in the diverse texts described above (which also reflect an equally diverse range of dialects and idiolects), it may be a tendency reflected in DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts to write and pronounce the writing/reading register of Hebrew in a manner that would better reflect its characteristic vowels and syllabic contours, both through natural linguistic developments (like a preference for verbal and nominal forms that retain etymological vowels יקטולו and the use of *aleph* as an epenthetic consonant), as well as more artificial means (like *plene* orthography, *aleph* as a word-internal *mater* for /ā/, the graphic duplication of a consonantal *yodh* or *waw*). Running counter to this tendency (and presumably something that partially precipitated it) are phenomena that threatened to obscure the etymological vowels and consonants of the language, the most pedestrian being scribal error, but which also include natural shifts in the language like the assimilation of /ʾ/ to /y/ or /w/; diphthong and triphthong contraction (especially, -āw > -ō and -īhū > -īyū in the 3ms suffix); the inherent weakness of the gutturals and their confusion or near disappearance in certain dialects; and vowel reduction. In addition, the language's historical shape was also affected by occasional influence from Aramaic in its lexicon and morphology, as well as by a limited tendency toward (perceived) archaism in its orthography (e.g., כִּיָּא, כִּיָּא).

Many of the characteristics of the scrolls (especially as relates to the phonology, but also the orthography and morphology) are shared with the Hebrew of the MT, though they are found in the DSS much more often than in the Hebrew Bible. In particular, students who are encountering the Hebrew of the DSS for the first time should pay attention to the following traits in order to better make sense of the Hebrew text:

(1) Scribal mistakes occur in numerous texts and one should be watchful for cases of dittography, haplography, and metathesis, as well as the occasional confusion between similar looking or similar sounding consonants.

(2) *Aleph* is used as a *mater* in at least two ways atypical of the MT: as a word-internal *mater* for /ā/ (e.g., דאורה for MT דורה) and as part of a digraph (with *waw* or *yodh*) to mark a preceding /ō/, /ū/, or /ī/ (e.g., כיא for MT כי). In its use as an internal *mater*, it frequently appears before or after a consonantal *waw* or *yodh*.

(3) *Aleph* representing a glottal stop sometimes develops from an etymological *yodh*, usually in the sequence /iyī/ (e.g., כתיאים for MT כתיים) or the sequence /āy/, /ōy/, and even once /ūy/ (e.g., אואב for MT איב). In rare cases, the opposite shift takes place, /' / shifts to /y/ where *aleph* might have quiesced (e.g., לביותיו for MT לבאותיו).

(4) On the other hand, etymological *aleph* is not written (reflecting the loss of the glottal stop) in positions where the glottal stop seems to have quiesced in corresponding MT forms and words (e.g., at the end of a syllable, ברטה and MT ברתה; after a consonant שו and MT שון; and after a shewa שרית and MT שרית, compare שארית), as well as within words of the *qatīl/*qitīl/*quṭl base patterns (e.g., רוש for MT ראש and מוד for MT מאד).

(5) *Heh* as a *mater* marks word-final /ā/ in places that the MT usually has simply a *qamets* (e.g., קטלתה for MT קטלת).

(6) A *heh* that constitutes a morphological affix (like the definite article, the *heh* that begins the *niphal* infinitive construct and the *hiphil* perfect and infinitive construct) can sometimes elide, as in the MT. The elision in the DSS, however, is more frequent than in the MT and together with other factors, suggests the quiescence of *heh* in the dialects of some writers/scribes. In some texts (notably 1QIsa^a and 1QS) it can be replaced by *aleph*. Rarely, it seems that *heh* assimilates to a neighboring vowel (as in תהוו *tōwū*).

(7) *Waw* as a *mater* marks all manner of /u/ and /o/ vowels. The unexpected presence of *waw mater* in a word (i.e., the presence of a *waw* where the corresponding MT word does not have a /u/ or /o/ vowel) is often attributable to a base pattern for a noun unlike the one found in the MT (e.g., *quṭl instead of MT *qatīl); due to a neighboring bilabial, *lamedh*, *nun*, or *resh*; due to a distinct morphology (i.e., pausal forms *yqṭwḥw* and *qṭwḥw*, as well as imperfect + suffix forms *yqṭwḥl* + suffix and *yqṭwḥ!* + suffix).

(8) *Heh* seems to represent a clearly articulated and distinct phoneme. It is sometimes confused with *heh* due to the two letters' similar shape and the similarity in their place of articulation.

(9) *Yodh* as a *mater* is rarely used to mark word-internal /ē/ or short /i/ where the corresponding MT words do not contain a *mater*. In addition, two *yodhs* (and more rarely two *waws*) can mark the presence of a single consonantal *yodh* (or *waw*) (e.g., יהייה for MT יהִיֶה) or the presence of two contiguous *yodhs* (or *waws*) (e.g., ענייה for MT עֲנִיֶה). Sometimes /y/ shifts to /ʾ/ where *aleph* might quiesce (see point 3 above).

(10) *ʿAyin*'s quiescence is found only occasionally; it is worth noting again that no word with etymological *ʿayin* is misspelled consistently among the scrolls. Nevertheless, certain texts (especially those associated with the sect 1QS, 1QH^a, 1QIsa^a) seem to exhibit a particular tendency to drop this letter and presumably its associated sound.

(11) *Resh* is presumably articulated in the back of the mouth, as it was in later Masoretic times. Such a pronunciation seems to have made it easy for scribes to miss it in copying and writing.

(12) *Samekh* is often written for etymological *śin* and vice versa, both letters representing the sound /s/.

(13) The morphology of pronouns will generally be clear to the student who knows Biblical Hebrew, but one should note the frequent ה- ending to most independent and suffixed pronouns. Note also the apparent collapse of the diphthong /āw/ to /ō/ in the 3ms suffix on plural nouns, the result of which is that where one would expect יִ-, one sometimes finds just י-; furthermore, in 1QIsa^a where one would expect יִ-, one sometimes finds י-.

(14) The morphology of nouns is characterized, as stated just above, by a variation in the base pattern for certain nouns (e.g., **quṭl* instead of MT **qaṭl* as well as **maqṭul* or **maqṭāl* instead of MT **maqṭal*); by the emergence of new base patterns or the growing prominence of rare patterns (e.g., **qittūl*: פרוש); by the emergence of new by-forms for otherwise well-attested words (e.g., מבינה instead of MT בִּינָה), especially where this concerns the emergence of a masculine by-form of a feminine MT word (e.g., ברך for MT בִּרְכָה) or a feminine by-form of a masculine MT word (e.g., מטעת for MT מִטְעֵ). Also, **quṭl* nouns in construct can have an optional Aramaic-like form (e.g., קטול).

(15) The morphology of verbs will also usually be clear to the student familiar with Biblical Hebrew, especially if one keeps in mind the orthographic and phonological tendencies noted above (e.g., loss of *aleph*, marking of short /o/ with *waw mater*, and so on). In addition to the emergence of entirely new verbs, one should note the use of common verbs in different stems and with somewhat different nuances. One will also note the tendency for pausal forms in the *qal* plural imperfect and imperative

(*yqṭwlw* and *qṭwlw*), as well as the peculiar morphology of the *qal* imperfect + suffix, *yqṭwl* + suffix, which seems to alternate with the so-called pausal form, *yqṭwl* + suffix, and with the defective form *yqṭl* + suffix. Some features, like the use of the pseudo-cohortative for the 1cs/p *waw*-consecutive imperfect will be familiar to students who have read texts dominated by LBH. But, the use of short forms of III-*yodh* roots in places one would expect the long form will seem unusual.

Further conclusions relate to specific points that may not be essential for the intermediate student to master, but which contribute to our understanding of the language as it is manifested in the DSS.

First, the plethora of scribal errors in the scrolls should give caution to anyone attempting to draw significant linguistic information from a single misspelling of a word. Furthermore, the study illustrates that despite a tendency for *plene* orthography among the DSS-SP9 texts, there is still a great deal of variation in the spelling of words.

The study confirms that historical short /u/ vowels were often marked with a *waw mater*, though only erratically for **quṭlat* nouns like חמכה “wisdom.” In part, this might have been to distinguish between otherwise orthographically and phonetically similar forms like **ʕormāh* **ʕormāh* (“her cleverness”) and *ʕormā* “cleverness”). In other cases, the short /u/ vowel is marked by a *waw mater*, though corresponding words (or verb forms) from the MT do not bear a /u/ class vowel. Many examples are adduced for this phenomenon, but since each word usually admits of at least two explanations, it is difficult to be sure which explanation to trust. Ambiguity also inheres in the identification of some **quṭl* nouns in the construct state; such nouns may be spelled in their construct form with a *waw mater* between second and third root consonants, which makes them look like adjectives (e.g., גדול might be the construct form of the abstract noun גדל “greatness” or the adjective גדול “great”).

The sequence *aleph* + *waw mater* alternates with *waw mater* + *aleph* in cases where there is no preceding vowel (ראוש “head” versus רואש, both = *rōš*). Where there is a preceding vowel (including a muttered vowel [that is, vocal shewa]), and the *aleph* has not been lost due to quiescence or, as rarely happens, due to assimilation to a preceding or following vowel, the *waw mater* almost always follows the *aleph* (e.g., מאור “light”). This suggests that the *aleph* was pronounced as a glottal stop (*māʕor*, const. *māʕor*).

The study demonstrates the reality of the practice of writing two *yodhs* or *waws* for a single consonantal *yodh* or *waw* (or, more rarely, for two contiguous *yodhs* or *waws* with no intervening vowel). Other instances of

juxtaposed *yodhs* in the orthography can best be explained not as indicating a single vowel, but rather as cases of a consonantal *yodh* followed by an /i/ vowel (יִרְאוּ “they will fear”), of dittography (בִּיַד “in the hand”), of orthographic practices shared with the MT (י to represent *-īyī-* as in עִבְרִיִּים “Hebrews” or *-īyē-* as in נְשִׂי “leaders of” [reflecting the shift **nāsī’ē > nāsīyē*]).

In relation specifically to phonology, the study has demonstrated that although some guttural consonants could sometimes be confused with each other due to their imprecise articulation, not all gutturals were equally liable to such imprecision, nor were the gutturals equally likely to be confused for each other. *Aleph* is lost with some frequency word-internally at the end of a syllable and when preceded by a consonant or muttered vowel, though, it seems to be retained when preceded by a full vowel (although rarely in these cases it assimilates to a preceding or following vowel). *Aleph* sometimes replaces etymological *heh* and, more rarely, etymological *‘ayin*, suggesting the relative weakness of the phonemes associated with these letters (especially in DSS-SP9 texts). More often than in the MT, the *heh* is lost word-internally when it would have been preceded by a muttered vowel. The *‘ayin* is more rarely lost word-internally than either *aleph* or *heh*, and is not repeatedly dropped from specific words in the DSS. The quiescence of the *‘ayin* phoneme is most frequent in 1QS, 1QH^a, as well as 1QIsa^a. Although *ḥeth* was sometimes lost from the end of syllables, this is quite uncommon; and, misspellings of *kaph* for *ḥeth* suggest that this guttural was not “weakened” as other gutturals sometimes were.

The study has shown that although *aleph* and *yodh* can alternate with each other, the environments where such shifts typically take place are rather predictable. The shift of *yodh > aleph* occurs somewhat frequently, especially between /i/ vowels (*-īyī- > -ī’ī-*, as in כִּתְיָאִים “Kittim”) and where a diphthong (*-āy-* or *-ōy-*) might have formed between the preceding vowel and the *yodh* consonant (*-āyī- > -ā’ī-*, as in פִּתְאִים “simple”; *-ōyī- > -ō’ī-*, as in גּוֹאִים “peoples”). In these cases, *aleph* seems to function as a means of separating vowels or a consonant + vowel combination and thus as a means of preserving the syllabic structure of words. The shift *aleph > yodh*, on the other hand, is attested infrequently, primarily where an /i/ vowel directly precedes the *aleph* and another (non-/i/ vowel) follows (*-ī’ā- > -īyā-* or *-īyē-*, as in יִשְׁיִיכָה “he will deceive you”; *-ī’ā- > -īyā-*, as in אֱלִיָּב “Eliab”; *-ī’ē- > -īyē-*, as in דָּנִיֵּל “Daniel”; *-ī’ū- > -īyū-*, as in הִחְטִיּוּם “they made them sin”). In some cases the shift *aleph > yodh* may also help preserve the syllabic structure of a word; this is attested where the *aleph*

was liable to quiesce (e.g., לְבִיּוֹתָיו in 4Q169 3–4 i, 4 in a quotation of Nah 2:13 for MT לְבִיּוֹתָיו “its lionesses”). Similar shifts involving *aleph* and *waw* are found in the DSS for similar reasons.

Of the remaining phonological shifts evidenced in the scrolls, the most important are *-ihū* > *-iyū* and *-āw* > *-ō*, both of which involve the 3ms pronominal suffix. Although these shifts are suspected to be real features of some idiolects, they are not always represented through the orthography. Instead, the 3ms suffix on singular short words like אב “father” is most often הו- (i.e., אבִּיהוּ) and the 3ms suffix on plural words and certain prepositions (like עַל) is יו- (i.e., עַלְיוּ). At least in some texts, these spellings probably represent a pronunciation closer to that in the MT (e.g., *’ābīhū*, *’ālāw*). The writing of a *yodh* in the 3ms suffix on plural words (יו-) seems to be an orthographic way of distinguishing plural nouns. Often, in plural feminine nouns ending in *-ōt*, where the 3ms suffix has no *yodh*, the feminine plural morpheme has a *waw mater* (וּתוּ-), and where this *mater* is missing, the suffix is usually spelled with a *yodh* (תִּי-).

The place of the accent or stress is not known, but the DSS do attest a consistent preference for forms that correspond to MT pausal forms. This occurs with some noun + suffix forms (e.g., רַעֲיִכָה), but applies most frequently to verbs. For example, *qal* plural imperfects attest a *mater* to mark the theme vowel (יִקְטוּלוּ); an /o/ or /u/ vowel appears between first and second root consonants in *qal* geminate verbs (יְהוֹנֹכָה and יְזוּמוּ). Furthermore, DSS verbs whose MT analogs show alternate theme vowels (one for context and one for pause) consistently evidence in the DSS a preference for the vowel they exhibit in their MT pausal forms. Specifically, the verb בָּגַד attests an /o/ or /u/ theme vowel, but חָפֵץ and טָרַף attest an /a/ vowel; an /a/ vowel also occurs in the imperative of יִרְשׁ.

In relation to morphology, the study has demonstrated that there is little real evidence for the *qere perpetuum* phenomenon of the 3fs independent pronoun (הוּא = *hī’*) in the DSS. The alternation one finds in this and other independent pronouns between the basic form and the form with a final *heh mater* are probably reflective of distinct pronunciations (הוּא = *hū’* and הוּאָה = *hū’ā*).

Verb forms and certain orthographic practices that are rare in the MT are more common in the DSS and vice versa. This applies not only to the well known *plene* spelling of the 2ms perfect verbs (קָטַלְתָּה) and apparent pausal forms (יִקְטוּלוּ), but also to forms like the *hiphil* second- and first-person perfect forms of בּוֹא “to come” which often bear an *ō* connecting vowel in the DSS, as in הֵבִיאוּתָה “you brought,” though not in the MT,

where such a connecting vowel appears primarily where object suffixes are attached to the verb. In a similar way, although the *hiphil* infinitives construct in the MT are written defectively primarily when suffixes are attached, in the DSS the *hiphil* infinitives construct appear defective after אִין “not” and after the *lamedh* preposition. Finally, the *niphal* and *piel* feminine singular participles are marked by the ה- morpheme more often than in the MT, where the ת- morpheme predominates.

Almost all examples of *yqwtl* + suffix involve verbs with an /o/ or /u/ theme vowel. This makes it likely that the *waw mater* between first and second root consonants is prompted by the theme vowel (e.g., יִדְוֹרְשֶׁהוּ “they will examine him” 1QS VI, 14). Variation between *yqtwl* + suffix and *yqwtl* + suffix is paralleled by similar variation among the DSS in *qal* imperative + suffix and the rarer variation in the *qal* infinitive construct + suffix. The variations found in these three groups are similar but not identical to the variations in other Hebrew traditions.

With the exception of 1QIsa^a, 1QS, and a few other shorter texts (like 4Q107 [4QCant^b]), the influence from Aramaic seems marginal. Nevertheless, one still gets a hint of Aramaic influence in a wide variety of ways in a wide variety of texts, including in some DSS-NSP texts (e.g., 4Q229, 4Q381, 4Q448). In terms of orthography, the use of *aleph* as an internal *mater* for /ā/ may be related to the same, more widespread orthographic practice in Aramaic. In relation to morphology, note the Aramaic-like pronoun זֶן or זֶן “this” (4Q371 1a–b, 8, compare Aramaic זֶן or זֶן) and the following examples of pronominal suffixes: the numerous cases of the 3ms וְהִי- attested in 1QIsa^a (e.g., מַעֲשׂוֹהֵי “his works” 1QIsa^a at Isa 10:12); the 3mp עֲלֵיהֶם “over them” (4Q176 20, 3), אֲבֵיהֶן “their father” (4Q17 [4QExod–Lev^f] at Exod 40:15), [עַל]יָהֶן “over them” (4Q277 1 ii, 7); 3fp עֲלֵיהֶן “over them” (1QS III, 25); 2fs (in 1QIsa^a, as in לְבַבִּי “your heart” at Isa 47:7 for MT לְבַבִּי); and 1cp אֲבֹתֵינוּ “our fathers” (4Q381 46a+b, 4). Note also the alternation between *aleph* and *heh* in the prefix of the causative stem in 1QS for example, בְּאוֹפִיעַ “when [they] shine” 1QS X, 2) and in 1QIsa^a (e.g., אֲוֹדוּ “give thanks” 1QIsa^a at Isa 12:4) as well as the presence of *heh* prefixes in some imperfect and participial forms (וְיִהְיֶה “and he will establish” 1QS III, 9; מַהֲסִיר “is removing” 1QIsa^a at Isa 3:1 for MT מְסִיר); the תִּי- ending of 2fs perfect verbs in 1QIsa^a (eighteen times); the /o/ or /u/ theme vowel in the *qal* imperfect to אֲכַל, בָּחַר, זָרַע, פָּעַל, שָׁכַב (again in 1QIsa^a); *heh*-preformative verbal nouns הוֹרִיָּה “teaching” (4Q491c 11 i, 16); הַנְּזִיָּה “sprinkling” (4Q512 1–6, 6); and the final *nun* on plural forms: יָמִים “days” (11Q20 XII, 5) corrected to יָמִים, פָּחִין “traps” (4Q184 1, 2),

בשמין “spices” (4Q107 [4QCant^b] at Song 4:10). In addition, the spelling of the construct form of **quṭl* nouns with a *waw mater* between second and third root consonants (i.e., קדוש) may reflect Aramaic influence. Lexical items that presumably show Aramaic influence (whether or not they were interpreted by speakers as genuine Hebrew words) include some of the words listed above in the section “Nouns” (§5.3), including הטללים “the shadows”; כידן “javelin”; מוזנים “scales”; מתקל “stumbling.” Note too the verbs: כנה “to gather” or “to be gathered” (1QIsa^a at Isa 30:20; [י]סתגון “they will increase” (4Q523 3, 1), as well as the interjections: היכה “how?” (1QIsa^a at Isa 1:21); הכן “indeed” (1QIsa^a at Isa 40:7). Also of relevance are the various plural spellings of the word “day” with a *waw mater*, which suggests Aramaic influence: יומי “days of” (1QS II, 19; III, 5); ימי “my days” (1QIsa^a at Isa 38:10) for an intended ימי; and ביימי “in days of” (1QIsa^a at Isa 1:1). Some words that seem borrowed from Aramaic are also found in the MT, like קצת “end.” Other features that may reflect Aramaic influence include the independent form of the preposition *min* instead of prefixing to a following word (e.g., מן טהרת “from the purity of” 1QS VII, 3); the spelling and associated pronunciation (reflecting /wū/ > /ū/) of the 3mp imperfect of יהוה: יהו *yāhū* “may they be” (4Q448 II, 7). In other matters, the Hebrew of the DSS seems to parallel phenomena in Aramaic: the shift /ā/ > /ō/ in proximity to bilabials, *lamedh*, *nun*, *resh*; the shifts /y/ > /ʾ/ and /ʾ/ > /y/; the apparent penultimate accent on some verbal forms ending in a vowel.

It should also be stated that although some texts, like 1QIsa^a, do attest numerous phenomena and words apparently due to Aramaic influence, it is also the case that certain features of Aramaic are not attested. For example, the blurring of distinctions between III-*waw/yodh* and III-*aleph* verbs is found perhaps only two times in 1QIsa^a, though the same blurring is widespread in DSS Aramaic.

One conclusion that can be drawn from the above list is that the Aramaic influence on Hebrew was not pervasive. It seems to affect the idiolects of certain scribes or writers, and specific features within these idiolects. Given the influence of Hebrew on DSS Aramaic, one can conclude that the Aramaisms found in the scrolls are at least in part due to some scribes/writers being bilingual, if not multilingual.¹

1. On the Hebraisms in DSS Aramaic, see Muraoka, *GQA*, passim (e.g., for loanwords, 78–81). That scribes were bi- or multilingual seems to be the consensus. See Willem F. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges* (OTS 36; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 8; Steven E.

Some of the features documented in this book are common to all groups of texts, while some are peculiar to DSS-SP9 only or to DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts. Those features that seem to be widespread and are attested in all text groups include: scribal mistakes; marking etymological short /u/ with *waw* (though this is not found typically in the biblical scrolls of the DSS-NSP group); preservation of the sequence *aleph* + *waw mater* when the *aleph* is present and when a vowel (sometimes even shewa) immediately precedes the *aleph*; the use of אָ-, אַ-, אִ-, אֵ- to mark final vowels; spirantization; elision of *aleph* (and quiescence of the glottal stop); elision of *heh* (and quiescence of the glottal fricative); writing of *aleph* for etymological *yodh* in gentilic nouns, II-*yodh*, and III-*yodh* nouns; writing of *yodh* for etymological *aleph*; occasional elision of *resh*; writing *samekh* for *sin* and *sin* for *samekh*; writing the 3ms pronominal suffix הוּ- on short words (like פֶּה “mouth”); use of the pseudo-cohortative; lack of short jussive forms.

Most of these features, it should be mentioned, have parallels in the MT and suggest a shared heritage between the Hebrew of the MT (especially LBH) and that of the DSS. The relative frequency of some of these features in the DSS as compared to the MT may suggest a diachronic development: for example, elision of *aleph* and *heh*, the variation between *aleph* and *yodh*, and confusion between *samekh* and *sin*, not to mention the use of the pseudo-cohortative.

Those features that seem to be most common or peculiar to the DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts include: **quṭl* bases for MT **qaṭl*/**qiṭl* bases; development of an /o/ or /u/ vowel due to a neighboring bilabial (/b/, /m/, /p/), *lamedh*, *nun* or *resh* or due to another /o/ or /u/ vowel; **quṭl* nouns in construct exhibiting a *waw mater* between second and third root consonants; *qal* imperfect + suffix with a *waw mater* between first and second root consonants (*yqwṭl* + suffix); שָׂרָא “head” spelled with a *waw mater* with or without the *aleph*; writing two *yodhs* for a consonantal *yodh* and two *waws* for a consonantal *waw*; occasional elision of ‘*ayin* (i.e., quiescence of voiced pharyngeal fricative); writing *waw* for etymological *aleph*; writing *aleph* for etymological *waw*; the contractions -*ihū* > -*iyū* and -*āw* > -*ō* in the 3ms pronominal suffix on plural nouns; increased use of prothetic *aleph*; spelling the 2ms/p pronominal suffix with a final *heh mater*; spell-

Fassberg, “Which Semitic Language Did Jesus and Other Contemporary Jews Speak?” CBQ 74 (2012), 277; Joosten, “Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek,” 359.

ing the 3mp pronominal suffix with a final *heh mater*; spelling the 2mp independent pronoun with a final *heh mater* (אתמה); spelling the 3m/fs independent pronouns with a final *heh mater* (הואה, היאה); the Aramaic 3ms suffix on plural nouns, ויהי-; spelling the 2ms/p perfect forms with a final *heh mater*; adverbial *heh* on words like מאדה “much.”

Some of the above features of DSS-SP9 and DSS-SP1c texts are to be attributed to a specific dialect or tradition belonging to those writing the majority of the DSS. Note especially the **quṭ!* bases, the development of /o/ or /u/ vowels, occasional elision of *‘ayin*, the phonologic shifts *-īhū > -īyū* and *-āw > -ō*, the pronunciation of various pronouns with an optional *-ā* ending, the adverbial *heh* on adverbs like מאדה. The consistency with which one sees these features suggests they were not only part of the spoken vernacular of the scribes, but also part of the language with which they used to write and read (some) texts.² This presumes, of course, that the Hebrew of these texts is not entirely artificial or merely archaizing, but rather reflects in some muted ways, unique dialects of Hebrew.

2. This does not mean, however, that such scribes were necessarily ignorant of alternate orthographies, phonologies, and morphologies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abegg, Martin G. "The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 325–58 in vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999.
- . "Linguistic Profile of the Isaiah Scrolls." Pages 25–41 in *Qumran Cave 1, II: The Isaiah Scrolls, Part 2: Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint. DJD 32. Oxford: Clarendon, 2010.
- . "Qumran Text and Tagging." In *Accordance 9.5*. Altamonte Springs, Florida: OakTree Software, 1999–2009.
- Abegg, Martin G., James E. Bowley, Edward M. Cook, and Casey Towes. "Grammatical Tagging of Dead Sea Scrolls Biblical Corpus." In *Accordance 9.5*. Altamonte Springs, Florida: OakTree Software, 2009.
- Abegg, Martin G., James E. Bowley, Edward M. Cook, Emanuel Tov. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2003–.
- Accordance 9.5*. Altamonte Springs, Florida: OakTree Software, 2011.
- Alexander, P. and G. Vermes. *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: 4Q^{Serekh} Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts*. DJD 26. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Allegro, John M. *Qumran Cave 4.I (4Q158–186)*. DJD 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Andersen, Francis I. and A. Dean Forbes. *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible: Dahood Memorial Lecture*. BO 14. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1986.
- . *The Vocabulary of the Old Testament*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1992.
- Baden, Joel. "Hithpael and Niphal in Biblical Hebrew: Semantic and Morphological Overlap." *VT* 60 (2010): 33–44.
- Baillet, Maurice. *Qumran Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*. DJD 7. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.

- . “Textes des Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q.” Pages 45–166 in vol. 1 of *Les ‘Petites Grottes’ de Qumrân*.” Edited by Maurice Baillet, J. T. Milik, R. de Vaux. 2 vols. DJD 3. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
- Bar-Asher, Moshe. “A Few Remarks on Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic in Qumran Hebrew.” Pages 115–30 in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. STDJ 36. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . “Grammatical and Lexical Phenomena in a Dead Sea Scroll (4Q374)” (Hebrew). *Meghillot* 4 (2006): 153–67.
- . “הַמֶּן (= מֶן) in a Fragment from Qumran” (Hebrew). *Leshonenu* 55 (1990): 75.
- . “The Language of Qumran: Between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew (A Study in Morphology)” (Hebrew). *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 137–49.
- . “On the Language of ‘The Vision of Gabriel.’” *RevQ* 23 (2008): 491–524.
- . “On the Language of the ‘Vision of Gabriel’” (Hebrew). *Meghillot* 7 (2009): 193–226.
- . “Qumran Hebrew between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew: A Morphological Study.” Pages 3–17 in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz. FAT 2/35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- . “Qumran Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew” (Hebrew). *Meghillot* 8–9 (2010): 287–317.
- . “Some Unusual Spellings in the Qumran Scrolls” (Hebrew). *Meghillot* 3 (2005): 165–76.
- . “Two Phenomena in Qumran Hebrew: Synchronic and Diachronic Aspects” (Hebrew). *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 167–83.
- Barr, James. *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1986*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Bauer, Hans and Pontus Leander. *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*. 2 vols. Halle: Niemeyer, 1922.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. “Damascus Document.” Pages 1–185 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Volume 3: Damascus Document II, Some Works of the Torah, and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 3. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

- . *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)*. DJD 18. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Ben-Hayyim, Ze'ev. "The Forms of the Pronominal Suffixes, ך-, ת-, ה- in the Different Masoretic Schools of the Hebrew Language" (Hebrew). Pages 66–99 in *Sefer Asaph qovets ma'amare meh'qar, mugash li-khevod ha-Rav prof. Simḥah Assaf, 'al yede yedidab, ḥaverab ve talmidab, li-melo't lo shishim shanah*. Edited by U. Cassuto, J. Klausner, and J. Gutman. Jerusalem: ha-Rav Quq, 1953.
- . *A Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew: Based on the Recitation of the Law in Comparison with the Tiberian and Other Jewish Traditions*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 2000.
- . *Studies in the Traditions of the Hebrew Language*. Madrid: Instituto Arias Montana, 1954.
- . "Traditions in the Hebrew Language, with Reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 200–214 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Scripta Hierosolymitana 4. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958.
- . "The Tradition of the Samaritans and its Relationship to the Linguistic Tradition of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic Language" (Hebrew). *Leshonenu* 22 (1958): 223–45.
- . "ישנים גם חדשים מן צפוני מדבר יהודה" (Hebrew). *Leshonenu* 42 (1977–1978): 278–93.
- Bergsträsser, G. *Hebräische Grammatik*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Vogel, 1918 (vol. 1 [phonology and morphology]); Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1926–1929 (vol. 2 [verb]).
- Bernstein, Moshe J. and Aaron Koller. "The Aramaic Texts and the Hebrew and Aramaic Languages at Qumran: The North American Contribution." Pages 155–96 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant. STDJ 99. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Beyer, Klaus. *Althebräische Grammatik*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- . *Die Aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer, samt den Inschriften aus Paläsina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.
- Biber, Douglas. *Dimensions of Register Variation: A Cross-Linguistic Comparison*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1995.

- Blau, Joshua. "A Conservative View of the Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 20–25 in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. STDJ 36. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "Non-Phonetic Conditioning of Sound Change and Biblical Hebrew." *HAR* 3 (1979): 7–15.
- . *On Polyphony in Biblical Hebrew*. Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities Proceedings 6/2. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1982.
- . *On Pseudo-Corrections in Some Semitic Languages*. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1970.
- . *Phonology and Morphology of Biblical Hebrew: An Introduction*. LSAWS 2. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2010. An earlier edition appeared in Hebrew as *Torat ha-hegeh veba-tsurot* (1972).
- . "Some Remarks on the Prehistory of Stress in Biblical Hebrew." *IOS* 9 (1979): 49–54.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehard, and Winston, 1965.
- Bolozky, Shmuel. "Israeli Hebrew Phonology." Pages 287–311 in vol. 1 of *Phonologies of Asia and Africa*. Edited by Alan S. Kaye. 2 vols. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997.
- Breuer, Yohanan. "On the Hebrew Dialect of the *ʿĀmōrāʿīm* in the Babylonian Talmud." Pages 129–50 in *Studies in Mishnaic Hebrew*. Edited by Moshe Bar-Asher. ScrHier 37. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1998.
- . "Intervocalic *Aleph/Yodh* Interchanges in Mishnaic Hebrew." *Revue des Études juives* 159 (2000): 63–78.
- Brockelmann, C. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*. 2 vols. Berlin: n.p., 1908–1913; reprinted Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1961.
- . *Hebräische Syntax*. Neukirchener: Neukirchener Verlag, 1956; 2nd ed. 2004.
- Brønno, Einar. "The Isaiah Scroll DSIa and the Greek Transliterations of Hebrew." *ZDMG* 106 (1956): 252–58.
- . *Studien über hebräische Morphologie und Vokalismus auf Grundlage der mercatischen Fragmente der zweiten Kolumn der Hexapla des Origenes*. Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft / Brockhaus, 1943.
- . "Zu den Theorien Paul Kahles." *ZDMG* 100 (1951): 521–65.

- Carmignac, J. "Compléments au texte des hymnes de Qumrân," *RevQ* 2 (1959–1960): 267–76, 449–558.
- . "Précisions apportées au vocabulaire de l'hébreu biblique par La Guerre des Fils de Lumière Contre les Fils de Ténèbres." *VT* 5 (1955): 345–65.
- Charlesworth, James H. *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Rule of the Community: Photographic Multi-Language Edition*. Philadelphia: American Interfaith Institute, 1996.
- . *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Charlesworth, James H. et al., eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Charlesworth, James H. and Loren Stuckenbruck. "Rule of the Congregation." Pages 108–17 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- . "Blessings." Pages 119–31 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Ciancaglini, Claudia A. *Iranian Loanwords in Syriac*. BI 28. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2008.
- Collins, John J. *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Cook, John A. "The Hebrew Verb: A Grammaticalization Approach." *ZAH* 14/2 (2001): 117–43.
- . "The Semantics of Verbal Pragmatics: Clarifying the Roles of Wayyiqtol and Weqatal in Biblical Hebrew Prose." *JSS* 49 (2004): 247–73.
- Cross, Frank Moore. "Lamentations." Pages 229–37 in *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. DJD 16. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- . "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies." Pages 1–14 in vol. 1 of *The Madrid Qumran Congress, Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*. Edited

- by Julio Treballe Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. 2 vols. STDJ 11. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . “Some Problems in Old Hebrew Orthography with Special Attention to the Third Person Masculine Singular Suffix on Plural Nouns [-âw].” *EI* 27 (2003): 18*–24*.
- Cross, Frank Moore and E. Eshel. “1. KhQOstracon.” Pages 497–507 in *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Edited by S. J. Pfann et al. DJD 36. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Donald W. Parry, Richard J. Saley, and Eugene Ulrich. *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel*. DJD 17. Oxford: Clarendon, 2005.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich. *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament*. Berlin/Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1920.
- Dimant, Devorah. “An Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Cave 4 (4Q385B = 4Q385 16).” Pages 11–30 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*. Edited by George Brooke. STDJ 15. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- . *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4, Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*. DJD 30. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.
- . “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii).” *RevQ* 23 (2007): 43–61.
- Doudna, Gregory L. *4Q Peshar Nahum: A Critical Edition*. JSPSup 35. London: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Driver, G. R. “Supposed Arabisms in the Old Testament.” *JBL* 55 (1936): 101–20.
- Elwolde, John F. “Developments in Hebrew Vocabulary between Bible and Mishnah.” Pages 17–55 in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University, 11–14 December, 1995*. Edited by T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. STDJ 26. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . “RWQMH in the Damascus Document and Ps 139:15.” Pages 65–83 in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. STDJ 36. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Enos, Gregory. “Phonological Considerations in the Study of Hebrew Phonetics: An Introductory Discussion.” Pages 41–47 in *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*. Edited by W.R. Bodine. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992 [written in 1986].

- Eshel, E. and H. Eshel. "Jericho papDeed of Sale ar." Pages 37–41 in *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*. Edited by James Charlesworth et al. DJD 38. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- Eshkult, Mats. "Some Aspects of the Verbal System in Qumran Hebrew." Pages 29–46 in *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period: Proceedings of a Fourth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls & Ben Sira*. STDJ 73. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . *Studies in Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique in Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 12. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990.
- Farrar, Christopher and Yehiel Hayon. "The Perception of the Phoneme *Aleph* (ʾ/) in Modern Hebrew." *HAR* 4 (1980): 53–78.
- Fassberg, Steven E. "The Infinitive Absolute as Finite Verb and Standard Literary Hebrew of the Second Temple Period." Pages 47–60 in *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period: Proceedings of a Fourth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. STDJ 73. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . "Israeli Research into Hebrew and Aramaic at Qumran." Pages 363–80 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant. STDJ 99. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- . "The *Kethiv/Qere* קֹרֵא, Diachrony, and Dialectology." Pages 171–80 in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*. Edited by Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé and Ziony Zevit. LSAWS 8. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012.
- . "The Lengthened Imperative הִטְּלֶהָ in Biblical Hebrew." *HS* 40 (1999): 7–13.
- . "The Movement from *Qal* to *Pi*^ʿ*el* in Hebrew and the Disappearance of the *Qal* Internal Passive." *HS* 42 (2001): 243–55.
- . "The Preference for Lengthened Forms in Qumran Hebrew" (Hebrew). *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 227–40.
- . "The Syntax of the Biblical Documents from the Judean Desert as Reflected in a Comparison of Multiple Copies of Biblical Texts." Pages 94–109 in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. STDJ 36. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "Which Semitic Language Did Jesus and Other Contemporary Jews Speak?" *CBQ* 74 (2012): 263–80.

- Field, F. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive, Veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1875.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Tobit." Pages 1–76 in *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Para-Biblical Texts, Part 2*. Edited by M. Broshi et al. DJD 19. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- . *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays*. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Freedman, D. N. "Chapter 1: The Evolution of Hebrew Orthography." Pages 3–17 in *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Orthography*. Edited by D. N. Freedman, A. Dean Forbes, and F. I. Andersen. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "Review of E. Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*." *JSJ* 19 (1988): 115–17.
- Gavrilov, A. K. "Techniques of Reading in Classical Antiquity." *Classical Quarterly* 47 (1997): 56–73.
- Goerwitz, Richard L. "Tiberian Hebrew Seghol: A Reappraisal." *ZAH* 3 (1990): 3–10.
- Gogel, S. L. *A Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew*. SBLRBS 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Gordis, R. *The Biblical Text in the Making: A Study of the Kethib-Qere*. New York: Ktav, 1937.
- Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. "Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran Documents." Pages 101–37 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. *ScrHier* 4. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958.
- . *Text and Language in Bible and Qumran*. Jerusalem: Orient Publishing House, 1960.
- Greenstein, E. L. "An Introduction to a Generative Phonology of Biblical Hebrew." Pages 29–40 in *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*. Edited by W.R. Bodine. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992 [written in 1989].
- Gumpertz, Y. F. *Mivṭa'è Səfatenu: Studies in Historical Phonetics of the Hebrew Language*. Jerusalem: Haraav Kook, 1953.
- Gzella, Holger. *Tempus, Aspect, und Modalität im Reichsaramäischen*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur: Mainz Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission 48. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004.
- Hackett, Jo Ann. "Hebrew (Biblical and Epigraphic)." Pages 139–56 in *Beyond Babel: A Handbook for Biblical Hebrew and Related Languages*.

- Edited by J. Kaltner and S. McKenzie. SBLRBS 42. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Harviainen, Tapani. *On the Vocalism of the Closed Unstressed Syllables in Hebrew: A Study Based on Evidence Provided by the Transcriptions of St. Jerome and Palestinian Punctuations*. SO 48. Helsinki: Finish Oriental Society, 1977.
- Hendel, Ronald S. "Sibilants and šibbōlet (Judges 12:6)." *BASOR* 301 (1996): 69–75.
- Holmstedt, Robert D. "The Phonology of Classical Hebrew: A Linguistic Study of Long Vowels and Syllable Structure." *ZAH* 13 (2000): 145–55.
- Huehnergard, John. "Afro-Asiatic." Pages 138–59 in *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Edited by Roger D. Woodard. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2004.
- Hurvitz, Avi. "Was QH a 'Spoken' Language? On Some Recent Views and Positions: Comments." Pages 110–14 in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. STDJ 36. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Isbell, C. D. "Initial 'Alef-Yod Interchange and Selected Biblical Passages." *JNES* 37 (1978): 227–36.
- Janssens, G. *Studies in Hebrew Historical Linguistics Based on Origen's Secunda*. Orientalia Gandensia 9. Leuven: Peeters, 1982.
- Joosten, Jan. "Biblical Hebrew as Mirrored in the Septuagint: The Question of Influence from Spoken Hebrew." *Textus* 21 (2002): 1–19.
- . "The Disappearance of Iterative WEQATAL in the Biblical Hebrew Verbal System." Pages 135–47 in *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting: Typological and Historical Perspectives*. Edited by S. E. Fassberg and A. Hurvitz. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- . "The Function of the Semitic D Stem: Biblical Hebrew Materials for a Comparative-Historical Approach." *Orientalia* 67 (1998): 202–30.
- . "Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 351–74 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University, 2010.
- . "The Knowledge and Use of Hebrew in the Hellenistic Period." Pages 115–30 in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. STDJ 36. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "Pseudo-Classicism in Late Biblical Hebrew, in Ben Sira, and in Qumran Hebrew." Pages 146–59 in *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages: Proceed-*

- ings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, held at Leiden University 15–17 December, 1997.* Edited by T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde. STDJ 33. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Joosten, Jan and Jean-Sébastien Rey, eds. *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period; Proceedings of a Fourth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira.* STDJ 73. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Kesterson, J. C. “Tense Usage and Verbal Syntax in Selected Qumran Documents.” Ph.D. dissertation. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1984.
- Khan, Geoffrey. “The Historical Background of the Vowel *šere*.” BSOAS 57 (1994): 133–44.
- . “The Pronunciation of the *resh* in the Tiberian Tradition of Biblical Hebrew.” HUCA 66 (1995): 67–80.
- . “The Pronunciation of the Verbs *hyh* and *xyh* in the Tiberian Tradition of Biblical Hebrew.” Pages 133–44 in *Semitic and Cushitic Studies*. Edited by G. Goldenberg and S. Raz. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994.
- . “The Tiberian Pronunciation Tradition of Biblical Hebrew.” ZAH 9 (1996): 1–23.
- . “Vowel Length and Syllable Structure in the Tiberian Tradition of Biblical Hebrew.” JSS 32 (1987): 23–82.
- Kim, Yoo-Ki. “The Origin of the Biblical Hebrew Infinitive Construct.” JSS 57 (2012): 25–35.
- Kister, Menahem. “Lexical and Linguistic Gleanings from the Dead Sea Scrolls” (Hebrew). *Leshonenu* 67 (2004): 27–44.
- . “Newly-Identified Fragments of the Book of Jubilees: Jub. 23:21–23, 30–31.” *RevQ* 12 (1985–1987): 529–36.
- . “Some Lexical Features of the Writings from Qumran” (Hebrew). Pages 561–69 in *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*. Volume 2. Edited by Menahem Kister. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- . “Some Observations on Vocabulary and Style in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 137–65 in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. STDJ 36. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . “Three Unknown Hebrew Words in Newly-Published Texts from Qumran” (Hebrew). *Leshonenu* 63 (2000–2001): 35–40.

- Könnecke, Clemens. *Die Behandlung der hebräischen Namen in der Septuaginta*. Programm des Koeniglichen und Groening'schen Gymnasiums zu Stargard in Pommern 124. Stargard: Gymnasium, 1885.
- Kutscher, E. Y. "Canaanite, Hebrew, Phoenician, Aramaic, Mishnaic Hebrew, Punic" (Hebrew). *Leshonenu* 33 (1969): 83–110.
- . "Hebrew Language: Dead Sea Scrolls." Cols. 1583–90 in vol. 16 of *Encyclopedia Judaica*. New York: MacMillan, 1971.
- . *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Edited by R. Kutscher. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1982.
- . *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Complete Isaiah Scroll*. STDJ 6. Leiden: Brill, 1974. Originally published in Hebrew as *Ha-Lashon ve-ha-Reqa' ha-Leshoni shel Megillat Yesha'yahu ha-Selema mi-Megillot Yam ha-Melah*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1959.
- . *Studies in Galilean Aramaic*. Translated by M. Sokoloff. Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1976.
- . "Two 'Passive' Constructions in Aramaic in the Light of Persian." Pages 133–51 in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies, Jerusalem, 19–23 July 1965*. Edited by Z. Ben-Hayyim et al. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1969.
- Licht, Jacob. *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea, 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB, Text, Introduction and Commentary*. Jerusalem: Bialik, 1965.
- Martin, Malachi. *Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Louvain: Publications universitaires, 1958.
- McCarter, P. Kyle. "Hebrew." Pages 319–64 in *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Edited by Roger D. Woodard. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2004.
- Mercati, G. *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae, pars, prima, Codex rescriptus Bybliothecae Ambrosianae O. 39 SVP: Phototypice expressus et transcriptus*. Rome: Bybliotheca Vaticana, 1958.
- Meyer, Rudolf. "Bemerkungen zu der hebräischen Aussprachetradition von Chirbet Qumrān." *ZAW* 70 (1958): 39–48.
- . *Hebräische Grammatik*. 3rd ed. 4 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1966–1968.
- . "Das Problem der Dialektmischung in den hebräischen Texten von Chirbet Qumran." *VT* 7 (1957): 139–48.
- Milik, J. T. "Textes Non Bibliques." Pages 77–149 in *Qumran Cave 1*. Edited by D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik. DJD 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.

- Morag, Shelomo. "The Geminated Vowels" (Hebrew). *Tarbiz* 23 (1952): 236–39.
- . *The Hebrew Language Tradition of the Yemenite Jews*. Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1963.
- . "On the Historical Validity of the Vocalization of the Hebrew Bible." *JAOS* 94 (1974): 307–15.
- . "Language and Style in *Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah: Did Moreh ha-Ṣedeq Write This Document?*" (Hebrew). *Tarbiz* 65 (1996): 209–23.
- . "Palestinian and Babylonian Features in the Oriental Traditions of Hebrew." Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, n.d.
- . "Pronunciations of Hebrew." Cols. 547–62 in vol. 16 of *Encyclopedia Judaica*. 2nd ed. Detroit: MacMillan, 2007. First published in cols. 1120–45 of vol. 13. New York: MacMillan, 1972.
- . "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations." *VT* 38 (1988): 148–64.
- . "Review of E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*." *Kirjath Sepher* 36 (1960): 24–32.
- . *Studies on Biblical Hebrew* (Hebrew). Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995.
- Moreshet, Menahem. "The Hiphil in Mishnaic Hebrew as Equivalent to the Qal." *Bar-Ilan* 13 (1976): 249–81.
- . "On the Nuf'al Stem in Post-Biblical Hebrew." Pages 126–39 in *Studies in Hebrew and Semitic Languages Dedicated to the Memory of Prof. Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher*. Edited by Gad B. Sarfatti et al. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1980.
- Morgenstern, Matthew (Moshe). "Notes on the Language of the Qumran Scrolls" (Hebrew). *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 157–68.
- . *Studies in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic Based upon Early Eastern Manuscripts*. HSS 62. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- . "The System of Independent Pronouns at Qumran and the History of Hebrew in the Second Temple Period" (Hebrew). Pages 44–63 in *Sha'arey Lashon: Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic and Jewish Languages Presented to Moshe Bar Asher, vol. 2: Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic*. Edited by A. Maman et al. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik Institute, 2007.
- Muchiki, Yoshi. "Spirantization in Fifth-Century B.C. North-West Semitic." *JNES* 53 (1994): 125–30.
- Muraoka, T. "An Approach to the Morphosyntax and Syntax of Qumran Hebrew." Pages 193–214 in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and*

- Ben Sira*. Edited by T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. STDJ 36. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic*. ANES Supp 38. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- . “Hebrew.” Pages 340–45 in vol. 1 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2 vols. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University, 2000.
- . “The Participle in Qumran Hebrew with Special Reference to Its Periphrastic Use.” Pages 188–204 in *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages: Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, held at Leiden University 15–17 December, 1997*. Edited by T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. STDJ 33. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . “Verb Complementation in Qumran Hebrew.” Pages 92–149 in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University, 11–14 December 1995*. Edited by T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. STDJ 26. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Murtonen, A. *Hebrew in Its West Semitic Setting: A Comparative Survey of Non-Masoretic Hebrew Dialects and Traditions*. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 13 [Part 1: A Comparative Lexicon], 16 [Part 2: Phonetics and Phonology. Part 3: Morphosyntactics]. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1986–1990.
- . “A Historico-Philological Survey of the Main Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents.” *Abr-Nahrain* 4 (1963–1964): 56–95.
- Naudé, Jacobus A. “A Perspective on the Chronological Framework of Biblical Hebrew.” *JNSL* 30 (2004): 87–102.
- . “The Transitions of Biblical Hebrew in the Perspective of Language Change and Diffusion.” Pages 189–214 in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*. Edited by Ian Young. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Newsom, Carol. “Admonition on the Flood.” Pages 85–97 in *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Para-Biblical Texts, Part 2*. Edited by M. Broshi et al. DJD 19. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- . “Shirot ‘Olat HaShabbat.” Pages 173–401 in *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by E. Eshel et al. DJD 11. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Nitzan, B. “Curses.” Pages 1–8 in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. Edited by E. Chazon et al. DJD 29. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.

- Nöldeke, Theodor. *Compendious Syriac Grammar*. Translated by James A. Crichton. London: Williams & Norgate, 1904. Repr. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2001.
- Norton, Jonathan. "The Question of Scribal Exegesis at Qumran." Pages 135–54 in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*. Edited by Anders K. Petersen et al. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Novick, Tzvi. "The Meaning and Etymology of **אִוִּי**." *JBL* 127 (2008): 339–43.
- Ohala, J. J. "Sound Change." Pages 520–25 in vol. 11 of *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Edited by Keith Brown. 2nd ed. 14 vols. Oxford: Elsevier, 2006.
- Olyan, Saul. "ParaKings et al." Pages 363–416 in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by H. Attridge et al. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Pardee, D. "Canaanite Dialects." Pages 386–90 in *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Edited by Roger D. Woodard. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2004.
- . "Review of *Matres Lectionis in Ancient Hebrew Epigraphs* by Z. Zevit." *CBQ* 44 (1982): 503–4.
- Pérez Fernández, Miguel. *An Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Peursen, Wido Th. van. *The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*. SSSL 41. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Poirier, John C. "The Linguistic Situation in Jewish Palestine in Late Antiquity." *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 4 (2007): 55–134.
- Polak, Frank. "Style is More than the Person: Sociolinguistics, Literary Culture, and the Distinction between Written and Oral Narrative." Pages 38–103 in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*. Edited by Ian Young. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Puech, Émile. "Du bilinguisme à Qumrân?" Pages 171–89 in *Mosaïque de langues mosaïques culturelle: Le bilinguisme dans le Proche-Orient Ancien*. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1996.
- . *Qumran Grotte 4.XXVII: Textes araméens, deuxième partie: 4Q550–575a, 580–587 et appendices*. DJD 37. Oxford: Clarendon, 2009.
- . *Qumran Grotte 4.XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)*. DJD 25. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

- . “Le Rouleau de Cuivre de la Grotte de Qumran (3Q15).” Pages 169–219 in *Le Rouleau de cuivre de la grotte 3 de Qumran (3Q15): Expertise—Restauration—Épigraphie* by Daniel Brizemeure, Noël Lacoudre, Emile Puech. 2 vols. STDJ 55. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Qimron, Elisha. “Consecutive and Conjunctive Imperfect: The Form of the Imperfect with *Waw* in Biblical Hebrew.” *JQR* 76 (1986–1987): 149–61.
- . “Diphthongs and Glides in the Dead Sea Scrolls” (Hebrew). *Mehqarim* 2–3 (1987): 259–78.
- . “The Distinction between *Waw* and *Yod* in the Qumran Scrolls” (Hebrew). *Beth Mikra* 52 (1972): 102–12.
- . *Grammar of the Hebrew Language of the Scrolls of the Judean Desert* (Hebrew). Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1976.
- . *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. HSS 29. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- . *History of the Hebrew Language: The Classical Division. Unit 2: The Hebrew of the Second Temple Period* (Hebrew). Tel Aviv: The Open University of Israel, 2004.
- . “Initial *Alef* as a Vowel in Hebrew and Aramean Documents from Qumran Compared to Later Hebrew and Aramaic Sources” (Hebrew). *Leshonenu* 39 (1975): 133–46.
- . “The Language.” Pages 65–108 in *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat Ma’ase ha-Torah*. Edited by Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell. DJD 10. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- . “The Language and Linguistic Background of the Qumran Compositions.” Pages 551–60 in *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*. Volume 2. Edited by Menahem Kister. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- . “The Nature of DSS Hebrew and Its Relation to BH and MH.” Pages 232–44 in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. STDJ 36. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . “A New Approach to the Use of the Forms of the Imperfect without Personal Endings.” Pages 174–81 in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University, 11–14 December, 1995*. Edited by T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. STDJ 26. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . “Observations on the History of Early Hebrew (1000 B.C.E. –200 C.E.) in the Light of the Dead Sea Documents.” Pages 349–62 in *The*

- Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappoport. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . “רֵאשׁ and Similar Words” (Hebrew). *Leshonenu* 65 (2003): 243–47.
- . “Studies in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls” (Hebrew). *Hebrew Linguistics* 33–35 (1992): 79–92.
- . “Waw as Marker for a Glide” (Hebrew). Pages 362–75 in *Homage to Shmuel: Studies in the World of the Bible*. Edited by Zipora Talshir et al. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2001.
- . “A Work Concerning Divine Providence.” Pages 191–202 in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield*. Edited by S. Gitin et al. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- . “עֲנוּת and Its Kindred Forms” (Hebrew). *Leshonenu* 67 (2004): 21–26.
- Qimron, Elisha, and James H. Charlesworth. “Cave IV Fragments.” Pages 53–103 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth et al. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- . “Rule of the Community.” Pages 1–51 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth et al. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Qimron, Elisha, and John Strugnell. *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat Ma’ase ha-Torah*. DJD 10. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Qimron, Elisha and Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky. “Notes on the So-Called Gabriel Vision Inscription.” Pages 31–38 in *Hazon Gabriel: New Readings of the Gabriel Inscription*. Edited by Matthias Henze. SBLEJL 29. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- Rabin, Chaim. “Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew.” Pages 144–61 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958.
- . *A Short History of the Hebrew Language*. Jerusalem: Publishing Department of the Jewish Agency, 1973.
- Ravid, Dorit Diskin. *Spelling Morphology: The Psycholinguistics of Hebrew Spelling*. Literacy Studies 3. New York: Springer, 2012.

- Rendsburg, Gary A. "Ancient Hebrew Morphology." Pages 85–105 in vol. 1 of *Morphologies of Asia and Africa*. Edited by Alan S. Kaye. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- . "Ancient Hebrew Phonology." Pages 65–84 in *Phonologies of Asia and Africa*. Edited by A. S. Kaye. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997.
- . "The Galilean Background of Mishnaic Hebrew." Pages 225–40 in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*. Edited by L.I. Levine. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1992.
- . "Hazon Gabriel: A Grammatical Sketch." Pages 61–91 in *Hazon Gabriel: New Readings of the Gabriel Inscription*. Edited by Matthias Henze. SBLEJL 29. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- . *Israelian Hebrew in the Books of Kings*. Bethesda: CDL, 2002.
- . "Linguistic and Stylistic Notes to the Hazon Gabriel Inscription." *DSD* 16 (2009): 107–16.
- . *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms*. SBLMS 43. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- . "Qumran Hebrew (with a Trial Cut [1QS])." Pages 217–46 in *Dead Sea Scrolls at 60: Scholarly Contributions of New York University Faculty and Alumni*. STDJ 89. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Revell, E. J. "Studies in the Palestinian vocalization of Hebrew." Pages 51–100 in *Essays on the Ancient Semitic World*. Edited by J.W. Wevers and D.B. Redford. Toronto: n.p., 1970.
- . *Hebrew Texts with Palestinian Vocalization*. Near and Middle East Series 7. Toronto: n.p., 1970.
- Reymond, Eric D. *New Idioms within Old: Poetry and Parallelism in the Non-Masoretic Poems of 11Q5 (= 11QPsa)*. SBLEJL 31. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- Sáenz-Badillos, Angel. "El Hebreo del S. II d. C a la Luz de las Transcripciones Griegas de Aquila, Simmaco, y Teodocion." *Sefarad* 35 (1975): 107–30.
- . *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Translated by J. Elwolde. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1993. This is a slightly revised and expanded version of *Historia de la Lengua Hebrea*. Sabadell: Estrada Vilarrasa, 1988.
- Sanderson, Judith E. "Ezekiel." Pages 209–20 in *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. DJD 15. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

- Schattner-Rieser, Ursula. *L'Araméen des manuscrits de la Mer Morte, I: Grammaire*. Instruments pour l'étude des langues de l'Orient ancien 5. Prahins, Switzerland: Zèbre, 2004.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Temple Scroll." Pages 1–173 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Volume 7: Temple Scroll and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Schniedewind, William M. "Linguistic Ideology in Qumran Hebrew." Pages 245–55 in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. STDJ 36. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage." *JBL* 118 (1999): 235–52.
- Schniedewind, William M. and D. Sivan. "The Elijah-Elisha Narratives: A Test Case for the Northern Dialect of Hebrew." *JQR* 87 (1997): 303–37.
- Schoors, Antoon. "The Language of the Qumran Sapiential Works." Pages 61–95 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran*. Edited by C. Hempel et al. BETL 159. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- Schorch, Stefan. "Spoken Hebrew of the Late Second Temple Period According to Oral and Written Samaritan Tradition." Pages 175–91 in *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period; Proceedings of a Fourth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by Jan Joosten and Jean-Sébastien Rey. STDJ 73. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Schuller, E. "Hodayot." Pages 69–254 in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. Edited by E. Chazon et al. DJD 29. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- . "Non-Canonical Psalms." Pages 75–172 in *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by E. Eshel et al. DJD 11. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Segal, J. B. *Aramaic Texts from North Saqqâra with Some Fragments in Phoenician*. Texts from Excavations 6. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983.
- Segal, M. H. *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1927.
- Segal, M. Z. *Diqduq Leshon ha-Mishna* (Hebrew). Tel-Aviv: Devir, 1936.
- Skehan, Patrick W. and Eugene Ulrich. "Isaiah." Pages 7–143 in *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. DJD 15. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

- Skehan, Patrick W., Eugene Ulrich, and Peter Flint. "Psalms." Pages 7–170 in *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. DJD 16. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- Smelik, Willem F. *The Targum of Judges*. OTS 36. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Smith, Mark S. "Converted and Unconverted Perfect and Imperfect Forms in the Literature of Qumran." *BASOR* 284 (1991): 1–16.
- . *The Origins and Development of the Waw-Consecutive*. HSS 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- . "The Waw-Consecutive at Qumran." *ZAH* 3 (1991): 161–64.
- Sperber, Alexander. "Hebrew Based Upon Biblical Passages in Parallel Transmission." *HUCA* 14 (1939): 153–249.
- Stegemann, Hartmut, Eileen Schuller, Carol Newsom. *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayot^a with Incorporation of 4QHodayot^{a-f} and 1QHodayot^b*. DJD 40. Oxford: Clarendon, 2009.
- Steiner, Richard C. "Addenda to *The Case for Fricative-Laterals in Proto-Semitic*." Pages 1499–1513 in *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau*. Edited by A. S. Kaye; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991.
- . "Ancient Hebrew." Pages 145–73 in *The Semitic Languages*. Edited by R. Hetzron. London: Routledge, 1997.
- . *The Case for Fricative-Laterals in Proto-Semitic*. AOS 59. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1977.
- . "From Proto-Hebrew to Mishnaic Hebrew: The History of פֿ- and פֿֿ-." *HAR* 3 (1979): 157–74.
- . "On the Dating of Hebrew Sound Changes (**h* > *h* and *G* > *ʾ*) and Greek Translations (2Esdras and Judith)." *JBL* 124 (2005): 229–67.
- . "Variation, Simplifying Assumptions, and the History of Spirantization in Aramaic and Hebrew." Pages *52–*65 in *Sha'arei Lashon: Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Jewish Languages Presented to Moshe Bar-Asher; Vol I: Biblical Hebrew, Masorah, and Medieval Hebrew*. Edited by A. Maman et al. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2007.
- Strugnell, John. "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan.'" *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163–276.
- Strugnell, John, and Daniel J. Harrington. *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2, 4QInstruction (Mûsâr Lĕ Mĕvîn), 4Q415 ff.* DJD 34. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- Sukenik, E. L. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1955.
- Tigchelaar, E. "Assessing Emanuel Tov's 'Qumran Scribal Practice.'" Pages 173–208 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Pro-*

- duction of Texts*. Edited by Sarianna Metso et al. STDJ 92. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . “Review of Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*.” *DSD* 14 (2007): 368–72.
- Tov, Emanuel. “Canticles.” Pages 195–219 in *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. DJD 16. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- . “Correction Procedures in the Texts from the Judean Desert.” Pages 232–63 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . “Jeremiah.” Pages 145–207 in *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. DJD 15. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- . “Review of James Barr, *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible*.” Pages 3–16 in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*. Emanuel Tov. TSAJ 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008. Originally published in *JSS* 35 (1990): 303–16.
- . *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. STDJ 54. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd revised ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.
- Tov, Emanuel, ed. *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University, 2006.
- Tov, Emanuel, and S. White. “365. Reworked Pentateuch.” Pages 187–351 in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by H. Attridge et al. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Uffmann, Christian. “Intrusive [r] and Optimal Epenthetic Consonants.” *Language Sciences* 29 (2007): 451–76.
- Ulrich, Eugene. “24. 4QLev^b.” Pages 177–87 in *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. DJD 12. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Ulrich, Eugene et al., eds. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls*. VTSup 134. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Ulrich, Eugene et al. *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. DJD 15. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- Ulrich, Eugene and Peter W. Flint. “Introduction to 1QIsa^a.” Pages 59–95 in *Qumran Cave 1, II: The Isaiah Scrolls, Part 2: Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint. DJD 32. Oxford: Clarendon, 2010.

- Ulrich, Eugene and Peter W. Flint, eds. *Qumran Cave 1, II: The Isaiah Scrolls, Part 2: Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants*. DJD 32. Oxford: Clarendon, 2010.
- VanderKam, J. and J. T. Milik. "Jubilees." Pages 1–185 in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by Harry Attridge et al. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Vegas Montaner, Luis. "Some Features of the Hebrew Verbal Syntax in the Qumran *Hodayot*." Pages 273–86 in vol. 1 of *The Madrid Qumran Congress, Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*. Edited by Julio Treballe Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. 2 vols. STDJ 11. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Watson, Janet C. E. *The Phonology and Morphology of Arabic*. Oxford: Oxford, 2002.
- Washburn, David L. *A Catalogue of Biblical Passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Text Critical Studies 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Weinfeld, M. and D. Seely. "Barkhi Nafshi." Pages 255–334 in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. Edited by E. Chazon et al. DJD 29. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- . "Lament of a Leader." Pages 335–41 in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. Edited by E. Chazon et al. DJD 29. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- Weinreich, Uriel. "Is a Structural Dialectology Possible?" *Word: Journal of the Linguistic Circle of New York* 10 (1954): 388–400.
- Weitzman, Steve. "Why Did the Qumran Community Write in Hebrew?" *JAOS* 119 (1999): 35–45.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. *Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. STDJ 1. Leiden: Brill, 1957.
- Wevers, J. W. "Heth in Classical Hebrew." Pages 110–12 in *Essays on the Ancient Semitic World*. Edited by J.W. Wevers and D.B. Redford. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1970.
- Wright, W. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. 3rd ed. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896–1898.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983.
- Yalon, Henoch (Hanoch). *Introduction to the Vocalization of the Mishna* (Hebrew). Jerusalem: Bialik, 1964.

- . *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Philological Essays* (Hebrew). Jerusalem: Shrine of the Book and Kiryat Sepher, 1971.
- Yardeni, Ada and Binyamin Elizur. “A Hebrew Prophetic Text on Stone from the Early Herodian Period: A Preliminary Report.” Pages 11–29 in *Hazon Gabriel: New Readings of the Gabriel Inscription*. Edited by Matthias Henze. SBLEJL 29. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- Yeivin, Israel. *The Hebrew Language Tradition as Reflected in Babylonian Vocalization*. (Hebrew.) Text and Studies 12. 2 vols. Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1985.
- . “The Verbal Forms יקטולנו, יקוטלנו in DSS in Comparison to the Babylonian Vocalization” (Hebrew). Pages 256–76 in *Bible and Jewish History: Studies in Bible and Jewish History Dedicated to the Memory of Jacob Liver*. Edited by Benjamin Uffenheimer. Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, 1971.
- Young, Ian. *Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew*. FAT 5. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.
- . “Observations on the Third Masculine Singular Pronominal Suffix -h in Hebrew Biblical Texts.” *HS* 42 (2001): 225–42.
- . “Late Biblical Hebrew and the Qumran Peshet Habakkuk.” *JHS* 8 (2008). http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/JHS/Articls/article_102.pdf.
- Yuditsky, Alexey (Eliyahu). “The Weak Consonants in the Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Hexapla Transliterations.” Pages 233–39 in *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period; Proceedings of a Fourth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by Jan Joosten and Jean-Sébastien Rey. STDJ 73. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Zevit, Z. *Matres Lectionis in Ancient Hebrew Epigraphs*. ASORMS 2. Cambridge, Mass.: ASOR, 1980.

SOURCES INDEX

DEAD SEA SCROLLS	Isa 4:1	108
	Isa 4:5	108 n. 186
BIBLICAL SCROLLS (INCLUDING PHYLACTERY TEXTS)	Isa 5:1	59, 160
	Isa 5:2	190 n. 130, 198
	Isa 5:4	15, 23, 89
1Q4 (1QDeut ^a)	Isa 5:5	92, 104 n. 168
Deut 13:4	Isa 5:6	110
	Isa 5:17	139
1Q7 (1QSam)	Isa 5:19	159
2 Sam 23:12	Isa 5:21	92
	Isa 5:23	111, 184, 185
1QIsa ^a	Isa 5:24	108 n. 186
7, 11, 17, 35, 46, 48, 72–77, 84, 98–99, 106, 111–13, 145–47, 157, 164, 174, 185, 186, 189, 194, 195, 197, 226, 227, 229, 231	Isa 5:25	146
Isa 1:1	Isa 5:26	121 n. 227
34, 92, 177 n. 86, 232	Isa 5:28	173 n. 69
Isa 1:4	Isa 5:29	200
189	Isa 6:9	94
Isa 1:6	Isa 6:13	61
192	Isa 7:1	181
Isa 1:7	Isa 7:14	132, 141
189 n. 128	Isa 8:2	105
Isa 1:9	Isa 8:4	52
181	Isa 8:6	172, 181
Isa 1:10	Isa 8:7	134
101	Isa 8:9	101 n. 158
Isa 1:15	Isa 8:18	104 n. 168
44, 133, 141	Isa 8:23	121 n. 227
Isa 1:17	Isa 9:3	67
44	Isa 9:5	191
Isa 1:20	Isa 9:6	47
192	Isa 9:7	92
Isa 1:21	Isa 9:10	59
61, 105, 153, 232	Isa 9:11	27, 146
Isa 1:23	Isa 9:12	96 n. 136
44	Isa 9:16	146
Isa 1:24		
2 n. 3, 105 n. 173, 147, 187		
Isa 1:25		
105		
Isa 2:2		
121 n. 227		
Isa 2:3		
47, 86		
Isa 2:4		
121 n. 227		
Isa 2:6		
120		
Isa 3:1		
194, 231		
Isa 3:9		
167		
Isa 3:24		
109, 171, 184		

<i>1QIsa^a (cont.)</i>		Isa 17:2	37, 181
Isa 9:19	52 n. 128	Isa 17:4	92
Isa 9:20	146	Isa 17:9	61
Isa 10:4	146	Isa 17:10	197, 214, 218
Isa 10:7	121 n. 227	Isa 18:2	192
Isa 10:9	107 n. 179	Isa 18:7	192
Isa 10:11	190	Isa 19:6	30 n. 38
Isa 10:12	159	Isa 19:14	167
Isa 10:31	231	Isa 19:16	194
Isa 11:1	51	Isa 19:17	61
Isa 11:10	121 n. 227	Isa 19:20	61, 188
Isa 11:12	121 n. 227	Isa 20:1	181, 215
Isa 11:14	120	Isa 21:2	39
Isa 11:15	61	Isa 21:4	109
Isa 11:16	61	Isa 21:13	181
Isa 12:2	59, 160	Isa 21:15	109, 184
Isa 12:4	103, 231	Isa 22:1	134
Isa 13:4	121 n. 227	Isa 22:3	192 n. 139
Isa 13:9	29	Isa 22:4	85 n. 76, 126
Isa 13:16	164 n. 45, 167 n. 55	Isa 22:6	181
Isa 13:19	87, 189 n. 128	Isa 22:17	216, 218
Isa 13:22	130 n. 262	Isa 22:20	190
Isa 14:1	189	Isa 23:1	103
Isa 14:3	192	Isa 23:2	94
Isa 14:6	121 n. 227	Isa 23:3	121 n. 227
Isa 14:7	173, 178 n. 89	Isa 23:6	30 n. 38, 203 n. 178
Isa 14:9	121 n. 227	Isa 24:12	192
Isa 14:12	105	Isa 25:1	92
Isa 14:18	121 n. 227	Isa 25:3	130
Isa 14:19	172	Isa 25:7	121 n. 227
Isa 14:26	121 n. 227	Isa 25:10	110
Isa 14:27	146	Isa 26:1	192
Isa 14:28	34	Isa 27:3	214
Isa 14:29	35	Isa 27:7	192 n. 139
Isa 14:31	35	Isa 27:9	132
Isa 14:32	35	Isa 28:4	61
Isa 15:2	37 n. 67, 44	Isa 28:7	58
Isa 15:3	160	Isa 28:15	89
Isa 15:5	90	Isa 28:20	89 n. 94
Isa 15:7	39	Isa 28:22	92
Isa 16:1	96	Isa 28:28	105
Isa 16:2	37	Isa 29:1	181
Isa 16:3	125, 129, 144	Isa 29:2	61
Isa 16:5	184	Isa 29:7	121 n. 227
Isa 17:1	61	Isa 29:8	121 n. 227, 146

Isa 29:9	90	Isa 37:12	121 n. 227
Isa 29:11	198	Isa 37:13	101
Isa 29:13	198	Isa 37:14	215
Isa 29:14	190 n. 131, n. 133	Isa 37:17	189
Isa 29:16	30 n. 38	Isa 37:20	103
Isa 30:7	190	Isa 37:26	101, 132, 196 n. 154
Isa 30:8	60, 160, 222	Isa 37:29	122, 133, 170
Isa 30:10	101	Isa 37:30	96
Isa 30:12	97	Isa 37:33	104
Isa 30:20	86, 232	Isa 37:34	185 n. 116, 187
Isa 30:21	47, 59	Isa 37:38	105, 146, 174, 181
Isa 30:22	42	Isa 38:9	206 n. 186
Isa 30:23	109	Isa 38:10	34, 177 n. 86, 232
Isa 30:28	101, 107 n. 178, 121 n. 227, 172	Isa 38:15	172
Isa 30:31	46	Isa 38:20	194 n. 148
Isa 30:33	110, 126, 132	Isa 39:7	97
Isa 31:3	134	Isa 39:8	30 n. 38
Isa 31:8	201, 214	Isa 40:7	105, 153, 232
Isa 32:14	192 n. 139	Isa 40:9	36 n. 65, 203 n. 178
Isa 33:1	27 n. 20, 191	Isa 40:11	160 n. 29
Isa 33:7	134, 188	Isa 40:12	84
Isa 33:10	105	Isa 40:14	89 n. 94
Isa 33:15	111, 184, 185	Isa 40:15	84, 121 n. 227
Isa 34:1	121 n. 227	Isa 40:17	81 n. 63, 102, 121 n. 227, 144
Isa 34:2	121 n. 227	Isa 40:21	87
Isa 34:4	172	Isa 40:24	33, 97
Isa 34:6	45	Isa 41:2	121 n. 227
Isa 34:8	178	Isa 41:5	41 n. 85, 44, 134
Isa 34:9	61	Isa 41:8	76 n. 48
Isa 34:10	60, 160	Isa 41:14	187
Isa 34:11	60, 104, 160, 190 n. 130	Isa 41:17	214
Isa 34:13	61	Isa 41:18	121, 129, 141
Isa 34:15	134	Isa 41:24	184 n. 113
Isa 35:6	44	Isa 41:26	87
Isa 35:8	34, 216, 220 n. 219	Isa 41:27	174 n. 74
Isa 36:1	215	Isa 42:1	121 n. 227
Isa 36:3	174	Isa 42:2	188
Isa 36:11	174	Isa 42:5	104
Isa 36:15	173	Isa 42:6	121 n. 227, 190, 214
Isa 36:18	121 n. 227	Isa 42:13	77
Isa 36:21	126, 132, 160 n. 29	Isa 42:14	103
Isa 36:22	174	Isa 42:16	109
Isa 37:2	174	Isa 42:19	25 n. 10, 47, 94
Isa 37:10	61, 126, 141, 190 n. 133	Isa 42:20	77, 97

<i>1QIsa^a (cont.)</i>		Isa 50:6	77
Isa 42:22	174	Isa 50:9	214
Isa 42:25	48 n. 117	Isa 50:11	61
Isa 43:8	25 n. 10, 47	Isa 51:2	190
Isa 43:9	121 n. 227	Isa 51:4	103
Isa 43:13	197	Isa 51:6	32 n. 50
Isa 43:17	178, 197	Isa 51:8	110, 197, 201 n. 172
Isa 43:19	178 n. 89	Isa 51:9	109 n. 187, 110, 155
Isa 43:20	178 n. 89	Isa 51:10	155
Isa 43:23	196 n. 154	Isa 51:11	177
Isa 43:28	178	Isa 51:12	155
Isa 45:1	121 n. 227	Isa 51:20	174 n. 74
Isa 45:4	105	Isa 52:5	191
Isa 45:7	77	Isa 52:10	121 n. 227
Isa 45:8	39, 61	Isa 52:14	187 n. 124
Isa 45:12	104	Isa 52:15	121 n. 227
Isa 45:13	184, 185	Isa 53:2	121, 187 n. 124
Isa 45:14	62 n. 166	Isa 53:8	30 n. 38, 173 n. 69, 191
Isa 45:20	121 n. 227	Isa 53:9	95
Isa 45:23	171	Isa 54:2	59, 103
Isa 46:1	96 n. 140	Isa 54:3	52 n. 128, 121 n. 227
Isa 46:7	188	Isa 54:5	189
Isa 47:2	203 n. 178	Isa 54:7	172
Isa 47:7	231	Isa 54:11	62, 96
Isa 47:8	95 n. 128	Isa 54:15	30
Isa 47:9	201	Isa 55:5	32 n. 50
Isa 47:12	203 n. 178	Isa 55:12	55, 172, 190 n. 132
Isa 47:13	110	Isa 55:13	104 n. 168, 176
Isa 48:8	192 n. 141	Isa 56:2	15, 23
Isa 48:11	41–42	Isa 56:6	120 n. 220
Isa 48:14	89	Isa 56:7	189 n. 130, 196 n. 154
Isa 48:15	196 n. 154	Isa 56:10	56 n. 135, 110
Isa 48:16	87	Isa 57:2	174 n. 74
Isa 49:2	32 n. 50	Isa 57:9	178
Isa 49:4	48 n. 117, 90, 103 n. 162, 179	Isa 57:13	178
Isa 49:6	121 n. 227	Isa 57:15	101
Isa 49:8	214	Isa 57:17	194
Isa 49:9	121, 129	Isa 57:18	160 n. 29
Isa 49:17	174	Isa 57:20	103
Isa 49:22	121 n. 227	Isa 58:3	32
Isa 49:23	27 n. 20	Isa 58:4	101
Isa 49:24	192	Isa 58:9	205
Isa 49:25	172, 192	Isa 58:10	48, 217
Isa 49:26	203	Isa 58:11	107
		Isa 58:12	192 n. 141

SOURCES INDEX

261

Isa 59:5	46	Isa 66:2	59
Isa 59:6	184	Isa 66:10	60, 104, 160
Isa 59:7	120 n. 223, 161 n. 34	Isa 66:12	121 n. 227, 171, 190
Isa 59:10	48, 217	Isa 66:18	121 n. 227, 161 n. 34
Isa 59:14	104 n. 168	Isa 66:19	43 n. 96, 44, 55, 121 n.
Isa 59:17	146		227, 132
Isa 59:19	130	Isa 66:20	121 n. 227, 174
Isa 60:3	121 n. 227		
Isa 60:5	121 n. 227	1Q8 (1QIsa ^b)	15 n. 7
Isa 60:6	67, 176	Isa 16:2	37
Isa 60:7	121, 141	Isa 16:7	160
Isa 60:11	121 n. 227	Isa 17:2	37
Isa 60:12	121 n. 227, 215	Isa 26:2	52, 81 n. 61
Isa 60:14	95	Isa 41:8	76 n. 48
Isa 60:15	61	Isa 41:18	121
Isa 60:16	121 n. 227	Isa 43:23	196 n. 154
Isa 61:3	192 n. 141	Isa 47:9	201
Isa 61:6	46, 55, 121 n. 227, 123, 124, 190 n. 132, 207	Isa 48:20	126
Isa 61:9	121 n. 227	Isa 51:5	210 n. 196
Isa 61:11	121 n. 227	Isa 52:14	187 n. 124
Isa 62:2	121 n. 227, 192 n. 141, 214	Isa 53:2	187 n. 124
Isa 62:4	60, 160	Isa 55:12	124, 141
Isa 62:8	130, 149	Isa 55:13	30
Isa 62:9	36 n. 66, 215	Isa 56:7	196 n. 154
Isa 63:1	95 n. 130, 160 n. 29	Isa 58:6	37
Isa 63:7	44	Isa 58:9	42, 62
Isa 63:8	30 n. 38	Isa 60:4	190
Isa 63:11	160 n. 29	Isa 60:6	203
Isa 63:13	32, 101	1Q10 (1QP ^s ^a)	
Isa 64:1	96, 121 n. 227	Ps 119:32	36 n. 65
Isa 64:4	215		
Isa 64:6	104	1Q16 (1QpPs)	9
Isa 64:7	93, 95 n. 128		
Isa 64:9	61	2Q3 (2QExod ^b)	7, 7 n. 5
Isa 64:10	173	Exod 18:21	125 n. 242
Isa 65:1	190, 192 n. 141		
Isa 65:2	161 n. 34	2Q7 (2QNum ^b)	7
Isa 65:3	77		
Isa 65:7	48 n. 117, 90, 179	2Q12 (2QDeut ^c)	7
Isa 65:9	190		
Isa 65:10	59 n. 152, 160 n. 31	2Q13 (2QJer)	7, 186
Isa 65:14	188	Jer 48:27	59 n. 152, 160 n. 31
Isa 65:20	190 n. 130	Jer 48:28	203 n. 178
Isa 65:21	44		

2Q16 (2QRuth ^a)		4Q24 (4QLev ^b)	98
Ruth 2:22	145 n. 314	Lev 2:16	80
		Lev 22:23	94
4Q1 (4QGen-Exod ^a)		Lev 23:10	196 n. 154
Gen 35:26	192		
Gen 39:17	196 n. 154	4Q26 (4QLev ^d)	
Exod 6:8	196 n. 154	Lev 17:11	158
4Q5 (4QGen ^e)		4Q26a (4QLev ^e)	
Gen 41:6	37	Lev 20:2	3 n. 4, 36 n. 66
4Q7 (4QGen ^g)	133	4Q26c (4QLev ⁱ = XLev ^c)	
Gen 1:9	132	Lev 26:36	196 n. 154
4Q9 (4QGen ^j)		4Q27 (4QNum ^b)	7, 186
Gen 41:18	187 n. 124	Num 16:1	181
		Num 19:1	31
4Q11 (4QpaleoGen-Exod ^l)		Num 20:13	36 n. 65
Exod 12:9	176	Num 24:9	25
Exod 26:33	196 n. 154	Num 26:32	172
Exod 28:40	153	Num 27:1	181
		Num 31:54	125 n. 242
4Q13 (4Q[Gen-]Exod ^b)	7		
Exod 2:3	201 n. 173	4Q31 (4QDeut ^d)	
		Deut 3:18	37
4Q14 (4QExod ^c)		Deut 3:19	36 n. 65
Exod 17:7	69	Deut 3:26	30
Exod 17:8	29		
		4Q32 (4QDeut ^e)	
4Q17 (4QExod-Lev ^f)		Deut 8:2	145 n. 314
Exod 40:15	66, 162, 164, 231		
Exod 40:18	67	4Q33 (4QDeut ^f)	136 n. 286
Exod 40:20	67	Deut 7:22	155
Exod 40:22	67	Deut 8:9	108
4Q22 (4QpaleoExod ^m)		4Q35 (4QDeut ^h)	
Exod 7:18	120 n. 222	Deut 33:9	3 n. 4
Exod 12:38	224	Deut 33:10	28
Exod 25:27	37		
Exod 26:11	196 n. 154	4Q37 (4QDeut ^j)	7
Exod 32:17	160		
		4Q38 (4Q Deut ^{k1})	7
4Q23 (4QLev-Num ^a)			
Num 4:40	37	4Q38a (4QDeut ^{k2})	7
		Deut 19:11	155

SOURCES INDEX

263

4Q40 (4QDeut ^m)	8	4Q57 (4QIsa ^c)	8
		Isa 9:6	59
4Q41 (4QDeut ⁿ)		Isa 23:10	203
Deut 5:1	204	Isa 23:12	203 n. 178
Deut 5:9	216	Isa 24:15	54
Deut 5:20	156	Isa 48:11	41
Deut 5:22	217		
		4Q58 (4QIsa ^d)	
4Q42 (4QDeut ^o)		Isa 48:11	59
Deut 5:1	204	Isa 48:15	196 n. 154
		Isa 48:20	126
4Q44 (4QDeut ^q)		Isa 57:19	25
Deut 32:42	26-27		
		4Q59 (4QIsa ^e)	
4Q49 (4QJudg ^a)		Isa 8:6	109
Judg 6:13	80 n. 59	Isa 8:8	95
4Q51 (4QSam ^a)		4Q60 (4QIsa ^f)	
1 Sam 2:29	127	Isa 22:18	214
1 Sam 31:3	76 n. 47	Isa 22:19	194 n. 149
2 Sam 2:6	76 n. 47		
2 Sam 6:2	32	4Q61 (4QIsa ^g)	
2 Sam 6:3	76 n. 47	Isa 43:23	196 n. 154
2 Sam 11:11	205		
2 Sam 19:7	57	4Q62 (4QIsa ^h)	
2Sam 24:16	121, 141	Isa 42:6	214
2Sam 22:44	121 n. 227	Isa 42:11	25
4Q52 (4QSam ^b)		4Q68 (4QIsa ^o)	35
1 Sam 20:38	160 n. 29		
		4Q70 (4QJer ^a)	
4Q53 (4QSam ^c)	8	Jer 12:14	204 n. 182
2 Sam 14:10	32	Jer 14:10	121
2 Sam 14:31	36 n. 65	Jer 15:19	126
2 Sam 15:3	33	Jer 18:21	3 n. 4
		Jer 17:10	3 n. 4, 32
4Q55 (4QIsa ^a)		Jer 17:16	32
Isa 23:3	54 n. 131	Jer 17:17	108
		Jer 17:21	34
4Q56 (4QIsa ^b)		Jer 18:18	203
Isa 13:4	32	Jer 18:21	37
Isa 13:7	86		
Isa 13:16	167 n. 55	4Q72 (4QJer ^c)	195
Isa 18:7	191		
Isa 19:18	110		

4Q73 (4QEzek ^a)		4Q87 (4QPs ^e)	
Ezek 23:44	81 n. 61, 52	Ps ;126:2	121 n. 227
Ezek 23:45	29		
4Q74 (4QEzek ^b)		4Q88 (4QPs ^f) (non-Masoretic works listed under 4Q88 in "Nonbiblical Scrolls")	xvii, 50 n. 122, 122
Ezek 1:21	32	Ps 107:4	178 n. 89
4Q76 (4QXII ^a)		Ps 107:27	49 n. 120, 202 n. 175
Mal 3:1	52, 81 n. 61	Ps 109:4	69
		Ps 109:25	87
4Q77 (4QXII ^b)		4Q89 (4QPs ^g)	
Zeph 2:13	32	Ps 119:37	36 n. 65
4Q78 (4QXII ^c)		Ps 119:43	36 n. 65
Joel 2:11	8 32	Ps 119:83	187 n. 125
4Q79 (4QXII ^d)		4Q90 (4QPs ^h)	
Hos 2:2	85	Ps 119:13	69
		Ps 119:14	56 n. 135, 133
4Q80 (4QXII ^e)			
Zech 4:2	8 87	4Q93 (4QPs ⁱ)	
		Ps 104:4	42, 145 n. 314
4Q82 (4QXII ^g)		Ps 104:5	69
Hos 2:14	8 108		
Hos 7:14	37 n. 67	4Q96 (4QPs ^o)	8
Hos 12:8	92	Ps 115:4	121 n. 227
4Q83 (4QPs ^a)		4Q98 (4QPs ^q)	
Ps 38:22	214	Ps 112:1	145 n. 314
Ps 69:4	117 n. 211		
4Q84 (4QPs ^b)		4Q98g (4QPs ^x)	
Ps 93:5	85 n. 78	Ps 89:23	121, 141
Ps 102:16	130	4Q99 (4QJob ^a)	
Ps 103:10	27 n. 25	Job 37:5	95
Ps 116:19	157		
4Q85 (4QPs ^c)		4Q104 (4QRuth ^a)	
Ps 50:21	104	Ruth 1:9	67 n. 7
Ps 50:23	3 n. 4, 203	4Q107 (4QCant ^b)	11, 37, 231
Ps 52:8	130	Song 2:13	60 n. 153
		Song 2:17	166
4Q86 (4QPs ^d)		Song 3:1	25
Ps 104:2	42	Song 2:13	26 n. 17
Ps 104:4	42	Song 4:10	66, 232

SOURCES INDEX

265

4Q109 (4QOoh ^a)	8	4Q135 (4QPhyl H)	8, 8 n. 6
Qoh 5:15	154	Deut 5:22	215
Qoh 7:5	25	Deut 5:28	32
Qoh 7:7	95	Deut 6:4	204
Qoh 7:19	95 n. 132		
		4Q136 (4QPhyl I)	8, 8 n. 6
4Q111 (4QLam)	8	Exod 12:44	69
Lam 1:12	193	Exod 12:48	69
Lam 1:15	30, 68		
Lam 1:17	71, 110	4Q137 (4QPhyl J)	8, 8 n. 6
		Deut 5:1	204
4Q112 (4QDan ^a)		Deut 5:11	46
Dan 2:41	162 n. 36	Deut 5:15	134
		Deut 5:16	41 n. 85
4Q113 (4QDan ^b)		Deut 5:29	133
Dan 8:7	103 n. 163, 215	Deut 5:31	204
Dan 8:16	154		
		4Q138 (4QPhyl K)	8, 8 n. 6
4Q114 (4QDan ^c)		Deut 10:18	160 n. 29
Dan 10:6	145 n. 314	Deut 11:1	145 n. 313
		Deut 11:6	125, 141
4Q116 (4QDan ^e)		Deut 11:9	36 n. 65
Dan 9:12	35		
		4Q139 (4QPhyl L)	8, 8 n. 6
4Q128 (4QPhyl A)	8	Deut 5:11	46
Exod 12:43	160	Deut 5:15	134
Exod 12:44	160		
Deut 10:13	133, 145 n. 313	4Q140 (4QPhyl M)	8, 8 n. 6
		Exod 13:3	160
4Q129 (4QPhyl B)	8	Deut 5:33	31
Deut 5:10	133, 141	Deut 6:2	133, 145 n. 313
Deut 5:11	46		
Deut 5:20	156	4Q141 (4QPhyl N)	8, 8 n. 6
Deut 5:22	154	Deut 32:17	132
Deut 5:24	44		
Deut 5:27	30	4Q142 (4QPhyl O)	8
Deut 5:29	133		
		4Q143 (4QPhyl P)	8
4Q130 (4QPhyl C)			
Deut 11:13	133	4Q144 (4QPhyl Q)	8
Deut 11:21	36 n. 65		
		5Q1 (5QDeut)	
4Q134 (4QPhyl G)	8, 8 n. 6	Deut 7:17	154
Deut 5:1	204		
Deut 5:20	156		

5Q6 (5QLam ^a)		Ps 126:2	121 n. 227
Lam 4:8	187 n. 124	Ps 126:6	145 n. 313
Lam 5:2	120	Ps 136:11	59 n. 146, 198
		Ps 137:9	167 n. 55
6Q4 (6QpapKgs)		Ps 139:17	80 n. 59
2 Kgs 7:8	175	Ps 140:5	212, 222
		Ps 141:7	151
6Q7 (6QpapDan)		Ps 141:9	212, 222
Dan 10:12	81 n. 63, 125, 141	Ps 143:5	184 n. 113
		Ps 144:3	217
8Q3 (8QPhyl)		Ps 149:7	121 n. 227
Deut 11:6	125		
Deut 11:10	158	11Q6 (11QPs ^b)	8
11Q1 (11QpaleoLev ^a)		11Q7 (11QPs ^c)	7 n. 5, 8
Lev 18:27	155	Ps 2:3	31
Lev 21:10	145 n. 314		
Lev 25:30	52 n. 128, 206	11Q8 (11QPs ^d)	8
Lev 25:32	107	Ps 81:6	133 n. 272, 170
Lev 26:18	80		
Lev 26:19	31	XQ3 (XQPhyl 3)	
Lev 26:21	200 n. 170	Deut 5:1	204
Lev 26:25	196 n. 154		
		NONBIBLICAL SCROLLS	
11Q2 (11QLev ^b)		1Q14 (1QpMic)	8
Lev 13:58	30	8–10, 7	40 n. 81
Lev 13:59	172		
11Q5 (11QPs ^a) (non-Masoretic works listed under 11Q5 in “Non-Biblical Scrolls”)	8, 173 n. 70	1QpHab	8, 112, 146–147
Ps 93:1	29	I, 11	69
Ps 104:24	49 n. 120	II, 6	57 n. 137
Ps 119:2	217	II, 12	120
Ps 119:37	93 n. 117	III, 6	145 n. 313, 147
Ps 119:40	32	III, 7	145 n. 313
Ps 119:42	80 n. 59	IV, 2	193
Ps 119:83	187 n. 125	IV, 6	197
Ps 119:86	222	IV, 7	204
Ps 119:117	92	V, 1	205, 206
Ps 119:161	175	V, 5	145 n. 313
Ps 119:175	217, 221	VI, 11	166
Ps 121:2	92	VII, 1	24
Ps 121:7	217, 219 n. 217	VIII, 3	136
Ps 124:7	32	VIII, 5	145 n. 311
		VIII, 7	36, 142, 145 n. 311
		VIII, 10	136

VIII, 15	202	II, 3	135, 214, 221
IX, 3	202	II, 4	134
IX, 9	62 n. 165	II, 19	34, 177 n. 86, 232
IX, 14	27, 45	III, 1	205
X, 1	25	III, 3	205
X, 2	42, 86	III, 5	34, 177 n. 86, 232
X, 5	218	III, 6	170 n. 60, 193
X, 10	62, 146	III, 7	145 n. 313
X, 11	62, 101, 146	III, 8	145 n. 313, 184 n. 112
XI, 2	62	III, 9	194, 231
XI, 6	151	III, 15	61, 109
XI, 9	30	III, 25	162, 231
XII, 4	122, 141	IV, 4	96
XII, 5	215	IV, 6	160
XII, 11	159	IV, 9	153, 184
XIII, 1	85	IV, 10	184
		IV, 11	172, 183, 184
1Q18 (1QJub ^b)		V, 2	94
1-2, 2	147 n. 319	V, 5	159
1-2, 3	147 n. 319	V, 10	100
		V, 13	81 n. 61
1Q20 (1QGenApocr)		V, 20	162, 176 n. 81
II, 18	185	V, 21	176
III, 13	185	V, 24	108
XIV, 9	59 n. 150	VI, 3	25
XXI, 21	119	VI, 5	40 n. 81
XXI, 34	143 n. 305	VI, 6	40 n. 81
XXII, 1	162 n. 36	VI, 7	95
		VI, 11	109
1Q22 (1QDibreMoshe)	8	VI, 14	211, 215, 231
1 ii, 10	40 n. 81	VI, 15	194 n. 148
		VI, 17	145 n. 313, 159, 206, 215
1Q26 (1QInstr)	8	VI, 18	206
		VI, 20	94
1Q27 (1QMyst)	8	VI, 21	206, 215
1 i, 3	49 n. 120	VI, 22	36, 50, 101 n. 158, 215
1 i, 10	216	VI, 24	24
1 i, 11	153	VI, 26	103, 172 n. 65, 184 n. 112
		VI, 27	93
1QS (= 1Q28)	6, 8, 10, 34, 52 n. 125, 99, 106, 112, 146, 147, 226, 227, 229, 231	VII, 3	67, 70 n. 22, 94, 96, 232
I, 7	79 n. 57	VII, 4	59, 160
I, 9	205	VII, 10	197
I, 14	193	VII, 11	94 n. 126
I, 16	94	VII, 12	180 n. 96
		VII, 13	171, 184 n. 112

<i>1QS (cont.)</i>		I, 16	25
VII, 14	94, 109	I, 18	145 n. 313
VII, 20	52 n. 128, 206	I, 19	171, 207 n. 189
VII, 20–21	207 n. 190	I, 20	100
VII, 22	52 n. 128, 206	I, 22	145 n. 313
VIII, 2	92	I, 27	85
VIII, 3	209	II, 2	25
VIII, 5	24, 169	II, 10	40 n. 77, 222
VIII, 6	25, 40 n. 81		
VIII, 8	51	1QSb (= 1Q28b)	8, 52 n. 125
VIII, 10	40 n. 81	III, 20	215
VIII, 13	104	III, 27	27, 130 n. 262
VIII, 25	31, 170 n. 60	V, 23	28 n. 26
VIII, 26	206	V, 25	50
IX, 14	162 n. 35, 175	V, 27	29
IX, 18–19	31 n. 48	V, 28	217
IX, 20	154		
IX, 23	174	1Q29 (1QTongues Fire)	9
X, 1	32	13, 4	164
X, 2	103, 153, 231		
X, 3	174	1Q30 (1QLit Text? A)	9
X, 6	105		
X, 12	105	1Q31 (1QLit Text? B)	9
X, 13	215		
X, 19	24	1QM (= 1Q33)	6, 8, 10, 52 n. 125, 122,
X, 25	167	181	
X, 26	40, 183, 191	I, 1	174
XI, 1	29	I, 4	120
XI, 2	153, 179, 184	I, 8	45 n. 103
XI, 3	145 n. 313	I, 12	160
XI, 7	32, 48 n. 117, 179	I, 13	205
XI, 17	170 n. 60	II, 13	66
XI, 21	107	II, 17	51 n. 124, 172
XI, 22	172 n. 64	III, 2	30, 174
		III, 6	205
1QSa (= 1Q28a)	8, 52 n. 125, 112,	III, 9	174
173 n. 70		III, 15	79 n. 57
I, 1	85	III, 17	125 n. 242
I, 2	180	IV, 1	79 n. 57
I, 4	162 n. 35, 176 n. 81	IV, 2	125 n. 242
I, 6	153	IV, 9	101
I, 10	206, 208	IV, 13	209
I, 11	32	V, 3	29, 91
I, 12	206	V, 6	152, 172
I, 14	177	V, 7	166, 171, 184 n. 112

V, 9	152 n. 6, 165	1QH ^a (= 1Q34)8, 35–36, 50 n. 22, 98–99,
V, 10	24 n. 5, 184 n. 112	112, 173 n. 70, 227, 229
V, 12	24 n. 5, 133 n. 272, 170	II, 12
V, 13	184 n. 112	IV, 16
VI, 1	56	V, 13
VI, 2	184 n. 112	121 n. 226, 173
VI, 3	171	V, 20
VI, 5	29, 91	49 n. 120
VI, 10	29	V, 25
VI, 15	183	50
VII, 3	172 n. 64	V, 26
VII, 12	85	161 n. 34
VII, 13	174	V, 27
VII, 15	120	161 n. 33
VIII, 2	161	V, 29
VIII, 6	194	161 n. 33
VIII, 7	165 n. 48	V, 30
VIII, 14	165 n. 48	58 n. 145
VIII, 15	100 n. 154	VI, 23
IX, 6	161, 174	182 n. 106
IX, 7	169	VI, 31
IX, 8	167 n. 50	184 n. 112
X, 3	157, 204 n. 181	VI, 34
X, 11	194	182
XI, 5	184	VI, 34–35
XI, 9	200	183
XII, 3	188	VI, 34–35
XII, 4	133, 141	183
XII, 10	204	VII, 25
XII, 13	223	168 n. 56
XII, 14	141	VII, 27
XIII, 9	190	153
XIV, 6	183	VII, 31
XIV, 7	122, 149, 172, 183	170 n. 60
XIV, 9	165	VII, 34
XV, 2	122	153, 183 n. 111
XVI, 7	120	VII, 34–37
XVII, 2	156	58 n. 142
XVII, 8	156	VII, 37
XVII, 11	61	184 n. 112
XVII, 10	194	IX, 10
XVIII, 2	192	27
XVIII, 10	160	IX, 16
XIX, 3	156	49 n. 120
		IX, 17
		35 n. 63
		IX, 30
		201
		X, 9
		42, 183
		X, 10
		183
		X, 11
		173
		X, 19
		161 n. 34, 212 n. 204
		X, 20
		172 n. 64, 184
		X, 25
		158
		X, 28
		30, 184
		X, 30
		79
		X, 31
		158
		XI, 7
		215
		XI, 8
		26
		XI, 29
		94, 94 n. 126
		XI, 30
		24
		XI, 31
		106, 184, 185
		XI, 39
		62
		XII, 7
		216, 219 n. 217
		XII, 8
		88 n. 89
		XII, 14
		58 n. 145
		XII, 15
		161 n. 34
		XII, 16
		218

<i>1QH^a</i> (<i>cont.</i>)		XVII, 7	193
XII, 19	48 n. 117, 58 n. 145, 170	XVII, 23	32 n. 50
n. 60		XVII, 27	56, 184
XII, 20	161 n. 34	XVIII, 4	49 n. 120
XII, 25	217, 218	XVIII, 8	25, 33
XII, 30	154	XIX, 30	28, 176
XII, 32	170 n. 60	XIX, 31	91
XII, 34	202, 221 n. 227	XIX, 32	108
XII, 37	89 n. 93	XIX, 35	88
XIII, 12	71, 200	XX, 10	91
XIII, 15	201	XX, 12	58 n. 145
XIII, 16	80, 136, 200	XX, 26	169
XIII, 23	42 n. 89	XX, 28	94
XIII, 28	35 n. 63	XX, 31	206 n. 186
XIII, 30	180 n. 96	XX, 35	154
XIII, 32	175	XXI, 10	196 n. 154
XIII, 36	148	XXI, 25	26
XIII, 37	148	XXI, 27	215
XIV, 11	79	XXII, 25	91
XIV, 13	33, 184	XXII, 27	180
XIV, 15	196	XXII, 37	211, 214
XIV, 24	57, 216	XXIII, 12	168 n. 56
XIV, 26	167	XXIII, 28	85
XV, 5	24, 209	XXIV, 26	69
XV, 8	167	XXV, 8	191
XV, 10	196	XXVI, 27	79, 197
XV, 13	49, 137		
XV, 14	24	1Q34bis	
XV, 15	24, 30	3 i, 3	161 n. 34
XV, 24	164 n. 45, 167	3 i, 7	79
XV, 32	93 n. 117		
XV, 34	170 n. 60	1QH ^b (= 1Q35)	7 n. 5, 8
XV, 37	79, 91, 170		
XVI, 8	26	1Q36 (1QHymns)	7 n. 5, 8
XVI, 9	40 n. 78	25 ii, 3	30
XVI, 19	39		
XVI, 22	169	3Q4 (3QpIsa)	9
XVI, 22-23	166 n. 49		
XVI, 23	165	3Q5 (3QJub)	9
XVI, 26	199, 200		
XVI, 28	167	3Q6 (3QHymn)	9
XVI, 29	180 n. 96		
XVI, 31	101	3Q9 (3QSectorian Text)	9
XVI, 36	183		
XVI, 37	121, 141		

SOURCES INDEX

271

3Q15 (Copper Scroll)	6, 10–11, 67 n. 6,	4Q163 (4Qpap pIsa ^c)	8, 52 n. 125
98, 112		23 i, 17	91
I, 4	88		
III, 4	133	4Q164 (4QIsa ^d)	9
VIII, 3	93		
IX, 2	89	4Q165 (4QpIsa ^e)	8
X, 3	132 n. 265		
XI, 4	91	4Q166 (4QpHos ^a)	8
XI, 9	163	II, 18	67, 153
XI, 10	89 n. 91		
XII, 1	89	4Q167 (4QpHos ^b)	9
4Q88 (4QPs ^f) (Psalms listed under 4Q88 in “Biblical Scrolls”)	xvii, 50 n. 122, 122	4Q168 (4QpMic?)	9
VIII, 14	126 n. 248	4Q169 (4QpNah)	9, 127, 173
X, 7–8	204 n. 180	3–4 i, 4	124, 141, 207, 230
X, 11	121, 129	3–4 i, 6	159 n. 28
X, 12	200	3–4 i, 9	159 n. 28
		3–4 ii, 3	106, 184, 185, 209
		3–4 ii, 4	70, 184
4Q158 (4QRP ^a)	8	3–4 iii, 2	93
4, 5	175	3–4 iii, 4	93
4, 6	39	3–4 iii, 5	122
6, 5	205	3–4 iii, 10	159 n. 28
9, 5	130 n. 262	3–4 iii, 11	159 n. 28, 184 n. 112
10–12, 7	158–59	3–4 iv, 2	164, 167
14 i, 8	41	3–4 iv, 4	164 n. 45, 167
4Q159 (4QOrdin)	8	4Q171 (4QpPs ^a)	8
1 ii, 5	142	1–2 ii, 4	132, 141
2–4, 1	93 n. 117	1–2 ii, 14	135, 202, 218, 221 n. 227
2–4, 8	190 n. 133	1–2 ii, 23	152
		1 + 3–4 iii, 5	80 n. 59
4Q160 (4QVisSam)	8, 52 n. 125	3–10 iv, 7	71
1, 3: 201		3–10 iv, 27	42, 172 n. 65
3–4 ii, 3: 203			
7, 4: 205		4Q172 (4QpUnidentified)	9
4Q161 (4QpIsa ^a)	8	4Q174 (4QFlor)	8
8–10, 6	40, 191	I, 6	57
8–10, 11	145 n. 311	1–2 i, 15	79
8–10, 18	216	4, 4	193 n. 145
		4, 6	161 n. 33
4Q162 (4QpIsa ^b)	9		

4Q175 (4QTest)	8, 11, 84	4Q184 (4QWiles)	8
3	67	1, 2	66, 172 n. 64, 231
4	46, 100, 187	1, 7	197
7	79	1, 17	184 n. 112
9	89 n. 94, 187	2, 6	93 n. 118
10	187		
11	59, 129, 148, 160	4Q185 (4QSap Work)	9
15	102	1–2 I, 9	156
16	91, 143	4 i, 3	49
17	67		
22	85, 127	4Q186 (4QHoros ^c)	8
23	103	1 i, 6	85
28	79		
		4Q197 (4QTob ^b ar)	
4Q176 (4QTanh)	8	4 i, 16	151 n. 4
1–2 i, 6	60, 80, 160		
1–2 i, 10	160	4Q200 (4QTobit ^c)	8
8–11, 7	157	2, 3	24
8–11, 6	167	4, 6	80, 105 n. 173
8–11, 12	157		
15, 2	196 n. 154	4Q201 (En ^a ar)	
20, 3	16 n. 10, 162, 163, 231	3, 10	98
24, 2	26 n. 13		
		4Q204 (En ^c ar)	
4Q176a (4QJub ¹ ?)		1 i, 26	62
19–20, 3	48 n. 117, 50 n. 121	4, 3	126 n. 246, 144 n. 309
4Q177 (4QCatena A)	8	4Q209 (Enastr ^b ar)	
5–6, 15	187 n. 125	23, 4	98
10–11, 2	187		
10–11, 9	153	4Q210 (Enastr ^c ar)	
14, 4	203	1 ii, 14	165
4Q178 (Unclassified Fragments)		4Q215 (4QTNaph)	8
5, 2	40	1–3, 5	193
		1–3, 7	147 n. 319
4Q179 (4QApocrLam A)		4Q215a (4QTimes)	8
1 i, 14	31, 49		
4Q180 (4QAgessCreat A)	8	4Q216 (4QJub ^a)	
		I, 4	79
4Q181 (4QAgessCreat B)	8	II, 3	89
2, 9	45 n. 103	II, 12	199–200
		V, 3	145 n. 314
4Q182 (4QCatena B)	9	V, 5–8	80 n. 59

V, 9	126, 145 n. 314	4Q230 (Catalogue of Spirits ^a)	
V, 10	164	1, 2	172
VII, 10	27	1, 3	153
VII, 15	32		
		4Q238 (4QWords of Judgement)	
4Q219 (4QJub ^d)	8	1	188
I, 12	62		
II, 20	184 n. 112	4Q251 (4QHalakha A)	8
II, 21	61	1–2, 4	164
II, 26	61	8, 4	151
II, 31	62	10, 6	187 n. 125
II, 32	102		
		4Q252 (4QCommGen A)	63
4Q221 (4QJub ^f)	8, 146–47	I, 10	174 n. 74
3, 5	144, 145 n. 313	I, 22	56
4, 9	144	II, 6	61
5, 2	144	IV, 1	147 n. 319
7, 10	145 n. 311	IV, 2	131 n. 262
16, 5	136		
		4Q254 (4QComGen C)	8
4Q222 (4QJub ^g)	8		
1, 2	147 n. 319	4Q255 (4QpapS ^a)	9
1, 4	95 n. 129	2, 6	145 n. 313
		4Q256 (4QS ^b)	8
4Q223–224 (4QpapJub ^h)	8		
1 i, 2	174	4Q257 (4QpapS ^c)	8
2 i, 45	43		
2 ii, 4	43, 147	4Q258 (4QS ^d)	
2 ii, 11	56	I, 2	101
2 ii, 12	43, 147	II, 2	160 n. 29
2 iii, 12	43, 147	II, 3	160 n. 29
2 iv, 5	105 n. 173, 153	VII, 2	52 n. 128, 206
2 iv, 18	43, 147	VIII, 3	31 n. 48
2 v, 3	94, 205	IX, 7	199
		IX, 9	199
4Q225 (4QPsJub ^a)	8		
2 i, 4	143 n. 304	4Q259 (4QS ^e)	8
2 i, 6	111	II, 3	52 n. 128, 206
2 i, 10	193 n. 145	II, 5	52 n. 128, 206
2 ii, 4	142, 143 n. 304	III, 17–18	31
2 ii, 7	164		
		4Q260 (4QS ^f)	8
4Q227 (4QPsJub ^c)	8	I, 1	174
		II, 1	153

4Q261 (4QS ^g)	9	9 ii, 14	81 n. 61
1a-b, 3	145 n. 313	9 iii, 4	221 n. 227
5a-c, 3	91	10 i, 2	174
		10 i, 3	132, 141
4Q262 (4QS ^h)	9	10 i, 12	89, 205
B, 1	145 n. 313	11, 9	163
B, 2	145 n. 313	11, 13	188 n. 125
4Q263 (4QS ⁱ)	9	4Q267 (4QDamascus Document ^b)	8, 52
3	26 n. 17, 60 n. 153	n. 125	
		9 v, 12	34, 176
4Q264 (4QS ^j)	9		
		4Q268 (4QDamascus Document ^c)	8
4Q265 (4QMisc Rules)	8	1, 1	201
3, 2	136	1, 2	153
4 i, 8	161	1, 3	79
4, i, 10	161		
		4Q269 (4QDamascus Document ^d)	8
4Q266 (4QDamascus Document ^a)	8,		
147, 173		4Q270 (4QDamascus Document ^e)	9,
1a-b, 3	81 n. 61	122, 147	
1a-b, 19	203	6 ii, 7	145 n. 311
1c-f, 4	81 n. 61	6 iv, 14	145 n. 313
2 i, 4	145 n. 313, 159	6 iv, 18	171
2 ii, 2	145	6 iv, 19	145 n. 313
2 ii, 4	145 n. 312	6 v, 15	145 n. 311
2 ii, 21	159 n. 28	7 i, 18	111
5 i, 13	33		
5 ii, 4	145 n. 313	4Q271 (4QDamascus Document ^f)	8
5 ii, 6	159 n. 28	1, 2	69
5 ii, 7	61 n. 158	3, 9	160
6 i, 3	58 n. 145	5 i, 3	153
6 i, 5	58 n. 145	5 i, 15	209
6 i, 8	158, 164		
6 i, 9	131 n. 262	4Q272 (4QDamascus Document ^g)	9
6 i, 11	158	1 i, 16	165
6 ii, 2	145 n. 311		
6 ii, 4	81 n. 61	4Q273 (4QpapDamascus Document ^h)	8
6 ii, 11	50		
6 iii, 8	145 n. 313	4Q274 (4QToh A)	8
8 i, 2	159	1 i, 8	164
8 i, 3	120, 145 n. 311	2 i, 9	51
8 i, 5	145 n. 311	3 i, 9	164
8 i, 6	159 n. 28	3 ii, 5	169
8 i, 7	79, 81 n. 61		

4Q277 (4QToh B)	8	4Q300 (4QMyst ^b)	10, 50
1 ii, 4	: 164	1a ii – b, 4	49 n. 120
1 ii, 7	162, 164, 231	3, 3	49 n. 120
1 ii, 8	43	3, 5	207 n. 189
4Q280 (4QCurses)	8	4Q301 (4QMyst ^{c?})	8
3, 2	69	4Q302 (papAdmonitory Parable)	
4Q282b (Unidentified Fragments B)		3 ii, 7	40 n. 81, 208
1, 2	167	4Q303 (4QMeditation on Creation A)	8
4Q284 (4QPurification Liturgy)		1, 5	102 n. 160
2 i, 3	124, 141, 206, 207 n. 188	4Q304 (4QMeditation on Creation B)	9
4Q284a (4QHarvesting)		4Q305 (4QMeditation on Creation C)	9
2, 6	120	4Q306 (4QMen of People who Err)	9
4Q285 (4QSefer ha-Milhamah)	8	4Q317 (4QCryptA Lunisolar Cal)	9
3, 2	120	4Q320 (4QCal Doc/Mish A)	9, 168
8, 8	209	4Q321 (4QCal Doc/Mish B)	9, 168
4Q286 (4QBer ^a)	8	II, 3	165
1 ii, 3	32	4Q321a (4QCal Doc/Mish C)	
1 ii, 6	168	IV, 8	160 n. 29
5a-c, 2	62	V, 5	160 n. 29
17a, 2	177	V, 7	59, 160
4Q287 (4QBer ^b)	8	V, 8	160 n. 29
4Q289 (4QBer ^d)	8	4Q322 (4QMish A)	9
4Q290 (4QBer ^e)	9	4Q323 (4QMish B)	9
4Q292 (4QWork Cont. Prayers B)	8	4Q324 (4QMish C)	9
2, 3	161 n. 33	4Q324a (4QMish D)	9
4Q298 (4QCryptA Words of the Maskil)		4Q324b (4QpapCal Doc A?)	9
3–4 ii, 6	184 n. 112, 203	4Q324c (4QMish E)	9
4Q299 (4QMyst ^a)	8, 50 n. 122	4Q325 (4QCal Doc/Mish D)	9
3a ii – b, 5	49		
3a ii – b, 7	145 n. 312, 159 n. 24		
3a ii – b, 8	145 n. 312, 159 n. 24		
3c, 6	145 n. 313		
17 I, 2	49 n. 120		

4Q328 (4QMish F)	9	4Q365a (4QT ^{a?})	8
1, 1	80 n. 59	2 i, 10	176
		2 ii, 7	24, 176
4Q329 (4QMish G)	9	2 ii, 8	108
		2 ii, 10	110
4Q329a (4QMish H)	9	3, 5	176 n. 85
4Q330 (4QMish I)	9	4Q366 (RP ^d)	
		1, 2	151
4Q337 (4QCal Doc E?)	9		
		4Q367 (4QRP ^e)	
4Q364 (4QRP ^b)	8, 52	1a-b, 6	52 n. 128
3 ii, 7	43	1a-b, 8	52 n. 128
4b-e ii, 5	222		
9a-b, 10	181	4Q368 (4QapocrPent A)	
9a-b, 11	153	2, 5	198
11, 2	67	2, 9	198
11, 3	26, 79 n. 58	10 ii, 5	40 n. 81, 208
17, 3	27, 30	10 ii, 7	102-3, 141, 144
21a-k, 3	143		
22, 2	85	4Q369 (4QPrayer Enosh)	8
24a-c, 4	43, 136, 203	1 ii, 3	104, 121 n. 228, 160 n. 30
26a ii, 3	43, 136, 203	2, 2	110
26c-d, 2	42	3, 3-4	156 n. 16
28a-b, 7	205		
30, 5	62 n. 166	4Q370 (4QExhortation Based on the Flood)	
		1 i, 2	44
4Q365 (4QRP ^c)	8		
1, 2	57, 59	4Q371 (4QNarr and Poet Comp ^a)	9-10
2, 3	175	1a-b, 4	170
2, 7	217	1a-b, 8	154, 231
6a i, 4	188	7, 4	167
6a ii + 6c, 3	92		
6b, 6	42 n. 90	4Q372 (4QNarr and Poet Comp ^b)	122
7 i, 3	217	1, 11	47, 86
12a I, 4	42	1, 15	47, 86
12a-b ii, 2	96	1, 20	143
12b iii, 5	145 n. 313	3, 3	193
12b iii, 9	110, 184, 185	6, 4	122
13, 1	45		
23, 5	28	4Q374 (4QExod/Conq. Trad.)	
26a-b, 8	36, 145 n. 313	2 i, 4	85
32, 8	195	2 ii, 8	145

SOURCES INDEX

277

4Q375 (4QapocrMos ^a)	8	4Q382 (4Qpap paraKgs)	8
		1, 2	162
4Q376 (4QapocrMos ^b ?)		9, 6	41
1 iii, 2	27 n. 23, 145 n. 314	9, 7	214
		23, 1	26, 91
4Q377 (4QapocrPent B)	8	104, 1	156 n. 16
2 ii, 9	165		
		4Q384 (4Qpap apocr Jer B?)	8
4Q378 (4QapocrJosh ^a)			
3 i, 5	49	4Q385 (4QpsEzek ^a)	52 n. 125
3 ii + 4, 7	125 n. 242	2, 3	105 n. 173, 193
		2, 7	103
4Q379 (4QapocrJosh ^b)	98, 99 n. 152,	2, 9	153
177		4, 1	164
12, 6	175 n. 80	6, 4	164
22 ii, 13	96		
		4Q385a (4QapocrJer C ^a)	
4Q380 (4QNon-Canonical Psalms A)		17a-e ii, 8	167
2, 4	32 n. 50	18 i a-b, 3	121
		18 i a-b, 7	43, 162
4Q381 (4QNon-Canonical Psalms B)	32,	18 ii, 7	67
35, 52, 122, 164, 177, 231			
1, 2	121, 141	4Q386 (4QpsEzek ^a)	
1, 3	142	1 ii, 4	79 n. 58, 154
1, 5	105	1 ii, 5	164, 165
10–11, 3	180	1 ii, 7	165
10–11, 47	180	1 iii, 1	202
15, 6	43 n. 94		
31, 1	154	4Q387 (4QApocrJer C ^b)	
31, 3	170, 201	A, 4	194
31, 6	105 n. 173	2 ii, 8	164
31, 7	165	3, 6	26, 47, 86
33a-b + 35, 8	24		
44, 2	154	4Q388 (4QpsEzek ^d)	
45a + b, 2	135 n. 285, 202	7, 5	105 n. 173
46a + b, 4	155, 163, 231		
46a + b, 5	37	4Q388a (4QapocrJer C ^c)	
46a + b, 8	198	7 ii, 4	145 n. 314
50, 4	32, 86	7 ii, 5	143
69, 8	32		
69, 9	143	4Q390 (4QApocrJer C ^e)	10
76–77, 10	101	1, 8	164
79, 5	56 n. 135		
80, 1	101	4Q392 (4QWorks)	10
		1, 4	145 n. 312

4Q392 (<i>cont.</i>)		4Q401 (4QShirShabb ^b)	8
1, 5	145 n. 312	22, 2	189
1, 9	145 n. 312		
2, 4	174 n. 73	4Q402 (4QShirShabb ^c)	8
6-9, 5	153		
		4Q403 (4QShirShabb ^d)	8, 52 n. 125, 169
4Q393 (4QComConf)	8	1 i, 1	79
		1 i, 4	30
4QMMT	6, 10, 11, 18, 73	1 i, 19	32
		1 i, 23	205
4Q394 (4QMMT ^a)	8	1 i, 27	32, 180
1-2 iv, 3	92	1 i, 31	29, 30
3-7 i, 5	39 n. 73, 153 n. 8	1 i, 36	174
3-7 i, 8	32	1 i, 38	43 n. 94
3-7 i, 12	195	1 i, 42	106
3-7 i, 15	143, 148	1 i, 43	145 n. 313
3-7 i, 18	209	1 i, 45	55
3-7 i, 29	39 n. 73, 153 n. 8	1 ii, 24	32
3-7 ii, 1	143, 148-49	1 ii, 26	106
3-7 ii, 13	143, 148-49		
3-7 ii, 14	39 n. 73, 153 n. 8	4Q404 (4QShirShabb ^e)	10
8 iv, 8	169		
		4Q405 (4QShirShabb ^f)	8, 50 n. 125, 169
4Q396 (4QMMT ^c)	8	11, 3	159 n. 25
1-2 i, 3	39 n. 73, 153 n. 8	15 ii-16, 4	145
1-2 iv, 7	145 n. 312, 159 n. 24	19, 4	106
		19, 5	56
4Q397 (4QMMT ^d)	8	19, 7	24
		20 ii-22, 7	145 n. 312
4Q398 (4QpapMMT ^e)	8	20 ii-22, 11	24, 68, 106
11-13, 2	43, 132, 141	20 ii-22, 12	66
11-13, 3	132, 141	23 i, 7	169
14-17 i, 7	145 n. 311	23 i, 9	2 n. 3, 148
14-17 ii, 4	145 n. 312	23 i, 13	145 n. 313
14-17 ii, 7	145 n. 312	23 ii, 8	50
		23 ii, 10	106
4Q399 (4QMMT ^f)	10		
		4Q407 (4QShirShabb ^h)	10
4Q400 (4QShirShabb ^a)	8		
1 i, 15	188	4Q408 (4QapocrMoses ^{c?})	
1 ii, 6	106	3+3a, 7	190 n. 133
1 ii, 19	48 n. 117, 179		
2, 6	48 n. 117, 179	4Q409 (4QLiturgical Work A)	10

SOURCES INDEX

279

4Q410 (4QVison Int)	8	8, 6	44, 199
1, 4	164	8, 11	44
		9 + 9a-c, 7	199
4Q412 (4QSap-Didactic Work A)	10	55, 8	195
		69 ii, 15	43 n. 94
4Q413 (4QComp conc. Div. Provid.)	50	81 + 81a, 4	48, 184
n. 122		81 + 81a, 13	166 n. 49
1-2, 1	49 n. 120	87, 13	174
		88, 5	26
4Q414 (RiPur A)	8	89, 2	174
8, 4	184	95, 3	199
		103 ii, 4	222
4Q415 (4QInstr ^a)	8	103 ii, 5	211
9, 11	84, 166	103 ii, 6	174
18, 2	172 n. 67	126 ii, 5	49 n. 120
		126 ii, 13	69
4Q416 (4QInstr ^b)	8, 52 n. 125,	127, 2	195
1, 16	143 n. 304	127, 6	84
2 ii, 12	165	139, 2	49 n. 120
2 iii, 2	74 n. 43	159 i, 5	174
2 iii, 8	199	167 a + b, 2	84
2 iii, 16	31, 142, 143 n. 304	188, 7	221 n. 227
2 iii, 17	48 n. 117, 161 n. 33, 222	211, 3	178
2 iii, 19	183	223, 3	122 n. 233
2 iv, 1	142, 143 n. 304		
2 iv, 9	110	4Q418a (4QInstr ^e)	8
2 iv, 10	108 n. 185	14, 1	36 n. 65
4, 3	204		
		4Q418b (Text with Quotation of Ps 107?)	
4Q417 (4QInstr ^c)	8, 146, 168	1, 4	202
1 i, 16	24, 34 n. 57, 164		
1 i, 17	34 n. 57, 167	4Q418c (4QInstr ^f)	10
1 i, 23	192 n. 138		
2 i, 5	24	4Q419 (4QInstr-like Composition A)	8
2 i, 10	108		
2 i, 13	36 n. 65	4Q420 (4QWays ^a)	8
2 i, 15	36 n. 65		
2 i, 17	156	4Q421 (4QWays ^b)	8
2 ii + 23, 7	136		
2 ii + 23, 24	199	4Q422 (4QParaGen-Exod)	8-9
29 i, 7	145 n. 313, 156		
		4Q423 (4QInstr ^g)	9
4Q418 (4QInstr ^d)	8, 50 n. 122, 52 n. 125,	6, 3	57
168, 173 n. 70		9, 2	217
7b, 11	28		

4Q424 (4QInstruction-like Comp B)	10,	1 i, 7	145 n. 313
173		7b, 3	92, 121, 129
1, 8	165		
1, 10	199	4Q435 (4QBarki Nafshi ^b)	7 n. 5, 9
1, 13	121		
3, 2	193	4Q436 (4QBarki Nafshi ^c)	9
4Q425 (4QSap-Didactic Work B)	10	4Q437 (4QBarki Nafshi ^d)	9
1+3, 6	25	2 i, 2	204 n. 182, 213
		2 i, 7	207 n. 189
4Q426 (4QSapiential Hymn Work A)	9	2 i, 10	216
1 i, 1	184 n. 112	2 i, 16	153
1 i, 4	91	9, 1	184 n. 112
1 i, 9	187 n. 124		
1 ii, 4	179	4Q438 (4QBarki Nafshi ^e)	9
		4 ii, 5	40 n. 78
4Q427 (4QH ^a)	9		
7 i, 15	167, 182	4Q439 (4QLament)	10
7 ii, 16	157	1 i + 2, 2	165
		1 i + 2, 7	121 n. 226
4Q428 (4QH ^b)	9		
		4Q440 (4QHodayot-like text C)	7 n. 5, 9
4Q429 (4QH ^c)	9	3 i, 21	193
2, 10	71		
3, 7	148 n. 325	4Q442 (4QIndiv Thanksgiving B)	10
4Q430 (4QH ^d)	10	4Q443 (4QPersonal Prayer)	9
1, 2	161 n. 34		
		4Q444 (4QIncant)	10
4Q431 (4QH ^e)	10		
		4Q448 (4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer)	231
4Q432 (4QpapH ^f)	9	II, 2	34
4, 1	102, 211 n. 204	II, 3	34
5, 2	49 n. 120	II, 7	142, 149, 232
		II, 8	34
4Q433 (4QHodayot-like Text A)			
1, 3	164	4Q453 (4QLament B)	
		1	105 n. 173, 153
4Q433a (4QpapHodayot-like Text B)	7 n.		
5, 9			
2, 9	51	4Q457b (4QEschat H)	10
4Q434 (4QBarki Nafshi ^a)	10	4Q460 (4QNarrative Work)	9
1 i, 2	32	7, 8	221
1 i, 3	31	9 i, 8	156

4Q461 (4QNarr B)	10	4Q477 (4QRebukes Reported by Overseer)	9
4, 3	184 n. 112		
4Q462 (4QNarrative C)	9	4Q487 (4QpapSapB?)	10, 50 n. 122
1, 6	101 n. 158	2, 8	49 n. 120
1, 14	49	5, 5	130
1, 18	190 n. 133	15, 3	184
1, 19	31	24, 20	183 n. 111
4Q463 (4QNarr D)	10	4Q483 (papGen ^o)	
		1	40
4Q464 (4QExposition on the Patriarchs)		4Q491 (4QM ^a)	9
9		1-3, 8	32 n. 50
3 I, 6	31	1-3, 9	25, 47, 120 n. 221, 120 n. 224
4Q464a (4QNarr E)	10	1-3, 10	32, 32 n. 50, 125 n. 242
		1-3, 13	197 n. 156, 219 n. 216
4Q467 (4QText Mentioning 'Light of Jacob')		1-3, 15	206
1+2, 3	153	1-3, 17	120 n. 221, 120 n. 224
4Q468b (4QUnidentified Fragments C)		8-10 i, 4	32, 171, 184 n. 112
1, 2	145 n. 314	8-10 i, 5	122, 148-49, 172
		8-10 i, 7	193
4Q470 (4QText Mentioning Zedekiah)		8-10 i, 8	95
1, 4	193	8-10 i, 15	15
		8-10 ii, 13	28
4Q471 (4QWar Scroll-like text B)	9	8-10 ii, 17	32
		13, 6	120
4Q471a (4QPol Text)	10	4Q491c (4Q491 11-12, 4QSelf-Glorification Hymn ^b)	11, 57
		11 i, 8	32
4Q471b (4QSelf-Glorifying Hymn);		11 i, 13	57
		11 i, 16	164, 208, 231
4Q472 (4QEschatological Work B)		11 i, 17	57
1, 4	145 n. 314	11 i, 18	57
		11 i, 21	57
4Q473 (4QTwo Ways)	9	11 ii, 13	203
2, 3	170 n. 60		
4Q474 (4QText Concerning Rachel and Joseph)	9	4Q492 (4QM ^b)	10
		4Q493 (4QM ^c)	10
4Q475 (4QRenewEarth)	10	4Q494 (4QM ^d)	10
1, 2	217		

4Q495 (4QM ^e)	10	4Q508 (4QpapPr Fêtes ^b)	10
2, 1	79	2, 2	204
4Q496 (4QpapM ^f)	9	4Q509 (4QpapPrFêtes ^c)	9
13, 1	66	7, 6	32, 59 n. 149
4Q498 (4QpapSap/Hymn)	10	4Q510 (4QShir ^a)	10
		1, 5	59
4Q499 (4QpapHymn/Prayer)	10	4Q511 (4QShir ^b)	9
4Q500 (4QpapBenediction)	10	3, 7	202, 221 n. 227
		8, 5	121 n. 225
4Q501 (4QapocrLam B)	9	10, 11	43 n. 94
1, 4	101, 189, 200 n. 171	10, 12	164
1, 6	175	20 ii, 3	202
		30, 5	84
4Q502 (4QpapRitMar)	9, 166	63 i, 4	45 n. 103
1, 7	61	63–64 ii, 3	216, 221 n. 227
		63–64 iii, 2	206
4Q503 (4QpapPrQuot)	9	121, 2	62 n. 162, 121 n. 225
1–6 iii, 7	169		
15–16, 5	30	4Q512 (4QpapRitPur B)	9
15–16, 11	169	1–6, 6	208, 231
21–22, 1	54	21–22, 2	206
51–55, 8	29	27, 1	206
4Q504 (4QDibHam ^a)	9	4Q513 (4QOrd ^b)	9
1–2R ii, 9	205	3–4, 2	168
1–2R ii, 18	189		
1–2R iii, 3	81 n. 63, 102, 141, 144	4Q514 (4QOrd ^c)	98
1–2R iii, 4	189	1 i, 6	111
1–2R iii, 7	68	1 i, 8	91
1–2R iv, 6	103		
1–2R iv, 11	27 n. 23	4Q521 (4QMessianic Apocalypse)	
1–2R v, 11	202	2 ii + 4, 8	205
1–2R v, 16	204 n. 182	2 ii + 4, 11	30
5 ii, 4	202	7 + 5 ii, 12	164
7, 6	29–30		
7, 10	214	4Q522 (4QProph Josh)	9
		8, 3	79
4Q505 (4QpapDibHam ^b ?)	7 n. 5, 9	9 i–10, 13	176
		9 i–10, 14	69
4Q506 (4QpapDibHam ^c)	9	9 ii, 10	125, 141, 144
		9 ii, 11	143
4Q507 (4QPr Fêtes ^b)	10		

SOURCES INDEX

283

4Q523 (4QJonathan)		5Q13 (5QRule)	9
1–2, 2	103		
3, 1	232	5Q15 (NJar)	
		1 ii, 7	47
4Q524 (4QT ^b)	9		
		6Q9 (6Qpap apocrSamKgs)	10
4Q525 (4QBeatitudes)	9	32, 1	120
1, 1	49 n. 120		
1, 2	49 n. 120	6Q12 (6QApocr Proph)	10
2 ii + 3, 5	214, 216		
2 iii, 4	187 n. 124	6Q18 (6QpapHymn)	9
5, 5	50		
10, 6	37	8Q4 (8QMez)	
14 i, 2	187	35	102
14 ii, 18	168 n. 56		
14 ii, 21	156	11Q5 (11QPs ^a) (Psalms passages listed	
14 ii, 26	166	under 11Q5 in “Biblical Scrolls”)	8
14 ii, 28	172	XVIII, 1	35 n. 65
23, 6	49 n. 120	XVIII, 3	49 n. 120
		XIX, 15	63, 199–200
4Q530 (EnGiants ^b ar)		XXI, 11	187 n. 125
1 i, 2	165	XXI, 12	216
		XXI, 15	199, 201
4Q531 (EnGiants ^c ar)		XXII, 12	223
1, 1	189	XXIV, 10	222
18, 2	165	XXVII, 9	30
		XXVIII, 8	213
4Q542 (TQahat ar)		XXVIII, 9	187 n. 124
3 ii, 13	46	XXVIII, 14	49 n. 120
4Q550 (4QJews at the Persian Court ar)		11Q10 (tgJob)	
1, 3	98	VII, 5	98 n. 150
5 + 5a, 2	189	XXXV, 2	47
		XXXVI, 2	162
4Q552 (4QFour Kingdoms ^a ar)			
1 i + 2, 7	98	11Q11 (11QApocPs)	9
4Q554 (NJ ^a ar)		11Q12 (11QJub + XQText A)	9
1 i, 15	47	3, 2	56
5Q10 (5QApocrMal [5QpMal?])	10	11Q13 (11QMelch)	9
		II, 6	161 n. 34
5Q11 (5QS)	10	II, 11	62
5Q12 (5QDamascus Document)	10		

11Q14 (11QSefer ha-Milhamah)	9, 173	LI, 4	161 n. 34
1 ii, 11	209	LI, 5	30
		LI, 6	53 n. 130, 81, 132
11Q15 (11QHymns ^a)	10	LII, 12	143 n. 304, 216
		LII, 16	29
11Q16 (11QHymns ^b)	9	LIII, 5	216
		LIII, 11	216
11Q17 (11QShirShabb)	10	LIII, 20	25, 44 n. 97
IX, 7	106	LIV, 14	215 n. 208
X, 5	145 n. 313	LIV, 20	42, 156
X, 7-8	149	LV, 21	161 n. 33
		LVI, 8	200 n. 169
11Q18 (11QNJ ar)		LVI, 11	41 n. 85, 130
8, 3	143 n. 305	LVI, 18	170 n. 60
9, 4	143 n. 305	LVII, 4	125 n. 242
		LVII, 7	217
11Q19 (11QT ^a)	9, 52, 157, 195	LVII, 10	170
II, 7	215 n. 208	LVII, 12	126, 129
VIII, 10	153, 154	LVIII, 4	125 n. 242
XI, 10	168	LVIII, 5	24
XVII, 9	184 n. 113	LIX, 3	184
XVII, 15	43 n. 94	LIX, 4	50, 175 n. 80
XVIII, 10	168	LIX, 7	49
XVIII, 13	196 n. 154	LIX, 8	174
XX, 16	151, 152	LIX, 11	196 n. 154
XXVI, 12	161 n. 33	LIX, 16	200 n. 169
XXIX, 9	126	LIX, 18	143
XXX, 9	153	LXI, 11	130
XXXI, 6	170 n. 60	LXI, 14	204 n. 182
XXXIII, 13	133 n. 275	LXII, 5	53, 81, 132
XXXVI, 11	24 n. 5	LXIII, 7	120 n. 223
XXXVIII, 12	184	LXIII, 8	120 n. 223
XXXVIII, 14	24	LXIII, 11	187 n. 124
XXXVIII, 15	176-77 n. 85	LXIII, 12	196 n. 154
XL, 10	177 n. 85	LXIV, 2	143 n. 304
XL, 15	29	LXIV, 3	143 n. 304
XLII, 9	134	LXIV, 6	130
XLII, 15	125 n. 242, 141	LXIV, 9	170
XLII, 16	91	LXIV, 11	161 n. 33, 216
XLIII, 10	169	LXIV, 14	161 n. 33
XLIII, 15	187 n. 125	LXV, 3	153
XLIV, 15	29	LXV, 10	28
XLVIII, 3	175 n. 80	LXVI, 13	25 n. 7
XLVIII, 10	157	LXVI, 9	79
L, 14	30, 33		

SOURCES INDEX

285

11Q20 (11QT ^b)	9, 157, 195	9:22	142
IV, 26	152	10:3	30 n. 44
V, 3	152	11:6	135, 202
XII, 5	66, 231	13:9	47, 118 n. 215
XII, 25	79 n. 58	15:4	97
		17:6	97
11Q27 (11QUnidentified C)	9	22:7	143 n. 304
		25:24	78 n. 53
11Q29 (11QFrg Rrelated to S)	10	26:29	76 n. 48
		27:19	3 n. 4
PAM43686 9, 1	49 n. 120	29:27	207 n. 188
		30:20	211 n. 203
PAM43692 85, 1	120	31:39	196
		38:21	153
Mas 1b (MasLev ^b)		38:27	78 n. 53
Lev 10:17	158	42:35	163
Lev 11:35	191	43:29	135, 179, 212 n. 205, 221
Lev 11:38	191	n. 226	
		45:23	79 n. 58
Mas 1d (Ezekiel)		49:8	156 n. 16
Ezek 36:24	196 n. 154	49:22	196 n. 153
Ezek 36:35	154	49:27	136 n. 286
Ezek 37:12	196 n. 154		
		Exodus	
Mas 1h (Ben Sira)		1:15	115
Sir 41:2	95 n. 129	2:3	175 n. 76
Sir 42:4	84 n. 74	3:18	116 n. 206
Sir 44:11	92 n. 112	4:15	142, 163
		6:24	123 n. 236
Mas 1k (MasShirShabb)	9	8:16	217
i, 2	130 n. 262	14:15	188
ii, 23	30	15:16	182, 182 n. 107
		15:20	42 n. 90
Mas 1n (MasUnidentified Qumran-Type Frag.)	9	15:25	188
		17:4	217
		18:26	135, 210 n. 198
		20:25	196
		22:17	209
		29:35	156
HEBREW BIBLE			
GENESIS			
2:17	205	30:35	106
2:23	175 n. 76, 178	32:9	172 n. 65
2:24	143 n. 304	32:16	188
3:8	193 n. 143	36:19	43 n. 94
3:10	193 n. 143	36:35	42
5:1	207	39:17	45

Leviticus		13:12	130
11:14	123	14:13	123
22:16	205	15:12	115, 115 n. 202, 116 n. 206
23:12	168	17:13	130
25:30	207 n. 188, 207–08 n. 190	19:20	130
26:18	80 n. 59	20:2	179, 212 n. 205
		21:8	190
Numbers		21:18	143 n. 304
1:16	25 n. 12	28:50	202
4:24	206	28:59	118
4:27	175 n. 75	28:66	119
6:24	219 n. 217	31:17	50 n. 121
6:25	135, 179, 212 n. 205, 221	32:38	221
9:7	41 n. 83	32:46	62 n. 166
11:11	80	33:9	91 n. 106, 143 n. 304
16:2	25 n. 12		
24:4	194	Joshua	
24:8	161 n. 34	2:17	118
24:16	194	23:5	211 n. 202
24:17	59, 160		
26:9	25 n. 12	Judges	
30:6	25 n. 11	4:4	117
32:24	118	4:21	45
35:20	135, 211 n. 202	5:12	204 n. 180
		8:16	30 n. 42
Deuteronomy		9:8	220
1:21	136	9:9	175 n. 76
1:45	85	9:11	175 n. 76
2:5	174	9:13	175 n. 76
2:24	203	14:18	223 n. 232
2:31	43, 136, 203		
3:24	36 n. 65	1 Samuel	
4:24	117	1:22	143 n. 303
4:31	61	2:10	145
5:1	204	4:7	151 n. 2
5:9	212 n. 205, 217–18	10:11	151 n. 2
5:20	136	14:21	151 n. 2
5:21	136, 156	14:33	78 n. 53
6:4	204	15:5	80 n. 60, 200
6:7	213	16:1	66
7:24	41 n. 83	16:7	143 n. 303
8:3	41 n. 83	17:7	107 n. 178
9:23	43, 203	19:7	151 n. 2
9:28	42	21:8	123
13:3	212 n. 205	22:18	123

22:22	123	21:7	76 n. 48
23:33	105 n. 171		
25:18	134 n. 276	2 Kings	
25:29	220 n. 224	2:4	41
31:3	76 n. 47	3:24	30 n. 42
31:4	213, 222	4:3	157
31:13	161 n. 34	4:7	157
		8:28	116 n. 206
2 Samuel		8:29	116 n. 206
2:18	117	11:4	123
3:25	28	11:9	123
5:2	151 n. 2	11:10	123
6:3	76 n. 47	11:15	123
6:9	104 n. 171	13:6	80
7:12	97	19:23	173
8:3	28 n. 28	19:25	78 n. 53
11:24	119 n. 216	20:18	97
12:1	46	23:10	182
12:22	221		
14:19	66	Isaiah	
15:24	28 n. 28	2:13	166
16:11	97	3:15	118 n. 214
19:14	80	3:16	134
20:8	145, 146	9:3	178
21:12	85, 119 n. 216	10:13	78 n. 53
22:11	30 n. 44	10:34	40
22:40	82	11:1	109 n. 187
22:43	92 n. 115	15:2	177
23:10	198	16:7	166
23:12	198	18:4	175 n. 76, 210
23:33	104 n. 171	23:12	116 n. 206
		27:3	211 n. 202
1 Kings		27:4	175 n. 76
1:18	76 n. 48	28:22	76 n. 48
5:15	142	30:12	212 n. 205
5:25	85 n. 79	30:19	135, 179, 212 n. 205, 221
9:9	150	n. 226	
11:17	116 n. 206	30:21	118 n. 215
11:39	80 n. 59	30:33	151 n. 2
12:4	76 n. 48	37:20	76 n. 48
12:18	104 n. 171	37:24	173
13:7	178 n. 91	40:2	60, 80 n. 59, 160
14:8	160	40:11	118
18:4	162	40:28	45
19:20	175 n. 76	41:9	45, 160

<i>Isaiah (cont.)</i>		14:20	123
44:13	175 n. 76	19:2	124 n. 241
45:13	143 n. 303	24:26	209
48:8	136	26:2	178
48:20	126	27:6	116 n. 206
50:4	121	28:3	123
51:19	118 n. 215	32:21	43 n. 94
51:23	143 n. 303	32:27	161 n. 34
59:3	175 n. 76	33:11	135
61:1	121	34:8	50 n. 121
61:6	123	35:9	42
62:2	211 n. 202	35:10	220
63:15	36 n. 65	36:8	89 n. 94
		38:16	196
<i>Jeremiah</i>		43:11	28
2:10	115, 116 n. 206		
2:34	118	<i>Hosea</i>	
3:2	117 n. 213	2:14	67
3:21	118 n. 213	5:11	28 n. 28
5:7	197 n. 156	14:6	51
6:2	80		
6:19	161 n. 34	<i>Joel</i>	
11:15	157	4:9	121 n. 227
12:11	108 n. 183	4:12	121 n. 227
13:7	223 n. 231	4:19	120 n. 223
13:25	45 n. 101		
16:4	119	<i>Amos</i>	
25:12	52 n. 128	5:16	148
26:6	154	8:8	98 n. 151
30:10	43	9:6	145 n. 314
32:31	151 n. 2	9:7	116 n. 206
33:16	197		
34:9	116 n. 206	<i>Jonah</i>	
38:11	118	1:14	120 n. 223
38:12	118		
46:5	192	<i>Micah</i>	
46:27	43	1:7	192
52:23	223	2:8	151 n. 2
		2:9	167 n. 55
<i>Ezekiel</i>		3:2	161 n. 34
1:7	173 n. 71	3:3	161 n. 34
4:16	173 n. 71	6:8	188
5:1	173 n. 71		
9:8	220	<i>Nahum</i>	
14:14	123	1:3	183 n. 108, 183 n. 109

SOURCES INDEX

289

2:9	203	55:16	58 n. 141
2:13	124, 141, 159 n. 28, 207, 230	56:6	161 n. 34
3:3	70	58:8	86
3:10	167 n. 55	71:9	211
		73:2	27 n. 21
Habakkuk		80:14	98
1:8	145 n. 313	82:2	62
1:12	206	83:7	116
2:5	145 n. 311	90:4	151 n. 2
2:8	202	90:10	109 n. 187
2:10	27 n. 24, 42, 86	91:11	213
		94:20	212, 219
Zephaniah		103:4-7	157
2:6	131	104:12	118
		104:29	80, 200
Haggai		105:28	27
1:8	196 n. 154	107:27	202
1:9	196 n. 154, 221	116:6	118
		116:12	159 n. 26
Malachi		119:130	117
1:9	135	120:1	223 n. 231
2:10	136	121:7	219 n. 217
		137:1	220 n. 224
Psalms		140:2	211 n. 202
7:3	136 n. 286	141:5	58 n. 141
8:8	118	144:13	52 n. 125
9:16	154	145:8	183 n. 109
9:17	121 n. 229	148:2	146
10:8	118 n. 215		
10:10	118 n. 215	Job	
10:14	118 n. 215	6:27	42
13:3	153	7:5	86
18:11	30 n. 44	13:3	135
18:39	210 n. 198, 211 n. 203	13:51	80
18:40	82	15:22	148
18:43	92 n. 115, 211 n. 203	15:31	80
18:46	210 n. 198	24:12	42 n. 88
19:14	31 n. 49, 42	26:12	27
26:2	220	29:2	211 n. 202
35:19	121 n. 229, 212	31:22	151 n. 2
35:27	212	34:10	180 n. 96
37:9	132	38:13	98
44:27	223	38:15	98
49:6	221	40:19	145 n. 312
52:2	123	40:22	221

<i>Job (cont.)</i>		Daniel	
41:25	148	2:35	165
		3:8	119
Proverbs		3:12	119
1:22	117	8:26	76 n. 48
5:7	168 n. 56	9:19	204
7:11	118 n. 214	9:24	109 n. 187
14:3	211 n. 202	10:17	105 n. 173
16:27	146	11:12	131
20:21	109 n. 187	11:23	209 n. 195
28:22	175 n. 76		
31:21	118	Ezra	
		2:69	131
Ruth		6:15	57 n. 139
1:8	67 n. 7	8:2	123
1:9	67 n. 7	8:25	135, 210 n. 198
2:2	175 n. 76	9:6	223
2:8	135, 210 n. 198	10:8	178
Song of Songs		Nehemiah	
1:4	213	3:13	85
1:7	117	3:14	85
2:7	118	4:1	116
3:5	118	4:2	116
7:2	118	12:44	45 n. 101, 118
		12:47	45 n. 101, 118
Qohelet		13:16	45
4:14	85		
4:8	146	1 Chronicles	
12:5	86 n. 82	1:6	30 n. 44
		2:13	66
Lamentations		3:1	129
1:4	108 n. 183	3:5	191
1:7	173 n. 71	4:43	82
1:10	173 n. 71	5:10	116
1:16	118 n. 214	5:19	116
2:4	173 n. 71	5:20	116
3:60	161 n. 34	6:8	123 n. 236
3:61	161 n. 34	7:14	116 n. 206
4:14	175 n. 76	10:3	76 n. 47
		10:18	104 n. 171
Esther		11:35	104 n. 171
1:14	27 n. 21	12:2	47, 118 n. 215
1:16	27 n. 21	12:9	118
1:21	27 n. 21	12:16	134

12:39	80, 82	44:24	142 n. 302
13:7	76 n. 47	48:12	142 n. 302
13:12	104 n. 171, 105 n. 173		
17:24	76 n. 47	CD	
18:3	28 n. 28	II, 10	61 n. 158
20:8	191	XIV, 8	176
22:9	123 n. 236	XV, 11	159
22:19	123 n. 236		
25:4	123	HazGab	
25:27	123	64	109
28:9	76 n. 48	68	102 n. 161
		74	134
2 Chronicles			
6:41	165 n. 48	TAD	
9:18	178	A2.2, 15	165
17:11	116, 129		
20:25	206	OTHER TEXTS FROM DEAD SEA REGION	
21:15	118		
21:16	116	Jer 3 ver, 1	98
21:19	119		
22:1	116	KhQ 1	
22:5	85	5	90
26:7	116, 131	8	206
28:23	221		
29:22	43 n. 94	Mur 1	
32:13	122	Exod 6:8	196 n. 154
32:17	122		
32:30	221 n. 226	Mur 42	
33:7	28 n. 26	4	151 n. 4
35:12	169		
36:21	207 n. 188	Mur 88 (XII)	
		Joel 4:5	196 n. 154
		Amos 9:6	145 n. 314
		Mic 2:9	167 n. 55
ATNS 26, 6	149	Nah 3:10	167 n. 55
		Zeph 3:6	121 n. 227
Ben Sira (see also Mas 1h)		Hag 1:8	196 n. 154
3:11	142 n. 302	Hag 1:9	196 n. 154
3:16	142 n. 302		
9:18	142 n. 302	5/6H̄ev 44 16	149 n. 332
14:1	142 n. 302		
15:5	142 n. 302	XH̄ev/Se 5	
37:24	142 n. 302	2 (at Exod 13:5)	154 n. 12
39:17	142 n. 302	4 (at Exod 13:10)	154 n. 12
39:31	142 n. 302	5 (at Exod 13:14)	154 n. 12

RABBINIC WORKS

<i>m. Ber.</i>	
6:1	62
<i>m. Pe'ah</i>	
5:1	62
<i>m. Soṭ.</i>	
4:3	62
<i>m. Sanh.</i>	
1:6	62
8:4	62
<i>m. Šebu.</i>	
3:11	62
<i>t. 'Erub.</i>	
8:13	151 n. 4
<i>t. Soṭ.</i>	
2:3	151 n. 4
<i>b. B. Qam.</i>	
63a	151 n. 4
<i>b. Bek.</i>	
7b	151

WORD INDEX

Erroneously spelled words are listed under their proper spellings, except in rare cases.

HEBREW WORDS

- אב**, 31, 36 n. 65
 אביו/אביהו, 19–20, 25 n. 7, 102, 142–50, 230
 אבותו, 36, 145 n. 313
אבד (verb), 200
 יאבד (אב), 32
 יובדו, 200
אבדן. See **בדן**
אביר, 30 (אביד)
אבית. See **בית**
אבן, 85 (הבנים)
אגן, 175 (אגונות)
אדס = **הדס**, 104 n. 168
אהב
 אהוב (inf. cstr.), 205
אהבה, 101 n. 158
אהל, 54, 184 (אוהול)
אוב, 54
אוט, 165, 172 n. 67
אופן, 54
און
 תוצו, 126
אוצר, 54
אור
 האירותה, 56
 יהיר, 105
 מאירים, 56
אור, 54
אורה, 54
אורים, 54
אות, 54, 101
און
 האינו (imv.), 101 (אוינו)
און, 50 n. 123, 54
אזרוע. See **זרוע**
אח, 142, 145 n. 313, 145 n. 314
אחזה, 47 (אחזזה), 107 (אזתמ), 179 (אחזת)
אחר (verb), 193
אוט/אט, 172
א'י/א'י, 153
א'י, 130 n. 262 (אם > אים)
אויב/איב, 26–27 (אויב), 54, 119, 121, 129–30, 141, 149 (אויבד), 226
איה, 153
איכה, 153
איככה, 105, 153
איל, 43
איל, 44 (איאל)
איש, 85 (הנשים היש), 104 (הנשי), 127 n. 251 (היש), 180 (הנשי)
אגזרי, 29 (אגזרי)
אכל (verb), 200
 תאכולנו, 201, 214
 יאכלו (< יאחלו), 197 (יאכולם), 215
 אכול (inf. cstr.), 48 n. 117, 50 n. 121
אכל, 51 n. 123, 54
אכלה, 49, 54
אל (God), 24, 32 (א), 43, 95 (על), 95 n. 129 (עאל)
אל (these), 154
אל (to), 24, 33 (על > אל), 76, 93–95, 145 n. 311 (אלו)

- אל (not), 94
 אֱלֹה, 24, 154
 אלוהות, 167
 אלוהים, 24 (אלוהוהים), 36 n. 65, 102
 (אלוים, אלויכה)
 אלף, 32
 אם, 34
 אִמְץ, 183 (אמוץ)
 אמר (verb), 200
 ויואמר/יואמר, 30, 30 n. 38, 44 (יומר),
 55, 80 (יומר)
 תואמרו, 44 (תמרו)
 תתיאמרו/תתאמרו, 46, 124
 אמת, 31
 אנה, 153
 אנו, 155
 אנוש, 48, 180 (אנושי)
 אנחנו, 32, 155
 אני, 155
 אניה, 54
 אנכי, 155
 אסף
 תוסף, 80, 200
 הספם, 85
 אפו, 57
 אפך (verb), 189
 יופך, 189
 יופכו, 101–2, 189
 אפס (אכס), 30 (אפץ), 28
 אפר, 92
 אוקדח/אקדח, 172
 ארב
 יורו, 71
 יורבו, 71, 80 n. 60, 200
 ארבע, 30 (אבעים)
 ארץ
 האריכי, 59
 ארץ, 51 n. 123, 54, 183 (ארוץ)
 ארמלות, 166
 ארץ, 85 (הרץ), 85
 אררה, 164
 ארש
 יארש, 57
 ישאש, 166
 אתי/את, 155
 אתה, 76, 92, 93, 95, 155
 אתמה/אתם, 162–63, 234
 תמול. See
 אתנם, 67
 אתנן
 ב, 30 (כ), 57
 באר, 79 n. 58 (בירות)
 בבץ. See
 בוץ (<בצץ)
 בגד
 נבגוד/תבגוד/יבגוד, 136
 בדל
 הבדל (inf. cstr.), 101 (בדל)
 בדרך, 152 (אבדרך), 165
 בהל (verb), 189
 בוא
 באו, 43 (באוו), 132 (בוו), 141
 יבוא, 52 (יבאו), 55, 79 (יבו), 81
 יבואו, 43 (יאבואו), 132 (יבאוו), 141
 תבאנה/תבואינה, 201
 הביאותה, 54, 81, 230–31
 הבאתי, 196
 הבי (inf. cstr.), 79 n. 57 (הביא)
 הביאו (imv.), 125 (הביו), 144
 בוז (verb), 188
 בוץ (<בצץ), 24
 בזה (verb), 188
 בזא, 32 (בזה)
 בחיר, 25, 27
 בחר
 הבחרה, 29, 105 (אבחר)
 בחור, 37
 בינה, 168
 אבית/בית, 151–52
 בכה
 יבכיון, 134
 בכור, 47
 בכר
 מבכריה, 26
 במה, 44 (במות)
 בן, 3 n. 4
 בנה
 בנוית, 134
 בניה, 167
 בנין, 167
 בקיע, 164

- בקש
 בשקתי, 25
 ברא
 ברתנו/בראתנו, 79, 189, 226
 הבריך (inf. cstr. + suff.), 127
 בריאה, 126 (בריה)
 ברך
 אברכנו, 105 (הברכנו)
 מברכים, 24
 הבריך, 40 n. 81 (הברך), 127
 ברך (= ברכה), 169, 227
 בורך/ברך, 171
 בשם, 66 (בשמין), 232
 בשר, 69 (בסר)
 בתולים, 28
 גאון, 53
 גאות, 53
 גבה (verb), 106
 גְּבַה, 51 n. 123, 106
 גְּבַה, 107
 גבול, 167
 גבורה, 36 n. 65
 גדול, 167, 182
 גדוף, 178 (גודפים)
 גדי, 134
 גדל
 יקדילו, 29
 גִּדְּל, 51 n. 123, 182 (גדול), 228
 גדע, 93 n. 117
 גדפן, 164
 גוי, 38, 75, 82, 119, 121–22, 128–29, 141, 149, 229
 גוייה, 70
 גור
 גר, 30 (גד)
 גזע
 גיזע, 40 n. 78
 גזע, 26, 40 n. 78
 גיא, 170 (גי)
 גלה
 גלו (*qal* pass. part.), 148
 מגולי, 194
 גם, 34
 גמל
 גמלאם, 44 (גמלאם)
- גער
 תגער, 91
 גופן/גפן, 172
 גרן, 51 n. 123
 גשר, 164
 דאג
 תדאיגי, 56
 דאה
 וידא, 30 n. 44 (וירא)
 דבר
 דברום (inf. cstr.), 176 (דברום)
 דבר, 27 (דברון)
 דקלי, 29 (דקלי)
 דוה, 43 (דאוה), 226
 דון, 164
 דוק, 165
 דור, 38
 דוש
 ידע, 30 n. 42 (ידע)
 הדש (inf. abs.), 105
 דייה, 134
 דכא (verb), 188
 דכה (verb), 188
 דמע, 91
 דעה, 59 (דעהא), 91
 דִּרְדֵּךְ, 3 n. 4, 25, 36 n. 65, 170
 דרש
 ידורשהו/ידורשהו, 211, 215–17, 231
 דורשם, 222
 ה- = ו-, 159–60
 הא- (3fs suff), 60, 160
 הא, 95 n. 129 (הע)
 הגוי, 34 (הוגי), 164, 167
 הדוש, 110 (חדוש)
 הואה/הוא, 6, 15, 15 n. 7, 24, 132 (הוה), 141, 154, 158, 162–63, 230, 234
 הוה
 יהו, 142, 149, 232
 הווה, 62
 הוי, 27 n. 20
 החרם, 169
 היאה/היא, 58, 126 (היה), 154, 158, 162–63, 230, 234
 היה
 הייה, 59 (היהא), 61 (הייה)

- היה (*cont.*)
 היית/הייתה, 61
 יהייה, 61, 227
 תהיה (= תהי), 198
 נהייה, 61
 תהיינה/תהינה, 3 n. 4, 37
 היות, 61, 104 (איות)
 נהיית, 61 n. 157
 היכה, 153, 232
 היככה (= MT איככה), 105, 153
 הכן (= MT אכן), 105, 153, 232
 הכרות, 167
 הלזו/הלזו
 הלך
 נאלכה, 47, 86
 התלך (inf. cstr.), 100 (התלך)
 הם-המה-/הם, 16, 16 n. 10, 161–62
 המה, 154, 158
 המן, 153
 הן-הם = הן, 162, 164, 231
 הנה, 103 (אנה), 104 (אנה)
 הניפה, 168
 הנף, 168
 הפך (verb), 189
 יהופכו, 102
 הקרב, 169
 הרס
 מהורסך (= MT מהרסך), 174
 י-י, 142–50
 והי, 16 n. 10, 159, 164, 231, 234
 זאת, 27–28 (זוות), 55
 זה, 154
 זהב, 24 n. 5
 זו, 154
 זור
 האזורה, 46
 זידה, 164
 זך or זן, 154, 231
 זכר
 זיכרוכה, 215
 זכורני, 222
 זלעפות, 175 (זלעפות)
 זמן, 167
 זמם
 זיזומו/זימו, 202, 221 n. 227, 230
 זמן, 167
 זנה
 זנת (*qal* 3fs), 195
 זנח
 הזנחתי, 193
 זעף
 זאף, 93 n. 118
 זעק (verb), 188
 זעקה, 31
 זרוע/זרוע, 151
 זרע
 זרוענו, 197, 214, 218
 זביב, 109 (זביב?)
 חגג
 יחגו, 202
 נחגה, 202
 חגורה, 109 (הגורה)
 חדר, 108
 חובר, 110
 חוה
 השתחוות (inf. cstr.), 209
 חול, 111 (< כול)
 חורטום (חורטומים), 175
 חזא
 חוזא, 110
 חזיון, 134
 חזק
 החזיקה, 108
 החזיק (inf. cstr.), 104 (אחזיק)
 חזק, 51 n. 123, 183 (חזוק)
 חטא
 חוטא/חוטי/חטא (sing. part.), 42, 86, 189
 החטיאום, 125, 141, 144, 229
 חטא, 132 (חטאוו), 170 (חט)
 חטאת, 36 n. 65, 53, 80, 170
 חיד. See יחד
 חיה
 החיות, 101 (חיות)
 חיה, 108
 חכמה, 49–50 (חוכמה)
 חליפה, 95 (יפות)
 חלל
 איחל, 41, 59
 חלמה, 164

- חלץ
 חלוץ, 37
 חמר, 30 n. 38 (חמ), 172 n. 64
 חניניה, 108
 חנם (חנום), 175
 חנן
 יחן, 202
 יחונכה, 135, 221, 230
 תחון, 202
 חסר, 183 (חסור)
 חפה (חופהא) (< חפף >), 59
 חפץ (חפץ), 109
 חצוצרה, 30
 חק (< חקק >), 47
 חקה (verb), 188
 חקק (verb), 188
 חרב
 וחרבו, 30 n. 38
 חרב (הרב), 109
 חרבה, 49
 חרבן, 164
 חורגול (חורגול), 175 n. 80
 חרוץ, 28 (חרוש)
 חרס, 110
 חרש (verb), 188
 חרת (verb), 188
 אחורתם, 216
 חשב
 תחושבהו, 217
 יחשובוני, 215
 חשה
 (אחשית), 103
 (החשית), 103
 חשק (השק), 109
 חטוב. See טהור
 טהור, 24, 106
 טהר, 24, 51 n. 123, 106
 טהרה, 50 (טוהרה), 101 n. 158
 טוב and טב, 24 n. 5,
 טול
 הטל (inf. cstr.), 100–101 n. 154
 טלל, 166, 232
 טמא
 וטמיתם, 42
 טמאה, 81, 132
- טרף
 יטרפו, 136 n. 286
 יבש (יבישה), 42
 יגה
 הוגו (אוגו), 103
 יגע
 הוגיע (inf. cstr.), 101 (לוגיע)
 יגר
 הוגירני, 193
 יד (ייד), 61
 ידה
 הודו (imv.), 103 (אודו), 231
 ידע
 ידעתכהו, 91
 יודיע, 77
 יו = י- , 142–50, 230
 יוד, 164
 יום, 30 (מים < ים), 33, 34 (יומים), 66
 (הימים > המים), 131 n. 262
 231–32
 יחד, 25
 יטב
 יטב, 41 n. 85
 יטיב, 37
 תטיב, 37
 יכח
 הוכיח, 40 n. 81 (הוכח), 108
 יכל
 ייוכל, 61 n. 158
 ילד
 יולד (*qal* pass.), 191
 ילדה, 192
 ילל
 יללו (*piel?*), 194
 יליל, 37 n. 67
 ילילון, 37 n. 67
 הילילו (imv.), 103, (אילילו)
 ים (היים), 62 (ימם < ים)
 ימן
 תיאמינו, 47
 יסד
 ישד, 69
 יסף
 (ה)וסף, 40 n. 81
 יסר (verb), 193

- יעף, 137 (לעפים)
 יפע
 יפיע (inf. cstr.), 103 (אופיע), 231
 יצא
 יאצאו [י], 25, 47
 יאצו [ו], 42 n. 90
 יאצו [הו] ציאתו [ו], 42
 יוציא, 198
 יוציו/תוציו, 126
 יצג
 יצק, 28 n. 28
 יצר
 יצרת, 35 n. 63
 ירא
 ירא, 32 (ירה), 86
 יראו, 41, 130, 229
 יראה (inf. cstr.), 205
 ירה
 יור, 28
 יורו, 71
 יוריה (inf. cstr.), 208, 231
 ירש
 יירש, 57, 59
 יראשו/ראשו and ראשו/רש, 43, 136
 ירשו, 31
 ישב
 יישבו, 41
 יישבנה, 42
 ישב, 41
 ישימו (ישומו), 178 n. 89
 ישע
 יושיענו, 103 (אושיענו)
 יושיא, 92
 יושור/יורש/יורש, 33–34, 179, 184 (ישור)
 יתום (יתום), 44
 יכאר. See כאר/כער below
 יכבד
 יכבדני, 3 n. 4, 203
 יכבד, 30
 יכבד, 183, 184 (כבוד), 30
 יכבד, 30 (בוד)
 יכבד, 183
 יכס
 יכסו, 30
 יכשו
 יכשו, 40
 יכשו, 139
 יכוהנו (כוהנות), 179 (כוהנה), 48 n. 117
 יכלכל
 יכלכל, 32
 יכון
 יכונבה, 105
 יכונ, 194, 231
 יכורבה, 174
 יכחש
 יכחס, 70 n. 22, 96 n. 138
 יכיא/כי, 7, 15, 57, 225
 יכידן, 166, 181, 232
 יכול (כוול), 27 n. 23 (כול), 35
 יכלא, 24
 יכליא (כלאיות), 45
 יכלל, 166
 יכנע
 יכנע/ניכנע, 40, 191
 יכנף (verb), 86, 232
 יכסא, 47 (כסיא), 59
 יכסף (כשפו), 69
 יכסע
 יכסע (?), 96
 יכער/כער
 יכארום, 93
 יכאורה, 93
 יכפור, 51 n. 123, 184 (כפור)
 יכרוב, 48
 יכרע, 25
 יכשל
 יכשל. See שכל
 יכתב
 יכתב/יכתוב, 215, 217
 יכתובו (יכתובו), 209
 יכתבהא, 222
 יכתת
 יכתת (qal pass.), 192
 יכתו (qal pass.), 192
 יל, 32 n. 50
 ילא, 32
 ילאום, 54
 ילבאה, 124 (לביותיו), 141, 207, 226, 230
 ילהוב/להב, 106 (להוב), 171, 184 (להוב)

לוח

- נלוא, 189
- לוח, 165
- לח = לחה, 169
- לוחי/לוחי, 107 n. 178, 172
- לחם
 - הלחם, 110 (חלחם)
- לכד
 - ילכודה, 215
 - לכודני (inf. cstr.), 213
- למעאן/למעאן, 46, 68, 100, 187–88
- לעג
 - ילעיגן, 193
- לקח
 - יקחו, 192
 - לוקח (*qal* pass.), 191
 - ילקח, 192
- מוד(ה)/מואד(ה)/מאוד(ה)/מאד(ה), 54, 84, 185–86, 223–24, 234
- מאות/מאות, 122, 128, 141
- מאור, 52–55, 81, 228
- מוזנים/מאזנים, 84, 166, 232
- מאס
 - מאשו, 69
- מאפלה, 164
- מבוא, 28 (מבואי), 148–49
- מבינה, 168, 227
- מבנה, 167
- מבנית, 167
- מגע, 164
- מדבר, 25, 32
- מדרוד/מדרד, 174
- מה, 33, 35 (סה)
- מהתלה, 101 (מתלות)
- מוג
 - גמוג, 32, 35 (נסוג)
- מוט
 - טמוט, 29
- מוסד, 32
- מוסדה, 31
- מוסר, 31
- מועד, 32 n. 50
- מוצא, 28
- מור
 - תמר, 44 (תאמר)

מחא

- ימחוא, 55 (ימחוא), 124 (ימחיו), 141, 190 n. 132
- מחה
 - מחיתה, 40 n. 78
- מחמוד/מחמד, 173
- מחשבה, 96, 109 (מהשבה)
- מחשך (מהשוך), 109
- מחתה, 40 n. 78 (מחיתה), 108
- מטל
 - מטלים, 77
- מטעת/מטע, 169, 227
- מטר
 - המטר, 40 n. 81
- מי, 57 (מיא), 60, 225
- מכאוב, 31
- מכה, 31
- מכך
 - התמכך, 27 n. 20
- מלא
 - מלו, 189
 - מלאות/מלואת (*qal* inf. cstr.), 52 n. 128, 55, 206–8
 - מליאות (*piel* inf. cstr.), 124 (מליאות), 141, 206–7
- מלאכה, 26 n. 17 (מלכאה), 60 n. 153
- מלוש, 165
- מלך (מל), 34 (מלך)
- ממלכה, 34
- מן, 35 (-ם), 67
- מסחור/מסחר, 174
- מעה, 97
- מועל/מעל, 171
- מעלל, 32
- מעמוד / ממוד, 89, 174, 205
- מענה, 42 (מעני. sing.), 91
- מענה, 91
- מערב, 89
- מערכה, 29, 91
- מעשו, 27, 145 n. 313 (מעשו)
- מפלג, 169
- מצא
 - נמציתי, 190
- מצוה, 36 n. 65, 38, 132–33 (מצאותי), 141, 145 n. 313 (מצותו)

- מקדש, 32
 מקנה, 36 n. 65
 מור/מר, 172
 מרדוף/מרדף, 174
 מרה
 תמר, 44 (תאמר)
 ויאמרו, 44 (ויאמר)
 המרות, 103 (אמרות)
 מרט
 מורט (*qal* pass.), 191
 ממורט, 192
 מרר
 תמר, 44 (תאמר)
 משח
 מושחני (*inf. cstr.*), 212–13
 משיכה, 164
 משלוח/משלח, 173–74
 משוטה/משסה, 174
 משפט, 36 n. 65
 מתי, 153
 מתקל, 166, 232
 גא, 176 (גו)
 גאם, 54, 56 n. 135, 185 n. 116 (גואומ),
 186–87
 גאן
 מנעצץ, 95
 נצה, 79 (נאצה)
 גבא
 אנבא (*niphal* *inf. cstr.*), 103 (הנבא)
 גבי, 58, 79 (גבי)
 גגד
 הגיד, 39 (הגיד)
 גגה (*verb*), 107
 גגה, 51 n. 123, 107
 גגיע/נגוע, 167
 גגח
 תנכח, 29
 גגע
 נגוע, 32
 גדה, 110 (גדוח)
 גהל
 מנהל, 110 (מנהל)
 גהר
 יהיר, 105
- גוא
 יאנה, 25, 44 n. 97
 הנא, 25, 25 n. 11, 44 n. 97
 גום
 גום (*inf. cstr.*), 56 n. 135
 גוע
 געוו, 90
 גוף
 הניפותה, 196
 הנפה (*inf. cstr.*), 101 (נפה)
 מהניף, 194
 גזה
 הזיה, 208, 231
 גזל
 זל, 39 (יזל), 61
 גחל
 וינחיל, 32
 גחשה, 31 (נחה)
 גחשת, 108
 גטה
 גטויה/נטויה, 27 n. 21, 121 (נטואה), 134
 (נטויה), 141
 הטא, 189
 גטש
 גטושנו, 214
 גיחוחכם, 111 (גיחוח)
 גכה
 יכה, 31, 46 (יאכה), 198 (= יך)
 ויכו, 30 n. 42 (ויכו)
 גכנהו, 203
 גכאי, 59 (גכא)
 גכר/גכר, 47, 86
 גכרי, 120 (גכריים)
 גכש, 36 n. 65
 גצב
 השיב, 28 n. 28
 גצפה, 164
 גצר
 ינצר, 67
 אצורה, 214
 גקב
 יקובנו, 214
 גקובני, 222
 גקה
 ינקו, 77

- נקי, 119–20
 נקף
 נוקפו/ניקפו, 40, 191
 נשא
 אשא, 92
 תישאו (תשוא), 39
 תשאו, 34
 גושיאי[ם], 26, 79 n. 58
 תנשינה, 190
 הנשא (inf. cstr.), 105
 נשג
 תסיג/תשיג, 69
 נשיא, 126 (נשיי), 128–29, 229
 נשא
 ישיכה, 61, 126, 129, 141, 229
 נשף
 נעשף), 33, 97
 נתך
 מתך, 26
 נתן
 יתן (*qal* pass.), 191
 ינתן, 67
 נתץ
 יתץ (*qal* pass.), 191
 סבב
 יסובוכה, 221
 סוג
 אסיג, 104 n. 168
 מסיג, 69
 סור
 יהסירך, 194 n. 149
 מהסיר, 194, 231
 סחר
 סחורה, 96
 סכות, 69
 סלֵת, 51 n. 123
 סמך
 יסומכנו, 216
 ספר
 שפרתי, 69
 ספרנו, 30
 סקל
 יסוקלוני, 217
 סרפד, 30, 176 (סרפוד)
 סתר
 סתרת, 35 n. 63
 אהסתר, 194
 עבד
 יעובדו/יעבודו, 215–16
 עבוד (*imv.*), 48 n. 117, 222
 יתעבד, 30
 עָבַד, 32, 36 n. 65
 עבורה (עוברתמה), 178
 עבר
 אברו, 94
 יבור, 89
 יאבורו, 94
 יעבורנה, 33–34, 216
 נעבורי, 203
 עד, 29 n. 35
 עדה, 32, 91, 100
 עדות, 27, 56 n. 135, 133
 עואר. See עָוַר
 עוד
 העד (*imv.*), 105
 ואתועדדה, 26, 91
 עוה
 יעוה, 95
 נעוו, 90
 נעוות, 36 n. 65
 עויה, 63
 עול (עוול), 62
 עולם (עולום), 90
 לולם), 176
 עולם, 28
 עון, 27 n. 25, 44 (עאון), 133, 141
 עועי, 167
 אואר) / עָוַר, 25 n. 10, 47, 94
 עור, 164
 עזב
 יעזוב/ יעזוב, 211, 214, 216–17
 עזוז, 48 (עוזוז), 178
 עזר
 יעזורני, 217
 עוזרני, 222
 עטה
 יעוטך, 216, 218–19
 עטה (*sing. part.*), 42 (עטי)
 עילול, 164, 167
 עילום, 28 n. 26
 עים, 61
 עין, 92
 עיף (עאף), 121

- עכשו, 164
 על, 16 n. 10, 24, 76, 93–95
 עליו/עלו, 36, 142
 עלה
 העלות, 91
 עלה (ההולה), 96
 עלו
 תעלו, 97
 עם, 24, 91, 92 (אם), 95 (> עת)
 עם (עמם <), 24, 34
 עמד
 יעמדו, 32
 עמודו (imv.), 203
 עמוק, 47
 עמס
 עמוס, 96
 ענה
 ואענה, 80 n. 59
 עניה, 62 (ענייה), 227
 ענש
 נאנש, 93 n. 117
 עפר, 92
 עץ, 25, 28 (עשים), 91
 עצב, 32
 עצה, 91, 92
 עצום, 51 n. 123, 184 (עצום)
 עצר and עוצר, 30 n. 38
 ערב
 העריבות (inf. cstr.), 209
 ערוה, 94
 ערד
 יערוכה, 214
 ערל, 184 (ערול)
 ערמה, 49, 228
 ערף, 51 n. 123
 עשה
 עשיתי, 190
 עשיתם, 189
 עשו, 33
 ישה, 15–16, 23, 89
 יעשה, 15–16, 23, 198 (= יעש)
 עשה (sing. part.), 42 (עשי), 144 n. 312 (עושו)
 עשרה/עשר, 51 n. 124, 88, 89, 92, 93, 172
 (עושרות)
- עשק
 יעושקנו, 216
 עשק (inf. cstr.), 92
 עת, 29 n. 35, 95
 עתה, 59 (עתהא), 76, 92, 93, 95
 פארה, 165–166
 פה (פיהו / פיו), 20, 142–50
 פח, 66 (פחין), 172 n. 64, 231
 פחוז, 172 n. 64
 פטר
 נפטרו, 29
 פלא
 נפלאות, 32, 53, 81
 הפלה, 32 (הפלה)
 פנים, 32, 145 (פנו)
 פסח (פסח), 69
 פעל
 אפעולה, 197
 פועל, 184 (פועול)
 פועלה/פועלה, 48 n. 117, 90, 179 (פועלת), 212
 פענה, 165
 פקד
 יפקודו, 215
 פקוד, 37
 פרוש, 166, 227
 פרי (פריאם), 44
 פרר
 חפר (<), 110
 פרש
 יפרושה, 215
 פשט (verb), 94
 פושט/פשת, 172
 פיתואם, 39 (פיתואם)
 פתח
 פתחו, 77, 97
 פוחי/פוחי, 82, 119, 121–22, 129, 141, 170, 171, 173, 229
 צבא, 53, 81, 132
 צבע, 93 n. 117
 צהרים, 48, 217–218
 צוה
 צוה, 71 (צפה?), 131 n. 262 (< צה)
 יזוהו, 62
 צחצחות, 107 (צחצחות)

- צחק, 28 n. 28
 ציה, 62 (צייה), 121 (ציאה), 141
 צנע (verb), 188
 צנף
 יצנופך, 214
 צעק (verb), 188
 צער, 164
 צפה
 צפה, 71
 צפון, 24
 קבוצ (קובציד), 178
 קבר
 תקוברמה, 216
 קובר/קבר, 172
 קדוש, 32, 106
 קודש/קדש, 30 (קודו), 47–51, 106, 184 (קדוש)
 קוה
 יקוו, 132 (יקאו)
 קוים, 132 (קואי), 141
 קול, 32, 38
 קום
 קומה (imv.), 204
 הקם, 40 n. 81
 קפץ
 יקופץ, 26
 קצה
 קצת (see also קצה (end) and קצת), 27
 קצה (end), 27 n. 24, 44–45
 קצר
 יקצר, 29–30
 קצור, 184
 קצת, 27 n. 24, 44–45 (קצאות), 232
 קרא
 קרתי, 190
 קראו, 192 n. 141
 קראו (inf. cstr.), 52, 55
 יקרה, 189
 יקראו, 192 n. 141
 תקראו, 190 n. 132
 קרב
 קרבת (pual 3fs), 195
 קרוב, 25
 קריא, 25, 25 n. 12
 קשוה, 133 (קסאות)
 קשב
 הקשיבו (imv.), 103 (אקשיבו)
 קשות, 164
 קושי/קשי, 172
 ראה
 ראו, 43 n. 96 (ראוו), 132, 142 (ראו/
 ראואי), 148
 ראויה, 79 (רויה)
 נרעתה, 94
 היראתי, 39 (היראתי)
 רוש/ראוש/רואש/ראש, 25, 52, 55, 74, 77–79, 81, 84, 177 (רואשי), 226, 228
 ראשון, 56
 ראשית, 74–75
 רבו, 133 (רבואותם), 141
 רבע, 51 n. 123
 רגם
 ירגמהו, 3 n. 4, 36 n. 66
 רגן
 רוכנים, 29
 רוגע/רגע, 172
 רויה, 134
 רוקמה, 51
 רחב
 נרחב, 109 (נרהב)
 הרחיבו (imv.), 103 (ארחיבו)
 רחב, 184 (רחוב), 185 (רחובו)
 רחוב, 110
 רחם, 51 n. 123
 רחמן (= רחמן), 180
 רחש, 164
 רמס
 ירמוסהו, 103 n. 163, 215
 ירמסוויו, 102–3, 141, 144
 רונה/רנה, 173
 רע, 42 (ריע), 136 (רעיכה), 230
 רעדודיה/רעדוד, 165
 רעיה, 61
 רעע
 ירועו, 202, 221 n. 227
 רצין
 רציאן, 59
 רצץ
 רצוץ, 37
 רוקח
 רוקחיד, 178

- רוקמה/רקמה, 172
 רשע (verb), 193
 מרישיעי, 26
 רשעה, 96 (רשהה)
 שבע
 שבו/שבאו, 89
 שדה, 144 n. 312 (שדו), 158 (שדהו)
 שחק
 ישחקו (< ישחוקו), 197
 אשחקה, 198
 שחק, 28 n. 28
 שטם (verb), 193 n. 145
 יסטמוני, 69
 שטמה, 165
 שכל,
 משכלה, 209
 אשכיל, 25, 33
 השכיל (inf. cstr.), 101 (שכיל)
 שמח
 תשסח, 108
 שנא
 [נ]שנאתה, 190 n. 133
 שפה, 24, 122, 133 (שפאותיכה), 170
 שרע
 שרוא, 94
 -ש, 39 n. 73
 שאה
 השאות (inf. cstr.), 101 (שאוות), 132
 שאון, 53–54
 שאר, 79 n. 58 (שר)
 שארית, 79 (שרית), 81, 137, 226
 שבה
 שבוי (שבאים), 121
 שבוע, 180 (שובועי)
 שבט, 32 n. 50
 שביא] (שביא], 172
 שובי/שבי, 43
 שבעה/שבע, 30, 88
 שבר
 נשברת/נשברה, 209
 שגג
 ישוגו, 221 n. 227
 שד (שדאים), 59
 שדד
 תושד, 191
 יושדו, 191
- שדך, 165
 שדף
 שדוף, 37
 שוא, 28 n. 28 (צו), 46 (לאשו), 62 (שוו),
 146, 170 (שו), 226
 שוב
 השיב, 40 n. 81 (השב), 105
 שוע
 תשויע, 42, 62
 שועה, 31
 שעים), 96 (שעים)
 שחוד), 184–85 (שחוד), 111
 שחת, 24
 שטף
 תשוטפני, 216
 שכב
 ישכוב, 197
 שכוב (inf. cstr.), 205
 שכן
 תשכון, 197
 שלהבת/שלהבת, 101
 שלוש, 89
 שלח
 אשלחה, 199
 שלל
 ישלוכה, 202
 שלם (verb), 193
 שם, 175 (שואם)
 שמה, 175 n. 80 (שומה)
 שמים ([ם]שמים), 35
 שמם
 תשם, 108
 שמע
 ישומעוני, 217–19
 שמעה (imv.), 204
 השמיע, 101 (שמיע)
 שמע, 25
 שמר
 ישומר/ישמור, 214–15, 217
 שמורני/שומרני, 222
 שנה
 שנאתה, 190 n. 133
 שנים, 32 (שים)
 שעה
 אשא, 92

שען

- נשנתי/נשענתי, 88
 שער, 29
 שפט
 ישופטני (ישופטני), 215–16
 ישפטו (ישפטו), 29
 שפוט (inf. cstr.), 48 n. 117
 השפטו, 71
 שפך
 תשופכנו, 216
 שפול (שפול), 184
 שקוי, 148 n. 325
 שקט
 השקיט (inf. cstr.), 103
 שרש, 51, 51 n. 123
 שרת
 משר- > משריתכה, 42 n. 89
 משרת
 תיכה
 שש, 42 (שיש), 92
 שתה
 ישתהו/ישהו, 36 n. 66
 תא (תו), 176
 תאנה, 26 n. 17 (התנאה), 60 n. 153
 תר/תור/תאור/תואר/תאר, 51 n. 123, 54, 84, 187
 תבונה, 27, 168
 תהו, 81 n. 63, 102 (תהוו), 103 n. 162
 (תוה), 141, 144
 תהום (תומות), 101
 תוך, 26 n. 16, 27
 תור, 47
 תורה, 32 (תורא)
 תזיז, 165
 תוחת/תחת, 171
 תלש (verb), 188
 אתמול/תמול, 151–52
 תמם
 תיתם/תתם, 31
 איתם, 31 n. 49, 42
 התמכך, 27 n. 20
 תעות, 56 n. 135
 תענית, 121 n. 225
 תפראת/תפארת, 87
 תופלה/תפלה, 172

תפש

- יתפושם, 215
 תפושם (inf. cstr. + suff.), 204–5
 תפתח, 110
 HEBREW / ARAMAIC PROPER NOUNS
 אבדון, 32
 אבירם (אבירום), 180–81
 אברהם (אברהרם), 31
 אברם, 31
 אופיר, 54
 אחז (אכחו), 34
 אליב/אליאב, 125, 129, 141, 229
 אמורי, 119
 אסר-חודן (אסר-חודן), 181
 אריאל (ארואל), 181
 ארם, 54
 אררט/הוררט, 105, 174
 אשאל. See אשאל
 אשור (אשו), 29 n. 38
 בית שן (בית שן), 79 n. 58
 בנימין (בנימים), 67
 דודנים (דודנים), 181
 דויד/דוד, 38
 דיפת, 30 n. 44
 דניל/דניאל, 47, 81 n. 63, 102, 129, 141, 229
 אררט. See הוררט
 חופרי/חופר, 172
 חזקיהו/חזקיהו, 173
 הנע (נע), 101
 יאור, 54 n. 131
 יהודה (יאודה), 32, 103
 יואן (יואן), 44
 יעקוב, 92
 ישעיהו, 92
 ישהק (ישחק/יצחק), 28 n. 28, 109
 יורדן/ירדן, 175 n. 80
 ירושלים/ירושלם, 31
 ישראל, 31
 אשמעל/ישמעאל, 66
 כנעני, 120 n. 222
 כתי, 82, 119–20, 127–29, 141, 226, 229
 לויאים/לויים/לויים, 120

מדין (מדים) 67
 מושה 31
 מומכן 27 n. 21 (מומכן)
 מסה 69 (משה)
 מערב 98 (מארבא)
 מצרי 120 n. 222
 נבאות 121, 141
 נבו 57 n. 139
 סדם 181 (סודם)
 סלע 96 (סלה)
 סמון 98 (שמון)
 עדלמי 181 (עודולמי)
 עיפה 176 (עיפו)
 עמלק 29 (עמלך)
 ערער 181 (ערערו)
 עשו 43 (עישאו), 147
 עשר 98 (אסר)
 פלשתי 120
 צער 95
 קיר 181 (קור)
 ראובן 54, 81 (רובן), 137, 144
 ריפת 30 n. 44
 רמליהו 181 (רומליהו)
 שראצר 181 (שראוצר)
 שאול and אשאו 2 n. 3, 32, 81, 152
 שאול 54 n. 131
 שבא 176 (שבא)

שובנא/שבנא 174
 שלח 109 (שילה), 178 n. 89 (שולח), 181
 שמעון 98 (שמון)
 תרצה 181 (תורצה)
 תרשיש > תלשישה 30 n. 38 (תרשיש)
 תרתן 181 (תורתן)

ARAMAIC

אית 46
 גאף 47 (גאף)
 חוי
 אחוית 70
 חטא
 חטו 189
 טמא
 אטמיו 189
 כוי
 כוייה 62
 גברי 119
 פותי 47
 קשוט/קשוט 185
 ריס 47 (ראס)
 שעה 98 (שתא)
 שרי
 שריוא 126 n. 246, 144 n. 309

AUTHOR INDEX

- Abegg, Martin G., 3, 4, 39, 41, 52, 68, 69, 72, 74, 84, 90, 147, 155, 157, 159, 162, 177, 195, 197–200, 202, 204, 208, 220
- Alexander, P., 7, 31, 38, 91
- Allegro, John M., 66, 71, 91, 93, 164, 190
- Andersen, Francis I., 48, 78, 80, 85, 144, 146
- Baden, Joel, 193
- Baillet, Maurice, 29, 40, 91, 95, 164, 172
- Bar-Asher, Moshe, 17, 45, 79, 102, 109, 128, 148, 154, 165, 167, 183, 193
- Barr, James, 20, 41, 58
- Bauer, Hans, xii, xv, 45, 115, 116, 117–19, 157, 175, 178, 180, 186, 191
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., 34, 159
- Ben-Ḥayyim, Ze'ev, 15, 29, 47, 60, 83, 114, 135, 146–48, 152, 195, 210, 212, 221
- Bergsträsser, G., 16, 19, 66, 82, 87, 115–19, 123, 128, 175
- Beyer, Klaus, 70 n. 24
- Biber, Douglas, 15 n. 6
- Blau, Joshua, 13, 16, 17, 19, 58, 78, 82, 83, 114, 115, 117, 119, 123, 124, 131, 186
- Bloomfield, Leonard, 16
- Bolozky, Shmuel, 83, 117
- Breuer, Yohanan, 17, 114
- Brockelmann, C., 115
- Brønno, Einar, 70, 210, 212
- Carmignac, J., 39
- Charlesworth, James H., 14, 25, 28, 31, 34, 91, 94, 98, 108, 109, 159, 176, 180, 183, 208, 223,
- Collins, John J., 10
- Cross, Frank Moore, 33, 71, 109, 163, 193
- Delitzsch, Friedrich, 27, 28, 30, 76, 109
- Dimant, Devorah, 26, 49, 122, 125, 162, 165
- Doudna, Gregory L., 159
- Elizur, Binyamin, 102, 134
- Elwolde, John F., 2, 51, 71
- Eshel, E., 24, 98, 109
- Eshel, H., 98
- Farrar, Christopher, 83
- Fassberg, Steven E., 158, 163, 194, 204, 210, 233
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A., 14, 70
- Flint, Peter W., 4, 104, 126
- Forbes, A. Dean, 48, 78, 80, 85, 144, 146
- García Martínez, Florentino, 2, 24, 25, 28, 31, 40, 50, 55, 62, 66, 91, 93, 95, 108, 159, 164, 172, 176, 180, 191
- Gogel, S. L., 41, 137, 146
- Gordis, R., 79
- Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H., 71–73, 76, 113, 210
- Gumpertz, Y. F., 66, 127
- Harrington, Daniel J., 20, 31, 34, 43, 44, 108, 110, 167, 178, 192, 196, 202
- Harviainen, Tapani, 138, 139
- Hayon, Yehiel, 83
- Hurvitz, Avi, 2, 14
- Isbell, C. D., 66
- Janssens, G., 70, 84, 212
- Joüon, P., xv, 66, 68, 80, 88, 115, 117, 118, 206, 208, 209, 212, 216
- Kesterson, J. C., 14
- Khan, G., 65, 68, 70, 84
- Kim, Yoo-Ki, 47
- Kister, Menahem, 18, 50, 71, 93, 164, 165, 167, 168

- Könnecke, Clemens, 181
- Kutscher, E. Y., 1, 3, 13–15, 17, 19, 29, 33, 34, 39, 43–48, 50, 57–62, 67, 68, 72, 73, 75–78, 85–87, 89–93, 95–97, 99, 101–3, 105, 107–11, 113, 125, 129, 132, 133, 135, 139, 140, 146, 148, 152, 155, 157, 159, 160, 164, 171–74, 176–78, 181, 183, 184, 188, 190–92, 194, 195, 197, 201, 206, 210–12, 216, 218, 220, 221
- Leander, Pontus., xii, xv, 45 n. 101, 115 n. 202, 115 n. 203, 116, 116 n. 208, 117, 117 n. 212, 118 n. 214, 118 n. 215, 119, 119 n. 217, 157 n. 20, 175 n. 76, 178 n. 88, 180 n. 95, 186 n. 121, 191 n. 137
- Licht, Jacob, 208
- Martin, Malachi, 3, 4, 91
- Mercati, G., 212
- Meyer, Rudolf, 13, 20, 139, 140
- Milik, J. T., 25–27, 89, 94, 95, 98
- Morag, Shelomo, 6, 13, 14, 17, 18, 140, 143, 210, 220
- Moreshet, Menahem, 191, 193
- Morgenstern, Matthew (Moshe), 47, 86, 102, 163
- Muraoka, T., xv, 2, 19, 33, 40, 46, 47, 57, 59, 66–68, 70–72, 75, 79, 80, 86, 88, 98, 105, 115, 117–19, 124, 128, 137, 143, 144, 151, 152, 157, 158, 163, 185, 187, 189, 191, 206, 208, 209, 212, 216, 220, 223, 232
- Murtonen, A., 73, 74
- Naudé, Jacobus A., 14, 15
- Newsom, Carol, 24–26, 29, 30, 35, 40, 43, 44, 80, 88, 91, 93, 94, 101, 106, 108, 138, 149, 164, 180, 182, 184, 200
- Nitzan, B., 69
- Nöldeke, Theodor, 126
- Norton, Jonathan, 82
- Novick, Tzvi, 165
- O'Connor, M., 76, 191
- Ohala, J. J., 15
- Pérez Fernández, Miguel, 95, 152
- Poirier, John C., 17
- Puech, Émile, 88, 89, 92, 93, 98, 103, 132
- Qimron, Elisha, 1–4, 6, 13, 16, 18, 27–31, 35, 36, 39–44, 46–50, 53, 55, 57, 60, 63, 66, 67, 69, 70, 72–75, 78, 79, 82, 85, 88, 90–96, 100–4, 106, 108–10, 120–22, 124–30, 132–37, 140, 143, 144, 148–52, 155, 156, 159, 161, 162, 164, 167, 169–72, 175–85, 191–93, 199, 200, 207, 208, 210, 213, 220, 221
- Rabin, Chaim, 14
- Ravid, Dorit Diskin, 66
- Rendsburg, Gary A., 13, 14, 69, 72, 102, 128, 134
- Reymond, Eric D., 63, 187
- Sáenz-Badillos, Angel, 71
- Schniedewind, William M., 13, 14
- Schoors, Antoon, 4, 49
- Schuller, E., 24–26, 30, 33, 35, 39, 40, 71, 80, 88, 91, 93, 94, 101, 105, 108, 138, 148, 164, 180, 182, 184, 200
- Seely, D., 40, 165
- Segal, J. B., 149
- Segal, M. H., 62
- Skehan, Patrick W., 94, 104, 210
- Smelik, Willem F., 232
- Smith, Mark S., 105
- Sperber, Alexander, 104
- Stegemann, Hartmut, 24–26, 30, 35, 39, 40, 80, 88, 91, 93, 94, 101, 108, 164, 180, 182, 184, 200
- Steiner, Richard C., 68, 70, 156, 161
- Strugnell, John, 20, 31, 34, 43, 44, 108, 110, 167, 178, 192, 196, 202
- Stuckenbruck, Loren, 25, 28, 180, 208, 223
- Sukenik, E. L., 15
- Tigchelaar, E., 24, 25, 28, 31, 40, 50, 55, 62, 66, 91, 93, 95, 108, 159, 164, 172, 176, 180, 191, 218, 220
- Tov, Emanuel, 6–10, 20, 23, 24, 26, 31, 33–35, 37, 58, 60, 62, 66, 82, 92, 96, 98, 109, 184, 218–20
- Uffmann, Christian, 117, 129
- Ulrich, Eugene, 4, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 61, 76, 89, 90, 94, 96, 97, 104, 107–10, 121, 124, 126, 132, 160, 184, 211, 216

- VanderKam, James C., 4, 57, 89, 94, 95
Vegas Montaner, Luis, 163
Vermes, G., 7, 31, 38, 91
Waltke, Bruce K., 76, 191
Watson, Janet C. E., 83
Weinfeld, M., 40, 165
Weitzman, Steve, 18
Wernberg-Møller, P., 107, 183
White, S., 24, 62, 92, 96
Wright, W., 114
Yadin, Yigael, 14, 25, 91, 92
Yalon, Henoch (Hanoach), 183, 191
Yardeni, Ada, 102, 109, 134
Yeivin, Israel, 144, 207, 210–13, 220, 222
Young, Ian, 14, 160
Yuditsky, Alexey (Eliyahu), 71, 72, 84,
102, 121, 134
Zevit, Z., 158

