

with Qumran is that of chronology. Since Pliny's account (completed ca. 77 CE) speaks of the Essene settlement in the present tense, it is believed that Pliny could not have been talking about Qumran, because the site had already been destroyed in 68 CE. But this argument has a number of weaknesses. First, Pliny might not have known at the time he completed his work that Qumran had been destroyed. Second, he might have written the passage in question before 68 CE, and simply not have modified it by the time of his death in 79 CE. And finally, as has already been mentioned, Pliny primarily relied upon sources in writing the *Natural History*. The section in question may have been from one of his (older) sources, rather than original to Pliny himself. Despite these objections, Pliny's geographical discussion remains an important part of the Qumran-Essene identification.

[See also Essenes.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam, A. *Antike Berichte über die Essener*. 2nd ed. Berlin, 1972. Greek text and brief commentary for all the ancient accounts of the Essenes.
- Beagon, Mary. *Roman Nature: The Thought of Pliny the Elder*. Oxford, 1992. A recent discussion of Pliny's *Natural History*, providing a helpful introduction to Pliny and to the ideas and themes that shaped this work.
- Laperrousaz, E. M. "Infra hos Engadda." Notes à propos d'un article récent." *Revue biblique* (1962), 369-380.
- Rackman, H., and W. H. S. Jones. *Pliny: Natural History*. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass., 1938-1963. Provides Latin text of Pliny's *Natural History* with an English translation. A brief introduction to Pliny is given in volume 1.
- Vermes, Geza, and Martin Goodman. *The Essenes according to the Classical Sources*. Sheffield, 1989. Provides Greek/Latin text, English translation, and brief introduction for the major classical sources describing the Essenes.

TODD S. BEALL

POETRY. Determining what is and is not poetry among the inscriptional finds of the Judean Desert is not a straightforward task. There are no graphic arrangements of versification, and no colophonic indicators marking a certain text as poetry. The primary method of determination is identifying key words and/or motifs that suggest a genre affiliation similar to the poetic genres in the biblical corpus, and an assessment of the diction as resembling that of biblical Hebrew poetry. Neither of these criteria is unambiguous, leaving the boundaries of this category uncertain.

Poetic Texts at Qumran. Two manuscripts of biblical psalms 11QPsalms^a [11Q5] and 4QPsalms^f [4Q88] contain a number of psalms which are not part of the Masoretic Text Psalter. Four of these were previously known in Syriac translation and one is preserved in *Ben Sira*

51.13-19. The remaining psalms (designated *Apostrophe to Zion*, *Hymn to the Creator*, *Plea for Deliverance*, *Apostrophe to Judah*, and an eschatological hymn) appear in these texts for the first time. Two manuscripts, noncanonical Psalms A (4Q380) and noncanonical Psalms B (4Q381), contain poetic compositions similar to the canonical psalms in their prosodic style, though no complete psalm and almost no single poetic line has been preserved in full. Another text of apocryphal psalms (Apocryphal Psalms^a) is too fragmentary for proper poetic assessment.

From Cave 1 a manuscript of thanksgiving psalms (*hodayot*) was found (1QH^a) consisting of one large piece (eighteen columns) and numerous fragments. A recent reconstruction (É. Puech, "Quelques aspects de la restauration du rouleau des hymnes," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 39 [1988], 38-55) suggests an original of at least twenty-six columns containing an estimated twenty-five psalms. An additional eight copies of these *hodayot* have been recovered, one from Cave 1 (1Q35) and six from Cave 4 (4Q427-432). The poetic character of these *Hodayot* has been the topic of a handful of studies.

A number of wisdom texts have survived, some of which present a diction similar to the biblical Proverbs (4Q184-5, 525). Other texts contain sapiential discourse but are quite fragmentary and therefore difficult to analyze poetically (4Q413, 416-419, 424). A composition from Cave 1 entitled "Mysteries" (1Q27) is arguably poetry, though the clearest fragment displays only seven full lines of text. On the periphery of the category of poetic compositions are the finds containing prayers or songs possibly associated with a liturgical celebration of some kind: (Liturgical Prayers [1Q34]; Festival Prayers^{ac} [4Q507-9]; Words of the Luminaries^{ac} [4Q504-6]; Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice^a [4Q400]; 11Q17; blessings: curse [4Q280], Berakhot^a [4Q286], Berakhot^b [4Q287]; Barkhi Nafshi^a [4Q434], Barkhi Nafshi^b [4Q436]).

Poetic Features. The study of biblical Hebrew poetry constitutes the basis for examining the poetry of the Judean Desert Scrolls. In the case of the former, poetic discourse is characterized by the sustained presence of parallelism, terseness of expression, and various rhetorical features. Although these elements are not altogether absent from biblical Hebrew prose, their regular and consistent presence across a stretch of text marks it out as "heightened" discourse, which fairly bears the designation *poetry*.

The most conspicuous feature of ancient Hebrew poetry is parallelism, or seconding, in which poetic lines are combined into two- (couplet) or three- (triplet) line units exhibiting various kinds of correspondence between the lines, ranging from repetition or virtual sameness to expansion or continuation. The nature of the correspon-

dence between the lines of a couplet or triplet (also called "bicolon" and "tricolon," respectively) can be described in terms of both the grammatical and semantic dimensions of the language, and may be active at the word and line levels. These cohesive two- or three-line units constitute the basic building blocks of the poetic composition. Once delineated, these blocks can then be combined into larger poetic paragraphs or strophes. Strophes are distinguished on the basis of perceived thematic cohesion and may be accompanied by marked rhetorical features. Poetic analysis, then, consists of exploring the contours of coherence in the poem, from the parallelism displayed in the basic units (couplets and triplets), to the patterning of these units into larger segments (strophes), making sense of the whole on the basis of a close examination of the parts.

Lineation. An initial challenge to analyzing the poetry of the Judean Desert Scrolls is determining the extent of each poetic line. For biblical Hebrew poetry, lineation is based on syntactic considerations (a line of poetry is co-terminus with a syntactic juncture) and parallel correspondences, aided by the reading tradition encoded in the Masoretic accentuation. In addition, lines of biblical poetry are roughly the same length, whether "length" is established by counting main grammatical constituents or syllables. In determining the lineation of noncanonical poetry (here, principally, 1QH^a), syntactic features are the main guide, and while line junctures can be fairly established in the majority of cases, uncertainty does exist. Should the expressions "I know" (*'ani yada'ti* [xx.10 = xi.]) or "I said" (*'ani amarti* [x.27 = ii.25]) be placed on the same poetic line as their following object clauses, or do they constitute a separate line? Should the temporal expressions "all day, continuously" (*kol hay-yom tamid* [xix.8-9; xi.5-6]) be placed with the preceding clause, the following clause, or be split up? Furthermore, lineation based on substantial syntactic breaks may result in lines of considerable length. One poem ends with a series of five elaborate infinitive phrases (xix.13-17 [xi.10-14]). Syntactic criteria would leave them as long lines, but it is also possible to divide them up into couplets by placing the break among the constituents of the phrase. Since lineation has a significant effect on the evaluation of poetic diction and parallelistic correspondence, this becomes an important issue.

Granting these difficulties, two noteworthy features of the *Hodayot* poems are the diversity of line length and the juxtaposing of lines of various lengths. While most lines consist of three or four constituents (roughly 8-12 syllables), there are many comprised of two (5-7 syllables) and some of five or six constituents (13-19 syllables). The presence of these long lines tends to weaken the terseness of the diction and affects the rhythmic nature of the poetry. This is especially so when short and long lines are

placed next to one another (e.g., *va-ani mah/ki' [hoda']tani besod amittekhah*, "and what am I / that you have instructed me in the secret of your truth," xi.4-6; see also v.34-36). While there may be a perceived rhetorical effect to this variation of line length, it contributes to a more prosaic style of poetry.

Couplets. The combination of two poetic lines to form a basic parallel unit is common in the *Hodayot*. Correspondence between the lines can be close in both the grammatical and semantic domains (*yesodei harim lisrefah / ve-shoreshei hallamish le-nahalei zefet*, "the foundations of the mountains will become a burning (mass) / and the roots of the flint a stream of pitch," [xi.32 = iii.31; see also viii.11-12, 14-15 = xvi.9-10, 12-13; xix.12-13 = xi.9-10; etc.]), though (nonparticle) word repetition across contiguous lines is surprisingly uncommon. Tight parallelism is particularly conspicuous in the opening strophes in which the writer expresses the reasons for his praise (see x.23-24 [ii.20-21]; xiii.7-8 [v.5-6]; xv.29-30; [vii.26-27]; xix.7 [xi.3]). The feature of ellipsis or gapping, where a term from the first line is to be understood in the second line, is also present in these psalms (*ki' hityatsavti vigebul rish'ah / ve-'im helka'im ba-goral*, "for I was placed in the territory of wickedness / and with the evildoers by lot," xi.25-26 [iii.24-25]; see also x.28 [ii.26]; xiii.18 [v.16]; xix.7-8 [xi.4-5]). More commonly, however, the relationship between the lines of a couplet is one of partial correspondence, with terms in one line without a lexically associated term in the other, or paired lines with different syntactic configurations. Especially striking is the number of couplets whose relationship of coherence is purely syntactic in nature; that is, a single clause is spread across two lines with one line being syntactically dependent on the other. In many cases, the second line of the couplet is dependent on the first (for the opposite, see x.30 = [ii.28]; xiii.17-18 [v.15-16]), either as an object clause (ii.25; xi.7), a relative clause (after *asher*, xiii.15 [v.13]), a purpose clause (v.14), an appositional phrase (x.8-9 [v.6-7]), or, most often, an infinitive phrase (xi.22-23, 28-29 [ii.21-22, 27-28]; xiii.13-15 [v.11-12]; xv.35-37 [vii.32-33]). Syntactic dependency effectively loosens the grammatical dimension of parallelism and often reduces the degree of semantic association between the lines as well.

Triplets. A prominent feature of the *Hodayot* is the relatively high percentage of three-line units employed. In both biblical poetry and the non-Masoretic Text psalms of 11QPsalms^a, the couplet is the primary poetic unit with the occasional presence of a triplet. By contrast, some of these noncanonical thanksgiving psalms are dominated by triplets (see xi.20-37 [iii.19-36]; xiii.7-21 [v.5-19]). In certain cases, the three lines manifest a perceptible degree of syntactic and/or semantic equivalence (xiii.14-15

[v.12–13]; xv.31 [vii.28]; xix.7–18 [xi.4–5]). In many other instances, two of the three lines display a closer correspondence to each other than to the third line, and often it is the second and third lines that exhibit a higher degree of parallelism (x.27–29 [ii.25–26]; xiii.11–12 [v.9–10]; xix.6–7, 11–12 [xi.3–4, 8–9; exceptions: xiii.9–10, 13–15 [v.7–8, 11–12]; xix.9–10 [xi.7–8]). In particular, the second and third lines may be comprised of parallel infinitive phrases (xi.22–23, 23–24 [iii.21–22, 22–23]; xv.32–34 [vii.29–31]) or other types of phrases or clauses dependent on an initial main clause line (xiii.9–10, 11–12 [v.7–8, 9–10]). In fact, grammatical subordination is a common feature of the tricollic units of these poems.

Larger units. While there seem to be relatively few examples of isolated single lines in the Hodayot, there are a number of units consisting of four or five lines which resist division into smaller, more standard units (couplet or triplet). In one *hodayah* (xix.6–17 [xi.3–14]), grammatical and semantic parallelism binds together a series of five verbal clause lines (8–10 [5–7]), a series of five short nominal clause lines (10–11 [7–8]), and a series of five long infinitive phrase lines (13–17 [10–14]). In another (x.22–32 [ii.20–30]), two units of four lines each are juxtaposed, each beginning with the personal pronoun *hemmah* “they” and concluding with a line introduced by *ki* (22–23; 23–25). In column xiii, lines 8–9 (v.6–7), appositional modification generates a four-line unit, and in column xi, lines 30–31 (ii.27–28) the ellipsis of an infinitive construct holds together four consecutive lines. Such large clusters of closely related lines are noticeably absent from the non-Masoretic Text psalms.

The Strophe. One observed feature of the *Hodayot* is the tendency for independent personal pronouns to introduce strophes (see especially x.24, 25, 30, 31 [ii.22, 23, 25, 28, 29]; xi.24 [iii.23]; xix.6, 10 [xi.3, 7]). However, apart from this, and the regular introductory formula for each *hodayah* (*odekhah adonay eli*, “I give you thanks, O Lord / O my God,” or *baruch attah adonay*, “Blessed are you, O Lord”), there are no constant strophic features in these psalms, and delineation must be based on thematic considerations and rhetorical elements. In some cases, repetition is a helpful guide; in column xiii, lines 7–21 [v.5–19], for example, the second half of the psalm is punctuated by the repetition of *attah eli* “you, my God,” which seems to serve as a strophic marker. Word repetition occurs within larger blocks of text and may function as a coherence-producing *leitmotif* (see the use of *yd'* in xix.10–13 [xi.7–10]). In addition, repeated syntactic features can give unity to a stretch of text: in xi.27–29 [iii.26–28] nine poetic lines constitute an expanded temporal setting signified by three infinitive phrases (*b* + infinitive construct).

Within the manuscript finds of the Judean Desert, the

poetic texts exhibit a range of prosodic styles. The non-Masoretic Text psalms of 11QPsalms^a and some of the other apocryphal psalms (4Q380–381) manifest a prosody similar to that of the canonical psalter, with the predominance of couplets, a relatively high degree of grammatical and semantic correspondence (parallelism), terseness of expression, and rhetorical features. Other poetic texts, principally 1QHodayot^a, display a prosodic style which, while bearing a definite resemblance to the canonical poetic tradition, has drifted toward the prosaic end of the prose-poetry spectrum. The presence of longer poetic lines, the diminished consistency of the couplet and the relatively higher frequency of three- (four- and five-) line units, the conspicuous presence of syntactic dependency, especially the infinitive phrase, are all signals of this drift. While still rooted in the biblical poetic tradition, the prosody of these texts bears its own distinctive character.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berlin, Adele. *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. Bloomington, 1985. Excellent discussion of grammatical and semantic dimensions of biblical parallelism.
- Carmignac, Jean. “Étude sur les Procédés Poétique des Hymns.” *Revue de Qumrân* 2 (1959–1960), 515–532.
- Holm-Nielsen, Svend. *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*. Acta Theologica Danica, 2. Denmark, 1960. Solid study of the text of 1QH^a.
- Kittel, Bonnie P. *Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 50. Chico, California, 1981. A fine study of the poetic structure of eight complete Hodayot, examining the parallelism between lines, as well as the strophic and stanza-level arrangements.
- Kraft, Charles F. “Poetic Structure in the Qumran Thanksgiving Psalms.” *Biblical Research* 2 (1957), 1–18.
- Kugel, James L. *The Idea of Biblical Poetry*. New Haven, 1981.
- Sukenik, Eleazar L. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Vol. 1. Jerusalem, 1955. *Editio princeps* of 1QH^a.
- Thiering, Barbara. “The Poetic Forms of the Hodayot.” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 8 (1963), 189–209.
- Watson, Wilfred G. E. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*. JSOT Supp. 26. Sheffield, 1984.
- Williams, Gary Royce. “Parallelism in the Hodayot from Qumran.” Ph.D. dissertation. Annenberg Research Institute, 1991. Thorough analysis of grammatical and semantic parallelism across 647 poetic lines of 1QH^a.

DAVID A. DIEWERT

POMPEY. See Rome.

POTTERY has been found in caves and settlements throughout the Judean Desert. Most of the material from Qumran dates to the late Iron Age (late seventh to early sixth centuries BCE) and to the Hasmonean and Herodian periods (late second century BCE to first century CE). It provided much of the basis for Paul Lapp’s ceramic typology (Lapp, 1961). Assemblages similar to that from Qum-