

- _____. 2012. *Corpus dei testi urartei: Vol. 4. Iscrizioni su bronzi, argilla e altri supporti. Nuove iscrizioni su pietra. Paleografia generale*. Documenta Asiana, vol. 8. Rome: Istituto di Studi sul Mediterraneo Antico.
- Wegner, I. 2000. *Hurritisch: Eine Einführung*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- _____. 2007. *Hurritisch: Eine Einführung. 2., überarbeitete Auflage*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Wilhelm, G. 2004. Urartian. In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, ed. R. D. Woodard. Pp. 119–37. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology. By ERIC D. REYMOND. Resources for Biblical Study, vol. 76. Atlanta: SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE, 2014. Pp. xvii + 309. \$37.95 (paper).

Some thirty years ago Qimron's *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, which was in fact an abbreviated English version of his Ph.D. thesis in Hebrew, was published (Qimron 1986). It was based on material published up until 1985. Since then no extensive research on the grammar of the Scrolls' Hebrew has appeared. Now that all the Scrolls have been edited and published in the DJD series, a new comprehensive study on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls (hereafter: DSS) is a desideratum.

The present book is, thus, a pioneer in this field. It starts with an introduction and general remarks (pp. 1–21). The orthography section (pp. 23–64) is fairly comprehensive, including a description of the scribal mistakes occurring in the Scrolls, a treatment of the *Plene* orthography and *Aleph* as internal *Mater Lectionis*, usage of the digraphs—*-ר-*, *-א-*, etc., and a chapter regarding utilization of double *Waw* (וּ) and *Yod* (יּ) to express the semi-vowels /w/ and /y/.

The next extensive section is phonetics and phonology (pp. 65–150). There is a very scrupulous study on the weakening of the gutturals in the Scrolls. Examining the interchange of the letters expressing gutturals, Reymond concludes that the common opinion regarding an almost complete weakening of the gutturals in the DSS idiom is far from satisfying. Another ample study in this section is dedicated to the glide shifts depicted by the interchange of the letters *Aleph* and *Yod*, *Aleph* and *Waw*, and *Yod* and *Waw*. A reader will further find an instructive treatment of the behavior of the diphthongs and triphthongs in the Hebrew of the DSS.

The next section is morphology (pp. 151–224). However, this does not consist of a systematic description of the verbal conjugations and declinations and nominal forms, but rather a group of inquiries into various morphological issues. It includes quite a detailed discussion of the pronouns in the Scrolls. Then there is a general description of the nouns, with a special treatment of the original *qul* forms. The occurring verbal conjugations are also described, with special attention to the *qal* imperfect and *qal* imperative suffixed forms.

The book concludes with a discussion concerning the nature of the Hebrew of the DSS.

Now I would like to make three remarks. The first is strictly technical. The author notes (p. 3) that the book is based on his readings and the inventory of Accordance software and the Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance. Yet in some cases it appears that the mentioned, usually peculiar, evidence should be deciphered differently (cf. Tigchelaar 2014). Now many of the readings suggested could be verified relatively easily by consulting the online Leon Levy DSS Digital Library of the Israel Antiquities Authority (<http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/>). Thus, מְרִישִׁיעַ (p. 26) should better be read as מְרִישִׁיעַ, the plural of מְרִישִׁיעַ 'evildoer' (Qimron 2013a: 99), פִּיתָאוֹם (p. 39) as פִּיתָאוֹם, the plural form of פִּיתָא 'simple' (Qimron 2010: 82–83), הִירָאֲתִי (p. 39) as הִירָאֲתִי, the passive form of הִרָאָה, compare Dt. 4:35 (Qimron 2014: 17), וִירְמָסוּרֹוּ (p. 141) as וִירְמָסוּרֹוּ (Qimron 2014: 135), etc. The reader is, therefore, encouraged to check the readings, especially the strange and unusual ones, on the online photographs of the DSS Digital Library.

The second remark concerns reference to other studies. In some instances, Reymond presents instructive discussions on knotty problems of the grammar of DSS Hebrew, but does not mention some previous studies on the very same issues, and does not consider their, occasionally dissimilar, conclusions. Thus, the gentilic nouns, such as פְּלִשְׁתִּיִּים, כְּתִיִּים, discussed on pp. 114–31, were treated in

Qimron 1997: 37–40. On the nouns ending in *-ūt*, such as הכרות (p. 167), see Bar-Asher 2012: 163–69. Concerning the forms הנפה/הנך (p. 168), see Qimron 1992. *Qutl* nouns (pp. 181–88) and their origin were reexamined in Qimron 2003. The form נואם ‘word’ in particular (pp. 186–87) was treated in Qimron 2004. Regarding the personal plural pronouns (pp. 157–64) one should now consult Qimron 2013b.

The third remark concerns the scope of the evidence. In some cases the evidence presented is apparently incomplete, which could impair the discussion. Thus, for instance, examining the 2fs suffix (pp. 156–57), Reymond says that beside the standard ך- one finds in the DSS the form כׁי- as in וגאליכי and מאתיכי (4Q176 8–11 7; 12), which, he believes, is a result of Aramaic influence. In fact, scroll 4Q176 cites there a biblical passage from Isa. 54:4–10. Aside from the aforementioned forms with כׁי-, there are ארמלותך, כבעלך, עושיך, etc. with ך-, and רחמתיכה in line 10 with כה-. A similar, apparently free, interchange occurs, for example, in the 1QIsa version of Isa. 57:9 מהמה לכה ותכרותי לכה משכבך ותכרותי לכה מהמה, and elsewhere. In light of these attestations, it should be asserted that the 2fs suffix in the DSS was written in three ways: ך-, כׁי-, and כה-. The form כה- seems to be a witness for an independent internal development of the suffix.

The author further argues that כׁי- “might be attributable to the presence of the suffix in the common . . . Hebrew text” as in [בתוכי] (4Q84) representing Ps. 116:19 בְּתוֹכִי. Yet, in the 4Q84 version of Ps. 103, one finds עוֹנֵךְ, תְּחִלּוֹתֶיךָ, חַיִּיךָ, הַמַּעֲטָרֶיךָ, נְעוּרֶיךָ vs. עוֹנֵכִי, תְּחִלּוֹתַי, חַיִּי, הַמַּעֲטָרִי, נְעוּרַי in the Masoretic text. One wonders, therefore, why the scribes of the DSS were so inconsistent. If there were really Aramaic influence, one would expect more extensive usage of כׁי-. At any rate, the evidence attests to the apparently free interchange of three allographs ך-, כׁי-, and כה-, which would, in my opinion, hardly be attributable to Aramaic influence.

Summing up, Reymond’s important study deals with fundamental problems of the grammar of the DSS. Since his thorough discussions are based on the full scope of data that have been published in the DJD, he concisely considers some complicated questions of Hebrew grammar. It is to be regretted, therefore, that the author did not always reexamine the evidence referred to, and avoided taking into account various opinions regarding a number of issues.

ALEXEY (ELIYAHU) YUDITSKY

THE ACADEMY OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE, JERUSALEM

REFERENCES

- Bar-Asher. M. 2012. *Leshonot Rishonim: Studies in the Language of the Bible, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Aramaic*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press. (Hebrew).
- Qimron. E. 1986. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- _____. 1992. Halakhic Terms in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Importance to the Study of the Halakha Development. In *The Scrolls of the Judaean Desert, Forty Years of Research*, ed. M. Broshi, S. Japhet, D. Schwartz, and S. Talmon. Pp. 128–38. Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute. (Hebrew).
- _____. 1997. On the Language Tradition of the Scribes of the Bible. In *Hadassah Shy Jubilee Book*, ed. Y. Bentolila. Pp. 37–43. Beer-Sheva: The Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press. (Hebrew).
- _____. 2003. גְּדֵל הַזְרוּעַ, גְּבֻהַּ הַקּוֹמָה, and קִדְשׁ הַהֵיכָל. In *Qol le-Yaakov: Studies Presented to Yaakov Bentolila*, ed. D. Sivan and P. Y. Kirtchuk-Halevi. Pp. 327–39. Beer-Sheva: The Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press.
- _____. 2004. *N^eum* and the History of the *qu’l* Pattern. In *Teshurot La-Avishur: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, in Hebrew and Semitic Languages Presented to Professor Yitzhak Avishur at Sixty*, ed. M. Heltzer and M. Malul. Pp. 295–99. Tel Aviv-Jaffa: Archaeological Center Publications. (Hebrew).
- _____. 2010. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew Writings*, vol. 1. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press. (Hebrew).
- _____. 2013a. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew Writings*, vol. 2. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press. (Hebrew).

- _____. 2013b. The Third Personal Masculine Plural Pronoun and Pronominal Suffix in Early Hebrew. In *Hebrew in the Second Temple Period*, ed. S. E. Fassberg, M. Bar-Asher, and R. Clements. Pp. 181–88. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. 2014 *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew Writings*, vol. 3. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press. (Hebrew).
- Tigchelaar, E. J. 2014. Review of E. Reymond, *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology*. *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 90: 778–91.

Ancient Hebrew Periodization and the Language of the Book of Jeremiah: The Case for a Sixth-Century Date of Composition. By AARON D. HORNKOHL. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics, vol. 74. Leiden: BRILL, 2014. Pp. viii + 517. \$210.

The book under review constitutes much more than its title promises. For while the focus of the research remains on Jeremiah throughout, in essence the author provides the first sustained monograph against the revisionist view of Hebrew diachronic study which has emerged in recent years. For the uninitiated, though, first some back-story:

For much of the twentieth century, commencing with the work of S. R. Driver and culminating with the work of Avi Hurvitz (whose studies have continued into the twenty-first century and indeed to the present day), Hebraists were in general agreement that the Biblical Hebrew (BH) language changed diachronically over the course of the millennium of attested texts. The changes were not as drastic as the changes from Old Egyptian to Middle Egyptian to Late Egyptian (extending over two millennia) or the changes from Old English to Middle English to Modern English (stretching over one millennium), but the changes were detectable nonetheless. Hence, as outlined by E. Y. Kutscher and as detailed by Hurvitz (the former was the main teacher of the latter), Hebraists understood that biblical texts could be placed on the continuum of Archaic BH (ABH), Standard BH (SBH), and Late BH (LBH).

This picture was challenged in a major work by Ian Young, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensverd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts* (London: Equinox, 2008). The authors contend that the differences in BH are not due to diachronic development, but rather serve as testimony to two coeval literary styles, one more conservative, one more liberal (for lack of better terms). Books written in the latter, with a heavy influence of Aramaic, presence of Persian loanwords, and so on (akin to LBH in the customary view) are clearly dated to the Persian period; but books composed in the former, which lacks a concentration of said developments (akin to SBH), also may be or should be dated to the Persian period—only the scribes who produced these texts adhered to a more conservative writing style.

Into this fray steps Aaron Hornkohl with the present masterful study, devoted to the book of Jeremiah, but with far-reaching implications beyond the linguistic profile of this single biblical composition. This monograph is a thorough revision and translation of the author's doctoral dissertation presented to the Hebrew University (2012), written under the supervision of Steven Fassberg.

The bulk of the book is devoted to detailed examinations of specific linguistic traits which may be used to distinguish SBH and LBH. These include nine features within the domains of orthography and phonology, twelve morphological elements, thirteen syntactic traits, and thirteen lexical items (pp. 72–355). Every issue studied receives a thorough inspection across the biblical corpus, with additional relevant information forthcoming from cognate Semitic languages and most importantly from post-biblical sources (Ben Sira, Dead Sea Scrolls, Tannaitic texts, etc.). Individual occurrences of each feature are listed, superb charts summarize the evidence in exceedingly clear fashion, explanations for the various developments are surveyed, and then the author turns his attention specifically to Jeremiah. Two illustrations of the method are provided here.

1) Hebrew attests to the two verbs קָרַע $q\text{-}y\text{-}q$ and $\text{קָרַעַ$ $z\text{-}q$, both meaning 'cry out, muster', with parallel noun forms $\text{קָרַעַ$ $q\text{-}y\text{-}q$ and $\text{קָרַעַ$ $z\text{-}q$, respectively, 'cry, scream'. The former set (with verb and noun tallied together) predominates in the Torah, to the ratio of 27:2, while the latter set (ditto) predominates in the LBH corpus, to the ratio of 3:11. "Especially illustrative are parallel or similar formulations from classical and post-classical biblical texts" (p. 80), such as Gen. 27:34 // Esther