examines texts that manifest a distinct, northern dialect of Hebrew. Cohen demonstrates how a knowledge of diachrony can inform textual analysis.

The fourth section contains essays that survey the issue of diachrony in Aramaic (Sokoloff), Ugaritic (Lam and Pardee), and Akkadian (Kouwenberg). In the fifth and final section, Zevit provides an extended review of *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts* (hereafter, *LDBT*) by Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd, a two-volume work to which *DBH* is a rejoinder. Special consideration of *LDBT* is appropriate due to frequent citation of this work within *DBH*. In many cases, *DBH* essays forcefully reject the putative central theses of *LDBT*, including the idea that varying literary styles account for observed linguistic differences better than diachrony. Despite this seeming unanimity of opinion, a critical reading of the *DBH* trove of resources suggests that ongoing studies of Hebrew diachrony should continue to answer critiques such as those of *LDBT*. For example, the essay of Ehrensvärd (who also authored chapters in *LDBT*) affirms that Hebrew experienced diachronic change (p. 181) and that there are clear differences between Early and Late Biblical Hebrew (p. 190), casting doubt on characterization of *LDBT* as utterly nihilistic toward the phenomenon of diachronic language change.

Considered as a composite whole, *DBH* is a technical work of scholarly depth. Inclusion of both generative and functional linguistic approaches is an uncommon but welcome advancement of widely varying theoretical perspectives. At times, contributors reach disparate (or complementary) conclusions, such as attributing the phenomenon of the infinitive absolute substituting for a finite verb to "style" (Ehrensvärd, p. 189), "diachrony" (Paul, p. 294), or "dialect" (Rendsburg, pp. 345–46). Furthermore, the fact that some chapter authors critically evaluate the work of other *DBH* contributors and on occasion note the absence of discernible diachronic change within texts in their purview testifies to the integrity of scholarship in the book. One claim within *DBH* highlights the need for circumspection when citing informal discourse during argumentation on contentious topics. The final chapter attributes confirmation of an inferred central principle of *LDBT* to personal e-mail communication with one of its authors. However, the same author expressly denied confirming that principle in an e-mail to the present reviewer.

Brief comments such as those above can scarcely do justice to the work of each *DBH* contributor and only hint at the complexity of the current state of discussion on Hebrew diachrony. Though complex indeed, the implications for broader Hebraic studies are weighty. Clearly, all informed discussion of Hebrew diachrony in the future will benefit from interaction with *DBH*.

Scott N. Callaham  
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


This volume contains 20 essays from the proceedings of the 12th annual international symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls
Book Reviews

and Associated Literature, which was also the 5th international symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira, which took place at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 29–31 December 2008. The essays are quite varied in topic; below is a list of the essays briefly summarized followed by a general comment on the volume.

Gary A. Anderson in “How Does Almsgiving Purge Sin?” (pp. 1–14) presents a study of lexical-semantic shifts predicated by an Aramaic-induced conceptual shift in the way sin is thought about: from sin as burden to sin as debt. The article interestingly raises the question of the connection between language and thought. In “Mistaken Repetitions or Double Readings?” (pp. 15–28), Moshe Bar-Asher examines the phenomenon of variant doublet words and phrases and argues that they are often intentional and offer a glimpse into the textual multiplicity of the second temple period, ancient scribal practices, and even interpretive strategies. Haim Dihi, “Linguistic Innovations in Ben Sira Manuscript F” (pp. 29–45), traces the innovation of the nouns הנשה and הנשים and the verbal root קמע to 31:31 in this manuscript. Mats Eskhult in “Relative ha-: A Late Biblical Hebrew Phenomenon?” (pp. 47–55) observes that apart from the instance in Josh 10:24 the relative ha- with finite verb only appears in “incontestably late writings” and is therefore likely a “postexilic phenomenon” that perhaps developed under Aramaic influence and only for a brief time. In “Shifts in Word Order in the Hebrew of the Second Temple Period” (pp. 57–71) Steven Fassberg suggests that six word order shifts involving verb-subject, modifier-noun, and set “binary expressions” may be related phenomena indicative of a general ‘end-focus’ shift in Late Biblical Hebrew.

Gregor Geiger, “Plene Writing of the Qôatel Pattern in the Dead Sea Scrolls” (pp. 73–81), provides a nuanced analysis of this shift by taking into account two factors (the emergence of a fixed biblical text and the lack of fixed vocalization) as complicating the statistics. Pierre Van Hecke in “Constituent Order in הָיָה Clauses in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls” (pp. 83–104) argues that, while copular הָיָה is normally verb-initial, pragmatic functions such as topic and focus, including the existential function of הָיָה explain exceptions to this normal order. Avi Hurvitz in “Terminological Modifications in Biblical Genealogical Records and Their Potential Chronological Implications” (pp. 105–16) argues for the late status of three genealogical expressions: derivations of the root לְעַבְדָו, “register”; the construction לְעַבְדָו... מבטיחו, “from... and upwards/beyond”; and the pronominal suffix form in the expression מבטיחו, “their fathers’ house.” Jan Joosten, “Imperative Clauses Containing a Temporal Phrase, and the Study of Diachronic Syntax in Ancient Hebrew” (pp. 117–31), proposes that a distinguishing feature of Late Biblical Hebrew is the loosening of the verb-initial order of the imperative used exclusively in classical Hebrew. Reinhard Kratz, “Laws of Wisdom: Sapiential Traits in the Rule of the Community (IQS 5–7)” (pp. 133–45), examines the wisdom background, particularly in Ben Sira, for the legal material in this Qumran text.

Noam Mizrahi, “Aspects of Poetic Stylization in Second Temple Hebrew: A Linguistic Comparison of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice with Ancient Piyyut” (pp. 147–63), makes the case that gender shifts evident in these writings compared with earlier Hebrew, while not identical, are analogous and stylistically intentional. Matthew Morgenstern in “The Literary Use of Biblical Language in the Works of the Tannaim” (pp. 165–79) examines the ways in which Tannaitic
writers borrow and play off of biblical language. In “The Third Personal Mas-
culine Plural Pronoun and Pronominal Suffix in Early Hebrew” (pp. 181–88),
Elisha Qimron argues, based on his examination of the development of these
pronominal forms, that the Qumran suffix forms would have been vocalized
analogously with the independent pronoun: that is, בְּרָקַי and בְּרַקְי. Jean-
Sébastien Rey, in “On the Prepositional Object with bet in Qumran Hebrew”
(pp. 189–213), convincingly attributes the increased use of ב- marked objects
with six instruction-related verbs (תְּלָה, נֶבֶט, יְדִיע, בֶּטֶן, בֶּטֶא, בֶּטֶא) to a diachronic
shift while less-convincingly arguing that a semantic distinction may fre-
quently account for divergences from this pattern in Qumran Hebrew. Ursula
Schattner-Rieser in “From the ‘Foundation’ of the Temple to the ‘Foundation’
of a Community: On the Semantic Evolution of אֵש (אש) in the Dead Sea
Scrolls” (pp. 215–24) traces the development of a metaphorical meaning of this
term in Hebrew, in contrast to the retaining of a literal meaning in the Aramaic
of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

(pp. 225–39), identifies six phrases as characteristic of Late Biblical Hebrew: הָב
טֹחֶרDenver, שְׁמַהְשֵׁש, שָׁמַיִם, שְׁמוֹאֵל, שְׁמוֹאֵל. “power and strength,” “gladness and joy,” “children
and women,” “old and young alike,” “the priests and the Levites,” “Judah and Benjamin.” In “Scribal Features
of Two Qumran Scrolls” (pp. 241–58) Emanuel Tov examines orthographic dis-
tinctions among the multiple Qumran scribes responsible for these scrolls and
evidence of corrective additions made by scribes to the scrolls. Alexey (Eliyahu)
Yuditsky in “The Non-Construct כּל/הכּל in the Dead Sea Scrolls” (pp. 259–68)
argues that the character of the extensive use these two constructions in the
Dead Sea Scrolls distinguishes the Hebrew of the scrolls from both Biblical and
Mishnaic Hebrew. Francesco Zanella, “Between ‘Righteousness’ and ‘Alms’: A
Semantic Study of the Lexeme צדקה in the Dead Sea Scrolls” (pp. 269–87), traces
the semantic shift of צדקה from righteousness (Bible), to denote a “merciful
and compassionate relationship” (Qumran), to indicating “alms” (Mishnah). In
“Content Clauses in the Dead Sea Scrolls” (pp. 289–98), Tamar Zewi analyzes
the introduction of content clauses in the Dead Sea Scrolls in comparison to the
biblical use of כ and ב and the Mishnah’s use of פ. Overall, the essays in this volume are a mixed bag, some making more
compelling cases than others. Most disappointing is that the five-year gap be-
tween the delivery of these papers and their publication is all too evident by
their complete lack of acquaintance with the discussions about linguistic dat-
ing of Hebrew set off by the 2008 publication of Linguistic Dating of Biblical
Texts by Ian Young, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensvärd. Many results of
these discussions have already been discussed in Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew
(Eisenbrauns, 2012), edited by Cynthia Miller-Naudé and Ziony Zevit. As a
result, some of the contributions in this volume are bound to look naive in
their approach to the linguistic data. A case in point is Rey’s article in which he
attempts, quite unconvincingly, to make a broad semantic distinction between
some of the verbs of understanding with the ב- marked object (dealing with
“theological” matters) and those without (dealing with “practical or ethical”
matters). A more convincing explanation can be offered by recourse to linguis-
tic theory on the diffusion of language change as a gradual process (something
discussed at length in several essays in the Miller-Naudé and Zevit volume), thus accounting for the few remaining departures from the Π-marked object in the data.

John A. Cook
Asbury Theological Seminary


In this important study, William Mierse has created an overall synthesis of Levantine temple and sanctuary architecture during the early Iron Age (IA). As a working definition, the author includes the modern states of Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, the Palestinian Authority, and Jordan as part of the Levant. Mierse evaluates the origins, features, and influences of architecture during the period that followed the area-wide disruptions at the end of the Late Bronze Age (1200 B.C.) and continued through the next half millennium, culminating with the ascendency of the Assyrian Empire (700 B.C.). He limits his examination to structures that (1) were identified as sacred spaces by the excavators, (2) exhibited an unusual design or prestigious building materials, and (3) included valuable or sacred objects which would be out of place in a non-sacred space. Of special interest are Mierse’s thorough analyses of Tell Ta‘yinat and ‘Ain Dara, which have been at the center recent scholarly discussions.

This work offers much of value to the reader, especially in three areas. First, Mierse compiles a complete summary and analysis of each of the sacred remains excavated at various Levantine sites. Second, he explores the societal influences that may have resulted in the development of architectural layouts, materials, and objects. And third, Mierse theorizes how these Levantine features may have later influenced sacred spaces on the Iberian Peninsula and in North Africa.

The first three chapters set up the analysis by providing a thorough synthesis of the existing evidence. The core of the study examines 38 structures, organizing the findings through four time periods: IA I (1200–1000 B.C.), IA IIA (10th century B.C.), IA IIB (9th to late 8th centuries B.C.), and IA IIC (late 8th to mid-6th centuries B.C.). The analysis further subdivides these time periods by geographic region: North Syria, Southern Coastal Plain, Israelite (or proto-Israelite), and the Phoenician region. The numerous maps, photographs, and illustrations of each site provide excellent support for the archaeological architectural synthesis. Finally, the analysis compares the sacred structures before and after the disruption caused by the “Peoples of the Sea,” paying critical attention to the stratigraphic development as older (LBA) temples were altered after 1200 B.C.

Mierse next turns to explore the societal influences affecting the development of sacred structures. Chapters 4 through 6 analyze the evidence gathered from the archaeological remains. Mierse argues that despite the changes in population, no major architectural shifts occurred between the LBA and the
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