very important (pp. 8-9). Here L. sets forth the chronology of Mesopotamia, Egypt, biblical events, Israel, Judah, Persia, the Gentile rulers, and Jesus and the early church. I found myself returning to these pages as I perused the different segments of the atlas. This chronological introduction often gives more detail than is found in other specific segments of the work. For example, the chronology of the kings of Israel and Judah is more detailed on p. 9 than it is later on in the publication.

The volume contains a very good colored map entitled “Israel in Old and New Testament Times” (pp. 10-11), but I did not find myself returning to this map frequently, since smaller and more specific maps are found on the pages that treat various topics, people, and/or events.

What I especially like about L.’s work is the fact that he generally treats a specific topic (e.g., “United Israelite Monarchy”) on facing pages. Thus, it is not necessary to turn pages to consult the maps, photos, biblical references, and sometimes site reconstructions that are essential elements of the topic being treated. Likewise, the biblical references are, for the most part, grouped together in a box labeled “Key” on one of the two pages; with a Bible at one’s elbow, it is easy to check them. Thus, the atlas is very user-friendly.

Lawrence gives two dates for Abraham, Joseph, Moses, the conquest of Canaan, and the period of the judges. The rationale behind these dates is whether the beginning of the exodus of the Hebrews from Egypt took place in 1447 or around 1270 B.C.E. L. refers to these two dates as an “earlier” and “a later placement.” Thus, the giving of the law and the conquest of Canaan could be dated either to the fifteenth or thirteenth century B.C.E.; the period of the judges could be located approximately either in 1380–1050 or in 1200–1050 B.C.E. Both “placements” are from a maximalist rather than a minimalist approach to biblical history.

Beginning with the treatment of the Philistines, L. no longer uses two “placements.” He situates them in the twelfth to eleventh centuries B.C.E. Although the map on p. 60 traces the Philistines’ journey by sea to Egypt and then on to Palestine, there are no indications of their land routes from their homeland to their newly found land.

There is very little to find fault with in L.’s work, even if one does not accept his dating(s) of the ancestors, the exodus, Daniel, and so on. Two oddities in the volume, however, are the location of the capital of the Edomites at Sela/Petra (pp. 80-81) and the orientation of the map entitled “Jerusalem in New Testament Times” (p. 143).

The printing and illustrations are of high quality throughout. The atlas may be recommended as a good teaching tool and as a companion for Bible reading and study. Moreover, it is affordable!

Burton MacDonald, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, NS B2G 2W5, Canada


Malessa’s study of verbal valency (his dissertation, written at Leiden University and directed by Takamitsu Muraoka) fills a significant gap in research on Hebrew verbs, which has long concentrated on issues of tense-aspect-modality and word order. In the first chap-
The problem of alternations among patterns of valency in Biblical Hebrew (pp. 1-4) is introduced by M. Dependency theory, which forms the framework of M.'s investigation (pp. 4-6), and valency theory, using the notions of quantitative (number of complements), qualitative (form of complements), and selectional (semantic role of complements) valency (pp. 7-8). The last chapter summarizes the most important results from the study and makes apparent M.'s unifying goal for his study: to demonstrate that there are syntactic, semantic, and historical factors that may explain, to one degree or another, the variations among valency patterns discussed in the book (pp. 217-19). The intervening chapters, standing somewhat independent of each other, focus on alternations among various valency-related patterns: direct objects unmarked or marked by 'et (chap. 2), alternation between direct object and objects marked by the preposition b with certain verbs (chap. 3), unmarked and marked (by ky or 'šr) complement clauses following the verbs of perception r'h and šm (chap. 4), infinitival clauses unmarked and marked with the preposition l (chap. 5), and several variations among prepositions marking (l, l, 'r, 'm) complements of verbs of speaking (chap. 6).

In chap. 2, M. dismisses certain factors that have been claimed to explain the alternation of unmarked and marked (with 'et) direct objects, such as fronting of the object and the presence or absence of an overt subject. Instead, he concludes that several factors—syntactic, semantic, and historical—help explain the use of the direct object marker: syntactically, objects are more frequently marked when they are separated from the verb by other elements; semantically, persons and other animate objects show a higher tendency to be marked than inanimate objects; historically, there is the decline in the use of the direct object marker in Biblical Hebrew as it is gradually replaced in certain environments by the preposition l, possibly under the influence of Aramaic.

In chap. 3, M. explains the alternation with certain verbs (qal of bnh, qr'; 'šh, hrg, prš, 'kl, and nš; and hiphil of nkš) between direct object complements and complements marked by the preposition b as semantically motivated with respect to the affectedness of the complement and the aspect of the verb: expressions with the preposition b (1) tend to show a lower degree of transitivity or affectedness than expressions with direct objects, and (2) tend to be durativ (i.e., activity) versus graduell-termativ (i.e., accomplishment) with direct objects. M. also finds with certain verbs (particularly verbs of observation, verba sentendi) that the construction with the preposition b also indicates intentionality of the subject.

In chap. 4, M. shows a correlation between the "syntactic integration" and the "semantic bond" of complements of verbs of perception (r'h, šm). Syntactically, complements introduced by whnh are the least integrated syntactically, while direct-object complements are the most integrated; in between these two lie clauses marked with a complementing element (ky, 'šr). Semantically, the more closely integrated that a complement clause is, the more immediate the events being described are to the speaker, either temporally or spatially.

In chap. 5, M. interacts with Ernst Jenni’s discussion ("Vollverb und Hilfsverb mit Infinitiv-Ergänzung im Hebräischen," Zeitschrift für Althebraistik 11 [1998] 50-67) of the alternation of infinitive complements with and without the preposition l. M. concludes that there is no semantic basis to this alternation, but that it may only be explained as dialectic, stylistic, and/or historical (the infinitive is always marked by l in the later literature).

In chap. 6, M. discusses alternations among the markings of the addressees that fol-
low verbs of speaking. Here again, his conclusions involve syntax, semantics, and historical factors. Syntactically, he finds that in the earlier literature the preposition 'l (versus l) more frequently marks the addressee following 'mr when there are intervening words between the addressee and the verb. Semantically, dbr (piel) followed by the preposition 'l is more oriented to the content of the speech, whereas when followed by the preposition 'r the expression is more oriented to the speaking event itself. In the latter case, the 'r has tended to be replaced in later Hebrew by 'm. M. further notes that qr alternates between marking the addressee with the preposition 'l when summoning the addressee to the speaker, and the preposition 'r for calling at a distance.

Malesa’s study is open to several criticisms. First, he presumes the traditional scheme for dating the Hebrew language and the biblical text (Early, Standard, and Late). Since that scheme is being increasingly questioned, it may no longer be simply presumed as the basis for the sort of observations M. makes on the historical development of valency patterns. Second, the import of M.’s semantic conclusions could have been made clearer if he had included translations of the Hebrew according to his analyses. Finally, the tentative nature of many of M.’s conclusions means that his study is a less substantial contribution to valency studies and more illustrative of the complexity of many linguistic patterns in Biblical Hebrew. This contribution, however, should not be underestimated in a field where scholars are often given to championing a single parameter as a panacea for explaining a multitude of linguistic patterns in the biblical text.

John A. Cook, Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, KY 40390


In this revision of the author’s dissertation (University of Durham, 2002, directed by Stuart Weeks), Min argues for Levitical authorship of Ezra-Nehemiah (E-N). Carefully argued, this monograph reexamines the question of authorship divorced from a presupposition of E-N’s connection to 1–2 Chronicles.

The book is divided into three parts (each consisting of two chapters): the social identity of the author, the literary depiction of the Levites not only in the Hebrew Bible and E-N but also in the historical context of the authorship.

In part 1, M. establishes the unity and independence of E-N, admitting that these questions are foundational for the rest of the study. As a result, the success of the monograph depends on the success of this first chapter. I am more convinced by his argument for separating E-N from Chronicles than by the case he makes for the work’s internal unity. In the second chapter, M. turns to the question of the social location of the author. In the earlier days of scholarship, the author was presumed to be the Chronicler. Only H. G. M. Williamson addressed the question of the authorship of a separate E-N, whom he concluded was a priest. M. accepts the priestly concerns of the text but seeks clearer specification of the priestly group to which the author belongs.

Part 2 attempts to answer that question. First, M. examines the difference between priests and Levites in texts outside of E-N. His conclusions are not radical, although they
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