

IAN JOOSTEN 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/Boston: Brill, 2008). Pp. xii + 250. \$139.

These fifteen essays from the 2006 symposium in Strasbourg include: Moshe Bar-Asher, "Un groupe de mots en hébreu biblique et qumranique: étude sémantique" (pp. 1-13); Haim Dini, "Amoraic Hebrew in the Light of Ben Sira's Linguistic Innovations" (pp. 15-27); Mats Eskhult, "Some Aspects of the Verbal System in Qumran Hebrew" (pp. 29-46); Steven E. Fassberg, "The Infinitive Absolute as Finite Verb and Standard Literary Hebrew of the Second Temple Period" (pp. 47-60); Pierre Van Hecke, "Constituent Order in Existential Clauses" (pp. 61-78); Bo Isaksson, "Circumstantial Qualifiers in Qumran Hebrew: Reflections on Adjunct Expressions in the Manual of Discipline (1QS)" (pp. 79-91); Jan Joosten, "L'excédent massorétique du livre de Jérémie et l'hébreu post-classique" (pp. 93-108); André Lemaire, "Remarques sur le vocabulaire hébreu de l'enseignement et de l'étude à Qumrân et dans Ben Sira" (pp. 109-24); Takamitsu Muraoka, "The Morphosyntax of the Construct Phrase in Qumran Hebrew" (pp. 125-32); Wido van Peussen, "The Word חָלַח in Ben Sira" (pp. 133-48); Elisha Qimron, "The Type חָלַח in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls" (pp. 149-54); Jean-Sébastien Rey, "Quelques particularités linguistiques communes à 4QInstruction et à Ben Sira" (pp. 155-73); Stefan Schorch, "Spoken Hebrew of the late Second Temple Period according to Oral and Written Samaritan Tradition" (pp. 175-91); David Talshir and Zipora Talshir, "חָלַח בַּיָּד וַיִּשְׁלַח יָדוֹ (Ben Sira 20,4; 30,20): Meaning and Transmission" (pp. 193-232); Alexey (El'yahu) Yuditsky, "The Weak Consonants in the Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Hexapla Transliterations" (pp. 233-39).

The topics and length of treatment are quite varied; below I summarize each essay with brief comments on some of the more significant ones. Bar-Asher presents a lexical study of *hgg/hwg* with respect to the interpretation of 4Q374. Dini examines twelve (mostly morphological) innovations common to Ben Sira and Amoraic literature, concluding that they "suggest the type of development typical of a living language" (p. 24). Unfortunately, Dini nowhere describes what constitutes "typical" development in living languages.

Eskhult surveys the verbal system in the Qumran writings within the discourse framework of Robert E. Longacre. Some of the data presented are interesting (e.g., predominance of modal *yiqṭāl* versus modal (*wəyqṭāl* in halakic portions of CD; predilection for the final infinitive construction; and frequent use of *wəʿāz* to mark apodosis in 4QInstructions), but his semantic descriptions are not completely clear. He seems uncertain about the modal interpretation (following Joosten) of *wəqṭāl* ("*wəqṭāl* is more or less modal when projected into the future" [p. 32]) and *yiqṭāl* (its modality "*wəqṭāl* neutralizes the idea of ongoing activity, and in effect *yiqṭāl* mostly refers to the general present or the future" [p. 32]). His uncertainty seems evident in his description of Prov 7:13: "Her [the strange woman] actions are described by frequentive *wəqṭāl* forms—in order to stress the habitual character of her doings—followed by a continuative *wayyiqṭāl*" (p. 44). He misses that this passage is framed as an eyewitness account of a past event: "through my window I looked (*nīšqāpī*) and saw (*wāʿēre*) . . ." (vv. 6a-7b); thus, the *wayyiqṭāl* in v. 13 continues the past narrative. The *wəqṭāl* forms in this verse are better understood as constituting a temporal protasis-

apodosis construction that contributes to the picture of the strange woman as brazen: “when she got hold of him (then) she kissed him (*wēhehēziqā bō wēnāšqā lō*).” The following *qāta-wayyiqṭōl* *synagmā* then resumes the storyline in the usual way: “she emboldened her face and said to him . . . (*hā-ʿezā pānēhā wātō ʾmar lō*).”

Fassberg discusses the increased use of the infinitive absolute functioning as a finite verb following another verbal form in the Second Temple period writings in the Hebrew Bible. He concludes that, rather than reflect spoken Hebrew of the period, the increased use of the infinitive absolute “reflects archaizing on the part of the scribes” (p. 59). Van Hecke argues that the general tendency of word order in existential clauses with prepositional phrases in Biblical Hebrew is likewise valid for Qumran Hebrew; namely, if the prepositional phrase is nominal, it follows the noun phrase, whereas if it is pronominal, it precedes (p. 65). He explains that a variety of factors account for exceptions to this tendency: constituent length/complexity, semantics, and (mainly) the pragmatic functions of topic/focus. Isaksson examines the circumstantial use of the infinitive construct in Qumran Hebrew, comparing it with examples in Biblical Hebrew and cognate constructions in Arabic. He concludes that this is an “ancient Semitic” construction and not an innovation of Late Biblical Hebrew (p. 91).

Joosten argues that various features in Jeremiah show that it should be categorized as “postclassical.” This argument accords with the data in Fassberg’s essay, showing a predilection in Jeremiah for the infinitive absolute following finite forms, though Fassberg concludes that Jeremiah is a “transitional” book (p. 58). Lemaire examines roots related to teaching and studying in Qumran and Ben Sira and their development vis-à-vis Biblical Hebrew (LMD, YRH, ŠKL, BYN, DRŠ, HQR, BQŠ, HGH/Y, YSR, PŠR), concluding that the importance of these terms in the Qumran writings is reflective of the functions of the Qumran group. Muraoka presents a tentative taxonomy of semantics of the construct phrase in Qumran Hebrew.

Van Peursen examines the three occurrences of *ḥiyp* in Ben Sira (44:17; 46:12; 48:8) but reaches no definitive conclusion regarding its meaning. Qimron examines the split between short third- and second-person *wayyiqṭōl* forms of *lamed-yod* roots and long first-person forms. Although Biblical Hebrew does not support Gottlieb Bergsträsser’s contention that the long first-person form developed on the analogy of the first-person modal (cohortative), Qimron finds that the Qumran Hebrew and Samaritan Hebrew data do support such an argument. He deduces that the distinction between person forms of *wayyiqṭōl* was still intact in the Second Temple period. Rey examines several constructions common to Ben Sira and 4QInstruction (4Q415-418) but otherwise rare in Late Hebrew *ʿal ṭiqṭōl* versus *lōʿ ṭiqṭōl*, the use of *pn* and of *lmh*, and the use of suffixed pronouns to express reflexive).

Schorch argues that the features of Samaritan Hebrew that do not fit diachronic explanation point to the status of Samaritan Hebrew as a distinct Hebrew dialect. Talshir and Talshir examine Ben Sira 20:4 and 30:20, arguing that the hemistich common to both (*kn n ʾmm ln ʾm bww/h*) was complemented in two distinct ways to form the two verses: with *wyhw/h mbqš mydw* in 30:20 and *kn ʾwsh b ʾwms mšpy* in 20:4 (the latter hemistich they judge as unoriginal in 30:20). After establishing the texts, the authors discuss at length their interpretation. Finally, Yuditsky compares and contrasts the treatment of glides and gutturals in

the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hexapla transliterations, finding that their treatment of glides is similar, while they differ in their treatment of gutturals.

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

JUHA PAKKALA and MARTTI NISSINEN (eds.), *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 93; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008). Pp. [x] + ii + 752. Paper €51.30.

The essays were to be a festschrift for Veijola’s sixtieth birthday, but they became instead a memorial volume because of his sudden death in August 2005. Walter Dietrich’s address at the memorial prefaces the collection: “To Know and Still Believe: The Scholarly Work of Timo Veijola” (pp. 1-8). The remaining thirty-eight essays are divided into four groups representing major areas of Veijola’s research and writing.

The first set of essays, “On Deuteronomy and Deuteronomism,” includes Georg Braulik, “Deuteronomium 4 and das gegessene Kalb: Zum Geschichtsgelalt paränetischer Rede” (pp. 11-26); Thomas Römer, “Moses, the Only Mediator? The Question of the Origin of the Two Decalogues” (pp. 27-41); Mika Aspinen, “Getting Sharper and Sharper: Comparing Deuteronomy 12-13 and 16:18-17:13” (pp. 42-61); Bernard M. Levinson, “Dusollst nichts hinzufügen und nichts wegnehmen” (Dtn 13:1): Rechtsformen und Hermeneutik in der Hebräischen Bibel” (pp. 62-94); Erik Aurelius, “Zur Entstehung von Josua 23-24” (pp. 95-114); Annti Laato, “Beloved and Loved: Despised and Rejected: Some Reflections on the Death of Josiah” (pp. 115-28); Christoph Levin, “Die Frömmigkeit der Könige von Israel und Juda,” (pp. 129-68); Walter Dietrich, “Vielität und Einheit im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk” (pp. 169-83); Pekka Särkiö, “Die fremden Frauen in der Familie Judas” (pp. 184-200); Winfried Thiel, “Das ‘Werk der Hände’” (pp. 201-23); Bob Becking, “Nehemiah as a Mosaic Heir: Nehemiah 13 as an Appropriation of Deuteronomy 7” (pp. 224-37); Karl William Weyde, “Ezra’s Penitential Prayer: Priestly Vocabulary and Concepts in Ezra 9” (pp. 238-50); Juha Pakkala, “The Nomistic Roots of Judaism” (pp. 251-68). The second grouping, “On Prophecy, Poetry, and Wisdom,” includes Trygve N. D. Mettinger, “Cui Bono? The Prophecy of Nathan (2 Sam 7) as a Piece of Political Rhetoric” (pp. 271-99); Hans M. Barstad, “Some Remarks on Prophets and Prophecy in ‘The Deuteronomistic History’” (pp. 300-315); Elise K. Holt, “Jeremiah’s Temple Sermon Revisited: Jeremiah 7 and 26 and the Quest for a Deuteronomistic Redactor of the Book of Jeremiah” (pp. 316-36); Martti Nissinen, “Das Problem der Prophetenschüler” (pp. 337-53); Annei Aejmelaeus, “Hannah’s Psalm: Text, Composition, and Redaction” (pp. 354-76); Oswald Loretz, “Die Befreiung der *nps*’ Seele, Totenseele des Gerechten aus der Scheel nach Psalm 49:16” (pp. 377-93); Otto Kaiser, “Der Verborgene und die Offenbare Gott bei Jesus Sirach” (pp. 394-412); Pancratius Beenjens, “Ben Sira and the Book of Deuteronomy” (pp. 413-33); Marko Marttila, “Die Propheten Israels in Ben Siras ‘Lob der Vater’” (pp. 434-50); Anssi Voitia, “For Those Who Love Learning: How the Reader Is Persuaded to Study the Book of Ben Sira as a Translation” (pp. 451-60). The third set of essays, “On Early Judaism and Christianity,” includes Tapani Harvi-