Steven E. Fassberg, Moshe Bar-Asher, and Ruth A. Clements, eds. *Hebrew in the Second Temple Period: The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of Other Contemporary Sources*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 108. Brill, Leiden, 2013. €112.00 hardback. xi + 331 pp. ISBN: 978-90-04-25478-7.

This volume includes the papers presented at the Fifth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira, held in Jerusalem in December 2008. The first such symposium was convened by Takamitsu Muraoka in Leiden in 1995; subsequent gatherings were held in 1997 (Leiden), 1999 (Beersheva), 2006 (Strasbourg); and in each case the proceedings volume followed. For the fifth such symposium, not only did the participants gather in Jerusalem, a natural home for studies of this sort, but the conference was held jointly as the Twelfth Orion Symposium

for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature. As indicated above, the results of that conference are presented in the volume under review here. As typically occurs in reviews of this type, I will focus on those essays which speak to my own interests, with no slight intended to the authors of the other articles in this collection.

Moshe Bar-Asher, 'Mistaken Repetitions or Double Readings' (pp. 15-28), tackles the problem of cases such as ויהושע ויושׁע in CD (A) 5:4. He is quite correct that the scribe deleted words in other places (including in the preceding line: נפתח {○○פנ}); hence, the fact that he did not so in this and other instances suggests that 'the copyist intentionally provided the two alternative versions, *juxtaposing them*' (p. 20). In this particular case, the 'two equally valid variants' (p. 27) represent first the biblical orthography and then the contemporary pronunciation. Note, by the way, that this essay also now appears in the author's own collected studies volume: Moshe Bar-Asher, *Studies in Classical Hebrew* (ed. Aaron Koller; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014), pp. 153-164.

Haim Dihi, 'Linguistic Innovations in Ben Sira Manuscript F' (pp. 29-45), treats several such issues from a single verse, Sir. 31:31. While valuable data are presented for the issues treated, I must say that the

author could have been clearer regarding his conclusions. For example, he notes that the noun חדוה occurs only here and in two Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH) texts (Neh. 8:10, 1 Chr. 16:27), that it is unattested both in Qumran Hebrew (QH) and in Tannaitic Hebrew (TH), and that it occurs widely across Aramaic dialects. Lacking, however, is a statement that the Hebrew word is a clear borrowing from Aramaic, whence it found its way into literary Hebrew of the 5th-2nd centuries B.C.E. But such has always been known or assumed; see, e.g., BDB, p. 292. Similarly, even after several readings of the section on the root ק-מ-ע ‘press, oppress, cause pain’, I still am unclear what the author opines, though I believe that he inclines to consider this verb to be a native Hebrew vocable and not a borrowing from Aramaic. The following may be a quibble, but I also found it annoying to read חדווה (with double *waw*) constantly, within the author’s discussion (not when citing the verse, though). While Modern Hebrew frequently uses double *waw* to mark the consonant /w/, all the dictionaries I consulted write חדוה in this instance.

    Mats Eskhult, ‘Relative *ha*-: A Late Biblical Hebrew Phenomenon?’ (pp. 47-55), constitutes a fine essay on the issue of the particle -ה before a suffix-conjugation verb, e.g., Ezra 8:25 תְּרוּמַת בֵּית־אֱלֹהֵינוּ הַהֵרִימוֹ ‘the

elevation-offering for the house of our God which they had offered'. Eight of the nine examples occur in LBH; the sole outlier is Josh. 10:24. Eskhult identifies an additional four examples in Ezra and Chronicles via textual emendation, e.g., 2 Chr. 15:11 מִן־הַשָּׁלָל [הַ]הֵבִיאוּ 'from the spoil [which] they had brought', though one will be less sanguine about these passages. Yet another eleven cases occur in which the consonantal form of the suffix-conjugation is indistinguishable from the participle form, e.g., Ruth 2:6 נַעֲרָה מוֹאֲבִיָּה הִיא הַשָּׁבָה עִם־נָעֳמִי 'she is a Moabite maiden, who returned with Naomi' (one expects הַשָּׁבָה); these are scattered throughout the Bible, in Genesis, Kings, Isaiah, Job, Ruth, and Daniel. Eskhult explains this feature as due to Aramaic influence, for in Aramaic the particle די occurs with both verbal forms, e.g., 1Q20 17:12 די פנה לדרומא 'which faces the south' (with participle), 1Q20 21:3 די יהב לי 'which he gave me' (with suffix-conjugation). The overlay of the two usages in Aramaic led to Hebrew authors using the same particle, in this case -ה, before both verbal forms. The confusion of expressions even penetrated the Masorah, as demonstrated by the last set of instances noted above.

One of the most important and far-reaching articles in this volume is Steven E. Fassberg, 'Shifts in Word Order in the Hebrew of the Second

Temple Period' (pp. 57-71). Six individual shifts are discussed, among

them: a) VS > SV; b) modifier (title) + head noun (proper noun) > head

noun + modifier, e.g., MT Isa. 37:1 חזקיהו המלך המלך > 1QIsaᵃ חזקיה המלך; and

c) modifier (weight/measure) + head noun (material) > head noun +

modifier (in which category the author apparently includes numeral +

item counted > item counted + numeral), e.g., 2 Kgs 5:23 ככרים כסף >

3Q15 (Copper Scroll) 7:16, 8:7, 12:1 זהב ככרין; 1 Kgs 7:16 חמש אמות > 2

Chr. 3:15 אמות חמש. All of these translocations in LBH have been observed

previously by scholars, with many of them attributed to Aramaic influence

– though no one until now has offered a single statement to account for

them all as part of a single complex. Fassberg elegantly proposes that all

six shifts in word order are due to a change from clause-initial focus,

predominant in Standard Biblical Hebrew (SBH), to "end-focus, in which

contextually known elements precede new ones, i.e., new information

becomes postponed and moves toward the end of the clause" (pp. 69-70).

One marvels at the way in which Jan Joosten continues to identify

subtle syntactic differences distinguishing SBH and LBH. The present

essay, 'Imperative Clauses Containing a Temporal Phrase and the Study of

Diachronic Syntax in Ancient Hebrew' (pp. 131-117), discusses the shift of

imperative + temporal phrase > temporal phrase + imperative, e.g., 1

Kgs 12:12 שובו אלי ביום השלישי 'come-again to me on the third day' > 2 Chr.

20:16 מחר רדו עליהם 'tomorrow go-down against them'. In Genesis through

Kings, the ratio of the former sequence to the latter is 28:1 (the sole

outlier, Num. 14:25, is treated in an appendix); while in LBH and Early

Post-Biblical Hebrew (Tobit, Ben Sira, DSS, etc.), the ratio is 8:17. Joosten

posits that this translocation is related to the breakdown in the classical

Hebrew verbal system: in SBH volitives appear in clause-initial position,

e.g., 1 Sam. 13:3 ישמעו העברים 'let the Hebrews hear!' (contrast Deut. 17:13

וכל־העם ישמעו 'all the people will hear'); whereas in LBH volitives may

appear in second or even in third position.

Noam Mizrahi, 'Aspects of Poetic Stylization in Second Temple

Hebrew: A Linguistic Comparison of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* with

Ancient *Piyyuṭ*' (pp. 147-163), reminds the reader of how the scholar of

ancient Hebrew must retain the broadest possible horizons when

approaching the literary remains. This essay focuses on masculine singular

by-forms of well-known feminine singular nouns, e.g., 4Q403 1 i 37 בין

'understanding' (cp. standard בינה), a form which occurs again in a single

(apparently anonymous) *piyyuṭ* for Sukkot. Mizrahi considers a historical

6

linkage between the Hebrew of the *Songs* and that of the *piyyuṭim* (PH), judiciously weighs the counter-arguments, and then in the end concludes that "the similarities between them are therefore the result of comparable stylistic motivations and aesthetic principles that were at work in shaping the linguistic profile of the *Songs* on the one hand and of PH on the other" (p. 161).

The present reviewer offers the following additional contribution to the subject. Mizrahi notes 4Q405 32 3 תרום 'offering' (cp. standard תרומה), to which he compares תמור '(in) exchange (for)' (cp. standard תמורה) in a poem by Yannai and in Sir. 3:14, 4:10 (both MS A I recto). Given the very fragmentary nature of 4Q405 32 (I have consulted the photograph), along with the difficulty in distinguishing *waw* and *yod* in this and other Qumran manuscripts, caution is advised. But if the reading is correct and one wishes to follow this path, one also should note Hos. 13:2 כתבונם 'by their skill' (cp. standard תבונה).

Moshe Morgenstern, 'The Literary Use of Biblical Language in the Works of the Tannaim' (pp. 165-179), reminds us "that like the previous levels of Hebrew, so Tannaitic Hebrew is apt to borrow words and expressions from the older levels of the Hebrew language" (p. 178). A

paradigm example is the use of the synonyms עברה and זעם in two passages of the Mekhilta (Pisḥa 7 and Pisḥa 11), and nowhere else within the Tannaitic corpus. The author concludes, "a dictionary of Tannaitic Hebrew [still a major desideratum! – G.A.R.] should aim to mark such lexemes as borrowings from Biblical Hebrew" (p. 179).

Elisha Qimron, "The Third Person Masculine Plural Pronoun and Pronominal Suffix in Early Hebrew" (pp. 181-188), rightly notes that the various forms of these morphemes have never been satisfactorily explained. The article surveys both the data and the different scholarly opinions, and then proposes a novel explanation (with a nod to an earlier suggestion by Hanoch Yalon). To Qimron's mind, the form הם in the Bible and in the DSS "must be a defective spelling" of המה (also well-attested in BH and QH), and the suffix form ם- "is almost always a defective spelling" of מה-, as in Samaritan Hebrew (p. 182). The author defends this position by noting that pronominal elements are commonly written *defectiva* in the Bible and elsewhere, e.g., ספרך 'your book', שמרת 'you guarded', and the numerous instances of תקטלן pronounced with final *-a* (38x in the Bible, 28 of which are found in the Torah). In addition, he observes the writing of עת 'now' (=עַתָּה [pausal עָתָּה]) in Hebrew inscriptions. For reasons which

cannot be expounded upon here (due to space concerns), I for one find Qimron's proposal difficult to accept. To be sure, his reconstruction clearly does not rise to the level of 'proven' – though I appreciate the learning and the ingenuity reflected in this essay.

The amount of data which Emanuel Tov continues to cull from his ongoing study of scribal practices at Qumran is illustrated once again in the essay "Scribal Features of Two Qumran Scrolls" (pp. 241-258). Tov treats 1QIsaᵃ, written by two scribes and 1QH, written by three. The former manuscript divides as follows: Scribe A wrote cols. 1-27 (Isaiah 1-33), while Scribe B wrote cols. 28-54 (Isaiah 34-66). The contrast between the two is easily visible, for example: a) the former wrote כי 122x and כיא 37x, while the latter wrote כי 2x and כיא 168x; and b) the former wrote הוא 66x and הואה 0x, while the latter wrote הוא 2x and הואה 29x. Similar statistics bear out the distinctions between the three individuals responsible for 1QH. Tov further pays close attention to the dozens of corrections which appear in these documents (as well as in the Qumran corpus as a whole), especially the inclusion of a *he* after the final *mem* of a pronominal suffix, e.g., 1QIsaᵃ col. 28, line 8 (Isa. 34:7) ארצמה 'their land'. "Since the corrections were made in one direction only, namely towards

the extremely full spelling of the Qumran scribal practice (rather than the reverse), this procedure further strengthens, in my view, the assumption of a Qumran scribal practice" (p. 257).

As indicated at the outset, space does not allow me to comment on the other many fine essays in this excellent volume, so I simply list here their authors: Gary A. Anderson, Gregor Geiger, Pierre Van Hecke, Avi Hurvitz, Reinhard G. Kratz, Jean-Sébastien Rey, Ursula Schattner-Reiser, David Talshir, Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky, Francesco Zanella, and Tamar Zewi. Three indices (Words and Phrases; Subjects; Ancient Texts) enhance the usefulness of this volume.

We look forward to future volumes in the series, which will present the results of the latest two colloquia (Leuven, 2011; Strasbourg, 2014 – mild disclaimer: the present reviewer participated in both) to the wider public.

GARY A. RENDSBURG
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY