

the eldest Solomon's son, born two or three years after the latter's accession to the throne at the age of twelve, as stated in III Kings 2:12 and in the *Seder Olam Rabba* 14, one may date the birth of Solomon *ca.* 959/8 B.C., about two years after the conquest of Jerusalem by David, if we rely on the historical background hidden behind the account of II Samuel 11:2-12:23 (cf. E. Lipiński, *Itineraria Phoenicia*, Leuven 2004, pp. 499–500). David's reign in Jerusalem started then *ca.* 961/0 B.C. after a long career of arms in the service of King Saul and of the Philistines, and a shorter reign at Hebron. The unique Iron Age stratum at Khirbet Qeiyafa is certainly somewhat older and must go back to the time of King Saul, as indicated also by the inscription on ostrakon, at least if we follow the decipherment and the quite convincing interpretation of É. Puech.

The material culture of Khirbet Qeiyafa should then be regarded as belonging to the North-Israelite tribe of Benjamin, a member of which was precisely King Saul. His power centre was Gibe'a of Benjamin, usually identified with Tell al-Fūl, some 30 km. north-east of Khirbet Qeiyafa. Since the first king of Israel was a Benjaminite, the tribe of Benjamin must have been an important one at that time, with a larger territory than the one attributed to the Benjaminites in later written sources. Moreover, the association of Khirbet Qeiyafa with an intermediate Iron I-II North-Israelite territorial formation is acceptable also from an archaeological view point, as shown by a recent study of I. Finkelstein and A. Fantalkin, *Khirbet Qeiyafa: An Unsensational Archaeological and Historical Interpretation*, "Tel Aviv" 39 (2012), pp. 38–63, in particular pp. 52–55.

Leaving this important historical and archaeological question aside, one should stress the high quality of the presentation of the site of Khirbet Qeiyafa and of the material discovered there in the volume under review. The lavish illustrations provided by the 65 splendid colour plates and the maps, plans, drawings of objects, synoptic tables of data constitute an important source of information also for scholars not used to read books in *'ivrit*.

Edward Lipiński

Eulàlia Vernet i Pons, *Origen etimològic dels verbs làmed-he de l'hebreu masorètic. Un estudi sobre la formació de les arrels verbals en semític* (Publicacions de la Societat Catalana d'Estudis Hebraics 2), Barcelona 2011, 404 pp.

The book of Mrs. Vernet i Pons is based on her doctoral dissertation directed by Prof. Gregorio del Olmo Lete and presented at Barcelona University. It is an etymological study of the verbs having *h* as third radical in Masoretic Hebrew. As well known, the third consonant of this group of verbs can etymologically correspond to *w* or to *y*, and several verbs in question are semantically related to verbs *secundae geminatae*, i.e. with the second radical consonant duplicated. The largest and most important chapter

of the book (chapt. 6) examines the verbs in question one by one, in alphabetical order (pp. 131–298). The genuine *tertiaie hē* verbs, like *gbh*, “to be high”, and *tmh*, “to be amazed”, are not examined in this chapter, but they are presented in the next one, on pp. 299–300. The English version of Gesenius’ dictionary and the third edition of Köhler’s and Baumgartner’s lexicon served as basis for this accurate analysis, which is conducted on the synchronic level of the Masoretic text, thus not in a diachronic perspective.

The two dictionaries used by the Author are based indiscriminately on texts dating from a very long period of almost one thousand years. These texts were written originally in at least three different dialects: the Judaeen or Jerusalemite, the Israelite, and the Transjordanian dialect or language of the Book of Job. Besides, Aramaic influenced the Hebrew language at least from the mid-first millennium B.C. on. All this has a bearing on research. For instance, the verb *mhh* in Numb. 34, 11 means “to strike” (p. 219) and offers a variant spelling of *mḥ*’, borrowed from Aramaic. In its turn, Aramaic *mḥ*’ is a phonetic variant of *mḥš* (Hebrew *mḥs*), resulting from the change /š/ > /ḡ/ (*mḥq*) of the velarized emphatic consonant and from the subsequent dissimulation of the fricative pharyngeal *ḥ* and velar *ḡ*. The dictionaries based on Masoretic Hebrew do not reflect the whole development and variety of the dialects involved. Their first aim is to present the language of the Hebrew Bible as read and understood *ca.* 1000 A.D. in the Karaite school of Ben-Asher at Tiberias.

Mrs. Vernet i Pons is aware of the apparently similar work published in 1970 by Meir Fraenkel, *Zur Theorie der Lamed-He Stämme. Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur semitischen-indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Jerusalem 1970). She considers it to be unacceptable from the scientific point of view and states at the outset that she will not discuss Fraenkel’s etymological reconstructions (p. 21). Rejecting his quasi-Nostratic method, she first presents the Afro-Asiatic or Hamito-Semitic language family, following Igor Diakonoff’s synthesis, as published in 1988 in *Afrasian Languages* (pp. 23–33). The hypothesis of the original homeland of the Semitic language family in North Africa is indeed the most rational one, but it cannot be clearly proposed without explaining the emigration of entire populations. Now, the Sahara was becoming increasingly dry in the Late Neolithic period, *ca.* 3,800–3,000 B.C., and this must have been the reason why Semites migrated then to other areas. Additional data are provided by the extension of the cattle breeding, which started *ca.* 8,000 B.C. in the Western Desert of Egypt, spread in the following centuries, and reached Ethiopia *ca.* 3,000–2,500. These facts should have been briefly mentioned on pp. 24–25 to explain the North-African hypothesis of the Semitic origins.

Another question concerns the emphatic consonants, regarded by the Author as originally glottalized. (pp. 27–28). The alleged Proto-Semitic glottalization of the emphatic consonants seems to be based on the present-day situation in the spoken languages. Pharyngealization and velarization are indeed rare, but this results from the cross-linguistical tendency to ease articulation. In this case, we have a concrete example in the pronunciation of glottalized *k*’ in Bilin, a Cushitic language spoken in Eritrea, around Keren. This *k*’ seems to be a comparatively recent realization of older

uvular *q*, attested in the earliest recorded Bilin material from the 18th century and still occurring in present-day neighbouring Awngi. The correspondence between an Egyptian emphatic and Semitic *'ayin* indicates that glottalization is a secondary phenomenon. In fact, Egyptian *ndm*, “pleasant”, *pśd*, “nine”, *śdm*, “to listen”, are rightly identified by O. Rössler with Semitic *na'im* “pleasant”, *tš* “nine”, and *šm'* with metathesis, “to listen”. In fact, *d* corresponds also to a Semitic emphatic consonant, i.e. a velarized one, not yet glottalized. The /' of *n'm*, *tš*, and *šm'* signifies that the Proto-Semitic velarization of the fricative consonant has supplanted the basic character of the original phoneme. Glottalization parallels the absence of fricative pharyngeals in a large part of the Ethiopian languages, but J. Crass assumes at present that this is an areal feature and that fricative pharyngeals can be reconstructed for both Ethio-Semitic and Cushitic (*Proceedings of the XIVth International Congress of Ethiopian Studies*, Addis Ababa 2002, Vol. III, pp. 1679–1691).

The second chapter deals with the structure of the Semitic root, bi-consonantal or three-consonantal, with a particular attention to its vocalic component (pp. 35–47). This is undoubtedly an important element, because no living language uses roots without vowels. The traditional approach to Hebrew and to other Semitic languages unfortunately projects the consonantal script into the linguistic realm. The third chapter discusses the question of the incompatibility of certain phonemes in constituting a viable root (pp. 49–60). A historical and morphological description of verbal and nominal roots is the topic of the next chapter (pp. 61–90), which prepares the central theme of the work. Verbal apophony is discussed in a separate chapter (pp. 91–130), where Mrs. Vernet i Pons presents and discusses the various possibilities regarding qualitative change and length. An aspect of these questions, usually neglected in Semitic studies, is the stress accent, which is phonemic in Hebrew and in other Semitic languages. This problem is not examined.

The discussion of the role of vowels in the Ugaritic verbal system (pp. 108–113) assumes with most Ugaritologists that there was only one prefix conjugation in the indicative of each stem. Instead, the verbal roots with initial *'aleph* show that there were two forms, like in Akkadian: a perfective or preterite **yīqtul* and an imperfective or present **yiqáttal*, as considered already in 1932 by Hans Bauer and convincingly argued in 1938 by Albrecht Goetze (JAOS 58 [1938], pp. 266–309), who postulated the existence of two prefixed verbal forms: *yīqtul* (perfective) and *yiqáttal* (imperfective). Their existence can be recognized only in verbs with the first radical consonant *'aleph*, because *ʾ* is used also when there is no following vowel, like in *yīqtul* forms, while *á* indicates a *yiqáttal*. We thus find *š'rh l'ikl 'šrm*, “the birds have not eaten its flesh” (KTU 1.6, II, 35–36), but *yákal ktr wḥss*, “Kushar-wa-Hasis will eat” (KTU 1.4, V, 41, a phrase announcing the next episode). In the first case, we have the feminine plural **ta'kulā* of the perfective and in the second case, the singular **ya'akkal* of the imperfective (> [yakkal]). Examples with the verb *'hd* are given in the reviewer's *Semitic Languages* §38.6 and in “Studia Judaica” 11 (2008), p. 303. The imperfective form is attested also in syllabic cuneiform script as *i-le-qa-aš-šu-nu-ti* (PRU III, p. 5, RS 15.14, lines 16 and 25), “he will take them”. The normal Middle Babylonian form would have been

ilaqqē-šunūti, while this spelling reflects Ugaritic **yileqqah* with a vowel change before the geminated emphatic *q*. One could also refer to fairly contemporaneous imperfectives from Emar which are influenced by the local idiom, e.g. *e-e-zi-ib-ka l'e'ezbibkal*, “I shall dismiss you” (Emar VI, 262, 21), instead of usual Middle Babylonian *ezbibka*. However, we cannot be sure that the lengthening pattern was in Ugaritic /C:/, thus *yiqáttal*. One could surmise that it was /:C/ like in Modern South Arabian, thus *yiqáttal*, but the vowel *e* of *i-le-qa-aš-šu-nu-ti* does not favour this hypothesis. The Ugaritic prefix conjugation thus seems to parallel the Akkadian *iprus* and *iparras* forms. In the reviewer’s opinion, the whole discussion of the subject in Ugaritic should thus be based on contemporary Akkadian and distinguish three verbal classes with a radical vowel *a*, *i* or *u*, like in Akkadian and in Classical Arabic.

Chapter 7 (pp. 299–336) offers an evaluation of the results of the etymological study of the verbs *tertiaie infirmae* in chapter 6. Mrs. Vernet i Pons distinguishes verbs with a Proto-Semitic or with an Afro-Asiatic pedigree. This distinction, based on the analyses of chapt. 6, is made for the verbal roots as well as for the denominative verbs. The reviewer would be hesitant in several cases of verbs with a supposed Afro-Asiatic background, often assumed on the basis of Chr. Ehret’s publications or of Orel’s and Stolbova’s *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary* (Leiden 1995). It is a risky procedure, as seen in the case of *nhh*, “to lament” (pp. 226–227). First, “to rest” and “to confess” are completely different notions. Then, if the radical consonants are *nhw*, the final *w* must result from a spirantized *b*. This is shown by Akkadian *nubbû*, “to lament, to mourn”, and by Libyco-Berber *nby*, “to lament”, attested in several inscriptions from the Roman period or earlier (*Mémorial Werner Vycichl. Articles de linguistique berbère*, Paris 2002, pp. 294–295). Both *nubbû* and *nby* lack the *h*, that appears in Egyptian *nhp(î)*, “to lament”, also in Coptic, but with an unvoiced *p* instead of *b*. The entire root seems to be *nhb/py* and requires a further explanation. Considering the phonotactic principle /:C/ = /C:/ and the geminated *b* of *nubbû*, the *h* can result from a long *ā* like in Abrām > Abraham. The original root would then be *na:by* or *nab:y*. The different labials *b/p* create no problem, since the distinction of voiced and unvoiced consonants was apparently non-phonemic in Proto-Afro-Asiatic.

The conclusion summarizing the results of the research (pp. 337–351) is followed by a table with transliterations of the Afro-Asiatic, Semitic, and Hebrew consonants, presented both in the usual transcription of the Semitists and in the phonetic alphabet, with some explanations (pp. 353–354). A large bibliography is collected on pp. 355–400. The bibliographical information is sometimes incomplete, lacking e.g. the title of the series. The usual abbreviation of the title of some journals is explained incorrectly, for instance *Orientalische Literaturzeitung* instead of *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*. An unusual practice consists sometimes in indicating in the bibliography only the pages related to the Author’s subject instead of giving the full reference.

In the reviewer’s opinion, the Author should be praised for her understanding and presenting of Semitic grammatical questions. A number of scholars interested in the subject would have probably preferred to read this book in a congress language, best in

English. However, the presentation is very clear, all the forms discussed are given either in good transcription or in Hebrew characters, and the work can thus be very useful also for readers not acquainted with Catalan.

Edward Lipiński

Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic* (Ancient Near Eastern Studies. Supplement 38), Peeters, Leuven-Paris-Walpole MA, 2011, XLV+285 pp.

The grammar under review, written by Takamitsu Muraoka, emeritus professor of Leiden University, appeared almost twenty years after the publication of *Studies in Qumran Aramaic* in the same series of Melbourne University (Abr-Nahrain. Supplement 3, Leuven 1992). The present work is conceived as a reference grammar, divided in four parts: phonology, morphology, morphosyntax, and syntax. The detailed table of contents (pp. VII–XI), the preface and the introduction (pp. XXIII–XXIX) are followed by a list of abbreviations and a bibliography (pp. XXXI–XLV).

Part I deals then with phonology (pp. 3–34), Part II with morphology of pronouns (pp. 37–51), nouns and adjectives (pp. 51–81), prepositions (pp. 81–84), numerals (pp. 84–90), adverbs (pp. 91–93), conjunctions and other particles (pp. 93–96), verbs (pp. 97–144). Part III considers morphosyntax examining the use of pronouns (pp. 147–155), of nouns and adjectives (pp. 156–163), and of verbs (pp. 164–181). Part IV deals with the syntax of expanded nominal phrases (pp. 185–206), expanded verbal phrases (pp. 207–227), and other syntactic issues (pp. 228–263). There is a list of technical terms (pp. 267–269), an index of passages quoted (pp. 271–275), of modern authors (pp. 277–280), of subjects (pp. 281–282), and of words discussed (pp. 283–285). All the quotations are printed in Hebrew characters, with masoretic vocalization when biblical texts are referred to. Eventually, a transcription of other texts is added with vocalization to indicate the form and the pronunciation in a concrete way.

The main problem raised by this grammar is the mixing of various forms of speech and the apparent unawareness of a situation comparable to the Arabic diglossia. Although Qumran Aramaic is no particular Middle Aramaic idiom, Muraoka's grammar applies this appellation to the Aramaic language used in manuscripts found in the Desert of Judah, viz. in the caves around Khirbet Qumran, in Wadi Murabba'at, in Naḥal Hever, allegedly in Wadi Seiyal, at Ketef Jericho and Masada. Only the Aramaic papyri from Wadi Daliyeh, dating from the 4th century B.C., and the Nabataean documents from Naḥal Hever are not included. Instead some vocalizations proposed by the Author correspond to Late Aramaic pronunciation.

One of the dialects concerned is Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, spoken at the time of the written documents and characterized, among other things, by the object marker *yt*,