

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*,

which is later ubiquitous in the Palestinian Targum fragments of the Pentateuch from the Cairo Genizah. It occurs very often in the documents from Naḥal Ḥever, but is extremely rare in literary texts, despite their exposure to the vernacular language of scribes and copyists. It is found only twice in the Targum to Job (11Q10), col. 35:9 and 38:9, once in Dan. 3:12, in Proto-Esther (4Q550, 5+5a:7), in Tobit (4Q196, 2:13), and sporadically in a few other texts, but never in Genesis Apocryphon or the Visions of Amram. In literary works, the direct object is generally not preceded by a syntactic indicator, but *l-* is occasionally employed before nouns. This syntagm is exceptional with pronominal suffixes (11Q10, col. 4:5). In fact, pronominal suffixes are regularly attached to the verb in the Targum to Job, in the Tobit fragments, in Genesis Apocryphon. This construction is found also in the stereotyped formula *ktbh* or *ktbyh*, “he wrote it”, in the legal documents from Wadi Murabba’at and Naḥal Ḥever (Mur 42:8,9; 46:11; 48:7; P. Yadin 10:73; etc.), occurring next to the name of a witness. However, it clearly belongs there to the formulaic language of legal acts and does not reveal anything about the daily speech of the writer. It is obvious that we do not deal with a single corpus of Qumran Aramaic, but with texts in Standard Literary Aramaic on the one hand, and with Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, on the other. The latter has influenced the language of legal documents. The scribes of the Nabataean deeds from Naḥal Ḥever, dating from the late 1st and early 2nd centuries A.D. better resisted the impact of spoken Aramaic and they never use the object marker *yt*. Instead, the legal formulations of the Nabataean tomb inscriptions at Mada’in Salih, which are somewhat older, contain several examples of *yt*, showing that its use was not limited to Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, to Palmyrene, and to Syro-Palestinian. It was Western Middle Aramaic. The Nabataean use of *yt* shows in any case that the parallel and nearly contemporaneous appearance of *yt* in letters and deeds from Naḥal Ḥever should not be explained by a constant exposure to Hebrew, but by the Aramaic dialect spoken in Palestine and different to some extent from the Standard Literary Aramaic used for literary purposes. A linguistic study of the Aramaic manuscripts found in the Desert of Judah should thus deal separately with texts redacted in a literary language, occasionally influenced by the vernacular idiom of scribes and copyists, and with letters and documents written Western Middle Aramaic, among which legal documents may preserve features of Official or Imperial Aramaic.

The disjunctive possessive pronoun *dyl-*, used in Aramaic deeds of the Persian period (*zyl-*), in the Samaria papyri as well, occurs also in several legal documents of the Judaean Desert, but it is attested only three times in Qumran literary texts: twice in Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20, col. 20:10 and 21:6), dating from the 1st or 2nd century B.C., and once in Enoch’s Epistle (4Q542, 1 i 8). This *zyl-/dyl-* is a feature characterizing various types of conveyance: gifts, sales, transfers. Instead, it is not typically West-Aramaic. Mixing Jewish Palestinian Aramaic with some legal phraseology and Standard Literary Aramaic is an unfortunate procedure.

Still another example is provided by the pronouns. The deeds of the Judaean Desert regularly use the demonstrative pronoun *dnh/dn’*, which is the standard form *znh/zn’* in documents from the Persian period, also in the Samaria papyri. The influence of

spoken Jewish Palestinian Aramaic is shown nevertheless by the seven examples of the demonstrative *dnn* in deeds from Naḥal Ḥever and Wadi Seiyal. Their meaning and function are the same as those of *dnh/dn'*. This new demonstrative *dnn* never appears in literary texts from Qumran, an evident prove that we deal with two different dialects: Official Aramaic, coloured by the spoken Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the scribes, and the Standard Literary Aramaic of the 3rd–1st centuries B.C. Later, as in Targum Onqelos, the impact of the vernacular *dnn* appears also in literary texts, for instance in Gen. 25:32; 32:5; Numb. 11:20. The determinative used as a rule in Standard Literary Aramaic texts from the Qumran caves is *dn*, often *dyn* later, in the Targums.

This being said, one must stress that the grammar of Qumran Aramaic, written by T. Muraoka, contains a wealth of material and provides an impressive amount of linguistic research. The structure of the grammar and the analyses are exemplary. It is undoubtedly a major research tool. Its user will nevertheless have the double task of reinterpreting Author's comments on differences perceived in the texts and of distinguishing the Standard Literary Aramaic, a written language, from Western Middle Aramaic, based on an actually spoken language. This distinction should apply also to spelling and phonology, to morphosyntax and syntax. It can generally rely on the provenance of the texts. Letters and deeds from Wadi Murabba'at, Naḥal Ḥever, and Wadi Seiyal are usually written in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic or are strongly influenced by it, while preserving some older legal terminology. Seventeen texts erroneously classified as 4Q342–4Q348, 4Q351–4Q354, and 4Q356–4Q361 belong to this group, but none is listed in the index of passages quoted in the grammar. Most fragments and scrolls from Qumran caves proper and the Aramaic Levi Document from the Cairo Genizah are instead redacted in Standard Literary Aramaic.

Beside the dialectal differences, there is the important distinction of spoken and written language, as well as the wide chronological gap between the texts in question. Most letters and deeds date from the first part of the 2nd century A.D., while the literary compositions from the Qumran caves go back to the 3rd–1st centuries B.C. There is a gap of at least 150–200 years between the two groups. Some Qumran manuscripts date from the first part of the 1st century A.D., but the works written in Standard Literary Aramaic are undoubtedly older. This explains the differences one can observe between the Standard Literary Aramaic of the Qumran texts and the Targums Onqelos and Jonathan, first written down *ca.* 100 A.D. For instance, the preposition *l-* appears only occasionally as object marker in the Standard Literary Aramaic of the Qumran texts, but its insertion is a general rule in the Targums, first committed to writing about two hundred years after the literary compositions attested at Qumran. A diachronic approach is always needed, but somewhat lacking in the grammar.

In phonology, one should also take Greek and Latin transcriptions into account, what is not done in the grammar under review. For instance, forms like μαθανα(ς) have a bearing on the interpretation of the internal *aleph* of *mr'n'* in P. Yadin 8,9, and Σαμβαθαιος with variants and many similar cases echoes a real degemination, even if it is not registered in Aramaic texts. The basic distinction of static and kinetic consonants is missing in the grammar. Now, the latter group, incorporating the plosives,

cannot be held continuously without changing quality and this explains the dissimilations and degeminations like Σαμβαθαιος etc. Besides, U. Schattner-Rieser (*L'araméen des manuscrits de la Mer Morte I. Grammaire*, Prahins 2004, pp. 48–49) has collected eleven Greek transcriptions showing that pretonic short vowels were still maintained in the 1st–2nd centuries A.D. The objection of T. Muraoka, contending that Greek phonotactics does not allow a word-initial ζβ and similar clusters (p. 31 and n. 213, p. 69, n. 290), is specious, for a prosthetic vowel could appear in such cases or an etymologically voiced consonant could change into a voiceless one, giving a form similar to σβέννῦμι, “to put out, to extinguish”. Since this never happens, while transcriptions like Βοικ- or Βοιχ- for /Bārk-/ never appear, Schattner-Rieser’s argument is perfectly valid. In any case, it is obvious that the vocalization of Biblical Aramaic reflects a later stage of Aramaic phonology. Some vocalizations proposed by the Author should therefore be corrected in order to bring them in agreement with the Greek transcriptions.

Very interesting for phonology are the spellings *hwrrt* for Urartu (1Q20, col. 10:12; 12:8; 17:9; cf. 1QIs^a 37:38) and *hdql'* (1Q20, col. 17:8; *pace* Muraoka) for Idiglat (Tigris) in Genesis Apocryphon, for they were apparently aimed at indicating an actual pronunciation of the toponyms. Such facts are not examined in the grammar, although they show that *aleph*, *hē*, and *heth* were not carrying the same phonetic value when the text was written.

A reference grammar of Standard Literary Aramaic, dealing with texts from the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, is a desideratum, but studies referring to particular sources, like those by S.E. Fassberg, R. Kutty, and A. Tal, or dealing with special questions are so far a prerequisite. The same can be said about Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Roman and Byzantine periods. The grammar under review can provisionally fill in these scholarly blanks and will certainly be used with great profit by specialists.

Edward Lipiński

Renaud J. Kutty, *Studies in the Syntax of Targum Jonathan to Samuel* (Ancient Near Eastern Studies. Supplement 30), Peeters, Leuven-Paris-Walpole MA, 2010. XIV + 285 pp.

The book under review is a slightly revised version of Renaud J. Kutty’s doctoral dissertation defended in January 2008 at Leiden University. To understand its purpose and its importance one should first situate it in the general frame of targumic studies and show the place of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets in the quite large field of targumic literature in the first millennium A.D.¹

¹ A large bibliography can be found in C. Tassin, *Targum*, in *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément XIII*, Paris 2005, pp. 1*–343*.