We have here extremely valuable fruits of indefatigable research by Prof. Klaus Beyer, who published already in 1984 a volume exactly with the same title [ATTM for short]. This was followed ten years later by an Ergänzungsband [ATTM E]. The book under review, published yet another ten years later [ATTM II], is not so much a “Band 2” as a revised Ergänzungsband.

It is apparent that the author has undertaken an extensive bibliographical updating. This is presented in small print, and is not just addition of names and titles, but also often very short comments. The style is occasionally telegraphic as may be illustrated by the following:

“Sie dient im Mittelhebräischen als feierliche, volltönende Langform, ebenso wie der Kohortativ (< Konjunktiv) und die Afformative -in/án (oft vor Kehllauten und in Pausa; besonders häufig in Dtn Jes Pss Hi, fehlend in Dan Esr Neh; selten babylonisch-mittelhebr.; in Qumran und Sekunda vom masoretischen Text abweichend; Energeticus? [R. Hetzron]; Dialetk [nicht in den althebr. Inschriften, aber ammonitisch!] oder aramäisch) als bloße Langformen des Impf. (der Kohortativ besonders des Impf. cons. 1.), 1 und * compaginis (BLH 525i,j) als Langformen des Nomens und -á an Adverbien” (56).

This leads at times to extraordinary, even for German, long sentences: e.g., the first three sentences on p. 73 consist of 7, 8, and 8 lines respectively.

There are also many other kinds of important Nachträge, for instance, quite a lot of entirely new documents not published in ATTM or ATTM E, such as *nV1–4 from Nahal Hever.

Given the nature of ATTM II in relation to its two predecessors it can be understood and used with profit only with the latter beside you constantly.

The texts published by B. must be based on his own reading of them now available in various collections and editions. Hence his readings differ quite often from the same texts published by other scholars. A comparison of A = 1QGenAp (p. 89) with the edition by three Israeli scholars (M. Morgenstern, E. Qimron and D. Sivan, “The
Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon,” *Abr-Nahrain* 33 [1995]: 30–54) and that by Fitzmyer (J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary* [3d ed.; Rome, 2004]) will show this. For instance, Col. 1, lines 3–4

B: שותן ורמא ד [.] [. . .] והרשע
MQS: בושת תל [. . .]
F: רמא ד [.] [. . .]

Often the reading partially offered in ATTM is appreciably improved: e.g., 1QGenAp 19.7.

One can see traces of constant revision as shown by an asterisk attached to a text or an item presented twice both in ATTM and ATTM II, e.g. the text U—4Q550<sup>c</sup>.

The relationship between the three publications by the author and the views represented by him in each of them is sometimes not apparent. To illustrate—

On p. 411 B. discusses the use of a word-final א as a marker of an immediately preceding ו or י as a vowel letter (a phenomenon sometimes called digraph, attested occasionally in Egyptian Aramaic, and typical of the Qumran orthography, both Hebrew and Aramaic. See T. Muraoka and B. Porten, *A Grammar of Egyptian Aramaic* [2 ed.; Leiden, 2003], §5k). Among the examples quoted we find אסוא “healing,” and in the section dealing with word-formation (444) this lexeme is mentioned along with וasive “request” and two others as an example belonging to Lamed-Yod roots. In the Glossary (519) it is vocalised as 'asū. In ATTM E, however, in the orthography section (278) the noun is absent, and in the morphology section (290) also, which is slightly reconstituted, we miss the noun, though we now find דכוי “purity” and טוכוי “error” instead as ending with -ū<sup>t</sup>, and in the Glossary the first is vocalised as dakū (332), whilst the latter is left unvocalised (354). Finally, in the orthography section of the ATTM II (316) we find none of these nouns mentioned. In the word-formation section (323) there is a paragraph on feminine nouns ending with -ū<sup>t</sup> (323) where we find דכוי under roots of III*<sup>+</sup>ū, but under roots of III<sup>+</sup> we find neither of the above-mentioned two nouns. In the Glossary we find all the four nouns listed, but only דכוי vocalised. One would not know whether the author’s view on this particular question changed between the three editions. This is rather frustrating and confusing. One wonders why Beyer, in this age of advanced IT, has not simply published a complete, revised edition.

To mention another example, the paragraph on the grapheme ע in ATTM (412f) is far more extensive than the corresponding ones in ATTM E (279) and ATTM II (317), between the last two of which there are only marginal differences. Is the paragraph in ATTM now to be scrapped altogether?

There are also cases in which exactly the same thing is said in one edition and in the immediately following one: e.g., ATTM E p. 278 on the letter ע and ATTM II p. 317. Likewise, on p. 318 in ATTM II there is a short line reading