to that of Lemaire. However, it is clear that wisdom became an important all-encompassing influence in the post-exilic period as it forged more literary links with other parts of the Old Testament corpus.

This book shows the range of studies that the one category of wisdom can incorporate under its umbrella. Whilst some would object to the broadening out of the wisdom corpus in this way, it is undeniable that the influence of wisdom was widespread both in Israel and in the ancient Near East. This volume points the way to future study which will, in my view, be concerned to re-evaluate these broader links.

There is a biographical note about Emerton, and a list prepared by Karen K. Maticich of his publications. The book ends with an index compiled by Carol Smith of authors, and an index of principal biblical and apocryphal references.

Cambridge

Katharine J. Dell


The first part of this edition was reviewed in VT 39 (1989), pp. 104-10. Since then, Rudolf Meyer, who prepared the first draft of that part, has died (2 April 1991), and the second part has been prepared by H. Donner, U. Rüterswörden and J. Renz.

This second part continues along the same lines as its predecessor, though we are told that “Das Abkürzungsverzeichnis wurde gründlich überarbeitet und ergänzt” (p. V). It is surprising that none of the errors in the first part to which I drew attention in my review (p. 109; cp. p. 105) has been corrected—and I refer here only to mistakes, not to differences of opinion. Among the latter, however, was my suggestion that there is a need for a table setting out the system of transliteration that is used, and it is unsatisfactory merely to state (part 1, p. IX) that a modified version of the system of the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft has been used, but without telling the reader what it is. No such table appears in the second part. I also suggested (p. 105) that the system of transliterating non-emphatic unvoiced sibilants in Epigraphic South Arabian should be replaced by the use of s', s'' and s', because this “system is non-committal and thus objective, whereas the system employed by Meyer and Donner may be misleading”. The policy that I suggested has been adopted in some places. Thus, on p. 369 the Sabaic cognate of Hebrew ħāmēš is given as ạMS', and on p. 378 ạS'R appears as the cognate of Hebrew ḫsr. On p. 241, however, DBṣ is given as the Sabaic cognate of ạbaṣ, and on p. 512 ạSR as the cognate of the Hebrew root ạṣr.
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It is to be hoped that the more appropriate system will be used consistently in future parts of the lexicon.

I have noted some further defects in the list of abbreviations, and I hope that they may be helpful in preparing future parts.

In several places a book is cited only by the year of a reprint, and not by the year of the original publication (e.g. “CWT”, “DTTM” and “FS Rowley”).

P. VII AHI: for “Davies, G.J.” read “Davies, G.I.”
P. X DA: for “Deir Alla” read “Deir ‘Alla”.
P. XV: the JBL and JS are no longer published in Philadelphia and London, respectively.
P. XVIII OTS: for “Studien” read “Studiën”.
P. XX SD: for “Saana” read “Sanaa”.
P. XXI TCHB: for “Tob” read “Tov”.

The quality of the entries in the lexicon continues to be of a high standard. Of course, however, there are places where scholars may legitimately hold different opinions or think that the addition of further references would be helpful. I offer the following comments on a small number of entries.

The roots, *dmm*, *dṁh* and *dmm* are discussed on pp. 245, 253-5. This is a complicated subject: some homonymous roots are distinguished, connections between some roots are recognized but not between others, and scholars’ opinions differ about some of the meanings in particular verses. Bibliographical references are given, but they might with advantage have been supplemented by a reference to G.R. Driver’s discussion of the roots in the *Festschrift* for N.H. Tur-Sinai, Spr Tur-Syny (Jerusalem, 1966), pp. 1*-11*. Among the questions that arise is that of the relation—if any—between the meanings “mhe. [i.e. Mittelhebräisch] schweigen, stumm sein” and Accadian “damānu jammern, klagen . . . u. u. DMM klagen”, which are noted in connexion with *dmm* I, “erstarren vor Schreck, bestürzt sein . . . sich still halten, schweigen”. The problem becomes acute in the noun *d*māmā, which is derived from this root and is said to mean both “Ruhe nach dem Sturm” and also “Säuseln”; and the only place where the former meaning seems to fit is Ps. cvii 29 where, however, *yāqūm* *sūrā līd*māmā is said to mean “er stillte den Sturm zum Säuseln”. Does the root *dmm* denote silence or some kind of noise (albeit a soft one), or are there two roots?

Pp. 257, 325: D. Winton Thomas’s first initial (= David) has been omitted.
P. 316 notes that the Hebrew letter *h* corresponds to two Proto-Semitic consonants: *h* and *ḥ*. There is a brief mention of the different ways in which the Hebrew letter is represented in Greek transliterations. It would have been helpful to add a reference to J.W. Wevers, “Ḥeth in Classical Hebrew”, in J.W. Wevers and D.B. Redford (ed.), Studies in the Ancient Semitic World (Toronto, 1970), pp. 101-12, in which he advances a good