organization was a major factor behind advances toward racial justice in the denomination that eventually did come about. While only a small remnant of the United Sabbath-Day Adventist movement remains, Jones points out that it occupies the only church building ever built by Black Adventists in New York City, which “stands as a monument to the refusal of African Americans to accept discriminatory practices” (186).

For its part, James K. Humphrey and the Sabbath-Day Adventists stands as a sign of the potential for historical study—thorough, disciplined, empathic to all, yet honest and unflinching—in helping to heal the remaining wounds of racial injustice in the Seventh-day Adventist movement.
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The first edition of *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Studia Biblica 14; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991) was a translation and revision/expansion by T. Muraoka of the 1923 French grammar by Paul Joüon. Though intended as an intermediate grammar, it was also one of the most comprehensive and up-to-date reference grammars of Biblical Hebrew. The current edition under review was motivated by an attempt to make corrections and incorporate suggestions from reviewers, as well as to acknowledge the many recent studies on Biblical Hebrew grammar that have appeared in the last decade and a half.

The new edition contains many improvements over the previous one. It combines the previous two paperback volumes into one hardbound volume. There are minor layout and typesetting changes, such as placing notes at the bottom of the page instead of at the end of the paragraph. Since the previous edition distinguished the main text from Muraoka’s additional notes, it could have given some readers the false impression that the main text was an exact translation of Joüon’s original French text, though in reality the main text already included many small revisions. The layout of the present edition blurrs any distinction between Muraoka’s and Joüon’s writing, thus correcting that false impression. There are also slight improvements in wording, usually resulting in more precision. For example, in paragraph 118u, the first edition contained the sentence, “This misuse has worn the form out and, together with the influence of Aramaic, has doubtless contributed to its demise,” which is replaced in the present edition by, “This misuse has led to the form falling into desuetude, a development which was no doubt reinforced by the influence of Aramaic.” Throughout the book, earlier references to, for instance, “our languages” are replaced by “Indo-European languages” (e.g., paragraph 111b) or “some non-Semitic languages” (e.g., paragraph 122c). Other changes include numerous additions and deletions of biblical references cited as examples. For instance, paragraph 79o states that the
cohortative of third weak verbs usually has the same form as the indicative. In the second edition, one more example is cited (Gen 46:31), two additional supporting references have been added (Gen 19:32; 50:5), and two previous ones deleted (Gen 1:26; 2 Kgs 14:8). Then, instead of “three,” the current edition states that “two cohortatives with—occur for the sake of assonance,” deleting Isa 41:23 from the list, but retaining Pss 77:4 and 119:117. There are also completely new paragraphs added. For example, between 118d and 118e, the second edition inserts paragraph 118da, which adds some further explanation on the uses of qatal when avoiding wayyiqtol.

The last two decades have witnessed a mushrooming of studies on Biblical Hebrew grammar. Recent studies include explanations of the verbal system based on discourse grammar/text-linguistics, as well as more traditional morphosyntactic studies. The current edition acknowledges these more recent studies. However, as in the first edition, there is less engagement with the secondary literature than what is found in, for instance, B. K. Walker and M. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, 1990). A more extensive survey of the recent literature and the different views would have been useful, though it is understandable why this grammar may not be the best suited venue for such a survey. Also, although Muraoka interacts with the recent literature, his basic views on Biblical Hebrew morphosyntax remain unchanged. For example, he retains Joüon’s traditional view that, though the Biblical Hebrew verb forms cannot fit exactly the labels of Indo-European languages, the verbal forms “mainly express tenses, namely the past, the future, and the present,” but often also express aspect and modality (paragraph 111c, see the footnotes on pp. 327-329). Further, he also rejects discourse/text-linguistic approaches:

Their virtually exclusive concern is to work out the taxonomy of various Hebrew verb “tenses” and how they function in a flow of narrative or discourse. In actual speech, however, and this is true for just any language, there are grammatically well-formed, self-contained and complete utterances containing just one verb. The tense form of such a verb must have a value of its own, which does not have to be derived from the value it would have when used in conjunction with another verb or verbs in a flow of speech (xviii).

It appears to me that this second edition consists primarily of many small improvements on the first edition, reflecting painstaking care and attention to detail. Muraoka has not changed his conclusions on the basics of Biblical Hebrew grammar, but has changed his opinion on many individual passages. I am not suggesting that he needs to change any of his views—after all, he is just as respected as, if not more than, the other scholars cited in his footnotes. This edition is not a major revision in the sense of significant changes. However, it is a welcome major publication and contribution. All in all, this reference grammar of Biblical Hebrew is an improved version of one that was already outstanding.
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