

“What’s Wrong with Grammaticalization?” p. 158). Rubín is to be complemented for illustrating the heuristic value of grammaticalization for Semitic studies: the collecting of various examples of grammaticalization found throughout the geographic and temporal range of the Semitic languages presents an important step forward both for linguists interested in the data and Semitists interested in typological arguments and explanations for Semitic language change. I am, however, less convinced that Rubín’s brief volume has offered “valuable insights into the history of the Semitic languages” (p. 154) beyond what has hitherto been known but admittedly widely scattered in the literature.

John A. Cook
Eisenbrauns
Winona Lake, IN 46590
jacook@eisenbrauns.com

VERB MOVEMENT IN BIBLICAL ARAMAIC. By Adriaan Lamprecht. *Acta Academica Supplementum* 1. Pp. iv + 165. Bloemfontein: UFS-SASOL Library, 2001. Paper.

Lest anyone overlook this modestly-sized and unassuming volume, let me say at the outset that this work is a significant contribution to the study of word order in Biblical Aramaic. Not only does Lamprecht address an understudied topic, he employs a theoretical framework, the minimalist program of Chomskyan generative linguistics, that is underused in biblical studies, even though it is one of the most prominent frameworks in general linguistics. Indeed, Lamprecht hypothesizes that “word order in Biblical Aramaic is not free,” as has been generally thought in biblical and Aramaic studies, and that verb “movement as proposed in the Minimalist Programme ... is adequate to explain the various word orders in BA” (p. 9). Given his minority conclusion, that Biblical Aramaic is a recognizable verb-subject language, it is well-worth the time necessary to work through this technical study.

Lamprecht organizes his investigation in seven chapters, the first of which is the introduction, in which he clearly sets out his research questions (p. 8), and the last of which is a summary of his conclusions. In the main body of the work, chapter 2 is a clear and concise introduction to the minimalist program as it was articulated by Chomsky in 1992 and 1994. Chapters 3 and 4 are the crucial sections in that the basic relationships of the subject and verb (chap. 3) and verb and object (chap. 4) are analyzed. Chapter 5 synthesizes the analyses advanced in chapters three and four in

that all three major constituents, verb (V), subject (S), and object (O), and the various orders in which they occur (SVO, OVS, SOV, OSV, VOS) are described within the model that has been developed. Finally, chapter 6 tackles double-object syntax in Biblical Aramaic (i.e., clauses with ditransitive verbs).

At the heart of Lamprecht's conclusions is the rejection of the description in reference grammars of Biblical Aramaic word order as "free." Instead, Lamprecht proposes that Biblical Aramaic has an unmarked surface word order of verb-subject-object (viz., the verb raises out of the verb phrase while the subject noun phrase remains in its site of origin in the verb phrase). Thus, clauses like Dan 6:8 are unmarked: *אֲהַרְעֶשׂוּ פֶלֶס סָרְכֵי מַלְכוּתָא*. However, Biblical Aramaic clearly exhibits a great deal of constituent movement, although it is not free but "licensed" (that is, linguistically motivated) for specific environments.

Notably, Lamprecht was quick to pick up on a development in minimalist syntax for which the minimalist implications were just being worked out when this monograph was written: the proposal of specific positions ("projections") at the front of the clause for pragmatically-oriented constituent movement. Specifically, Lamprecht suggests that the "marked and unusual" subject-verb word order (as in Dan 7:10 *דִּינָא יְהֵב*) reflects the movement of the subject, which normally remains in the verb phrase (i.e., below the raised verb), to a "Topic" phrase that is above the projection in which the verb may check its agreement features against the subject noun phrase (labeled as the "AgrSp" node). In other words, Lamprecht argues that the normal order would have been (unattested) *יְהֵב דִּינָא*, but that subject *דִּינָא* raised to the Topic phrase to create the subject-verb order. This structure also fits clauses in which the object precedes the verb (e.g., Ezra 4:17 *בְּהִנְיָא שְׁלָח מַלְכָא*). Additionally, Lamprecht suggests that there may be two Topic phrases, which account for cases in which we see double-fronting. For example, in the case of subject-object-verb clauses like Dan 7:1 *דִּינְיָאֵל חֵלֵם*, the subject occupies the first Topic phrase and the object occupies the second; both have been raised above the verb, which resides in its normal position. A similar proposal is made for the rare object-subject-verb examples like Dan 4:33 *וְלִי מְדַבְרֵי וְרַבְרַבֵּי יַבְעוּן*. Overall, Lamprecht's analysis is well-articulated and compelling, to a certain point.

In terms of layout, the work includes a few odd formatting features, such as the placement of example numbers on the right end of an example when the Aramaic script is used. If the intent here is to avoid obscuring the right-to-left direction of Aramaic writing (with which no Semitist would have problems anyway), then such examples really should have been right-justified as well to aid in reading ease. Otherwise, the manuscript was quite

clean. Aside from such picky matters, I have three criticisms: one on data, one on methodology, and one on theory.

While Lamprecht's model nicely accounts for the great majority of Biblical Aramaic clauses, his explanation for the verb-object-subject example in Dan 7:18 (וַיִּקְבְּלוּן מִלְכוּתָא קְדִישִׁי עַלְיוֹנִין) is torturous and hardly believable (pp. 113–130). Instead of forcing the syntax of this clause into his "two Topic phrase" structure, Lamprecht might have benefited from considering whether extraposition (a type of so-called "rightward" movement of a constituent) or right-dislocation would have provided a more economical (and believable) account. In other words, it could be that the subject עַלְיוֹנִין קְדִישִׁי moved down, or rightward, in the same way that relative clauses often do (e.g., "the man *who was wearing a hat* walked by" versus "the man walked by, *who was wearing a hat*," where the second example exhibits relative clause extraposition). In a related vein, I was dissatisfied with Lamprecht's general avoidance of accounting for non-argument constituents, such as adverbs and prepositional phrases, some of which are also fronted to the Topic phrase. Indeed, such items often affect the nature of subject and verb movement in many of the languages analyzed in the sources he cited, including German, Dutch, and modern Hebrew (e.g., the verb-second phenomena, which is addressed for modern Hebrew in U. Shlonsky, *Clause Structure and Word Order in Hebrew and Arabic: An Essay in Comparative Semitic Syntax* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997]).

In terms of methodology, I find it inexplicable why, when he considers just about every other relevant feature, Lamprecht does not even mention the issue of semantic operators, particularly modality. Operators are constituents, whether overt or covert, that effect change, whether syntactic (i.e., movement) or semantic (i.e., polarity reversal). It is well known that modality, including negation, is quite often an operator feature that affects verb and noun movement, and Lamprecht should have picked this up from the works included in his bibliography, the most salient of which is DeCaen ("On the Placement and Interpretation of the Verb in Standard Biblical Hebrew Prose [Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1995]). So, it is quite possible that jussive and indicative verbs, which Lamprecht lumps together in his data sample, represent syntactic structures more complex than he assumes. It is a point worth future study. Second, nowhere does Lamprecht define his notion of "Topic" nor explain the topicalization examples in their discourse context, an omission that will no doubt frustrate many readers.

Finally, by the publication date of 2001, there was much more work on the structure of the left-periphery that would have added an invaluable layer to Lamprecht's study. In particular, his model would have benefited from considering works like L. Haegeman and J. Guéron, *English Grammar: A*

Generative Perspective (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), in which both *Topic* and *Focus* phrases are proposed and empirically justified. In this same vein, Lamprecht should not have avoided revising in light of N. Chomsky's subsequent works available to him (*The Minimalist Program* [Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995]; particularly chapter 4 "Categories and Transformations," and N. Chomsky, "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework," in *Step by Step: Essays in Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka [Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000], pp. 89–155), since some of the projections so prominent in Lamprecht's analysis have been dispensed with on both theoretical and empirical grounds.

However, these criticisms and qualifications should not detract from my recommendation: this work should be read by anyone interested in the issues of verb movement and/or word order in Aramaic (or Hebrew, or any other Semitic language, for that matter). Lamprecht displays a sure competence in the theory and application of formal (generative) linguistics that is not common in Biblical Aramaic and Hebrew studies. The fields of ancient Hebrew and Aramaic studies would benefit from dozens more studies like this.

Robert D. Holmstedt
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
robert.holmstedt@utoronto.ca

BIBLICAL NARRATIVE AND THE DEATH OF THE RHAPSODE.

By Robert S. Kawashima. *Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature*. Pp. xi + 293. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 2004. Cloth, \$39.95.

In this book, Kawashima correlates two well-examined intellectual developments of ancient Israel: the first is the creation of biblical narrative (as "written verbal art") out of earlier epic (as "oral verbal art"); the second is the epistemic revolution of monotheism. The basis of this correlation is the philosophical-linguistic dichotomy of subjective versus objective time: the former Kawashima associates with epic and its accompanying "pagan" myth based on a monistic cosmos; the latter he associates with biblical narrative and the transcendent dualism that accompanied the monotheistic revolution in ancient Israel. The basis of this association is far from clear, but appears to work by analogy: inasmuch as biblical narrative developed from epic through an "alienation" (i.e., objectifying) of time, so also the transcendent

dualism of Israel's monotheistic thought came through the "alienation" of God.

After introducing his thesis in chapter 1, Kawashima illustrates the rise of biblical narrative from epic in chapter 2 through a comparison of Judges 4 and 5. In the following two chapters Kawashima argues that Ann Banfield's (*Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction* [Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982]) two types of "unspeakable sentences," characteristic of the modern novel, are likewise characteristic of biblical narrative: "pure narration" (chap. 3) and "represented consciousness" (chap. 4). In chapters 5 and 6, Kawashima draws on Homeric scholarship to contrast the techniques for expressing simultaneity (chap. 5) and use of type-scenes (chap. 6) in Homer, "as an exemplary achievement of the oral tradition" (p. 15), and biblical narrative. Finally, in the concluding seventh chapter, Kawashima engages in what he calls "archæology of ancient Israelite knowledge" in an attempt to correlate the "novelty" of biblical narrative with the equally novel monotheistic revolution in ancient Israel.

Kawashima's comparison between Homeric epic and biblical narrative casts into relief some of the artful features of the latter. However, ultimately I am unpersuaded by his thesis for two basic reasons: first, his failure to interact with the historical issues of Israelite religion and composition of the Bible makes his correlation of biblical narrative and monotheistic revolution an intriguing yet unsubstantiated claim; second, his analogy between the modern novel and biblical narrative is forced at times when he attempts to sweep away problematic data as inconvenient details. This latter point is indicative of Kawashima's general problem in doing justice to the Hebrew data, which is the focus of the remainder of this review.

In chapter 3, Kawashima applies Banfield's "pure narration" category to biblical narrative by introducing Emile Benveniste's (*Problèmes de linguistique générale* [Paris: Gallimard, 1966]) distinction between French *passé simple* and *passé composé*, with which he finds an analogous dichotomy in Hebrew *wayyiqtol* and *qatal*: the former members in each pair express non-deictic or objective time (= Banfield's "pure narration")—events that are portrayed in temporal sequence without reference to a speaker's deictic position; the latter members, by contrast, express deictic subjective time, which is always anchored to a speech situation. Because this division is easily confused with Harald Weinrich's (*Tempus: Besprochene und Erzählte Welt* [5th ed.; *Sprache und Literatur* 16; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1994]) influential narrative speech dichotomy, which has greatly influenced biblical studies (e.g., Weinrich's ideas have been particularly influential in the works of Talstra and of Niccacci), Kawashima is at pains to differentiate the two. Kawashima fails to note that Weinrich's division is discourse-