

very different from their pre-exilic predecessors' (p. 287). There seems to be here the implied conception of a kind of pristine agreed orthodoxy from which pre-exilic clergy deviated, to which the exile was intended to recall them, and according to which they are now legitimately being judged and condemned by the prophets. However, maybe what is evidenced by the continuation of the prophetic critique from pre-exilic to post-exilic times is that orthodox Yahwism/Judaism as traditionally understood took much longer to prevail than is generally assumed, and that during the sixth and fifth centuries BCE it was still being negotiated between opposing groups with different conceptions of what was legitimate. Certainly, to that extent Tiemeyer is correct to say that the post-exilic priests seem not to be so very different from their pre-exilic predecessors, but in assessing the implications of that position righteousness should perhaps not quite so readily be assumed to lie with the prophets. On the other hand, the ease with which such an assumption is so often made — in all sorts of scholarly contexts, not just here — certainly demonstrates the potency of the prophetic rhetoric, which was arguably one of the factors in creating the concept of 'orthodoxy' as we know it (or assume it).

A final niggle about the production of the volume: as well as a bibliography, it includes three indexes, Source Index, Subject Index and Authors Index. However, none of the three indexes covers material in the footnotes, which given that footnotes are a major location of author and text citations seems odd to say the least, and limits the usefulness of the indexes. In this computerized age of book production it should surely be possible to create indexes that cover the whole text of the book including the footnotes.

doi:10.1093/jss/fgn065

DEBORAH ROOKE  
KING'S COLLEGE LONDON

NICHOLAS P. LUNN, *Word-Order Variation in Biblical Hebrew Poetry: Differentiating Pragmatics and Poetics* (Paternoster Biblical Monographs). Paternoster, Bletchley 2006. Pp. xxii + 373. Price: £24.99 paperback. ISBN: 978-1-84227-423-1.

The raison d'être of Nicholas Lunn's monograph (a revision of his 2004 doctoral thesis) is to demonstrate that Biblical Hebrew (BH) prose and poetry share the same basic syntax. This would seem to be an obvious and therefore banal thesis, yet the supposed irregularity of poetic word order and the all-too-common practice of disregarding syntactic variation in, e.g., the Psalms, as a reflex of 'poetic style' highlights the importance of this research question. Lunn's work fills a niche, if for no other reason than to put an end to the avoidance of serious engagement with the syntax of BH poetry.

The book has 11 chapters, which fall into two primary sections. In the first section Lunn defines the problem (chapters 1–2) and establishes his linguistic model for analysing information structure (chapter 3). In the second section he uses this model to explain the various syntactic and pragmatic issues in BH poetic lines (chapters 4–8) and even whole texts (chapter 9). The last two chapters discuss the merits and faults of alternative approaches (chapter 10) and provide a summary (chapter 11).

At the heart of Lunn's study is the thesis that for all of the 'defamiliarization' techniques used in poetry, any word order variation 'has to remain within the limitations imposed by the syntactic constraints of the language' (p. 5). Thus, the majority of this work represents the working out of the grammar of BH word order variation and its manifestation in biblical poetry; Lunn has set for himself the task of distinguishing between syntactic or pragmatic influences on the word order in a

given poetic line and other poetic influences, such as chiasm. To do so, he builds especially on an information structure model proposed by Knud Lambrecht (*Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representation of Discourse Referents*, Cambridge 1994), which he summarizes and applies to BH prose in chapter 3 before applying it to biblical poetry in the following chapters.

I find most of Lunn's explanations in chapters 4–9 to be plausible and many to be likely. For example, on p. 123 he explains the structure of the three lines in Ps. 138:6 *kî ram yhw̄h // wēšapal yir'eh // wēgaboah mimmerhaq yēyeda'* 'Because Yhw̄h is exalted // yet he sees the lowly // but the haughty he knows at a distance' (my translation). The contrast between the first two lines is apparent (though God is exalted he still notices the humble), but it is the third line that illustrates the essential correctness of Lunn's distinction between syntactic constraints and techniques of poetic defamiliarization. He convincingly argues that the O-PP-V order of the third line is not due to defamiliarization but rather has a syntactic-pragmatic explanation; specifically, the initial object NP *gaboah* is a contrastive topic, the fronted PP *mimmerhaq* carries focus, and the final V *yēyeda'* is presuppositional, since it is broadly related to the preceding verb *yir'eh*. The result of such pragmatically-motivated reordering of the syntax is that, ironically, while God from his high position takes notice of the 'low', he maintains his distance from the 'high', or as Lunn explains, 'God does know these people, just as he knows all human beings, but these haughty ones he knows *from afar*' (p. 123; italics are Lunn's).

That said, I question Lunn's wholesale acceptance of Lambrecht's model of information structure; Lambrecht's theory, while admirable in its scope and refinement, has serious problems, especially relating to the definition of focus. For instance, Lunn (following the work of his thesis advisor, Heimerdinger) categorizes the S-V clause *hannabaš hiššī'ani* 'the serpent deceived me' (Gen. 3:13, my translation) as an 'event-reporting' clause with 'sentence-focus' and asserts that this 'is not a comment about [Eve's] own action (*What did you do?*), but a clause in which both subject and predicate share equal focus (*What happened?*)' (p. 80). I have two issues with this analysis. First, if BH is a V-S language (as Lunn asserts on p. 4), why are event-reporting clauses not V-S? Lunn never addresses this oddity — that basic word order does not fit into the very category of 'focus structure' (sentence-focus) that lacks any 'pragmatic presuppositions'. Into which of Lambrecht's three focus structures, then, does a basic V-S clause fit? Second, it is highly counterintuitive that all meaningful propositions fit into one of Lambrecht's three focus structures, or to put it another way, that there are no 'sans focus' meaningful propositions (note that Lambrecht explicitly distinguishes focus from 'new' information). It is a questionable model that does not allow for the existence of a basic word order, pragmatically neutral clause (which are admittedly rare but nonetheless possible). Lunn notes that parallel S-V clauses, such as *pî šaddiq yehgeh ḥokmâ // ûlēšônô rēdabber mišpaṭ* 'the mouth of the righteous utters wisdom // and his tongue speaks justice' in Ps. 37:30 (my translation), are common in Proverbs, likely due to the lack of significant pragmatic context (p. 132; also p. 78). Why these clauses should be marked for focus is unclear (contrast Lunn's analysis of such clauses with the analysis I provide in my 'Word Order in the Book of Proverbs' [Pp. 135–54 in L. Troxel, D.R. Magary and K.G. Friebel (eds), *Seeking out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. [Winona Lake, Ind. 2005]).

Lunn's work is indeed valuable, if for no other reason than its defence of the essential syntactic sameness of BH prose and poetry, which I take to be its primary

contribution. The book should be read and recognized for taking the critical next step in our study of ancient Hebrew grammar — applying advances in BH prose syntax to BH poetry and in the process to distinguish pragmatic influences on word order from poetic influences. Unfortunately, I cannot agree with Heimerdinger's effusive recommendation of the book on the front cover, back cover, and in the foreword: the devotion to Lambrecht's information structure model, which Lunn carefully and skillfully applies to the BH poetic data, is also the primary weakness of his analysis. I therefore suggest that it is time for those interested in pragmatics, information structure, and BH word order to set Lambrecht's book aside and look for other, more insightful models within general linguistics. It may very well be the other lasting contribution of Lunn's study that we in BH linguistics relegate Lambrecht's book to the status of supporting material rather than the central theoretical role it plays in the BH word order and information structure monographs by Heimerdinger, Shimasaki and Lunn.

doi:10.1093/jss/fgn066

ROBERT D. HOLMSTEDT  
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

D. GOODBLATT, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. Pp. 276. Price £45.00. ISBN: 9780521862028.

As I already stated in the blurb of the book, Goodblatt's study is a fine piece of work. The book has many insights, new ideas, and contributes a great deal to research on the issue of nationalism. My positive attitude towards Goodblatt's book does not contradict the fact that I have some minor reservations concerning it that I will briefly relate here:

1. Nationalism as a phenomenon. It is not necessary in this short review to enter again *ad nauseam* the arguments whether we can speak at all of nationalism in Antiquity. G., sensibly, agrees with me on that point (D. Mendels, *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism. Jewish and Christian Ethnicity in Ancient Palestine*<sup>2</sup>. Grand Rapids Michigan 1997; the latter view accepted by Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism and Modernism*. London and New York 1998). What both of us actually say about Jewish nationalism in the Second Temple period is that it is a somewhat different form of the one that emerged in the nineteenth century. One should emphasize that nationalisms (in plural!) differ throughout the course of history in their content and the way they are embedded in societies. This is also the case with, say, ancient imperialism that is so different from the modern phenomenon in various aspects; hence one who uses the last mentioned term in his own book quite freely (S. Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society: 200 BCE to 640 CE*, Princeton, NJ 2001), should take back his criticism concerning the use of the term nationalism in Antiquity. It should also be noted that nationalism as a phenomenon should be set by its researchers against the background of other nations. Although G. mentions in passing the Nabataeans and other peoples, he should have dealt in depth with other nations, either of the same period or those which emerged later in history. One cannot deal with nationalism in a vacuum, as G. in fact does.

2. The main argument of G.'s book is the use of language, Hebrew, as an indispensable aspect of nationalism. Basically I think that he is right. However, in line with Samuel P. Huntington's observations concerning the use of a *lingua franca* (*The Clash of Civilizations*, chapter 3), I would say that the use of Aramaic, especially by bilingual people (see G. p. 57), did not necessarily suppress Jewish nationalistic ideas, being merely a medium for communication of Jews with others in the region. The use of a *lingua franca* even sharpened the separate identity of the Jews