volumes of the series (see references above). With the exception of references to the theoretical linguistic literature, much of which is in English, this is largely a discussion with German-language grammarians and exegetes; moreover, a very important segment thereof, the use of the *Stellungsfeldermodell*, is phrased explicitly in terms devised for German grammar.

In vol. 2 the author has provided a complete syntactic analysis, with explicit charting of the principal verbal phrases according to the three categories described above, of Deut. 12 and of Judges 4 (as well as of certain verses in 2 Kings 22–23 that were discussed as an excursus in vol. 1). One resorts to this charting, therefore, to determine exactly where Dirks sees the break between theme and rhetoric, for example, occurring in a given verbal phrase (or across phrases in cases where a phrase is entirely thematic or thematic).

DENNIS PARDEE

The University of Chicago


In the past decade and a half, the debate has intensified concerning the tense and/or aspect of the Classical Hebrew indicative verb forms and the role of the so-called consecutive forms. Many of these studies attempt to elucidate the seemingly same Classical Hebrew verbal system by using discourse analysis. Endo takes such an approach and states that the "matter of 'sequentiality' in the verbal forms, which controls the flow of the story or the utterance (e.g., to begin, to stop or to continue the story), will be the main target of our investigation, though examination of other parameters such as 'tense,' 'aspect' and 'word order' is still needed" (pp. 28–29).

Following a brief summary of some prominent past studies of the Classical Hebrew verb (chap. 1), Endo examines word order, tense, and aspect in one-clause, two-clause, and three-clause utterances of direct speech (chaps. 2–4). He begins with direct speech because it more closely mirrors spoken language (the primary object of linguistic study) than does narrative (p. 30). He goes on to examine the syntactic relationships between clauses in direct discourse (chap. 5), in volitive clauses (chap. 6), and finally in narrative (chap. 7). He provides a separate treatment of verb tense and aspect in subordinate clauses (chap. 8).

Endo presents his model of the Classical Hebrew verbal system in the chart above (p. 321). Tense-aspect and sequentiaity are the two distinguishing parameters in the system.

Endo treats the conjunction on the sequential forms parenthetically because he understands sequentiaity to be encoded in the verb form itself apart from the semantic or syntactic value of the conjunction (p. 67). Thus, he proposes that there are two homophonic pairs in qatal and yiqtol: the one form nonsequential, the other sequential and usually appearing with the conjunction. He hypothesizes that "it is quite plausible that in Biblical Hebrew there are two sets of conjunctions in each temporal-aspectual distinction, which could have originally been distinguished by stress position (e.g., qatal for non-sequential vs. qatal for sequential; yiqtol for non-sequential vs. yiqtol for sequential, etc.)" (p. 321, n. 1). While few would dispute that there are two historically separate verbal conjugations behind Biblical Hebrew yiqtol—namely, the short prefix preterite *yqtol and the long imperfective *yaqatal—his argument that there are likewise two historically separate qatal conjugations behind Biblical Hebrew qatal is unconvincing.

The fundamental weakness of Endo's study, however, is his lack of a theoretical foundation. While he claims to employ discourse analysis, his study is confined to the syntactic and semantic relationships between two or three clauses at the most. His linguistic theory rests almost entirely upon Lyons and Comrie,1 two excellent but dated works. This is a detriment to Endo's aspectual claims since he adopts Comrie's aspectual taxonomy, which Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca have shown to contain categories that are not realized in any language.2

Exactly what contribution Endo's study makes to the discussion of the Classical Hebrew verbal system is unclear because he fails to define the central concepts in his theory. While he claims to adopt Comrie's definition of aspect, he makes an undefined distinction between perfective-implicative aspect and complete-incomplete aspect, which Comrie does not; instead, Comrie equates perfective and complete.3 But since Endo determines complete-incomplete aspect to be contiguous with past-nonsal tense, his obscure aspectual category of complete-complete is unnecessary—his system is actually based on a tense parameter, not aspect.

It is equally unclear what advancement Endo's theory makes over the usual discourse approach, which differentiates foreground-backgrounding of events, by claiming that sequentiaity is more basic to the Classical Hebrew verbal system. He claims that foreground-backgrounding is a "by-product of the issue of sequentiaity and non-sequentiaity" (p. 297). The examples by which Endo tries to show that foreground-backgrounding and sequentiaity-nonsequentiaity, however, are not conterminous—for example, waqatal used for background rather than foreground information—are meager and

3 Comrie, Aspect, pp. 18–21.
questionable. Certainly the fixed-form discourse marker wayhi should not be cited as an exception to the role of wayyiqtol in foregrounding information (p. 267).

Endo’s survey of past approaches in chap. 1 may be a profitable starting point for those wishing to enter the discussion of the Classical Hebrew verbal system. In addition, Endo’s treatment of verb tense-aspect in subordinate clauses (chap. 8) fills a gap, though his analysis could have benefited from the linguistic literature that discusses the role of the Reference-point in analyzing tense and aspect.4 Endo’s intuition is correct that direct discourse provides a means to consider sequentiality, since it presents a clear break from the surrounding narrative. But, here too, his incorporation of the concept of a Reference-point could have provided a more refined justification for his choice of direct discourse as a starting point in his investigation of sequentiality.

JOHN A. COOK

University of Wisconsin-Madison


Scholars who work with the Greek text of Numbers owe John Wevers a debt of gratitude for his detailed Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers. The breadth and depth of his linguistic skill is astounding. Those who have not devoted their lives to the study of Septuagint Greek will find a seasoned guide to lead them through the intricacies of the text and its variants. On a broader level, his conclusions about the original Greek text are also a welcome correction to some earlier views that suggested the book was compiled piecemeal by incompetent translators. Wevers says, “Num was an intelligent translator, who knew what he was doing” (p. xxvii), and then adds:

[It should be obvious to the reader that the Greek Numbers may have its weaknesses, but it can hardly be dismissed as a compilation of various attempts at translation. It is a third century BCE product of an Alexandrian translator, not as well-versed in the intricacies of Greek grammar as one might wish, but who tried to interpret the canonical text of the Hebrew book into the language of his contemporaries. He did not slavishly render the Hebrew text into Greek equivalents as some later translators did, but tried to inform his fellow Jews what God had to say to them. (p. xxiv]

From the perspective of those who have studied the Dead Sea Scrolls, however, the book has some weaknesses. Because Wevers is searching for clues about the Greek translator of Numbers, it is understandable that he prefers to attribute changes in the text to the translator rather than to a different parent text. He says:

One should not automatically presuppose a different parent text when differences between the Greek and Hebrew obtain; rather one should first seek for and pursue other explanations. It is only through such details that a picture of the attitudes, the theological prejudices, as well as of the cultural environment of these Jewish translators can emerge. (p. xlii)

Before the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered, it was common to suppose that differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts were always or usually the fault of the Greek translator who changed the text through careless mistakes, theological bias, or a desire to improve the text in some way. The Dead Sea Scrolls, however, prove that many of the differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts came from different Hebrew texts. It is therefore anachronistic now to insist that nontextual explanations of variants should be sought before textual ones.

Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers shows Wevers caught in a transitional state between his stated presupposition and the responsible practice of textual criticism shaped by evidence from Qumran. Generally, the textual analysis in the body of the book proceeds without regard to the text of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which is subsequently introduced in a footnote. On occasion, this means that the body of the book comes to