

ces and sentence groups; Disse, es his study entirely to how these pressed through the structure of al clauses. The morpho-syntactic syntactic grammatical categories Richter are here adopted with for the basic analysis of the con- uses; these smaller units are then ling to their position in the sen- the criteria of the *Stellungsfelder-* 'model of field positions') that is lar as a structure for grammars of erman. It has to do with the posi- various morpho-syntactic units t those that precede belong to the at follow to the *Hauptfeld*. (Be- does not have a complicated sys- ompounding like that of German, 'ld' of the German model was ed here.) In the final section of ters from the larger corpus men- tle are analyzed, Deut. 12 and all potential of these analyses has een realized. This assessment is following observations: (1) the just the verbal phrases, are an- dent sentences, with no attempt exhaustively to analyze the com- the morpho-syntactic units (this medied in part, it must be added, atments placed after the analysis al verbs); (2) in the analysis of verses with a *Vorfelddbesetzung* and thus a golden opportunity to plete analysis of a long unit con- ffective expression is missed (cf. 2); (3) a translation of the ana- s not provided, though this would reader—at least the one capable the nuances of German—a feel s comprehension of the flow of encapsulated in morpho-syntactic tion is basically that of the Rich- a the apparatus of abbreviations nkfully, explained in this work, n as assumed knowledge on the der) and with the idiosyncratic transliteration system to which een made in reviews of previous

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 Disse sees the break between theme and rheme, for example, occurring in a given verbal phrase (or across phrases in cases where a phrase is entirely thematic or rhematic).

DENNIS PARDEE

The University of Chicago

The Verbal System of Classical Hebrew in the Joseph Story: An Approach from Discourse Analysis. By YOSHINOBU ENDO. Studia Semitica Neerlandica, no. 32. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996. Pp. xiii + 351. € 36.08.

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 abstruse 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 reexamination 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-

CONTEXT	NON-SEQUENTIAL	SEQUENTIAL
PAST (complete)	<i>qatal</i>	(way) <i>yiqtol</i>
NON-PAST (incomplete)	<i>yiqtol</i>	(wə) <i>qatal</i>
VOLITIVE	impv., juss., and coh.	(wə) <i>qatal</i>

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 *sequentiality* are the two distinguishing parameters in the system.

Endo treats the conjunction on the sequential forms parenthetically because he understands sequentiality 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 homophonous 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., *qatála* for non-sequential vs. *qatalá* for sequential; *yiqtól(u)* 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 **yaqtul* and the long imperfective **yaqtulu*—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-imperfective 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-nonpast tense, his obscure aspectual category of complete-incomplete 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 foregrounding-backgrounding of events, by claiming that sequentiality is more basic to the Classical Hebrew verbal system. He claims that foregrounding-backgrounding is a "by-product of the issue of sequentiality and non-sequentiality" (p. 297). The examples by which Endo tries to show that foregrounding-backgrounding and sequentiality-nonsequentiality, however, are *not* conterminous—for example, *wayyiqtol*s used for background rather than foreground information—are meager and

¹ Bernard Comrie, *Aspect* (Cambridge, 1976); John Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (Cambridge, 1968).

² Joan Bybee, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca, *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World* (Chicago, 1994), pp. 137–38.

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 R(eference)-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 R(eference)-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

⁴ See Robert I. Binnick, *Time and the Verb: A Guide to Tense and Aspect* (Oxford, 1991).

Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers. By JOHN WILLIAM WEVERS. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 46. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998. Pp. xlxiii + 653. \$54.95.

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 Septuagintal 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:

[I]t 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. xxxiv]

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. xli]

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 noncontextual 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