

Muslims that pillaged the Palestinian countryside in the Abbasid period and forced the rural Samaritan population to convert, die, or flee to the relative safety of Arabic-speaking Nablus (and a few other cities). Today, spoken Samaritan Arabic still betrays Damascene features, which presumably reached Nablus with the survivors of a devastating seventeenth-century pogrom.

The Hebrew substrate words mentioned above can also be used as an argument in the debate on the emergence of Samaritanism. Until well into the twentieth century, the Samaritans were often seen as “the earliest Jewish sect” (as in the subtitle of J. A. Montgomery’s influential book from 1907), i.e., as secondary to Judaism. This perception is now being abandoned in favor of that of an Israelite matrix culture, from which both Judaism and Samaritanism emerged. In general, this is also the view adopted by Pummer, who uses the term “Samaritan” as a designation for a distinct religious group only for the time from about 200 BCE onward. However, some of Pummer’s interpretations still betray the earlier, Judeo-centric perspective: Even elements that are nowadays known exclusively from one of these sister religions might have comprised a trait of the Israelite matrix.

Thus, non-Pentateuchal Hebrew Israelite names attested at the Mt. Gerizim cultic district need not have been taken from the Jewish biblical books (p. 24), but are common Israelite heritage. This could also be true of some of the instances booked as “Jewish influence” (p. 35) on the Samaritans. And until Byzantine times, when their numbers dwindled, the Samaritans might even have influenced their Jewish neighbors. Of particular interest in this respect (and potentially also for the assessment of the relationship of the Samaritans to the rabbis, p. 70) are occasional midrashic parallels (e.g., M. Mishor in *Ilu* 3 [2000], M. Florentin in *JQR* 96 [2006]). And, by the way, if the adjective “Samaritan” is to be avoided for the early period, “general Jewish” (p. 204) should also be replaced by “Israelite.”

Some minor points might be corrected or supplemented: P. 54: The understanding of *kwt* in 4Q550^c as “Cuthean” is surely erroneous and can be dismissed. P. 66: Conspicuously, Rabbinic sources also use the term *šmr̄y* (not only *kwt*) to refer to a Samaritan (M. Sokoloff, *DJPA*, 558). P. 132: “Great Gate” is an implausible translation for the name of the Samaritan reformer Baba Rabba. *bb* ‘gate’ is an eastern Aramaic lexeme not otherwise attested in Samaritan Aramaic. Note, however, that in roughly contemporaneous Jewish sources from Palestine *bbh* Babba is a variant form of the common name *ʔbh* Abba (Y. Elitzur in *IEJ* 63 [2013]: 98 n. 21). P. 226 (with n. 30): A complete French translation of the Balaam-commentary has been provided by C. Bonnard and M.-C. Michau in *RHPR* 89 (2009). P. 243: The *Asaʔir* received its final form in the tenth-eleventh century, but clearly contains older parts that date back to Byzantine times; see C. Stadel in *JAOS* 135 (2015). Finally, the decision to use diacritics on consonants, but not vowels (p. 8 n. 12), was infelicitous: The layman is still confronted with enigmatic signs, while the reader with competence in Semitics is annoyed by seeming “mistakes” (and even this inconsistent system is not employed consistently, e.g., p. 150 *ʔAtlit*, p. 179 *Givʔat*, p. 226 *al-taniya*).

But this review must not end with carping criticism. Pummer’s book is a lively testimony to the great strides made in Samaritan studies in the past thirty years. It is a highly recommended, informative, balanced, and very readable introduction to an often neglected field that is of potential importance for neighboring disciplines such as biblical studies, the historiography of Palestine, and the intellectual history of the Islamic world, to name but a few. Hopefully, this excellent book will introduce many new students to the exciting world of the Samaritans.

CHRISTIAN STADEL
BEN-GURION UNIVERSITY OF THE NEGEV

Constituent Postponement in Biblical Hebrew Verse. By JOHN SCOTT REDD. *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. 90. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 2014. Pp. xii + 155. €68 (paper).

What makes Biblical Hebrew (BH) poetry *poetic*? This simple yet formidable question has long vexed Hebraists, and the present work enters the fray by exploring how “syntactic relaxation” can

contribute to the formulation of BH verse. The author's monograph stems from his 2012 Catholic University of America dissertation directed by Edward M. Cook, and it acknowledges the impact of the seminal work on Hebrew verse structure by Michael P. O'Connor. Redd strikes a generativist tone at the outset, contending "that a description of BH verse that generates only and all lines of BH verse . . . is a legitimate and worthwhile pursuit" (p. xi). His constituent-based analyses reinforce this, but he also makes efforts to incorporate useful structuralist and functionalist approaches in accounting for poetic word order variations. He grants due recognition in chapter one to Prague Linguistic Circle co-founder Roman Jakobson, whose astutely succinct characterization of the "poetic function as that which 'projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of [paradigmatic] selection into the axis of [syntagmatic] combination'" (pp. 7–8), remains influential for studies of BH parallelism.

Yet Redd ascribes even more significance to Jakobson's early colleague, Russian Formalist Victor Shklovsky, and his notion of "defamiliarization" (pp. 9–17), whereby language is deliberately rendered more opaque to challenge and engage the recipient more deeply in the communicative event. This can be accomplished through a variety of devices, including syntactic alterations of conventional word order patterns. Redd considers the syntagmatic "postponement" of select paradigmatic constituents to be among such defamiliarizing techniques that can optionally characterize BH verse.

If poetry is, as Shklovsky put it, "attenuated, tortuous speech" (p. 13), then one must, in order to recognize and appreciate poetry, understand the style of language that is being so contorted. Redd accordingly turns his attention in chapter two to the venerable poetry-versus-prose conundrum in order to discern the morphosyntactic baseline from which BH poetry ostensibly diverges. The "linguistic control set" (p. 18) upon which he settles is "Classical Biblical Hebrew [CBH] Prose." The author here dips an evaluative toe into the scholarly morass of BH diachrony, rather too briefly noting the important challenges that have been posed by Young, Rezetko, Ehrensverd, and company, and generally aligning himself with the conventional Archaic → Classical (Standard) → Late trajectory delineated by Kutscher, Hurvitz, and others.

Although issues involving diachrony are peripheral to Redd's project, one might still wonder whether any proposed CBH prose baseline is, in fact, more a literary reification than a linguistic reality. Is all of the poetry attested within the Hebrew Bible legitimately measurable against such a consistent linguistic standard? Are the poetic *Song of the Sea* (Exodus 15) and *Song of Deborah* (Judges 5), for instance—which Redd includes among his test corpus—typologically comparable with their respective (and probably subsequent) prose accounts in Exodus 14 and Judges 4? What might Hebrew prose have looked like during the late second millennium BCE, whence these two songs are conventionally thought to originate? Lack of evidence precludes a definitive answer, of course; yet it is worth bearing in mind that studies such as this might, in some cases, necessarily be relegated to comparing poetic apples with prosaic oranges.

After arguing that the basic word order for the CBH prose clause was likely V–S–O–PP (verb, subject, object, [non-pronominalized] prepositional phrase), Redd proceeds in chapter three with a detailed overview of how previous word order studies have attempted to account for preposed constituents (pp. 32–42). He delineates three main approaches: traditional Hebraist, typological–functionalist, and generative. Traditional Hebraist (perhaps better simply termed "philological") models have often interpreted preposing in terms of emphasis or circumstantiality. Typological–functionalist methods, including information structure theory, have enabled fine-grained explorations into the pragmatic dimensions of preposing, whereas generative adaptations have offered rigorous analyses of BH syntactic surface structures within larger discourse contexts.

Redd could afford to be more explicit as to where he situates his own study upon this broad scholarly landscape. His theoretical foundations are eclectic, drawing from all three of the aforementioned approaches; yet they also risk being underdefined. For example, when he states that "this analysis will not appeal so much to information structure or poetic device as it will to basic syntactical constraints and constructions" (p. 59), is he intending to subordinate functionalist interests to generativist priorities? His prefatory in-depth discussion about the formal syntactic differences between verbal phrase complements versus adjuncts (pp. 50–57) would seem to suggest this. On the other hand, functionalist constructs such as defamiliarization remain central to his study. Although Redd does consider some

notable foregoing studies of BH verse, staking out in greater detail their respective theoretical and methodological boundaries as well as overlaps—particularly in terms of how these are relevant for his own approach—would sharpen his overall project.

Redd begins to engage with his test corpus in chapter four, by analyzing those poetic clauses “in which the verb occurs after two or more preverbal (but not preposed) constituents” (p. 59). Under the latter, the author includes left (or, more accurately, *front*) dislocations, adverbial accusatives, and some discourse markers. Such diligence in respecting formal sentence argument structure is understandable from a generativist standpoint, and yet it seems to risk contorting the actual functioning syntagms of BH on behalf of maintaining a pristine formal syntax. The author’s analysis of Psalm 18:28a exemplifies this tension (p. 68): *כי אתה עם עני תושיע* “But you will save an afflicted people.” Because he opts to preclude preposed subject pronouns from his database (conceding that “this decision is perhaps the most controversial”; p. 64), and because he evaluates the initial particle as extra-predicative, Redd views this clause as not exhibiting verb postponement, which he instead defines as “postponing the verb to the third or fourth position in a clause-line” (p. 68). Neither is the verb following the noun phrase in Psalm 18:28b counted as being postponed: *ועינים רמות תשפיל* “and haughty eyes you make fall.”

Might not this kind of atomistic analysis, however, risk missing the syntagmatic forest amid the syntactic trees? Consider the verse as a whole, which is arguably instead prefaced by a double-duty front dislocation: “Verily, You—an oppressed people you deliver, but proud glares you cast down!” Regardless of whether Redd’s or my syntactic analysis is more plausible, each verb resides syntagmatically at the end of its respective clause, and both verbs are pragmatically postponed more so than they would be, absent the fronted pronominal construction. To simply not count extra-syntactic units which manifestly contribute phonetic and semantic values to the communicative functions of the syntagm seems to be immoderately reductionistic—Chomsky’s *colorless green ideas sleep[ing] furiously* notwithstanding. Human language is more than an “algebra” (pp. 109, 123).

Given Redd’s concentration upon constituent word order, employing more literal (and even wooden) English translations of the BH data in chapters four and five would have been a helpful touch toward illustrating his arguments. His tabulations of the data are excessively redundant in areas: text and footnotes from pp. 96–98 and pp. 130–32 are reincorporated verbatim, respectively, on pp. 98–103 and pp. 133–37. Redd tallies 94 instances of V-postponement (pp. 70–84), 30 instances of S-postponement (pp. 109–12), and 52 instances of O-postponement (pp. 123–28). These compose, respectively, 18.3%, 12.4%, and 18.0% of the sample corpus, showing that constituent postponement is not a highly common feature in BH verse. Such rates lend support to Redd’s contention that constituent postponement is an exception rather than the rule.

Yet the question remains whether all of these exceptions can be adequately explained by defamiliarization, a notion that, despite the author’s adroit descriptions, remains under-operationalized. Although he includes “Syntactic Tropes [of] Matching and Syntactic Dependency” (p. 86) among the poetic functions of defamiliarization, these features cannot account for all of the examples. Redd even admits “[i]t is not obvious from any of the instances of syntactic dependency that V-postponement was triggered by the syntactic trope” (p. 89), and he points rather circularly to Psalm 10 as containing “a clear case of defamiliarization for its own sake”: *אלה פיהו מלא ומרמות ותך*: “[With] a curse his mouth is filled; also deceit and oppression” (Ps 10:7a). This syntactic structure, however, serves a larger rhetorical purpose than mere defamiliarization. By postponing the verb to the center of the clause, the resulting subject noun-phrase + verb construction is rendered into both the source and the target of the surrounding complement noun-phrases. Iconicity and irony are driving the syntax here: curse, deceit, and oppression emanate fore and aft from the wicked one’s mouth (*inside-out*), even as such behaviors encompass and are themselves “filled” with “his mouth” (*outside-in*). Redd periodically acknowledges the significance of pragmatic features (e.g., his excursus at pp. 115–23), yet devoting even more sustained and integrative attention to these constitutive, and not merely ornamental, devices of BH verse would strengthen and deepen his disciplined syntactical analyses.

Despite periodic typographical errors, the author has constructed a rigorous and reflective investigation that is well deserving of scholarly engagement. An ample bibliography and serviceable

author–subject index complement his monograph. Redd ultimately concludes: “While pragmatic or poetic *operations* may trigger postponement, the fact that postponement is allowable at all is due to the *process* of defamiliarization” (pp. 139–40, italics added). He thus appears intent upon maintaining a firm distinction between functional (pragmatic) versus formal (poetic) components of BH verse, and this makes reasonable sense for a categorical approach—even though he permits defamiliarization somehow to float above this dichotomy. Still, fostering further analytical dialogue between these two mutually informative dimensions of Biblical Hebrew poetry remains a desideratum for Hebraists that ought not to be unduly postponed.

PAUL KORCHIN
BRIAR CLIFF UNIVERSITY

A Cultural History of Aramaic: From the Beginnings to the Advent of Islam. BY HOLGER GZELLA. Handbuch der Orientalistik, vol. 111. Leiden: BRILL, 2015. Pp. xv + 451. \$363.

In 2 Kings 18:26 and the parallel passage in Isaiah (36:11), Eliakim, who is majordomo to the Judean king Hezekiah, beseeches the Assyrian envoy to speak with him in *’ārāmīt* rather than *yəhūdīt*. Eliakim is not a linguist, so far as we know, and the distinction that he is trying to make is as much political as it is linguistic: speak the language of the kingdom of Aram-Damascus, which comprises the territories around Damascus and Aleppo, rather than that of the kingdom of Judea, in which we currently find ourselves. In Holger Gzella’s latest publication, we learn the story of how these two men came to speak this idiom as a common tongue, how Eliakim came to make his request, so strange on the face of it, and why any of this should matter to us, among many other things.

In the text as we have received it, this *’ārāmīt* might have referred specifically to what Gzella describes as the “Central Syrian Koine” (pp. 67–72), in addition to the standardized administrative and literary language that superseded it, likewise described as *’ārāmīt* in the biblical books of Daniel (2:4) and Ezra (4:8). The former book also describes *’ārāmīt* as the language of the “Chaldeans,” whom scholars posthumously elevated to the status of a nation state during the course of the early modern era, complete with a national territory (“Chaldea”), a national language (“Chaldaic”), and a national religion (“Chaldaism”), none of which could be said to have existed in any meaningful way outside of the minds of these scholars. For that reason, this same language was also described as Chaldaic, at least until Josef Markwart coined the term *Reichsarāmāisch* to describe it in 1927. How *’ārāmīt* was transmogrified into *Reichsarāmāisch* (or Achaemenid Official Aramaic as it is more generally known today) through the efforts of ancient states and modern scholars is an interesting but somewhat open question, and Gzella dedicates much of his account (pp. 105–211) to the *status quaestionis*.

Gzella is less evidently concerned with how something called “Aramaic” has become the subject of scholarly discourse, in the manner of some other cultural histories, and more with tracing the evidence for this phenomenon back into the historical record spanning from the early first millennium BCE to the advent of Islam. He nonetheless begins appropriately enough by furnishing us with some background (pp. 3–16), outlining those scholars whose authority precedes him, and from whom we have inherited such categories as Aramaic. In this regard, it ought to be noted that the use of this single term to signify the many languages that are the present subject of this discourse is a comparatively recent phenomenon. It and its cognates in other languages were vanishingly rare in the scholarly literature before the publication of Landau’s 1819 landmark *Rabbinisch-aramäisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*; plotting an *n*-gram, “Aramaic” surpasses “Chaldaic” in English-language scholarship only after 1858. In German, “Chaldäisch” still continued to be much more popular until 1882, when Kautzsch published his *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*. Nonetheless, this term continued to be popular in any language well into the early decades of the twentieth century.

In prior years, it was far more common to refer to the members of this category as distinct languages, as reflected by the fact that their study remains still quite atomized. Chief among these lan-