reinforces the petition. Verses 28-32 are a final (and eschatological) interpretation. Ps 18 is usually taken as a preexilic royal thanksgiving or victory hymn. Gerstenberger allows that the psalm is a reworking of older traditions, but the reflective air, the wisdom influence, and communal liturgical orientation indicate that it is a messianic thanksgiving song of the Jewish community "very probably" used in the synagogue worship of the postexilic period. Even Pss 20 and 21, which traditional exegesis has associated with Judean kingship, are interpreted in surprising ways. Ps 20 is a "small-scale liturgy concerned about afflictions of a local congregation" (p. 105). Ps 21 "would have its origin in synagogue worship" (p. 107).

The above snippets are perhaps unfair to the author. His conclusions are contrary to current views of modern scholarship, but they are not outrageous or extreme as they might first appear. Gerstenberger's earlier work, especially Der bittende Mensch (1980), undergirds many of his statements. Much can be learned from his careful analysis of structures, formulas, and settings. It is necessary for the reader to work through a given psalm; then even if one disagrees, one is stimulated by the larger and often surprising perspective in which the psalm is viewed. Finally, the work corresponds to the increased sensitivity to contextual interpretation in the modern exegetical approaches. The volume contributes greatly to such views by pointing out successive reinterpretations of prayers that are unremittingly open-ended.

Roland E. Murphy
Emeritus, Duke University
Chapel Hill, NC 27706


The publication of Lewis Glinert's Hebrew grammar is truly a milestone in the (short) history of Modern Hebrew (MH) linguistics. As Chaim Rabin puts it (on the jacket), it constitutes "the first general presentation of the spoken language of educated native Hebrew speakers." It provides a wealth of data; with an improved index, the detailed classification and numerous insights into the various subcategories make this volume an important source of information for general linguists, Hebraists, and students of Hebrew.

The structure of the volume. The book consists of forty-two chapters, followed by fairly elaborate endnotes, a bibliography, and a brief index. Most of the volume is devoted to a description of the major syntactic structures of Hebrew; the last five chapters provide a sketch of MH morphology. Pages vii-xxiii consist of a detailed table of contents. The first four chapters are sketchy (pp. 1-11) and contain only hints of information on the status of Israeli Hebrew, the data, and the methods of description used in the book. They must have been intended merely to set the socio-linguistic and historical background—just as the three pages devoted to pronunciation and the single paragraph on the difference between fast and slow speech were not meant as a description of Hebrew phonology, but serve only to define the conventions for transcription and phonetic representation.

The phonetic transcription is reliably consistent (note that all illustrations below follow Glinert's transcription conventions), with the exception of /'/ (used whether it derives from an original glottal stop, aleph, or from a voiced pharyngeal fricative, 'ayin), which in Israeli Hebrew may be realized phonetically only before a (heavily) stressed vowel. Although it may reflect variation in actual recordings, depending on degree of emphasis, the transcription of /'/ does not appear to be systematic: sha' a "hour," me' eit "hundreds" (p. 46), me' eit "coat" (p. 48), me' eit "coat" (p. 48), na'ivi "naive" (p. 482)—versus just as many cases in which a stressed vowel is not preceded by /', for example, ha-ir "the city" (p. 141), motzi la-or "publisher" (p. 442), ha-ele "these" (p. 46), efo "where" (p. 60), ish "man" (p. 457). The transcription le' itim "occasionally," where /' is not in a stressed syllable, is definitely an error.

The rest of the book (over ninety-eight percent of it) describes the syntax of words, phrases, and a variety of constructions. The author begins with a survey of various parts of speech: definite articles, pronouns, quantifiers, determiners, and adjectives. He then describes more complex phrases (such as prepositional phrases) and also discusses various constructions (such as passives, comparatives, questions, and relative clauses). The last five chapters are devoted to the morphology of nouns, verbs, adjectives, and prepositions. All in all, the book provides the general linguist with detailed information and significant insight into the structure of MH.

In what follows, we will concentrate on pointing out what we see as problematic. Most of the points to be raised relate to organization and coverage of material; others involve issues of interest to both Hebrew
general linguists. We wish to emphasize, however, that our criticism is intended to be constructive, possibly hinting at suggestions for improvements in future editions, and by no means detracts from the importance of this rich source of information on MI. The Grammar of Modern Hebrew is unquestionably a work of great pioneering value.

The register. The first question concerns the uniformity of the register described in this grammar. As defined in chap. 2, the book is primarily a description of educated Israeli Hebrew, based on acceptability judgements by a half-dozen informants, all native born Israelis, ages 15-60. The author states that the book is primarily a description of educated Israeli Hebrew, and that even though in both written and spoken Hebrew there exist formal as well as casual “educated norms,” the gap between the two is not anything approaching diglossia. Moreover, according to Glinert, speakers are only dimly aware of the norms they are using. The book is intended to represent all “standard varieties in most general use, i.e. the speech and writing, formal and casual, of educated speakers of the ‘prestige’ socioclect, namely those with a non-Oriental pronunciation” (p. 7). The author labels formal and casual styles as such, with most examples being unlabeled and representing a “neutral” variety (defined as “what is in all-round use”). The boundaries of this “neutral” variety, however, are vaguely defined, and illustrations often contain usage which does not belong in the region where formal and informal overlap—possibly because, as noted on p. 7, “speakers frequently mix formal and casual.” Whatever the reason, one occasionally wonders at the source of utterances containing elements from opposing registers. Thus, *lo orid et ha-kova* “I won’t take off my hat” (p. 14) and *ten lo lehikanes, ve-atsia lo kafe o tey* “Let him in and I’ll offer him coffee or tea” (p. 393) are “neutral” sentences in all-round use, except that the use of the future forms *orid* and *atsia*, respectively, without the pronoun *ani* “I” is clearly formal. Although the author notes that the use of the conjunction *ve-* “and” for “while at the same time…” is formal, he places it in a context that is mostly “neutral” (except for *be-yada “in her hand”*: sara rallva al ha-ofanayim ve-hi malfzika be-yada agasim “Sara rode on the bicycle and [while] she holds [held] pears in her hand” (p. 342).

In other cases, a list of consecutive illustrations contains elements whose registers clearly mismatch. Thus, for instance, while *gas-ruatl “vulgar,” yafe nefesh “refined” etc.* (p. 47) are adjective + noun genitives in all-round use, owing to their quasi-idiomatic collocability, *Hum-Hultsa “brown-shirted”* is formal as well as stilled. Whereas *ha-adam hahu “that person”* (p. 96) is “neutral,” the following *hatalmid denan “the foregoing student”* is clearly literary. A sentence like *siparti lo elh alHad ha-anashim diber aleha be-ahada* “I told him how one of the men spoke about her sympathetically” (p. 330) is essentially “neutral,” though it contains the formal *elHad “one of”* rather than the commoner *elad;* most components of the preceding sentence, *hanehagim Xazu peurey pe keysad mimitote tet tikrat habeton* “The drivers watched open-mouthed how the concrete ceiling collapsed,” belong in a higher register. The sub-standard *aflu she-“even though”* looks strange in a formal sentence like *aflu sheyeshto tolet raba bashimush, shokelet hamemshala le-osro* “And even though there is great benefit in its use, the government is considering banning it” (p. 357). In a morphological list containing a couple of illustrations, occasionally one is “neutral” and the other literary, as in *kolani “vociferous” vs. listani “big-jawed (literary-rare),” dokran “spiky” vs. zollani “creeping (literary-rare)”* (p. 489). In a list of stem + suffix nouns in all-round use (p. 434), *giz’an “a racist person”* is a literary exception; Israelis use *gaz’an*. Similarly, for Israelis, the singular of *botnim “peanuts”* is *boten*, not the literary *botna* (p. 455).

Greater care should have been taken, then, to select only bona fide “neutral” illustrations in all-round use and to label them more precisely for register—which might have been facilitated by distinguishing finer detail of degree of “height,” or formality. It should be noted, though, that no linguist can avoid occasional crossing of register boundaries—not even one of Chaim Rabin’s calibre (see Netiva Ben-Yehuda’s comment in *Lashon ve-Yirvit I [1990]*). In fact, Glinert should be commended for the numerous instances where he does point out major differences between formal and casual Hebrew. For example, he notes (p. 35) that the construct possessives are freely coined only in formal usage, but that expressions like *bigdey shabat “Sabbath clothes”* and *tsemer kvasim “sheep wool”* are frequent enough as “generic” types to be used at any register. The author also lists in some detail (n. 21, pp. 503f.) which nouns must be constructs to other nouns and goes through the list of construct possessives used in casual speech (though it would have benefitted the reader to find such statements before the detailed description of the construction). Similarly, he notes that the direct object suffix appended directly to verbs is formal and rather uncommon (*lehazhirIla “to warn you”), and that subject pronouns are omitted sometimes in formal usage in third person past and future but not in casual usage. He also notes that the dummy subject *ze* is mostly used in casual style (p. 63).
Even more interesting are Glinert’s descriptions of situations in which the syntax of formal Hebrew radically differs from the syntax of colloquial Hebrew, most notably in the areas of agreement (both nominal and verbal). This is where Glinert lives up to his promise of writing a descriptive non-normative grammar. Thus, for example, he notes that gender agreement may be lacking in casual usage of numerals, with the feminine form being used as a neutral form, especially from “11” to “19” (p. 81), and that in existential sentences predicate verb agreement is non-existent, probably due to the fact that the nominative subject is reanalyzed as a direct object (gam kan haya et ha-baaya ha-zot “Here too there was [3, m, s] such a problem [ace, 3, f, s]”). Although these facts have already been discussed in the literature (see Ziv [1976] and Hermon [1985], among others), it is still important that the casual option is now recognized as a viable variant rather than merely being labeled “substandard” usage. One should not underestimate the importance of the type of non-normative description attempted by the author in this volume: most analyses of Hebrew (especially the ones written in Hebrew and published in Israel) tend to describe a formal variety and pay very little attention to the language which is in all-round use. As mentioned on p. 6, the remarkable uniformity of his informant-judgments gives hope that this study is indeed representative of educated Israeli Hebrew, and at the very least it may establish a framework for further linguistic investigation.

The data. In general, the book is very good on details, presenting the reader with a variety of crucial examples and (as already discussed) often addressing the issue of differences between formal and casual Hebrew. There are a number of instances, though, in which the author’s description of the facts is not entirely accurate. For example, in his discussion of subject pronouns, he mentions that present tense verbs sometimes omit the third person pronoun:...(hu) lo yore “(he) doesn’t shoot” (p. 53, ex. 5). The facts have been widely discussed among generative grammarians describing this phenomenon, and there is agreement that in the present tense the subject can never be omitted, not even when the preceding context could identify the subject—see Boror (1980) and Hermon (1985), among others. Another example is the statement (p. 63) that dummy ze cannot be used where a le- “for, to” phrase accompanies the predicate, most notably with experiential adjectives such as kashe li “hard (for me)” (p. 63). The use of the dummy has, however, spread to these examples in casual speech: ze lo noaII li “It is not convenient for me,” ze lo mitlashke li “I don’t feel like it,” ze meshaamem lo “He is bored.” It may simply be the case that

Israeli Hebrew is changing so rapidly that what was considered substandard yesterday is the norm of today, making it very difficult to decide what to include in a description of standard educated Hebrew. Other illustrations, which appear to us unacceptable or very marginal, may be due to the use of prefabricated (see p. 6) utterances which escaped notice by the native-speaking judges. Here are some examples: niipasim kol paam bidey shotrim “[One] is caught each time by police” (p. 518; adding po “here” after the first word would have made it more acceptable), ha-kvish zorem mayim “The road is flowing with water” (p. 115; ha-af nozol lo “His nose is running” would have been acceptable), tadiran *meyatser “Tadiran produces” (p. 444; the Tadiran company is feminine, like all other companies, in spite of its “masculine” form), *grinberg ba’im “the Greenbergs are coming” (p. 455; only pluralized last names, i.e., ha-grinbergim, can denote the whole family), claiming that dag “fish” can be non-countable (only the plural, dagim, can have a non-countable reading) and sukar “sugar” countable (p. 451).

Targeting the non-expert reader. The author’s success in satisfying the target audience also needs to be evaluated. The book was written with two kinds of readers in mind: the advanced student of MH who knows almost no linguistics, and the general linguist who knows no Hebrew. Glinert sees no contradiction in this dual purpose; he provides word-for-word glosses and makes an “infinite effort at avoiding needless abstraction” (p. xxv). As far as students of Hebrew are concerned, the book indeed provides a wide array of facts without any “rules” or generalizations for the language learner. This may actually be a positive feature of this work, since it is questionable from a methodological point of view whether such generalizations help second language learners in their efforts at working out the system of the new language. On the other hand, the descriptions abound with traditional grammatical terminology, making the work difficult to comprehend for readers with no linguistic training. Consider, for example, the following statements: “To refer back to a whole clause, rather than a noun phrase, one uses not personal pronouns but ‘pro-clauses’” (p. 56); “Partitive phrases can introduce an exceptional relative clause of ‘being,’ lacking a relative conjunction…” (p. 76); “Many nouns express a verbal action or an adjectival state or a product thereof” (p. 376).

A solution would have been to provide non-linguist readers with a brief appendix, defining some of the terminology. The work contains a one-page list of abbreviations and conventions used in the glossing procedure, but it
is of little use to the reader not familiar with technical linguistic terminology to be told, for instance, that “OM” stands for “object marker.”

**Targeting the linguistically-trained reader.** We should also evaluate the usefulness of this work for the general linguist who knows little or no Hebrew. The issue here is whether uninterpreted data are more useful to the reader than data organized in terms of an analysis of the construction being described. The author has clearly opted to concentrate on presenting a large number of facts, and on the whole avoiding theoretical statements. Even the endnotes, where various theoretical issues could have been discussed in some detail, are usually reserved for exceptions and additional sub-classifications of the data.

At times it seems that the reader is confronted with a long list of seemingly unrelated facts. For example, in the treatment of relative clauses, the following list of options is given: relative clauses in which a resumptive pronoun is retained (*ele ha-tsifim she-garu baheim “These are the huts that we lived in [them]”); relative clauses without a pronoun (*efo ha-bragim she-yatsu “Where are the screws that came out?”); and relative clauses in which the pronoun seems to be moved to the beginning of the clause (*ha-boker she-bo higai “the morning on which I arrived”). The reader is thus left with the impression that Hebrew may allow a number of options for relativization: an overt pronoun which is not moved to the beginning of the relative clause, a moved overt pronoun, or no pronoun at all (which could be interpreted as a null pronoun). There follows a discussion of the fact that relative pronouns which are subjects are not usually expressed, while relative pronouns which are objects are “sometimes left unsaid and sometimes expressed as pronouns, depending on the register and sentence structure” (p. 361). Relative pronouns which are indirect objects and adverbials are “rarely omitted” (p. 362). In addition, it is mentioned that pronouns are often moved to the beginning of the relative clause, and that in all registers clauses which are long or complex tend to require a pronoun. No attempt is made to present a theoretical account for this complicated array of facts.

To link all types of relative clauses together, one could note that in Hebrew there are two basic options: an overt relative pronoun, which can be moved to the beginning of the relative clause but does not have to be moved (*ha-isha she-rattit ota “The woman that I saw [her]”; *ha-isha she-ota raitti “The woman that [her] I saw”), and a null pronoun, which always acts as if movement were involved. The latter strategy is limited to subject and direct object relative clauses (e.g., *ha-anashim she-bau “The people who came”; *ha-anashim she-pagashit “The people I met”). The crucial point here is, that in many instances, relativization involves movement of a null element or an overt pronoun to the beginning of the relative clause (the SPEC of CP position in current linguistic terminology). This has serious implications for the distribution of relative pronouns in Hebrew: as noted by the author, in certain long and complex sentences, only overt pronouns are possible. He misses out, however, on the important generalization that only overt pronouns which are unmoved are possible in these complex sentences. This falls out directly from the interaction of movement (of a null or overt pronoun) with principles of grammar which constrain movement. It is well known in the linguistic literature, that “long distance” movement (such as movement of relative pronouns) obeys certain constraints on movement. This was first discussed by Ross in his seminal work in the late sixties and has been incorporated in more recent versions of the theory as the subjacency condition. Basically, this condition prohibits movement out of certain structures. It is not the length of the sentence itself which determines whether movement can occur, but the complexity of the structure out of which movement occurs. For example, note the effect of movement in the following sentence: *hine ha-isha she-ota shamai she-David amar she-Moshe ohev t “This is the woman who I heard that David said that Moshe loves.” In this sentence, t marks the extraction site from which the pronoun ota was moved. The pronoun is moved two clauses away, with no ill effects. Incidentally, the sentence is equally grammatical without the pronoun ota. If the relativized element is inside a more complex structure, however, such as a wh-question or another relative clause, the pronoun cannot be moved away: *hine ha-isha she-ota ani makir et ha-ish she-ohev “This is the woman that I know the man who loves her.” Note that in this case the version without the pronoun is also ungrammatical. The reason for this sentence being ungrammatical is that the relative pronoun originates inside a clause which is dominated by another NP (a Complex NP in current terminology); extraction out of such complex domains violates the subjacency condition, as formulated in Chomsky (1981), inter alia. Null pronouns (what the author calls “unexpressed” relative pronouns) pattern with overt pronouns which have been moved away, providing the linguist with evidence that movement is involved in both instances. Our point here is that since the author was not interested in a possible analysis of the data, he actually missed out on presenting significant information, such as the availability of null and moved pronouns in complex structures.
The same point can be made regarding the author’s description of subject-raising. Syntacticians interested in Hebrew will be puzzled by his discussion of subject-raising. Subject-raising (a term introduced in generative transformational grammar in the early seventies) accounts for surface structures in English in which the main verb takes a subject which semantically (and syntactically) is the subject of a complement clause (which in most analyses appears in extraposed post-verbal position). Examples in English are sentences like “John seems to have left.” In this sentence the subject “John” is semantically the agent of an action, and at an abstract level “seems” lacks a subject. Another surface option is the sentence “It seems that John has left.”

Subject raising is discussed in §31.3, under the heading “‘Raising’ in object clauses.” First of all, it should be pointed out that Hebrew differs from English in not having the variation between a raised and unraised version. Thus, Hebrew does not allow *alul she-yosef yenatsa! “It is likely that Yosef will win.” Secondly, the standard analysis of subject raising in transformational grammar involves positing an abstract structure in which the higher “raising” verb has no subject (an “empty” subject position in recent grammatical theory). The noun phrase which is subject of the lower clause is “raised” into this empty subject position.

Even though the author claims that the raised structure is represented semantically by structures like alul she-yosef yenatsa! “[It is] likely that Yosef will-win” (p. 331), he does not address the question of what the syntactic analysis of these structures is. Later on that same page, he seems to claim that there is an implied (null?) subject in the lower clause, which is identical with the actual subject, citing examples like miharti laset “I quickly left.” Again, on that same page, it is stated that there is yet another type of subject-raising clause: aspectuals and modals like note “tend,” which have the following abstract syntax: [she-ha-sheleg kofe] note > ha-sheleg note likpo “The snow tends to freeze.” In these constructions, the author claims, the subject of the higher verb is a whole clause at the abstract level. It is left unclear how many abstract sources the author intends to posit for subject-raising structures, though he seems to have at least three different structures in mind. He does not, however, specify why all these structures belong together and what they have in common, nor does he provide any clear syntactic arguments for the grouping. For the general linguist it remains a puzzle why aspectual verbs like hitHil “begin,” modals like Hayav “must,” and adverbial-type verbs like mihar “be quick to” belong in the same category.

Incomplete discussion and referencing. At other times, the author does offer some explanation for the data, but ignores other theoretical approaches provided in the literature. An example is his treatment of tense. In chap. 13 it is stated that there are no sequence-of-tense rules in Hebrew. The author claims that the following rule holds for Hebrew: “The time of a situation is expressed from the vantage point of the person most directly contemplating it” (p. 121). Even though “vantage point” is not defined, from Glinert’s own examples it is clear that he is referring to the point of view of the subject (usually the agent) of the clause. In other words, he argues that there is a pragmatic explanation for tense in Hebrew. He does not consider an alternative account (such as the one proposed in Cole [1974]), in which tense in each clause is relative to the tense of the clause above it (a grammatical account). In most instances, the vantage point of the contemplator of the action equals the tense expressed in the clause.

There are sentences, however, in which no vantage point is expressed, since the sentence lacks an agent contemplating the action. Glinert’s analysis would predict that in such instances, it will be the speaker (who always speaks in the present tense) who determines the relative tense of the embedded clause. In the following sentence, for instance, this analysis would anticipate that the future tense expressed in the complement clause be a real future (with respect to the present tense of the speech act): haya heltraH she-hu yagia mukdam “It was necessary that he arrive early.” It is clear, however, that yagia is not exclusively interpreted as future with respect to present, but could also be an action which is past with respect to present. Crucially, the tense in the embedded clause is future with respect to the past tense of the main clause. Thus, one could say: haya heltraH she-hu yagia mukdam ve-hu be-emet higia mukdam “It was necessary that he arrive early and he really did (arrive early).” Another example: when telling about the experience of having gotten up in the morning and being surprised that it had rained at night, one would use: haya muzar she-yarad geshem kol ha-layla “It was odd that it had rained all night.” Again, the tense of the embedded clause is past with respect to the tense of the main clause.

In the examples given above, the speaker (and speech act) is in the present tense, but the tense of the complement clause is being interpreted vis-à-vis the tense of the main clause, even though there is no contemplator of action in the main clause. Cole (1974) argues, furthermore, that the tense of the main clause is relative to the tense of the speech act (which is always present tense), and hence one could claim that all tenses are relative...
in Hebrew. The author should have at least considered such an alternative analysis.

A related handicap for the general linguist is that though ample references are provided at the end of each chapter, only rarely is a particular explanation or view, or a body of data, associated with a specific source (e.g., Ornstein 1979, Schwarzwald 1981, and Bolotzky 1978 on p. 463; Bolotzky 1978 p. 468). One could argue that there is merit in this approach, in that it forces the linguist to read all the literature associated with the topic; still, reading everything is not always feasible. Also, even occasional use of some other author's data should be referenced more specifically, rather than the reference merely being included in a general "further reading" list.

The treatment of word-formation: general. Although the volume focuses on syntax, linguists whose main interest is word-formation would also find a wealth of information in it, particularly in the area of noun and adjective morphology, which tends to receive less attention from researchers of Hebrew than the verb system does (for a notable exception, see Ravid [1978], and elsewhere). The morpho-semantic classifications are appropriately restrained. It is pointed out that although certain "roots" have a sharply defined meaning, "root meanings are usually shadowy or non-existent. . . . Rather, roots exist to give grammatical form to the word. The meaningful building blocks in word formation are words, not roots—though fairly unpredictable even then" (p. 428). It is the distinctive vowel-patterns and/or affixes which may have meaning. The author also points out, correctly, that the verb patterns are meaningful in a restricted way (p. 461), in expressing "a limited number of general 'grammatical' notions, or more strictly, 'relationships' between verbs." Also, they tend to be much more meaningful in frequent verbs, as well as in coinages and word-coining productivity texts (p. 463).

Attention is also drawn (p. 430) to the fact that in noun/adjective formation, derivation is verb-based where internal vowel patterns but no affixes are involved, whereas noun-based derivation today mostly involves affixes. While this observation is essentially correct, it obscures the fact that the major dichotomy is not between affixed and non-affixed forms, but rather between discontinuous word formation, which involves fixed vowel configurations, with or without affixes, and continuous patterns, which involve affixation but do not affect the internal vowel configuration of the source (except for predictable reduction). While the former is mostly verb-based, the latter primarily affects existing nouns and adjectives. That this is so can best be demonstrated by occasional patterns which can be discontinuous as well as continuous, like the discontinuous CaCC + an pattern (p. 433) and its continuous counterpart Noun + an (p. 434)—for example, kablan "contractor (from kibul 'receive')," ragzan "a quick-tempered person (from ragel 'be angry')," vs. alHutan "radio operator (from alHutan 'radio')," tvusat "a defeatist (from tvusar 'defeat' [N])." Although Glinert's sub-classification within these patterns appears to suggest two semantically-separate patterns, a closer look (see also Bolotzky [1986b]) suggests that the two realization-types refer to essentially the same semantic categories, and that what looks like a basic difference is a function of verb-based vs. noun-based derivation. Although discontinuous word formation is still productive, it is continuous derivation, possibly under the influence of European languages, which has been expanding most rapidly in recent years, notably in compounding involving prefixes that are not independent words (du- "bi-,” beyn- "inter-,” anti- "anti-,” etc.; it is not a minor group, as suggested on p. 440) and trade names (like nu'of, compounded of nuva "a brand name" and 'of "fowl," p. 440).

Statements about specific word-formation patterns. As for the classification itself, Glinert offers some useful morpho-semantic observations with regard to specific patterns. He notes, for instance, that while both ma + CaeCa and ma + CeCaC + a (p. 432) are "instrumental," the latter tends to refer to something more complex ("device" vs. "machine," e.g., maceq "screwdriver" vs. mahresha "plowshare"). Or, while the most common reading of mi + Cac + a is "location," as in misada "restaurant," its masculine counterpart mi + CCaC (p. 431) primarily denotes "action or its result," as in mividn "test" (in a database collected by Bolotzky [1986b] "action or its result" cases outnumbered "location" in mi + CCaC by a 2:1 ratio). On the other hand, we find it somewhat misleading when it is stated (p. 432) that the second reading of ma + CeCaC + a is "(non-puristic) location." In fact, there are bona fide locatives in ma + CaeCaC + a, as in magena "anchorage, jetty"; moreover, the non-puristic ones referred to by the author are colloquial variants of puristic mi + Cac + a cases (e.g., maHbesa "laundry" vs. puristic millHbasa). Just as ma + CeCaC is often replaced by me + CaeCeC in colloquial usage, as in megahets for magnets "iron" (as pointed out on p. 432, unfortunately without illustrations). Also, although Glinert is correct in observing that the suffix + ut is normally added to existing stems to form continuously derived words without the internal vowels being affected, there are reasons to believe that at the same time there exist independent discontinous
patterns (i.e., with fixed internal vowel patterns) such as CCIC + ut (e.g., sdirut “regularity,” ptilhu “openness,” bidud “loneliness”—each derived from a different stem. See Bolozky and Schwarzwaldf [1989]). In verbformation, productive coinages could (as suggested in Bolozky and Saad [1983] and Bolozky [1986a]) be further refined by observing that while new (or potential) causatives realized in Hijil cover all types of causation, those in Piel are restricted to “cause to be” or “cause to become,” and that the “otherwise” Piel cases tend to be non-causative agents.

Occasional gaps and number of illustrations. The author does not claim to present all noun and adjective patterns—only the more significant ones, yet on the whole he manages to do so successfully, with occasional gaps. We would have expected, for instance, to find CiCC + on, as in shihan “regime,” alongside CiCaC + on (p. 439), particularly since Israelis merge some puristic CiCC + on cases with CiCaC + on, as in pitron “solution” shifting into colloquial pitaron (see Bolozky, forthcoming). Generally, there are appropriate illustrations for every sub-class, and statements are made as to degree of productivity, but one wonders at times at the number of illustrations cited—one and occasionally two for a given meaning—regardless of the number of cases involved. Thus, in the case of ma + CCEc (p. 432), for instance, only one illustration is provided for its common “instrument” meaning (matselaH “key”), and the same applies to the minor CC0C + et pattern, whose “unwanted mass of something” reference is illustrated by psolet “garbage.” Perhaps the commoner patterns should have been represented by additional examples to give a better sense of the scope of each phenomenon. The same is true of illustrations grouped together as if they were equally common or uncommon. For example, Glinert uses kfar “village” and shullan “table” as prototypes of uncommon patterns (p. 427). Actually, while shullan indeed represents an uncommon pattern, Avineri (1976) lists 122 nouns belonging to the CCaC pattern, and we could possibly add another forty-four if CCaC with a patah (e.g., zman “time”) is included as well.

General organization. The main difficulty for the linguist lies in the book’s organization, in two regards: the way syntactic information is presented in the book, and the lack of a good index. Browsing through the table of contents, it is unclear whether chapters are organized by construction, by rule, or by type of phrase. Linguists will have difficulty finding relevant information, since the organization is not clearly construction-based or rule-based, and the headings are occasionally misleading. For example, a linguist interested in whether Hebrew has subject raising (as in English “John seems to have left”—see our discussion above) will find these data under §31.3, whose heading, “‘Raising’ in object clauses,” does not adequately bring to mind all the various structures included in it. Causativization, on the other hand, is discussed in §15.7, under the heading “Double objects,” which is not where most linguists would look for it.

The greatest difficulty for the linguist, however, is the lack of a decent index. The volume’s two-page index, which is in Hebrew only, is a mere list of connectives, adverbs, quantifiers, and a couple of other expressions. The absence of a good index makes this work very inaccessible. A detailed index should contain not just vocabulary items but a list of all major constructions discussed, as well as some generative linguistic terminology (such as “subject raising,” “causatives”). This inadequacy can be easily remedied in the next edition, and that would make this grammar much more useful for the linguist interested in Hebrew from the point of view of cross-linguistic comparisons.

General evaluation. Even though we focused on some difficulties with the book, it should be emphasized again that this grammar is an important reference work. The author deserves praise for producing a volume which not only covers substantial data but is interesting to read and provides us with descriptions of both formal and casual Hebrew. He should be commended for the wealth of detail provided in most chapters. Often these details are original insights which to the best of our knowledge have not been noted in the literature. As one example out of many, in his discussion of relative pronouns, the author notes that adverbs containing relative pronouns are often omitted in restrictive relative clauses: banu lemakom she (bo) lo hayu mayim “We came to a place in which there was no water” (p. 363). Another interesting observation about these sentences is that the relative pronoun must be preposed if it is not omitted; that is, the pronoun bo in the above example must appear at the beginning of the relative clause. The book abounds with such interesting observations, amply illustrated by utterances that are well-presented, with Hebrew consonantal spelling, transcription, English translation, and glosses for the more complicated examples. As noted above, most of our criticism relates to organizational issues and to certain choices concerning data and/or theoretical account; it is primarily intended as suggestions for improvement in future editions of this excellent resource, which fills a major gap in the field. The Grammar of Modern Hebrew is an absolute must for all who are interested in the grammar of MII, regardless of their theoretical background.

The human religious experience has expressed itself in two opposing dimensions: religion is seen as the striving of the individual for inwardness, transcendence, and direct access to divinity, and, on the other hand, religion is seen as a group’s articulation of its system of meaning.

For some 2000 years mediation between God and his people has taken place for Jews through the revealed Torah and its mitzvot. Devotion to God is translated in the rabbinic tradition into a commitment for a way of life that follows the divine command.

What form, however, did devotion and piety take for the patriarchs, especially Abraham, in the long centuries before the Sinaitic revelation? By their interpretation of Gen 16:5 the rabbis could assert that Abraham observed both the Torah and the Oral Law (cf. Qidd. 4:14 and t. Qidd. 5 etc. as listed in S. Sandmel “Philo’s Place in Judaism,” part 2, HUCA [1955]:156f.). Philo and Paul, as well as the later kabbalistic authors, dealt with this problem of piety prior to and/or independent of Sinai. The issue was raised anew by hasidic masters in the late eighteenth century once the tension between spiritual devotion and the life of commandment had come to the surface since it had been demonstrated so prominently and dangerously in the Sabbatian upheaval a century earlier.

Green quotes from the homilies of such men as Dov Baer and his disciples, Levi Yitzhak of Berdichev and the Kalonymus Kalman Epstein, all of whom see in Abraham’s life of piety the spiritual-mystical embodiment of the 613 mitzvot. Major attention is then given to Nahman of Bratslav (1772-1810), Shne’ur Zalman of Ladi (1745-1813), and their immediate literary successors. These writers resolved the dichotomy between the spiritualist and the thought patterns of the sacramental by a return to the pre-hasidic Kabbalah. While asserting the primacy of Torah study and observance, they were given the key to unlock the mysterium within the mitzvot.

These seven lectures, presented in 1986 at HUC-JIR, Cincinnati, make challenging but difficult reading even for the professional student of Jewish thought.

Frank Rosenthal
Camarillo, CA 93012