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exiting new avenues of research, and scholars will find articles with which they can instantly engage. In short, this is a highly valuable (although quite expensive) resource for anyone interested in the Book of Psalms.

David Willgren, Lund University


In Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament, Constantine Campbell attempts an overview of recent developments in the study of the Greek of the New Testament. Campbell claims to cover only issues related to “the cutting-edge discussion” and issues in current development within the field of the study of Greek, particularly in the context of the New Testament. Campbell’s book is overall a decent introductory book for his intended audiences, even though certain chapters could have been fuller and more nuanced, particularly chs. 1 and 2. However, this book could for sure be improved upon in a future revised edition.

Ch. 1 briefly discusses Greek studies from the 19th century up to this day, covering the towering figures of Greek studies in the 19th century—such as Win- er, Bopp, Curtius, Brugmann, Blass, de Witt Burton—and for the early 20th century: Deissmann, Moulton, and Robertson. Introducing modern linguistics, Campbell covers the work of Saussure, the Prague school, Chantraine, the systemic grammar of Firth, Chomsky’s generative grammar, Barr’s seminal work on the semantics of biblical language, Halliday’s systemic functional linguistics, Greenberg’s linguistic typology, McKay’s ground breaking work on verbal aspect, Pike’s tagmemics and Louw & Nida’s work on semantic domains. Finally, Campbell accounts for the “Modern era” (1989–), beginning with the publications on verbal aspect by Porter and Fanning and those following and responding to their works, as well as The Encyclopaedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics.

For the 19th century it would have been appropriate to mention Humboldt who was one of the most influential thinkers within general linguistics and Grimm who founded historical linguistics. The Neogrammarians also merit mention, particularly since it was against their atomism that the Prague School (P.S.) reacted. Campbell’s presentation of the P.S. is strikingly lacking. The P.S., though admittedly founded by Vilém Mathesius, was rather centred on Roman Jakobson and Nikolai Trubetzkoy. Mathésius was not only “concerned” with the theme/rheme concept, but actually put forth a theory using terms equivalent to what later would be referred to as theme and rheme. Not only functional but also systemic/structural (Jakobson coined the term “structuralism”) perspectives were central for the P.S. Surprisingly Campbell does not mention the markedness concept—so central in verbal aspect studies—that was invented by Trubetzkoy and Jakobson. The P.S. influenced the Copenhagen and London Schools (Firth) and Halliday (which Campbell does mention when discussing Halliday) and had a long-term influence with regard to the systemic view of language. Campbell
writes that the P.S. is still influential today, but does not mention a single example of its far-reaching influence specifically in NT language studies, within which a considerable number of NT language scholars make use of P.S. concepts with explicit reference to P.S. scholars. Most of the material on the P.S. that Campbell includes could have been precluded and replaced with material considerably more relevant for NT language studies.

Ch. 2 accounts for some of the most recent and influential theories adopted within NT Greek linguistics. Campbell starts with a discussion regarding the need for linguistic theory and draws attention to various distinctions within linguistics, such as those between general and descriptive linguistics, diachrony and synchrony, theoretical and applied linguistics, and micro- and macrolinguistics. He also notes the major division between generative and functional linguistics, the last of which he accounts for in more detail, with particular attention to its application within New Testament Greek linguistics and especially as exemplified in the study of verbal aspect by Fanning and Porter.

In ch. 3, that deals with lexical semantics and lexicography, Campbell first discusses the significance of context (or co-text), the power of choice, lexical fields and ambiguity, and then proceeds to the lexicographical work of Danker, Lee’s important work on methodology within lexicography, as well as Louw & Nida’s important contributions to NT lexicography, such as the arrangement of the lexis according to semantic fields and the use of definitions for the indication of meaning.

Ch. 4 accounts for the discussion on deponency and the middle voice. Scholars are increasingly arguing for deponency to be displaced. Campbell accounts for the background for this tendency by covering the discussion from 1908 (Moulton) up to the 2010 SBL conference when all four presenters agreed that the deponent category should be abandoned entirely. Campbell agrees, but notes the remaining challenges of mixed and passive deponents, as well as the complex relationship between voice and lexis.

In ch. 5 Campbell discusses what verbal aspect is, the distinction between aspect and Aktionsart, and the relationship between aspect and tense. He briefly accounts for the history of aspect studies, beginning with Curtius and McKay, moves on with the work of Fanning and Porter and those responding and contributing to the debate, such as Decker, Evans, and Campbell himself. He mentions the applied studies of Mathewson and Cirafesi, and Huffman’s work on prohibitions. After discussing the issue of aspect and temporal reference, Campbell accounts for the perfect-debate, the interaction between aspect and Aktionsart, as well as the role of aspect in narrative and discourse. A mild criticism of Campbell’s account of the present state of the understanding of the Greek tenses is that he does not sufficiently underline the fact that among scholars who have actually done research on tense/verbal aspect, at least half (if not more) support a non-temporal understanding of the Greek indicative.

In ch. 6 Campbell first discusses idiolect, noting the individual language profiles of the NT writers and particularly zooming in on the aspectual usage of the Gospel writers. Secondly, he shortly covers the genre of the Gospels (biography) and notes that the aspectual usage varies considerably between the narrative genre
and the epistolary genre. Thirdly, he discusses register as a category that defines it as use in different social situations. Finally, Campbell reflects on how aspect usage is affected by idiolect and register respectively.

Campbell’s discussion of discourse analysis (DA) is divided between the approach of Halliday (ch. 7) and those of Steven Runge and Stephen Levinsohn (ch. 8). Chapter 7 accounts for the four major schools within DA: Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), a school focused both on Bible translation and DA, particularly on the sentence level; Halliday & Hasan; Continental Europe, with a focus on rhetoric; Louw’s South African School of DA. As for Hallidayan DA Campbell discusses the resources of cohesion and their analysis. In evaluating Hallidayan DA, Campbell argues it has not been applied to Greek yet. Here Campbell does not seem to be aware of the work of Long Westfall and Reed, among others. In ch. 8 Campbell accounts for Levinsohn’s work that belongs within SIL. Levinsohn’s work is eclectic, drawing together functional perspectives, idiolect and markedness. Levinsohn deals with the function of sentence conjunctions, patterns of reference, highlighting and grounding devices, the reporting of conversation and boundary features. Some drawbacks, noted by Campbell are too much focus on the sentence level and idiolect, as well as the potential lack of theoretical rigour, resulting in ad hoc solutions. Finally, Campbell accounts for Runge’s cohesive categories (in his *Discourse Grammar*), such as connectives, cataphorics, theme/rheme and thematic devices. Levinsohn deals with the function of sentence conjunctions, patterns of reference, highlighting and grounding devices, the reporting of conversation and boundary features. Some drawbacks, noted by Campbell are too much focus on the sentence level and idiolect, as well as the potential lack of theoretical rigour, resulting in ad hoc solutions. Finally, Campbell accounts for Runge’s cohesive categories (in his *Discourse Grammar*), such as connectives, cataphorics, theme/rheme and thematic devices. Among Runge’s weaknesses Campbell notes that the analysis is limited to the sentence level, the lack of an overall discourse theory as well as the dependence on a certain view of markedness.

Ch. 9 addresses the infected—but less important—issue of pronunciation of Greek. Even though Erasmian pronunciation most likely is incorrect (as Campbell points out), its pedagogical advantage makes it user-friendlier for a language that already is a challenge to learn. In the final chapter (ch. 10) methods for teaching and learning Greek are addressed.

Overall, what is worrying is that for some sections Campbell seems to rely on only one or two sources. Campbell could have provided a fuller, broader and more nuanced picture of some of the topics that he addresses if he had used a wider variety of sources. In particular, I think it would have been worthwhile for chs. 1 and 2 since perspectives and preferences vary among linguists in terms of what is important and regarding what is “in” or “out.”

Jan H. Nylund, Lund University


In the last decades, there has been a steady stream of articles, dissertations, and monograph-length studies devoted to issues related to the formation and purpose(s) of the Book of Psalms. Approaching the issues from various directions, these studies could be described as related to two “epicenters.” The first is found in North America, and has its roots in the work of Gerald H. Wilson. The second