

in royal norms stretching back 180 years, as attested primarily at Thebes, in Mansions of Millions of Years, and in shrines which acted as loci of private devotion to the goddess Hathor. Neither tradition was slavishly copied, but each was rather adapted for local circumstances.

In “Graffiti and Sacred Space: New Kingdom Expressions of Individuality in the Court of the Seventh Pylon at Karnak” (pp. 111–28), Chiara Salvador explores who can use sacred space. Some of the graffiti in this area are clearly datable to a time when this space was still ritually active, as they were cut when Ramesses IV added his name to the soubassement in the area.

As always, the *Tempeltagung* conference has shed light on a wide range of ancient Egyptian temples.

KATHERINE EATON
NEWTOWN NSW, AUSTRALIA

Alexander the Great and the East: History, Art, Tradition. Edited by KRZYSZTOF NAWOTKA and AGNIESZKA WOJCIECHOWSKA. *Philippika*, vol. 103. Wiesbaden: HARRASOWITZ VERLAG, 2016. Pp. 447. €88.

This volume is the product of a September 2013 international meeting of Alexander scholars held at Wrocław. It represents the second publication of such proceedings (the communications of the first meeting, held in November 2011, were also published in the *Philippika* series). The volume, containing twenty-four wide-ranging contributions (excluding the introduction), seeks to open new avenues for discourse on the eastern campaigns of Alexander, with a goal of introducing themes and sources that reach “beyond Arrian, Plutarch and the Vulgate authors as much as possible” (p. 1). Many contributions in this volume tackle important and enduring questions in Alexander scholarship, and truly shed new light on essential topics: e.g., the performance (or lack thereof) of the substitute king ritual, the founding and construction of Alexandria, the massacre of the Branchidae, the proskynesis affair, and literary portrayals of Alexander. While each provides its own important conclusions, the quality in writing, argumentation, and research depth varies wildly throughout, and this disparity detracts from the work as a whole. All contributions are written in English (a table of contents can be found at the publisher’s website: https://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de/title_921.ahtml); however, as with the previous volume, the editing of the book leaves much to be desired.

Space does not allow for a full explication of the argumentation of every article, so I will focus on those that present outstanding or particularly novel theses. Many of the articles in the first portion of the book make important contributions to the study of Alexander’s international and diplomatic relationships, as in that of I. Ladynin, who offers the hypothesis that the son of Nectanebo II made a missionary trip to Alexander after his conquering of Egypt. Editors Nawotka and Wojciechowska attempt to show that Alexander resurrected the neglected cult of the Apis Bull (as well as of the mother of Apis and the Buchis bull), a project undertaken on the advice of local experts and in a concerted effort to present himself as a legitimate son of Nectanebo II. E. Rung presents a new interpretation of IG II² 356, which has the Greek Thymondas as the honorand of the decree rather than the widely argued Mentor, an interesting proposition with implications for our understanding of Alexander’s relationship with Athens and Greek mercenaries (although, as acknowledged on p. 57, the author appears to understand the problems inherent in his case).

M. Ross shows the ways in which sources have skewed the stories of Alexander’s last months in Babylon through a study of the inconsistencies between the astrological omen practices of the Babylonians and the details given in Roman sources. R. Lane Fox tackles these questions, too, resurrecting the utility of the Classical sources to argue that their reading of the events became distorted over time, with interpretive layers being added that make it useless to attempt an interpretation with a Near Eastern lens (p. 115); this is a useful exercise and complements trends in the field.

The literary analyses of Alexander provide another avenue of approach for the second half of the book. G. Taietti’s piece makes the promising claim that she will show how Alexander is portrayed by

the “official” tradition historians as a Persian, Herodotean king, a representation that served as a way to make Alexander more understandable in his actions (or lack thereof) to Greek and Roman audiences as a descendant of or in relation to the Achaemenids. While well researched and written, and at times convincing, there is nothing about the tropes she cites that is particularly Herodotean (they could easily be quite current to imperial Roman authors, for instance the appeal to hubris or the tragic Warner motif), and even if they were, they are not specific to Achaemenid kings and can easily be applied to a Thucydidean Pericles or a Herodotean Pisistratus (the “builder king,” the “father king,” the “wicked tyrant”).

S. Müller’s article is masterful in showing that the epigrams on the Milan papyrus by Poseidippos portray Alexander as a melded image, combining a Macedonian conqueror and the new propagandistic representation of Ptolemy as the heir to Alexander. She shows how these two pictures blended together to create a vision of an all-encompassing warrior king by whose relation the Ptolemies could legitimize their own kingship. C. Djurslev writes an interesting piece that studies the parallels between Alexander and Dionysus of Nonnus’ late antique *Dionysiaca*. He observes that the Dionysus character in this poem should not be considered “an exact calque of Alexander,” but rather that we should understand “that there are certain features that interlock, creating an intertwining interface of heroic motifs and encomiastic themes” (p. 220), showing that the mythologization of Alexander as Dionysus was vigorous and ongoing late into the Roman period.

A. Fulińska initiates very important work by attempting to prove that Alexander’s apparent Persian affinities were part and parcel of Macedonian society before his conquest. Mostly using archaeological material, her efforts beg for a larger venture that should be undertaken in a book-length study. Her conclusion provides much ammunition for a redirection for the state of the field in general: “Therefore when Alexander defeated the Achaemenids he had not needed to adopt their customs entirely, because he may have had a number of them ingrained in his education and Macedonian background” (p. 244). P. Siekierka argues that we should view the deification of Alexander at Athens from the perspective of Athenian legal terminology. This is a good angle, and he provides convincing evidence that there was no Athenian—or even mainland Greek—deification of Alexander.

A. Kotlińska-Toma’s article addresses the presence of actors in Alexander’s entourage and makes a fascinating case for the performances of the satyr play *Agon* at the weddings at Susa in 324 BC, showing that the performance of the play “. . . in the spring and not the autumn was precisely and from the perspective of Alexander’s propaganda a necessity” (p. 284). R. Stoneman’s piece is a learned exposition of mirror imagery associated with Alexander in late Persian accounts. It shows how the literary image of the mirror changes through time, depending on political and religious issues, and how it is ultimately used to deprive Alexander of the ability to be considered immortal. A. Kłęczar provides a useful study of the motif of Alexander’s wisdom in Jewish traditions about the king, finding that the narrative is inconsistent in its assessment, though the standard moral lesson is always there: “Alexander may be great, but it is always God who is the greatest” (p. 353). Finally, J. Wiesehöfer provides a useful history of German scholarship on Alexander’s “policy of fusion” idea, contextualizing it within the academic and historical trends of racial pseudo-science and cosmopolitanism during and after the First and Second World Wars; his article makes clear that issues of source criticism in Alexander scholarship have still not been fully resolved.

Despite the value of many of these contributions, the editors of this volume have not been meticulous in their work: the introduction alone is rife with spelling errors, omitted definite particles, and misused (or missing) conjunctions. Several of the contributions also include perversions of the English language and suffer from a lack of basic proof-reading. One of the most disturbing slip-ups was the repetition of an entire paragraph (with inexplicable alternating italicizations) over the course of pp. 127–29. Furthermore, the editors have once again missed an opportunity to provide a cohesive analysis. The volume falls victim to organizational chaos; it appears at first glance to follow a west-east geographical/chronological approach, moving to an examination of Alexander’s portrayal in various types of literature (also presented in a chronological approach). However, this effort is already betrayed in the first two chapters, as the first contribution approaches the son of Nectanebo II, while the second refers to Nectanebo II himself. It would have been very useful for the editors to delineate a specific approach and provide clearer lines of interconnectedness between the articles.

Perhaps most disconcerting is the failure of the contributions to enter into meaningful dialogue with one another: several pieces were in direct competition or would have benefitted from internal reference, and others seem to be completely unaware of one another (e.g., the articles of Lane Fox and M. Ross both spend a good deal of time on the substitute king ritual, but fail to acknowledge one another's arguments). These omissions are not the fault of the authors of the articles, but are rather the mistakes of the editors, and more care should be taken in future publications. Nonetheless, readers will find much of value in individual contributions, and the volume certainly adds greatly to current understandings of Alexander's interactions with the East.

JENNIFER FINN
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY

The Morpho-Syntactic and Lexical Encoding of Tense and Aspect in Semitic: Proceedings of the Erlangen Workshop on April 16, 2014. Edited by LUTZ EDZARD. Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, vol. 104. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 2016. Pp. 242. €58 (paper).

This volume contains six of eight papers presented at a workshop under the same title which was organized by the Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg. No general observations are made by the editor in the preface, perhaps because a wide range of phenomena under the realm of tense and aspect are discussed in different Semitic languages, or because each of the contributors adopts quite a distinct approach to tense-aspect-modality (TAM).

The first paper by Michael Streck is an important step in filling the gap in describing the use of adverbs for tense-aspect marking as opposed to the use of verbal forms for the same purpose, which has received much attention. Section 2 of the article contains a fascinating discussion about the time-moving metaphor, aiming to explain the logic behind using adverbs such as “behind” to denote a future situation or “after” to denote a past one, rather than the contrary. The author makes an effective use of similar cross-linguistic tendencies to conclude that Akkadian is not an isolated case, and shows that a “logical” use of these adverbs also occurs. Double marking of temporal relations by both a verbal form and an adverb is exemplified by two cases in section 4. In both, as per the author, the adverb enables the temporal interpretation of the verbal form, which otherwise might be ambiguous. The first case (4.1) covers the use of the epistolary perfect, which, as claimed, usually combines a verb and an adverb to mark a situation which is anterior to one reference point but posterior to another. It is clear why an adverb is needed to elaborate on a form like the preterite *iprus*. It is unclear, however, why it is needed when *iptaras*, which, as claimed, is used exactly for this purpose, is in use. The second case (4.2) deals with the use of the present *iparras* with frequency adverbs to denote iterative past situations. Reading the examples makes one wonder, however, whether it is not the case that *iparras* is used in the historical present.

The article by Silje Susanne Alvestad and Lutz Edzard aims to look at the phenomenon of aspectual imperatives in Biblical Hebrew from a comparative perspective, and in this respect it is undoubtedly innovative. The situation is, naturally, compared with that of Slavic languages, which overtly mark this opposition. Unfortunately, it feels as if two separate articles were written—one dealing with the phenomenon in Biblical Hebrew and one in Slavic languages, and that not much attention was paid to the presentation of the similarities and the differences between them.

Two examples of valuable information that one can pick up from the reading but that were not highlighted in a comparative manner follow. First, a general statement about the fact that Biblical Hebrew and Slavic languages differ in both the morphological marking and the semantic value of aspectual imperatives is missing. Specifically for the semantic essence of the imperfective imperative—the Biblical Hebrew one is gnomic, whereas the Slavic one is iterative, habitual, or conative. A second note concerns what the authors call “fake” imperative/prohibitive. In Slavic languages the authors discuss