

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

the “fake” imperfective imperative, which is semantically perfective. In Biblical Hebrew, on the other hand, the idea of “fakeness” was attributed to the prohibitive, and it works in both directions, i.e., essentially perfective grams indicate an imperfective prohibitive, and vice versa.

The third paper, by Nora Boneh, argues that the verbal system of Modern Hebrew is primarily tense-oriented but, nevertheless, every verb form encodes, although not morphologically, aspectual information. Boneh presents and develops this argument in a very convincing manner, combining different relevant considerations in her analysis, such as tense, grammatical aspect, lexical aspect, and textual issues.

At the end of the paper she replies to Dekel, who perceives the Modern Hebrew system as primarily an aspectual one, by refuting some examples. The disagreement is, I believe, a result of the different approaches to aspectual theory that the two scholars adopt. Whereas Dekel interprets the opposition perfective vs. imperfective as looking at the situation as one integral unit vs. looking at its internal structure, Boneh adopts the different approach of overlap vs. non-overlap of temporal intervals. The two approaches give rise to different analyses. Thus in example (44) for instance, the verb *avda* is interpreted by Dekel as perfective, whereas Boneh interprets it as habitual, a category which, by the way, she doesn't see as aspectual, and thus the aspectual status of this verb is left unclear to the reader. This dispute is simply a reflection of a well-known problem in linguistics—the lack of universally agreed-upon definitions of grammatical categories. However, it doesn't harm the phenomenal analysis that Boneh conducts in this paper.

The meticulous article of Melanie Hanitsch introduces a refreshing approach to the research of grammaticalization using cross-dialectal materials. More specifically, the author compares the extent to which different modern Arabic dialects use a(n) (actual/general present) verb modifier before the prefix-conjugation (PC) to mark one of five categories of lexical aspect in order to draw conclusions about the grammaticalization path in which these modifiers have developed. The author even completes the picture by checking the compatibility of the active participle (AP) with the same lexemes. Although one can argue that the sample is not representative enough, or that the corpora in which the lexemes were searched are not exhaustive enough, there is no doubt that the results are convincing and that the presentation is impressive.

Salah Fakhry's article contributes important syntactic information about the TAM system of one of the most widely spoken yet poorly described dialects in the Arab world—the (Muslim) dialect of Baghdad. Some methodological issues arise, however. Materials from the sixties are considered together with others from the last decade for a dialect that underwent significant changes, which problematizes the synchronic validity of the research. The phonemic transcription lacks systematic guidelines—instances like *īnām* and *yīnām* ‘he sleeps’ appear side by side (3.1.8), weird combinations such as *aīy* in *ḡḡaīyir* ‘little (m.sg)’ occur (3.1.11), and some sounds seem unlikely, like /ḡ/ in the previous example. Finally, basic references to previous works about the TAM system of the dialect like Malaika (1963) and Abu-Haidar (1994), as well as to basic cross-linguistic work about TAM, are missing.

As for the description of the TAM system, it is well organized and presented in an easy-to-read manner. There are, however, a few instances which require clarifications. Two examples of such cases follow. First, it is claimed that the suffix-conjugation (SC) and the PC are not modal. Their modal use is, however, attested in Malaika (1963) and even in some of the examples in this article itself, like the verb *yirḥam* (3.1.3), which has an optative use, or the verb phrase *ʾarūḥ ʾaḡīb* in the following line, which presents a subjunctive use of the PC in a final clause. Second, the present relevance in 2.1 is a property of the use of the AP *mballila*, and not of the SC *muṭrat*. On the other hand, this use of the AP is absent from the description of the AP's functions in 4.1.

The last article, by Ronny Meyer, aims at answering one of the prevailing questions in Semitic languages in general—whether the binary system of SC vs. PC encodes temporal or aspectual opposition. Through a detailed and convincing analysis that combines diachronic and synchronic considerations and compares fourteen Ethiosemitic languages, the author shows that the SC vs. PC opposition was essentially, and in fact still is, aspectual, although temporal distinctions are obligatorily denoted in the

modern languages, mainly through periphrastic constructions. Moreover, the expansion of the verbal system enabled the development of further temporal-aspectual categories such as the continuous and the perfect. The discussion about the morphology of the verbal system in section 4 occupies almost half of the article and, although containing important information, is irrelevant to this volume at such length. The author adopts Comrie's definition of the continuous, but in fact only the use of the progressive is demonstrated, whereas no examples of the non-progressive are given. Thus, it is unclear whether the grams that supposedly mark the continuous can host a stative verb. If not, then the use of the term "continuous" should have probably been avoided.

To conclude, the volume presents some fascinating examples of the ways in which tense, aspect (and modality) are marked in different Semitic languages, and thus reflects a serious step further in the understanding of this complex constituent of the grammar of any language, particularly a Semitic one.

ASSAF BAR-MOSHE
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM
UNIVERSITÄT HEIDELBERG

Estudios de lingüística ugarítica: Una selección. By GREGORIO DEL OLMO LETE. *Aula Orientalis-Supplementa*, vol. 30. Barcelona: EDITORIAL AUSA, 2016. Pp. ii + 383.

Estudios de lingüística ugarítica: Una selección contains a selection of thirty-five previously published Spanish-language essays by Gregorio del Olmo Lete. The essays range in date from 1983 to 2015 and provide an overview of del Olmo Lete's contributions to Ugaritic lexicography, literary studies, and mythology. The majority of the essays—twenty-five out of thirty-five—originally appeared in *Aula Orientalis*, which was founded by del Olmo Lete in 1983 and quickly became the flagship journal for Spanish-language scholarship on the ancient Near East. As del Olmo Lete states in the prologue, the essays have not been updated to reflect advances in the field. Rather they have been left untouched in order to allow readers to trace the evolution of his thoughts and to demonstrate the tenuous nature of scholarship on such a fragmentary corpus. This is a healthy attitude and one that shines through in the rest of the work.

The book is divided into three sections: language, text, and myth. The language section opens with an overview essay on the Ugaritic language from 2010, which summarizes del Olmo Lete's thoughts on the linguistic features and genealogical classification of Ugaritic and sets the stage for the following nineteen essays on Ugaritic linguistics and lexicography. These essays are arranged in roughly chronological order and reflect del Olmo Lete's wide-ranging interests in Ugaritic religious, political, and social institutions. Almost all of them provide an exemplary model for future lexicographic work. The seven-part series "Glosas ugaríticas" (Ugaritic Glosses) is particularly noteworthy in this regard. In these essays, del Olmo Lete considers such diverse topics as the organization of the Ugaritic army, the nature of witchcraft at Ugarit, and the post-mortem divinization of the Ugaritic king, all while balancing literary, contextual, and comparative linguistic considerations. His conclusions are original, and in many cases have stood the test of time.

The sections on text and myth are more loosely organized, but they too reflect del Olmo Lete's wide-ranging interests in Ugaritic studies. Highlights of the text section include "Listas de ofrendas y listas de dioses" (Lists of offerings and lists of deities) from 1999 and "Las listas de los reyes de Ugarit" (The Lists of the Kings of Ugarit) from 2006. The former provides a global analysis of the god lists and offering lists from Ugarit and argues that they function in multiple different spheres of Ugaritic society; some reflect the royal-ritual sphere, while others reflect incantational activity. As such, the various god lists construct different combinations and hierarchies of deities. "Las listas de los reyes de Ugarit," on the other hand, correlates the syllabic king list RS 94.2518 with the consonantal king list KTU 1.113 in order to argue that KTU 1.113 is arranged in descending order and originally terminated with *nqmp*^f