

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*<sup>f</sup>

rather than *ʾmtmr*. This conclusion remains important for the reconstruction of Ugaritic history and royal ideology.

The section on myth contains only six essays, but they are all of high quality. The essay “Una ‘ventana’ en el templo de Baal” (A “Window” in the Temple of Baal) from 2006, for example, argues that RS 94.2953 preserves an Akkadian language variant of KTU 1.4 VII, which concerns the construction of a window or opening in the temple of Baal. Del Olmo Lete considers several options for the socio-historical setting of this text: It could be a myth legitimizing the reconstruction of Baal’s temple by the king or a high-ranking official or it could be a scribal exercise. Another significant essay is “Yarḫu y Nikkalu: Mitología lunar sumeria en Ugarit” (Yarḫu and Nikkalu: Sumerian Lunar Mythology at Ugarit) from 1991 in which del Olmo Lete argues that Sumerian influence on Ugaritic myth and cult was mediated by the Hurrians and is reflected in KTU 1.24.

The volume closes with an additional essay—called an “appendix” in the table of contents—on the contributions of the early twentieth-century Spanish scholar Ángel Amor Ruibal to the field of linguistics. This long article situates Ruibal’s work within its historical context and assesses its strengths and weakness. It is a fitting bookend to a work celebrating Spanish-language scholarship on linguistic issues. A second appendix lists the date and place of publication of the essays contained within the book, while subject, textual, lexicographic, and onomastic indices provide helpful tools for tracing the evolution of del Olmo Lete’s arguments over the years.

My criticisms of the book are relatively minor. First, the opening half of the book contains numerous typos, most likely the result of scanning errors during the production process. Most frequently, similar looking characters are used interchangeably: e.g., ‘e!’ (*sic*) for ‘el’ on p. 21 and ‘Lntersuchungen’ (*sic*) for ‘*Untersuchungen*’ on p. 26. In addition, the essay “Listas de ofrendas y listas de dioses” contains remnants of editorial activity from Microsoft Word showing where changes have been made on pp. 177, 194, 196, 197, and 211. Thankfully, these issues largely disappear in the second half of the book, but they distract from an otherwise elegant presentation of the material.

Second, the contents could perhaps have been chosen more selectively. Some of the essays, such as “Semántica de las preposiciones *l*, *b*, *bd*, en los textos administrativos” (Semantics of the prepositions *l*, *b*, *bd*, in the administrative texts), “Textes ugaríticas y su crítica literaria” (Ugaritic Texts and Literary Criticism), and “El Ciclo mitológico de Baal: Nuevas perspectivas de interpretación” (The Baal Cycle: New Perspectives of Interpretation) are reviews of other works. As such, they are important for understanding the history of scholarship, but they do not make for the most interesting reading, especially when they deal with works that are almost three decades old. One wonders whether they could have been replaced with additional content chapters. Even so, these review essays provide a model of gracious scholarship. In them, del Olmo Lete explains how and why he disagrees with other scholars, but does not insist on the correctness of his own interpretations. As he often repeats, the fragmentary nature of the data does not allow for dogmatism within the field of Ugaritic studies. He has his own preferences, but is open to changing his mind as the essays in *Estudios de lingüística ugarítica* show.

Finally, it would have been helpful if the essays were arranged in strict chronological order within each section. Such an arrangement would make it easier to trace the evolution of del Olmo Lete’s thoughts on a particular topic. As it stands—to cite one example—“Glosas ugaríticas I” (Ugaritic Glosses I) from 2001 appears sixty pages before “Un conjuro ugarítico contra el ‘mal ojo’” (A Ugaritic Incantation against the Evil Eye) from 1992 even though the 2001 essay proposes additional, semantically distinct cognates for Ugaritic *bt*.

These critiques do not detract from the overall value and importance of the book. Although the individual essays in the volume can be found elsewhere, *Estudios de lingüística ugarítica* provides a holistic overview of del Olmo Lete’s native-language scholarship as well as additional tools for assessing and appreciating the impact of his work. Due to its breadth of subject matter, I would recommend *Estudios de lingüística ugarítica* to anyone interested in Ugaritic studies.

AREN WILSON-WRIGHT  
RADBOUD UNIVERSITY