

*A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition.* By GREGORIO DEL OLMO LETE and JOAQUÍN SANMARTÍN, translated and edited by WILFRED G. E. WATSON. Third revised edition. 2 vols. Handbuch der Orientalistik, vol. 112. Leiden: BRILL, 2015. Pp. xlii + 470, 471-989. \$210.

Gregorio del Olmo Lete and Joaquín Sanmartín's *Dictionary (DUL)* has become the standard lexicon of Ugaritic. The first edition was in Spanish, *Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica* (Sabadell–Barcelona: AUSA); in quarto format, its two paperbound volumes, the first published in 1996 and the second in 2000, comprised xxvii + 560 pages, and it was, if memory serves, relatively inexpensive. The second edition, a revision translated into English by Wilfred G. E. Watson, was published in 2004 by Brill; also in two volumes, but now hardback and octavo, it comprised xlv + 1006 pages, and was much more costly. The new, third edition keeps the format of the second, though it is somewhat shorter at xlii + 989 pages, and, unfortunately, still too expensive for most students to purchase. In the second and third editions, the phrase *in the Alphabetic Tradition* was added to the title, to indicate that the dictionary does not include the few Ugaritic words that are attested only in syllabic (Akkadian) cuneiform texts, but not in alphabetic texts, such as /riḡlu/ 'foot'. As in the earlier editions, proper nouns (personal, divine, geographic, and month names) are also included.

For the third edition, the editors cite no fewer than ten types of changes, ranging from the correction of typos, the harmonization of text translations, and the addition of new cognates, to more substantive changes of content, especially the addition of new words and new references from texts published since the appearance of the second edition (in particular, those of the "Maison d'Ourtenou" published by P. Bordreuil, D. Pardee, and R. Hawley in *Ras-Shamra–Ougarit* vol. 18, 2012), but also changes made in accordance with suggestions offered in some of the lengthy reviews of the second edition, and the addition of new bibliography (and the exclusion of all but a few studies published before 1970). The editors also acknowledge once again that Dr. Watson has contributed much to the work in addition to his felicitous translation. Although it has the same format as the second edition, the layout of the new edition strikes me as clearer and easier to read than its predecessor.

Texts are cited according to the most recent (third) edition of *KTU (Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und anderen Orten)*, by M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and Sanmartín, (2013). As in the earlier editions of the *Dictionary*, the order of the entries follows the Latin alphabet, fronted by the three *aleph*'s and  $\text{ʿ}$ . (The *aleph*'s count the same in ordering, so that *ib* precedes *ābbl(y)*; in words that are otherwise spelled identically, *ā* precedes *i* precedes *ū*, so that *āb* precedes *ib*.) The editors now transcribe the *aleph* signs with *ā*, *i*, *ū* rather than simple *a*, *i*, *u* as in previous editions, a small but helpful change since it makes it clearer that the signs represent a consonant, not simply a vowel.

Etymological considerations remain important in Ugaritic lexicography, and the editors have again made generally judicious choices in their citation of cognates for most roots and words. Translations now accompany the cognates, an important addition that allows the user to judge the plausibility of the semantic relationship between the Ugaritic and the cognates cited. Not all of the proposed etymologies are convincing. For example, on p. 280, *dṯ* (in *dṯ ydṯ mṯqbḵ* 'your foe(?) will be completely struck down' *KTU*<sup>3</sup> 1.18.i:19) is compared with Semitic *\*d-w-s<sup>l</sup>* 'to trample', for which we would have to posit a unique change of *\*s<sup>l</sup>* to *ṯ*; more likely is a comparison with Arabic *ḍaṭṭa* 'to strike (someone) hard' (Freitag, *Lexicon Arabico–Latinum*, vol. 2, p. 7a), which fits the context at least as well.

Hebrew cognates are again cited according to *HALOT (The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament)*, by L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, translated by M. Richardson, 1994–2000) rather than the more recent 18th edition of *Gesenius' Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (edited by R. Meyer and H. Donner; single-volume edition 2013), the final fascicles of which may have appeared too late to be used (and the citation of which would, of course, have meant that Hebrew cognates were glossed in German rather than English). A lot of space is devoted to citing Eblaite cognates (for example, three full lines in the entry for the root *ʔ-b-d*); despite the large amount of time it must have taken to track down the Eblaite forms, the citations are perhaps not always the best use of space given the continuing uncertainties of Eblaite lexicography.

While, as noted, old typos have been corrected, a few new ones have occasionally been introduced. In Arabic cognates the letter *jīm* is usually transliterated *ǧ*, as in previous editions, but sometimes it

appears as the very different Turkish *ğ* (e.g., p. 297 s.v. *gml* II; p. 349 s.v. *hdg*). In some cognates, *h* appears as *ḥ*, for example Eblaite /ḥablum/ (p. 347, vs. the correct /ḥablum/ of p. 352 of the second edition) and “Syr. *ḥbq*, ‘to surround’, [but] *ḥbaqā*’, ‘embracing’” (also on p. 347). Other inconsistencies are the citations of Syriac forms sometimes as roots, as in *ḥbq*, just mentioned, and sometimes as 3ms perfects, as in *ḥbaš* on the following page (and *ḥbaq* in the second edition, p. 352).

I have noted also these typos:

*P. x*: For “allophon” read either “allophone” or “allophonic.” (The abbreviations “allom.” and “alloph.” seem to be used interchangeably; for example, on p. 986 *z̄bm* is said to be “allom. of *ḥbm*,” but on p. 601 *m̄zr* is “alloph. of *m̄tr*.”)

*P. 83* s.v. *ánz*: The root that is cross-referenced, /n-z(-y)/, is not in the dictionary.

*P. 129*: For *iwrḥ* read *iwrḥt*.

*P. 135* s.v. *ázhn*: For “second” read “first.”

*P. 182* s.v. *ḥrz*: For “presure” read “pressure.”

*P. 238* s.r. /b-š-š/: For “einschneiden” read “abschneiden.”

*P. 283* s.r. /d-m-r/: For “Syr. *dmr*” read “OSA *dmr*.”

*P. 963*: The order of the entries *yr̄gmbšl* and *yr̄gmil* should be inverted.

*P. 987 last line*: For “*dmn*” read “*dmn*.”

These are minor issues, however, that do not detract from the overall reliability and usefulness of the new edition. We remain very much in the editors’ debt.

JOHN HUEHNERGARD  
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

---

*The Verb and the Paragraph in Biblical Hebrew: A Cognitive-Linguistic Approach*. By ELIZABETH ROBAR. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics, vol. 78. Leiden: BRILL, 2014. Pp. xii + 220. \$142.

Biblical Hebrew (BH) is one of the most studied languages in the world and the BH verbal system is one of the most studied topics of BH grammar. Almost every year a monograph or two and a few articles about different aspects of BH verbal syntax are published. In view of such intensive production, the publication of new research seems to be justified on the basis of two interrelated factors: 1) newly introduced linguistic data; 2) heuristically innovative promising analytical framework(s). As for novel linguistic material, it can include different genres or corpus parts of the Hebrew Bible, other Hebrew extra-biblical corpora, comparative Semitic data, various contact materials, general cross-linguistic data, etc. As for methodology, the recent development of BH studies demonstrates that strict linguistic frameworks, as well as cross-linguistic studies and discourse analysis, greatly contribute to BH linguistic research and improve our understanding of the grammatical system.

The monograph of Elizabeth Robar suggests novel explications for some problems of the BH verbal system. The corpus under analysis remains undefined, which, in my view, is a considerable methodological deficiency. The linguistics of ancient written languages such as BH cannot be based on a scholar’s innate linguistic competence, but is essentially corpus-driven. Therefore the corpus delimitation is a crucial condition for properly conducted research. The literary diversity of examples in this monograph (both prose and poetry, classical and late texts) may mean that the Hebrew Bible as a whole provided the database, but there is no explicit confirmation of this. (However, the index of biblical quotations suggests quite a narrow scope.) The risk in such an approach is that the examples that could potentially challenge a theory are simply left out. Nevertheless, the author enlarges the linguistic data by adducing typological parallels with Neo-Semitic, particularly with Neo-Aramaic (pp. 89–92), as well as Bantu (p. 96) and some other languages.

The research is mainly theory-oriented: chapter 1 discusses in general “how language reflects and embodies human cognition” (pp. 1–60). As commonly in linguistic analysis aimed at a particular