Seventh, the Shechem Redaction, or the Torah-Prophets Redaction, represents an anti-Samaritan, pro-Hasmonean work effected by the middle of the second century if not in the third. About 400 B.C.E. Judeans and Samarians had both accepted the Torah, but then the Samaritans refused to accept the prophetic canon. Unable to find a basis in the Torah for their service as high priest and king, the Hasmoneans used the prophetic canon.

Future work on Joshua will have to pay serious attention to K. and the new theological, historical, and canonical presuppositions. I look forward to a commentary that shows more evidence for these positions and dialogues with other positions. I will enjoy representing a party with quite opposing understandings of the book.

Trent C. Butler, Chalice Press, Gallatin, TN 37066

PAUL D. KORCHIN, *Markedness in Canaanite and Hebrew Verbs* (HSS 58; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008). Pp. xvi + 369. $49.95.

This erudite study by Korchin promises to bring needed clarity to the long-standing controversy in Semitic linguistics regarding whether and to what degree the Northwest Semitic (NWS) prefixed verb paradigms underlying Amarna Canaanite (CanAkk) and Biblical Hebrew (BH) (*yaqtul, yaqtul-u, yaqtul-a*) formally *mark* values like tense, aspect, and mood. In the first three chapters, K. clearly sketches and evaluates the key linguistic origins, developments, and applications of markedness theory and then establishes a solid theoretical and methodological neo-structuralist model of markedness for Semitic morphology (see summary on pp. 63-64). In chaps. 4–5, K. applies and assesses with consistency and rigor the philological capabilities of his markedness model, evaluating the communicative value (i.e., deixis, mood, *Zeitbezug,* tense, aspect) of every unambiguous prefixed verb in the Amarna Letters and the Joseph story, following each data assessment with synthesis and interaction with preceding studies. In chap. 6, he summarizes his conclusions.

The table below summarizes K.'s understanding of the correlation between the formal and functional structures of CanAkk and BH with respect to markedness values (pp. 323-29).

	CanAkk		BH	
Unmarked	*yqtl-Ø*		*<yqtl-Ø*	
	(+/– Ant)	(+/– Ind)	(+/– Ant)	(+/– Ind)
Singly Marked	*yqtl-u* (– Ant)	*yqtl-a* (– Ind)	*<yqtl-u* (–Ant)	*<yqtl-a* (– Ind)
Double Marked	*yqtl-u-(n)na* (– Ant + Cont)	*yqtl-a-(n)na* (– Ind + Cont)	*yqtl-e-n*	
			(– Ant + Cont)	(– Ind + Cont)
	Temporal	Modal	Temporal	Modal

Korchin's research suggests that the paradigmatic suffix morphemes (*yqtl-u-* and *yqtl-a-*) function along distinct parameters of structuralized oppositions. The temporal opposition is characterized by the presence versus absence of the -*u*- morpheme, a feature detectable in BH only in certain hollow, original I-נ, and III-ה roots (as long *yiqtōl*). Its pres-

ence marks the form for non-anterior (– Ant) general time reference (*Zeitbezug*), thus locating the verbal situation either simultaneous with or subsequent to the temporal orientation (deixis) of its syntagm (pp. 75-78, 324, 328; cf. pp. 213-14, 306). The formal absence of the -*u*- morpheme signifies functional neutrality with respect to non-anteriority (+/– Ant). In contrast, the modal opposition is characterized by the presence versus absence of the -*a*- morpheme, a feature linked both morphologically and diachronically with the BH paragogic ה found on volitional forms. (For the -*a*- morpheme not being related to the Akk. ventive, see pp. 217-23.) Functionally, the presence of the -*a*- morpheme marks non-indicative (– Ind) modality (pp. 73-74, 324-25, 328; cf. pp. 246-47, 315), whereas its absence signifies functional neutrality with respect to non-indicative modality (+/– Ind). The energic endings -*(n)na* (CanAkk) and -*n* (BH) do not signal separate morphological paradigms but are enclitic particles suffixed to the *yqtl-u* and *yqtl-a* paradigms (including the BH particle -*nā<*) whose presence signals a verbal situation as being functionally *contrastive* (+ Cont) in some manner with its syntagmatic surroundings (pp. 325, 328; cf. 266-74, 320-22).

A number of comments are noteworthy with respect to this presentation. First, although K. affirms that word order is one of many factors that can help clarify modal function in unmarked prefix verbs (i.e., those lacking the morpheme -*a*-) (pp. 147, 212, 246, 306, 315), his research establishes that "verbal position does not in and of itself function to signify mood" (p. 246).

Second, the BH short *yiqtōl* (i.e., jussive) is unmarked for both modality and anteriority (= *yqtl-Ø*), so its use as an indicative is not strange (p. 295 n. 9; e.g., Ps 18:12; Deut 32:8). The presence of the morpheme -*a*- alone signifies non-indicative modality.

Third, linearity (or imperfectivity) is the primary aspectual value for the present tense, whereas punctuality (or perfectivity) is the primary aspectual value for the past and future tenses. For the past and future tense verbs to express imperfective aspect requires "special devices" like lexical *telicity : atelicity,* by which atelic (i.e., stative) verbs can convey durative verbal action independently of deixis-*Zeitbezug*-tense combinations (pp. 76, 307).

Fourth, with respect to temporal marking, Semitic languages like CanAkk and BH formally signal only *Zeitbezug* (i.e., "general temporal orientation") and not tense or aspect (p. 77). Tense is a *product* of deixis and *Zeitbezug,* the latter of which *locates* a verbal situation temporally (i.e., +/– Ant) with respect to a deictic reference point (pp. 78, 326). Aspect is pragmatically determined by various combinations of grammatical, lexical (*Aktionsart*), syntagmatic (e.g., time adverbials), and contextual factors and is in no way formally marked through Semitic verbal morphology (pp. 76, 326). K.'s case is strong, but he strikingly fails to interact with John A. Cook's influential dissertation, "The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System: A Grammaticalized Approach" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2002), which is equal in theoretical (though perhaps not methodological) rigor and argues that aspect *is* morphologically marked in BH.

Korchin's study is exceptional and stimulating, and it models well how a sound, developed theory and a rigorous, consistent methodology can yield both clarity and usefulness in approaching Semitic morphology and broader linguistic questions. Every reader will be forced to reconsider the validity of past models in light of the data presented in this volume.

Jason S. DeRouchie, Bethlehem College and Seminary, Minneapolis, MN 55415