

Ilu-lum-di-i read: AN-lum-di-i; Ilu-mu-ša-lim S. Ilib-bani read AN-mu-ša-lim S. Ili-bani; I-lu-ni/*Ilu-ni read: I-lu-ni/*AN-ni; Ilu-ši-bu-um-re-me-ni read: ^dši-bu-um-re-me-ni; I-qí-iš-ili read: I-qí-iš-AN; Īr-ra-ili read: ĪR.RA-AN; I-za-ḥim F. Gagum read: I-za-ḥi-im/I-za-i F. Gagûm; one name on p. 58 was omitted, thus read: I-zi-iz-mi-šar 24:7, Ka-ab-si-ia 24:18; p. 59, La-qí-i-pí S. Šat-turranu 6:**18 read: La-qí-i-pí S. Šat-Turranu 6:**19; **La-ṭà-bá-ia/**La-ṭà-bì-ia appears also in text 20 line 3; Mi-al-ki-i-a/*Mi-il-ki-ia F. Sūmū-Turan; Mu-ḥa-du-um S. Iašub-īl 20:(z):1; 2:7; 19:(a):1 read: Mu-ḥa-du-um S. Iašub-īl 20:(a):1; 2:7; 19:11, (b):1; under this person a certain Mu-ḥa-du-um S. ^dUš-bani 1:20n 5:25 was omitted; p. 60, Na-ra-am-^dSin F. Ilu-šibum-remeni read: Na-ra-am-^dSin F. Šibum-rēmēni; Pa-la-^dAdad B. Idin-kubi read: Pa-la-^dIM B. Iddin-Kubi; Puzur-īl-a-ba₄ S. of Īl-aba-na-šir read: Puzur-^dA.BA₄ S. ^dA.BA₄-na-šir; Qú-ur-ni-ia S. Šat-turranu read: Qú-ur-ni-ia S. Šat-Turranu; Ri-iš-ili-a-bé-e/*Ri-iš-ili-a-bi F. Erišti-^dŠamš-šat-uri read: Ri-iš-^dA.BI F. Erišti-^dSamaš-šāt-ūri; S-mu-^dTuran/*su-mu-^dTuran read: Su-mu-^dDUR.KIB Su-mu-^dDUR.KIB below one person was omitted: Sa-mu-um 24:9; ^dSin-i-qí-šam S. Iaḥzur-īl read: ^dSin-i-qí-ša-am S. Iaḥzūr-īl; Su-mu-ra-pí S. Iašub-īl read: Su-mu-ra-pí S. Iašub-īl; there's no Sūmū-rāpi S. ^dUš-bani in text 1!; p. 61, Ša-at-tu-ur-ra-nu/*Sa-at-tu-ra-nu read: Ša-at-tu-ur-ra-nu/*Ša-at-tu-ra-nu; Ša-bu-lum 19:10 S. Aḥi-ša-ili 19:(b):1 read: Ša-bu-lum 19:10 S. Aḥi-ša-ili 19:(a):1; Še-li-bu-um read: Še-le-bu-um; Ši-mat-^dĒ-a read: Ši-mat-^dĒ.A; Um-mi-ḥu-li-ia D. Ilu-šibum-remeni read: Um-miḥu-li-ia D. Šibum-rēmēni; Ú-qa-īl read: Ú-qa-AN; Ur-^dNanna S. I-...-īl read: Ur-^dNanna S. I-...-AN; ^dUš-ba-ni F. Muḥadun 1:20 read: ^dUš-ba-ni F. Muḥaddūm 1:20; 5:26; the name of U-za-i cf. I-za-i p. 58; Warad-ī-lí-ma-gir read: ĪR-ī-lí-ma-gir; Warad-ku-bi read: ĪR-KU.BI; p. 62, Warad-īr-ra f. Kididum read: ĪR.ĪR.RA; F. Kididum; Warad-Sin B. Ilka-uṭul read: Warad-Sin B. An-pí-uṭul; Za-ab-bi-ia S. Idin-uki read: Za-ab-bi-ia S. Iddin-uki; B. Iašub-īl read: B. Iašub-īl.

Index of divine names:

Read: ^dIM 2(b):3; 12(a):3; 16:19; 19(b):3; 20(a):2; 2(b):2; 569:DF and no ^dISKUR. ^dSU.ḤE.ZI read: ^dSU.ḤĒ.ZI; ^dUTU 20:9 read: ^dUTU 20:7.

Place names: read: Me Tu-ra-an 3:3.

River and canal names: ÍD.PA₅ ilu-ra-bi read: ÍD.PA₅ AN-ra-bi; ÍD.PA₅ ilu-šu read: ÍD.PA₅ AN-šu-[x].

Field names: ú-qa-īl read: ú-qa-AN.

Sumerograms: AN - ilu; A.ŠĀ - eqlum; ^dÍDUR.ÚL - ^dTuran; É.DŪ.A - epeš bītim read: É.DŪ.A - bīt epšu; ^dIM/^dISKUR read: ^dIM/^dISKUR; ^dĪR.RA - ^dIr-ra read: ^dĪR.RA - ^dIr-ra; ŠĀM - šemum read: ŠĀM - šimur; SE.GIŠ.Ī; ŠE.Ī.GIŠ read: ŠE.Ī.GIŠ.

Appendix: p. 67, no. 10 a, read: ... the water god; ... à l'époque des Perses achéménides, cachets, sceaux-cylindres et empreintes antiques découvertes à Suse de 1913 à 1967, Mémoires de la Délégation archéologique en Iran, Tome XLIII; p. 68, no. 13 a and no. 16 a, read: ... that opens at the front; no. 16 a read: ... Sun god ...; ... workshop I Copies of texts: the text on plate 19 read: 13 and not 10.

Poznań, March 1998

Witold TYBOROWSKI

* *
*

RAINEY, Anson F. — Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets: a Linguistic Analysis of the Mixed Dialect used by the Scribes from Canaan. Vol. I: Orthography, Phonology, Morphosyntactic Analysis of the Pronouns, Nouns, Numerals. Vol. II: Morphosyntactic Analysis of the Verbal System. Vol. III: Morphosyntactic Analysis of the Particles and Adverbs. Vol. IV: References and Index of Texts Cited.

The El-Amarna tablets, discovered in Egypt in the late nineteenth century, are the richest textual source for our understanding of the language, history, and culture of the Levant in the fourteenth century B.C.E. The language of the tablets is Western Peripheral Akkadian (WPA), a written *lingua franca* that served for international communication among the non-Akkadian speakers of the Ancient Near East, from Egypt to Mesopotamia.

All WPA texts share certain characteristics, but texts from different areas show the influence of the various local languages. These non-Akkadian features give us invaluable insights into many of the spoken languages of the Ancient Near East in the middle of the second millennium.

The Canaanite family is of particular importance, because of the light it sheds on the history of Biblical Hebrew. A comprehensive study of the mixed Canaanite-Akkadian language of the entire Canaanite Amarna sub-corpus is a long-standing desideratum.

Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets (CAT), by Anson Rainey, a leading scholar of Amarna studies, fills the need for a linguistic analysis of these texts. It will serve as the standard reference work for the linguistic interpretation of this important text corpus, and may serve as the inspiration for other studies of the Amarna texts and of their language.

The methodology of *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets* places the most emphasis on morphosyntax. By examining the syntactic environment that conditions the use of each morpheme, *CAT* achieves an outstanding analysis of problematic passages in the Amarna letters.

As an example we may take the discussion of the *-u* verbal suffix, which in standard Akkadian serves as the subjunctive marker (for verbs in subordinate clauses); in Central Semitic, however, **-u* (**-na* on m. pl. and other prefix-conjugation verbs with a vocalic suffix) contrasts the imperfect **yVqtVlu* to the jussive **yVqtVlφ*. The question arises: Are none, one, or both of these *-u* morphemes present in the Amarna texts? As Rainey shows, the Central Semitic morpheme is the only one used. Although some cases of *-u* in subordinate clauses do occur, these are actually marking Northwest Semitic imperfects and only coincidentally appear in a subordinate clause. Rainey's careful analysis¹⁾ examines the context of verbs with and without the *-u* marker, showing that all *-u* verbs are semantically imperfect, and verbs with or without it can occur equally in main or subordinate clauses.²⁾ By citing a number of passages, and then analyzing one passage in greater detail, Rainey both proves his thesis and makes it easily comprehensible even to the non-specialist.

¹⁾ Vol. II, pp. 195-202.

²⁾ The pioneering syntactic analysis of part of the Canaanite sub-corpus was William L. Moran *A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1950). Rainey's *CAT* uses similar methods in extending the analysis to the entire Canaanite sub-corpus.

The word order in the Amarna tablets is significantly different from that of standard Akkadian. Some of the differences may be explained by the interaction of West Semitic VSO order with standard Akkadian SOV order. It is necessary to explain how this interaction works. Rainey's analysis of one narrative passage (EA 234:11-27)³⁾ shows an enlightening syntactic analysis which applies the concepts of topic and comment, taken from discourse grammar, to the understanding of extraposition and other syntactic phenomena. By carefully distinguishing the topic (generally material already known to the reader at a certain point in the discourse) from the comment (new material about the topic), this analysis elucidates the apparently irregular alternation between SV and VS in the passage under discussion.

Although the discussion of individual passages is outstanding, and will be highly helpful in understanding these passages, more attention to the language system as a whole, rather than to specific cases, could have improved the analysis. In a morphosyntactic analysis, the morphemes should be ordered by syntactic role. For example, the syntactic functions of the 1st c.s., 2nd m.s., 3rd m.s., and 1st c.p. independent nominative pronouns are treated separately.⁴⁾ Yet these all have the same syntactic role, differing only in number and person, and should therefore be treated together, separately from the independent oblique pronouns, for example. Such an arrangement would allow the evidence provided by one pronoun to shed light on another.

The great range of *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets* should serve to inspire future studies. In particular, the title suggests a grammar dedicated specifically to the Canaanite found in the language of the Amarna tablets. Because such a grammar cannot be achieved without an analysis of the entire mixed dialect, *CAT* is a necessary first step. The next step is to filter out precisely what the El-Amarna tablets tell us about fourteenth century B.C.E. Canaanite, in the phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon. Next, the Canaanite of Amarna should be compared with the other meager second-millennium evidence, and then with later Hebrew and Canaanite and with other Semitic languages, so as to present the clearest possible picture of Canaanite of the mid-second millennium B.C.E. Much of this information is present in *CAT*, necessarily intermixed with the discussion of the mixed dialect as a whole.

Other indices would be welcome additions. A subject index would be the most beneficial: for example, it could expedite a search for specifically Canaanite grammatical analysis. A word-index would allow the researcher to trace a lexeme throughout *CAT*.⁵⁾

In addition to the grammatical analysis, there are extensive textual citations. The stated intention is to provide documentation that updates the "presently inadequate Amarna editions,"⁶⁾ namely, Knudtzon's edition, a model of its kind although quite outdated, and Rainey's valuable supplement, which added the materials not accessible to Knudtzon.⁷⁾ In

the eighty years which have passed since Knudtzon's *magnum opus*, new tablets have been discovered, new collations have improved on Knudtzon's readings, and new understandings of the cuneiform orthography have allowed better transcriptions. Therefore, one would hope that the improved texts in *CAT* would give the reader access to these developments, and that, if arranged sequentially and supplemented by other El-Amarna texts, they could serve as a nucleus for a much-needed modern text edition of the Amarna tablets.

This is rendered impossible, however, by the typographical errors in the work under review. The errors which affect the English do not generally disrupt the sense, but most of those which affect the Semitic transcriptions, including the transcriptions of the Amarna tablets, will lead to problems in understanding, forcing the scholar to turn back to the older editions.

Three types of errata affect the Semitic transcriptions throughout the work, while not generally disrupting the sense. First is the use of ˆ for about a third of the occurrences of the glottal stop in place of ˙. Fortunately, ˙ is only occasionally used for the pharyngeal ˁ, so that confusion between ˙ and ˆ is rare.

The second is the omission of the line divider mark (the slash in modern transcription), for example, in Vol. II, p. 233, 8th line, between EA 104 lines 29 and 30. This may be significant in some cases, but fortunately does not usually change the sense of the text.

The third type of common error is the faulty use of type-faces such as italic (for Semitic words), capitals (for logograms/Sumerograms), superscript (for determinatives and phonetic complements) and roman (for Sumerian). This type of mistake causes problems of interpretation when phonetic, logogram, determinative, or Sumerian-language values of cuneiform signs may be confused; fortunately, this is a problem of interpretation and does not generally affect the identity of the sign. For example, in Vol. III, p. 24 EA 129:41 is cited with [*i-na* MU š]a-an-ti; in Vol. II, p. 361, it is cited with [*i-na* MU]^{ša-an-ti} (with an incorrect EA number); and in Vol. II, p. 371, it is cited as [*i-na* MUš]^{a-an-ti}. (Knudtzon⁸⁾ reads [*i-na* ^{šattu}š]a-an(!)-ti.) The readings in *CAT* disagree on the legibility of the ša. Also, the different use of superscript in the citations leaves open the interpretation of ša-an-ti as a phonetic complement or as a syllabic writing. Some cases may result from changes in the author's opinion over the course of the composition of the work, and others are probably simple typographical errors. In any event, the reader is left in doubt as to the author's intentions.

The most extensive typographical error is found in Vol. I, pp. 38-43 and Vol. II, pp. 19-24, which are nearly identical. The differences in Vol. I include a number of additional words and passages and the improvement of some of the less felicitous word choices in Vol. II, suggesting that the text in Vol. I represents an edited copy of the text in Vol. II.

A list of the more significant errata may be found below. The list is in no way complete, since many errors that do not affect the sense had to be omitted in the interest of brevity, and many others doubtless escaped the eye of the reviewer.

Rainey, *El-Amarna Tablets 359-379, Supplement to J.A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*, 2d edition. *Alter Orient und Alter Testaments* 8. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Kevelaer, 1978).

⁸⁾ *El-Amarna Tafeln*, Vol. I, p. 550.

³⁾ Vol. III, pp. 265-66.

⁴⁾ Vol. I, pp. 48-68.

⁵⁾ An index of EA text numbers with their cities of origin, which will be of help in understanding the dialectal differences within Canaan in the material of *CAT*, may be found in Shlomo Izre'el, "A New Translation of the Amarna Letters," *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 47 (1990), cols. 592-97.

⁶⁾ Vol. I, pp. xii-xiv, xvi.

⁷⁾ J.A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*, Vorderasiatische Bibliothek 2. (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915; reprinted Aalen: Zeller, 1964); Anson F.

Corrigenda				
Vol.	Pg.	Line	instead of	read
I	x	5 from bottom	<i>hukurtu</i>	<i>nukurtu</i>
I	xv	middle	CAT 2	CAT 1
I	9	middle	LÚ.MEŠ <i>ḥa-zi-a-nu-ti</i> [EA 288:27]	LÚ.MEŠ <i>ḥa-zi-a-nu-ti</i> (i.e., insert space. Alternately, LÚ.MEŠ <i>ḥa-zi-a-nu-ti</i> , with superscript and no space. See Vol. I, p. 30, on the determinative LÚ.MEŠ.)
I	14	8	<i>pì</i>	<i>pí</i>
I	40	14 f.b.	<i>ú-ma-an-de-ši</i> [EA 1:17]	<i>ú ma-an-de-ši_x</i> (Compare Vol. I, p. 17, <i>ma-an-dī-še</i> ; Vol. I, p. 80, <i>-še</i> [full word not given at that citation]; Vol. II, p. 21, <i>ú-ma-an-de-ši_x</i> . Knudtzon ⁹⁾ reads <i>ú-diš ma-an-di-še</i> , with a note explaining the unexpected <i>diš</i> .)
I	42	2 f.b.	<i>nipissu</i>	<i>nipissu</i> (thus in Vol. II, p. 23)
I	42	last line	<i>išbassi</i>	<i>iššabassi</i> (same correction needed in Vol. II, p. 23)
I	97	3 f.b.	<i>iš-tu</i> [EA 149:41]	<i>iš-tu</i>
I	98	4	<i>a-bi-ka iš-tu/</i> UD.KAM.MEŠ [EA 85:70-71]	<i>a-bi-ka iš-tu/URUŠi-du-na</i> UD.KAM.MEŠ (i.e., insert <i>URUŠi-du-na</i>)
I	145	4 f.b.	<i>n</i>	<i>n¹⁰⁾</i>
II	27	6	<i>kaš</i>	KAŠ
II	27	3 f.b.	<i>timza'u</i>	<i>timza'ū</i>
II	38	middle	<i>tu-uš-sa</i> (EA 234:7)	<i>tu-uš-ša</i>
II	44	1	m.s.	m.p.
II	95	4 f.b.	<i>ešt^omō^h</i>	<i>'ešt^omō^h</i>
II	95	4 f.b.	Josh 15:20	Josh 15:50
II	115	13	in WS imperfect	is WS imperfect
II	119	middle	<i>t- -u(-na)</i>	<i>t- -ū(-na)</i>
II	150	6-8	<i>ù a-mur 'I-ta-at-ka-ma....</i> "Behold, Itatama (sic!= Etakama)" [EA 197:31; "sic!" notation is in CAT.]	Read with Vol. II, p. 348, <i>ù a-mur 'I-ta-ak!(AT)-ka-ma....</i> "And behold, Etakama". ¹¹⁾
II	179	5 f.b.	<i>ši-ip-'ri[-ia]/ la-a tu-ša-šu-na</i> [EA 126:41-42, EA number in CAT incorrect]	(Compare Vol. II, p. 183, <i>ši-ip-r[-i-ia]/ la-a tu-ša-šú-na</i> ; Vol. II, p. 243, <i>ši-ip-[-ri]-[-ia]/ la-a tu-ša-šú-na</i> .)

⁹⁾ *El-Amarna Tafeln*, Vol. I, p. 60.

¹⁰⁾ "Egyptian *n*, the hieroglyphic sign for water" (Vol. I, p. 145). The Egyptian sign *n* (not subscripted) is Gardiner sign N35 (Alan Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, 3d edition. [London: Oxford University Press, 1957], p. 490). It is iconographically derived from a picture of a ripple of water (*n*), but it is not the sign for 'water', which is *mw*, Gardiner N(35) (Michael Fox, personal communication, October 1997). The *mw* sign is formally derived from the *n* sign, as it is composed of three vertically stacked ripples, derived from *n*'s one. However, the formal similarity and the origins of Gardiner N35 make it likely that the Proto-Sinaitic *mēm* derives from Egyptian *n*.

¹¹⁾ Knudtzon reads *ù a-mur 'I-ta-at-ka-ma*, and adds in a note "Es kann kaum etwas anderes sein" (*El-Amarna Tafeln*, Vol. I, p. 726, including note e).

II	179	3 f.b.	EA 129:40-43	EA 126:40-42
II	233	14	the city rulers [EA 104:26]	your city rulers (<i>ḥa-za-ni-ka</i> , with 2 m.s. suffix)
II	233	middle	your towns [EA 104:28]	his towns (i.e., the commissioner's towns; URU.MEŠ- <i>šu</i> with 3 m.s. suffix)
II	262	5 f.b.	<i>'ilā</i>	<i>'ilīma</i>
II	297	middle	<i>'apīru</i>	<i>'apīru</i> (Similar errors appear in other citations of the word <i>'apīru</i> in the English translations.)
II	302	14 f.b.	<i>*šami'tī</i>	<i>*šami'tī</i>
II	306	13	<i>šaduq</i>	<i>šaduq</i>
II	306	middle	<i>ša-du-uq</i> [EA 287:32]	<i>ša-du-uq</i>
II	306	middle	<i>šaduq</i>	<i>šaduq</i>
II	306	middle	<i>'Ammišaduqa</i>	<i>'Ammišaduqa</i>
II	306	11 f.b.	<i>ma-ri-iš</i> [EA 114:50]	<i>ma-ri-iš</i>
II	361	9-6 f.b.	EA 132:32-35	EA 129:40-43
II	378	3 f.b.	IMÍ	IMÍ
II	380	8 f.b.	<i>qattil</i>	<i>quttīl</i>
III	17	5 f.b.		The Ea citation number (EA 130:39) is incorrect. Moreover, Kinahni is not spelled this way in the EA texts.
III	33	10	<i>'am</i>	<i>'am</i>
III	133	middle	<i>BE-ṭi-'ia'</i> [EA 155:29]	<i>BE-ti-ia</i>
III	166	12	<i>allū</i>	<i>allē</i>
III	168	7 f.b.	<i>r'ēh</i>	<i>r'ē^h</i>
III	265	10,4 f.b.	<i>Su-ta</i> [EA 234:14, 23]	<i>šū-ta</i>

Comments on some specific passages in CAT:

Vol. I, p. 35. "The *Glossenkeil* ... serves much as the colon in modern writing." While the *Glossenkeil* can have the appearance of colon, a better modern analogy to its function is to the single quotes used for foreign glosses, to italics used to label foreign words, to parentheses used for brief explanatory material, and to hyphens used to show connection to a previous line.

Vol. II, p. 27. There is no clear analogical basis for the development of 3 m.pl. suffix conjugations with *t-* from feminine collectives. The presence of a *t-* in feminine/collective **tVqtVl* is not enough to change **yVqtVlū(-na)* to **tVqtVlū(-na)*. Moreover, the use of the *i* prefix vowel in the 3rd m.pl., as opposed to *a* in the 3rd f.s., weakens the probability of a link between the two. (Rainey mentions that the *i* links the 3rd m.pl. to the 3rd m.s., as opposed to the 3rd f.s.) The evidence of other Semitic languages shows that collective usages of the singular do not bring about confusion between singular and plural forms. Thus, given that the adoption of *t-* by the 3rd m.pl. from the 3rd f.s. is so unlikely, a parallel development in East and West Semitic must be excluded.

The **tVqtVlūna* 3rd m.pl., found in Ugaritic, El-Amarna, and in some archaic texts from Mari (before the period in which we would expect West Semitic influence) remains difficult. If there is a relation between the **ti-* prefix and the

3rd f.s. collective, it lies in the earliest stages of Proto-Semitic, and its exact nature is lost to us.¹²⁾

Vol. II, p. 29. "Mimation in the Hazor legal text appears on some independent nouns but has been dropped from a noun in construct even though the case ending is still preserved." Mimation never existed on nouns in construct in Semitic and so cannot be said to have been dropped; no Semitic language has mimation in the construct state.

Vol. II, p. 151. A description of long *ī* in /*ʿašīrī*/ as a "*hireq compaginis*" (following Moran) is an anachronism. Although there may be a diachronic link between the difficult Biblical Hebrew phenomenon of *hireq compaginis*, found mostly in archaic texts, and the mid-second-millennium Canaanite suffix, the link does not explain either one. The meaning and syntactic conditioning of the *-ī*, if any, should be the same or clearly related in Biblical Hebrew and in second millennium Canaanite, if the *-ī*'s are to be placed together. If a diachronic analysis is the goal, cognates of the *-ī* in the Semitic languages should be compared with the Hebrew and Canaanite.

Vol. II, p. 192. The form *ia-šī-ni* (EA 282:14), with causative force, and thus apparently of the causative H stem, is problematic. Rainey notes that one would expect **yu-šī-ni* from **yawšī-nī*. Unless IA is simply to be read as *iu*,¹³⁾ it appears that an expected radical **w* is missing. The G **yVqtVI* conjugation of most **i*-imperfect **I-w* verbs shows a total lack of the **w* throughout the Semitic languages, but, as Rainey points out, that is not the case for the causative stem, so the proposed solution by appeal to a biconsonantal root in the causative would place Amarna Canaanite alone among the Semitic languages. The roots of such *I-w* verbs are biconsonantal only in the G imperfect, but they are otherwise triconsonantal.

A solution may be found in the crossover of **yaqtil* from the G to the H. When the H **yuhaqtil* underwent a phonological development into **yaqtil* (later *yaqtīl*), the H imperfect became formally identical with the **yaqtil* G imperfect for verbs with the imperfect theme vowel **i*. The **yaqtil* form became identified with the H while **yaqtul* and **yiqtal* remained for the G stem.¹⁴⁾ The results of this are evident in the great paucity of **i*-imperfect G verbs in Hebrew. A few exceptional ones do remain, however, and among these are the *I-w* verbs. Therefore, it is likely that in some dialects, close to but not identical to the ancestor of Hebrew, the *I-w* **yaqtil* verbs followed the strong **yaqtīls* and came to be identified as H-stem.

¹²⁾ See Shlomo Izre'el, "Early Northwest Semitic 3rd pl m Prefix: The Evidence of the Amarna Letters". *Ugarit Forschungen* 19 (1987), pp. 87-90; H. Limet "Observations sur la grammaire des anciennes tablettes de Mari." *Syria* 52 (1975), p. 48; A. Westenholz, "Some Notes on the Orthography and Grammar of the Recently Published Texts from Mari." *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 35 (1978), p. 165.

¹³⁾ John Huehnergard, "Northwest Semitic Vocabulary in Akkadian Texts," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 107 (1987), p. 716.

¹⁴⁾ H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*. (Halle: Niemeyer, 1922; Reprinted Hildesheim: Olms, 1965), p. 267 (§40b); Carl Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, Vol. 1. (Berlin: Von Reuther & Reichard, 1908), p. 548 (§258Bia); for the specific formulation, I would like to thank J. Huehnergard, p.c., 1990, 1997.

Vol. II, p. 302. "Since even in standard Akkadian, *qatil* can express a transitive action, it is not surprising that some examples appear in the EA texts from Canaan." In standard Akkadian, the verbs that can take active transitive syntax for *qatil* form a small and semantically closed class, specifically those in the semantic field of 'to hold, to take, to possess.'¹⁵⁾ Thus, West Semitic forms cited by Rainey such as *'ba¹-f¹ni¹-ti¹* (EA 292:29) and *ša-mi-ti₇* (EA 362:5) must be seen as wholly West Semitic in nature. The West Semitic languages show that these are both **qatil* transitive perfects.¹⁶⁾

Vol. II, p. 385. The unusual *ana* (EA 138:51) is described as a variant of *anāku*, "a defective writing of the 1st c.s. independent pronoun (certainly not a shortened **ana!*)." Yet the short form of the 1st c.s. independent pronoun, reconstructible to *'ana*, is well known in West Semitic languages. In particular, among the Northwest Semitic languages, Aramaic has *enā* (Syriac), Ugaritic has *an* alongside *ank* (syllabic *a-na-ku*), and Hebrew has *'nī* alongside *'ānōkī*.¹⁷⁾ While it is true that Canaanite forms do not usually appear in the mixed dialect as grammatical function words, the possibility of a 1st c.s. pronoun should at least be considered. (This *a-na* is not mentioned in Vol. I, pp. 47-48, in the section on the 1st c.s. independent pronoun, although other suggested 1st c.s. pronouns are.) If, however, an emendation is in order, *a-na a-na* could be a dittography.

Vol. II, p. 389. "Ugaritic employs the locative-adverbial with *-u*." The locative-adverbial *-um*, distinct from the nominative, is a characteristically Akkadian formation. The *-u* in the forms that Rainey cites indicates that Ugaritic uses the nominatives in the emphasizing infinitive forms, while Arabic, for example, uses the accusative *-an*, and Akkadian uses its locative-adverbial *-um*. The *-u* in Ugaritic cannot be described as a locative-adverbial, since such a morpheme has not been identified anywhere else in Ugaritic, whereas in Akkadian it is used more generally.

CAT is highly valuable for its analysis of grammatical difficulties in the mixed dialect of Canaanite Akkadian, and is destined to become an essential companion to the reading, understanding, and interpretation of the Amarna texts. One hopes that it will serve as an inspiration for text editions, and for studies in second-millennium Canaanite, in the pre-history of Biblical Hebrew, and in universal characteristics of creoles.

The price of the set of four volumes deserves mention. Reasonable prices allow the academic discourse which is transmitted in scholarly books to flow freely; the price of these books is far too high. The publisher received camera-ready copy, and so expenses were low, yet the set is so expensive that only a handful of Amarna specialists and some university libraries are likely to purchase it. The set of books is certainly too expensive for students in Amarna courses, and even most researchers will find it beyond their budgets. There are publishers in Semitics who sell larger

¹⁵⁾ John Huehnergard, "'Stative,' Predicative Form, Pseudo-Verb." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 46 (1987), pp. 228-29.

¹⁶⁾ Hebrew and Aramaic have **qatal* for the G perfect from the root *√šm*, following the attraction of the theme vowel to **a* by the guttural third radical. However, Arabic *samīa'* and the rare Hebrew pausal *šāmēa'* attest to the original vowel.

¹⁷⁾ The *-ī* in *'nī* comes from the *-ī* in *'ānōkī*, which is in turn the result of dissimilation of back vowels.

quantities of books — even specialized ones — at lower prices, and Brill would benefit the academic community by emulating them.

Emek Ha'ela, December 1997

J. Fox

* *
*

COGAN, Mordechai, and Israel EPH'AL (eds.) — Ah, Assyria. Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor. Scripta Hierosolymitana, Volume XXXIII. The Magnes Press. The Hebrew University Jerusalem 1991, 347 pages. \$ 35.

The *Festschrift* (English: the homage-volume) has its origins in 19th century Germany.¹⁾ The first one seems to have been published around 1864. The *Festschrift* was not always a scholarly work but was originally published to commemorate such events as the anniversary of a city or of a business. In the academic world it is to honor a colleague, usually on the occasion of his birthday, sometimes as early as the fiftieth. The *Festschrift* is sometimes the product of a scholar's students in which case the volume tends to have a uniform content. The majority of *Festschriften*, however, contain various contributions from friends, colleagues, faculty members, and distinguished scholars with the result that they cover a broad spectrum of fields and interests. Thus articles are published in *Festschrift* volumes from disciplines not necessarily related to the one of the person being honored. The problem is compounded by the increasing number of *Festschriften* being published, confronting the bibliographer with a Herculean task. The circumstances brought about the indexing of *Festschrift* articles the earliest of which seems to be Dorothy Rounds', "Index of Articles Related to Antiquity Published in *Festschriften* 1864-1953." Cambridge, Mass. 1962. The part on the Ancient Near East was compiled in collaboration with Robert H. Pfeifer.

Besides these difficulties, the editor and the reviewer are also confronted with insurmountable problems. These have often been articulated in articles complaining about the situation.²⁾ The reviewer, however, has a few options. He can select a few articles in his particular field of interest, make a descriptive account of each article, or even a combination of the two.³⁾

Although a *Festschrift* may be quite diverse in character, one of its strengths may be found in the different perspectives and approaches that are brought together from separate fields. The *Tadmor Festschrift* is a good example. The

volume reflects the spectrum of interests and problems which are being treated in various disciplines dealing with the Ancient Near East. Naturally, not all aspects of the field are represented, as the majority of contributions are first millennium and historical. At the same time, the book reflects the interests of the man whom it is honoring. The book contains contributions on Aramean pre-history by R. Zadok, history and literature in the Persian period by Sarah Japhet, an essay on the distinctiveness issue in ancient Israel by P. Machinist. On the philological side, there are interesting contributions from Tzvi Abusch, D.O. Edzard, W.G. Lambert, Thorkild Jacobsen and J.C. Greenfield.

The volume is in honor of Hayim Tadmor on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday. The book contains a preface and a list of abbreviations. It is divided into three parts: Part One — Neo-Assyrian History; Part Two — Literary and Historical Studies, and Part Three — Texts and Textual Studies. The book concludes with an autobiographical contribution from B. Mazar, a list of contributors, and a bibliography of Hayim Tadmor's works.

The reviewer has limited himself to just a few philological points. Eph'al's article (pp. 36-45) "The Samaritan(s) in the Assyrian sources" discusses non-literary texts in light of their relevancy to Israelites. Since the appearance of the article B. Becking has published a monograph called *The Fall of Samaria. A Historical and Archaeological Study*, Leiden, New York, Köln 1992.

Eph'al discusses personal names in CTN III 99.ii.16-23. He suggests that the name *Ya-u-ga-a-a* is possible an Israelite name although the ending *ga-a-a* is difficult to interpret and elucidates in a footnote (p. 42 n. 31): "Zadok..., explains *ga-a* as derived from גאהל 'to be exalted'. We may offer an alternative explanation to the ending *gâ* by assuming that it is a hyporistic form of such a verb as גבר (cf. גבריהו), גמל (cf. גמליהו), גמר (cf. גמליהו), similar to the ending of the name גיהא...". This suggestion is quite unlikely and Zadok's explanation is more plausible. The name *Ga-a-a* is attested in SAA XI 146:9 (the reading there *Zizibayu* is doubtful). The name *Bahê* is not Akkadian as the author assumes but Aramaic and is related to the well-known *Bahîanu* (Cf. F.M. Fales, SAAB VII/2 p. 144; R. Zadok, WSB p. 161). The etymology of the name *Atamru* is according to the author 'not clear enough' and not a Hebrew name. However, the name does have an etymology and is derived from the root < *mr which has been interpreted with the meaning 'speak' and 'see'. The form suggests that it is an Akkadian Gt (cf. H.B. Huffmon, APNMT p. 168). *Atamru* has also been connected to the Hebrew name אִתְמַר; see L. Köhler & W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*, Leiden 1967, 43a s.v. The article concludes with the observation: "It appears, then, that part of the references to 'the Samaritans' in our non-literary Assyrian sources are related to other nations rather than to Israelites either in the province or in Assyria itself. The later these references are dated after 720 B.C.E., the greater the chances that they are related to non-Israelites."

M. Liverani's contribution (pp. 65-79) "The trade network of tyre according to Ezek. 27", deals with the so-called prophetic 'Leichenlied' in Ezekiel 27. The author treats the terms עֲזֹבוֹן and מַעֲרָב (p. 77) and makes the following observation, "It is difficult to say something well-founded on the specific technical meaning of these two

¹⁾ Articles about the *Festschrift* have appeared since 1929. See S. Griswold Morely, "The Developments of the Homage-Volume", *Philological Quarterly* 8 (1929) 61-68; A. Gudemann, "The Homage-volume Once More", *Philological Quarterly* 8 (1929) 335-338. The most important contribution on the subject is still D. Rounds and S. Dow, "Festschriften", *Harvard Library Bulletin* 6 (1954) 283-298.

²⁾ I.L. Horowitz, "The Place of the *Festschrift*", in *Scholarly Publishing*, vol. 21 Nr. 2 (January 1990) pp. 77-83; C. Diamond, "Hommage ou Domage?", in *Philosophy* 58 (1983) pp. 73-88.

³⁾ In 1954 D. Rounds and S. Dow wrote the following note in their article: "No class of reviews is so poor as those of *Festschriften*. The nadir was reached recently in a 29-line 'review' of the sixty-dollar two-volume David M. Robinson *Festschrift* by one of the contributors to it, whose judgment includes the unfortunate statement that 'there is little which is exciting, mainly because the conventions of sound scholarship are so faithfully observed'". See D. Rounds and S. Dow, *ibid.*, 295 note 18.

terms, since they are hapax legomena, and on the semantic shifts linking them to the basic meanings of their respective roots. Very generally, and whatever be the direction from which the exchange is viewed, we can say that מערב belongs to the idea of 'receiving' ('to let enter' in the sense of 'to acquire'), while ערבון belongs to the idea of 'giving' ('to leave' into the hand of the trade-partner). It is perhaps worth noting that the root ערב has also the meaning of 'take on as a pledge, give to pledge' and that in post-Biblical Hebrew the word ערבון has the meaning 'pledge, surety' (see Akkadian *erubbatum*, AHW 248a.). On the other hand, ערב is attested in post-Biblical Hebrew as a 'bequest' (German: Hinterlassenschaft). In the present context it appears to have the meaning 'depositum' (cf. L. Köhler & W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*, Leiden 1967, 764a s.v. where the following meaning is given: "Handelsware mit d. Funktion eines Depositums, was Karawanen oder Schiffe zurücklassen zum Austausch gegen Landesprodukte..."). Both terms would seem to indicate that they are a type of surety or pledge. The passages in Ezekiel 27 give us information on sea trade. However, since we are not dealing with an economic text these terms are not necessarily exact and are employed as synonyms.

M. Weinfeld's article (p. 99-103) "Semiramis: her name and her origin", does not treat the Assyriological sources. Instead, late Greek sources are employed with references to Ugaritic and rabbinical interpretations. The philological questions concerning the name are dismissed in the article as follows: "The name Semiramis has been identified with Sammuramat, the queen mother of the Assyrian king Adad-nirari III (810-782 B.C.E.), but neither classical scholars nor Assyriologists have explained the derivation of these personal names" (p. 99). The name Sammu-ramat has posed difficulties and the common tendency has been to seek a solution outside of the Akkadian language. To a large extent, the material concerning the name Semiramis was assembled by W. Eilers in his *Semiramis Entstehung und Nachhall einer altorientalischen Sage* (Wien 1971) where also the various interpretations were discussed. Already J.J. Stamm claimed that the name Sammu-ramat was not Akkadian (MVAeG 44 p. 82 n. 2). W.F. Albright claimed that the name was Aramaic: "...Sammu-râmat (whose name is not Assyrian at all but Aramaic, meaning 'The Goddess Shammu [so! — the values of the sibilants were interchanged in Babylonian and Assyrian, as we know for scores of West-Semitic transcriptions] is Exacted')..." cf. W.F. Albright, *American Journal of Philosophy* 66 (1945) 100ff. This statement oversimplifies the situation and thus appears to fit Albright's argument. The picture is much more complicated as can be seen from the sibilant change š > s from Neo-Assyrian to West Semitic in the well known example of Šarru-ukin > Sargôn (cf. S. Moscati, *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of The Semitic Languages*. Wiesbaden 1964, § 8.32 p. 35: APN xviii-xix. For the relationship of the sibilants in Neo-Assyrian and West Semitic see R. Zadok, WSB § 4116 p. 245). Eilers also rejected an Akkadian derivation partly on the basis that the first element Sammu could not be identified as a Mesopotamian deity. What seems to have been overlooked in this matter is that the deity Sāmu is attested in Assyrian sources (Cf. R. Frankena, *Tākultu* p. 111 No. 119 for general comments; MVAeG 41/3 iii 30 where the deity is written d.Sa-mu and

the "Götteradressbuch" which had been edited by Frankena in *Tākultu* and re-edited by B. Menzel, AT, T 113-125 iii 29). In the "Götteradressbuch" d.Sa-a-mu is listed as one of the gods of the Marduk temple of Assur. This is interesting as it may hint at Babylonian origins. The verb in the name can also be explained from the Akkadian as deriving from *rāmu* and does not need to be explained as Aramaic. An example of this name type is Nabû-ramat attested in a Neo-Assyrian legal document cf. NALK 400:1; cf. C. Saporetti, OMA II 150 sub *ra'āmu*. Unless there is concrete evidence to the contrary there is no plausible reason why this personal name should not be considered Akkadian. The use of non-Assyrian sources (especially when they are late) can be risky in trying to attempt to explain events and names. Only the discovery of new sources will be able to contribute to a reliable picture of Sammu-ramat.

We thank the editors for their efforts and for making this volume available to the scholarly world.

Köln, January 1998

T. KWASMAN

* *
*

JURSA, Michael — Die Landwirtschaft in Sippar in neubabylonischer Zeit. (Archiv für Orientforschung, Beiheft 25). Institut für Orientalistik, Wien, 1995. (30 cm, II, 264, Ill., Abb.). ISBN 3-900345-03-1. ISSN 1015-3403. öS 690,-.

Michael Jursa hat in dem hier zu besprechenden Buch, dessen Titel auf eine umfassende Darstellung der Landwirtschaft in Sippar hindeutet, bewußt (s. S 1) weniger die Art und Weise der landwirtschaftlichen Arbeiten als die Organisation der landwirtschaftlichen Produktion des Šamaš-Tempels in Sippar in den Jahren 626-484 v. Chr. behandelt. Diese Zielsetzung hängt natürlich mit der Quellenlage zusammen, da keine aufschlußreichen Informationen zur Untersuchung der eigentlichen landwirtschaftlichen Tätigkeiten vorhanden sind, weil diese für den Tempel von keiner Bedeutung waren.

Das Material wird in zehn Kapiteln dargestellt, abgeschlossen von einer Zusammenfassung (Kap. 11), einem topographischen und prosopographischen Anhang (Kap. 12), und am Ende des Buches sind Keilschriftkopien, Indizes und eine Tafel zu finden. Das erste Kapitel beschreibt die verfügbaren Quellen und deren Inhalt, und bietet ein Überblick über die bisherigen Literatur. Die Kapitel 2 bis 7 widmen sich, in einer arbeitsaufwendigen aber sehr erfolgreichen prosopographischen Zugangsweise, der Beschreibung der einzelnen, in den verschiedenen Zweigen der Landwirtschaft des Tempels tätigen Gruppen (Viehucht bleibt außer Betracht): der Tempelbauern (*ikkarū*, Kap. 2); der Tempelgärtnern (*nukurribū!*, s. S. 35⁷⁹, Kap. 3); der *gugallus* (konventionell »Kanalinspektor«, Kap. 4); der *rab-banê* (eine Berufsgruppe, deren Übersetzung unsicher ist, Kap. 5); des weiteren der Beschreibung der Teilpachtabgaben und Teilpächter (*mišil, šibšu*, bzw. *errēšus*, Kap. 6); der Generalpacht und der Generalpächter (*rab sūti, bēl sūti* oder *ša muhhi sūti*, Kap. 7), bei der die Dossiers der acht namentlich bekannten Generalpächter im Detail behandelt sind.

Die folgenden zwei Kapitel (Pachturkunden, Kap. 8; Listen: Forderungen und Lieferungen, Kap. 9) haben die nach formalen Merkmalen gesonderten Dokumente der land-