

RECENSIONES

Jean Bottéro, Clarisse Herrenschmidt, Jean-Pierre Vernant, *L'Orient ancien et nous. L'écriture, la raison, les dieux*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1996. 230 pp. - ISBN 2-226-08729-X.

Aunque no se definieron nunca como almas gemelas, Jean Bottéro y Jean-Pierre Vernant compartieron mucho. Nacieron ambos en 1914 y vivieron los dos noventa y tres años; discípulos de grandes maestros (y maestros de grandes discípulos), se dedicaron a entender civilizaciones extintas desde la filología, la historia y la antropología, herederos de la mejor tradición intelectual francesa y apegados a un entonces sólido método estructuralista; y se propusieron además, sin previo concierto, una misma misión: hacer revivir el legado de aquellas culturas que ayudaron a interpretar tan decisivamente, la mesopotámica y la griega respectivamente. Bottéro se consideró siempre discípulo de Aristóteles y Vernant no dejó nunca de reivindicar su formación de filósofo (su tesis doctoral versó sobre la obra de Platón). De ahí que en sus trabajos, tanto el eminente asiriólogo como el gran helenista permanecieran en todo momento, pese a tratar temas de variada índole, en el nivel de los conceptos, de las categorías mentales y las verdades eternas. Ambos decidieron así penetrar en el mundo de los mitos, narrándolos (en traducciones ejemplares) para comprenderlos y hacerlos vivir de nuevo, pero también para tratar de descubrir los “fundamentos intelectuales” de su civilización, como gustaba llamarlos Vernant. A partir de los mitos y de su legado escrito en general, procuraron ambos mostrar, cada uno desde su mundo y repertorio de estudio, de qué manera surgió el pensamiento racional: *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs* (1965, traducido en 1993: *Mito y pensamiento en la Grecia antigua*) y *Religions, histoires, raisons* (1979) son ensayos de referencia obligada de Vernant, lo mismo que la obra de Bottéro *Mésopotamie. L'écriture, la raison et les dieux* (1987, traducido en 2004: *Mesopotamia: La escritura, la razón y los dioses*).

Parece que las vidas paralelas y el común empeño intelectual de Bottéro y Vernant acabaron por fin confluyendo en el libro que aquí se reseña. Y es probablemente a Bottéro a quien se deba el impulso o cuando menos la inspiración. No solamente porque la triple articulación esbozada en el subtítulo coincide con la de su libro de 1987 anteriormente citado, sino porque el título mismo señala desde su portada lo que podría calificarse de su máxima: no es en Grecia, patria de las formas políticas y democráticas modernas, donde hay que buscar las raíces últimas de “nuestra” civilización, es decir, la occidental; más profundas aún se encuentran las del antiguo Oriente en general y Mesopotamia en particular. Aunque no consta que lo expresara categóricamente, es claro que Bottéro intentó a lo largo de su vasta y erudita carrera sustituir el lema francés “nos ancêtres, les Gaulois” por “nos ancêtres, les Mésopotamiens”. Pero entendiéndolo, no desde una perspectiva racista o nacionalista, como puede deducirse precipitadamente de algunas de sus expresiones (“la civilisation mésopotamienne, l'aïeule de la nôtre”) o como se ha interpretado con frecuencia —y no sin orgullo— el origen galo del francés moderno, sino en su dimensión cultural. En otras palabras, no es el código genético ni la historia lo que compartimos con los antiguos babilonios, sino (parte de) la cultura. Con la invención de la escritura acaecida en Mesopotamia hacia 3200 a.C., recuerda e insiste Bottéro, el mundo (civilizado) no volvió a ser el mismo. Allí dio comienzo el progreso modernizador. Y para ilustrar la razón científica mesopotámica derivada de su pionero y complejo sistema de escritura, propone ver en los largos y elaborados tratados de adivinación cuneiformes la aplicación de un, acaso el primer método causa-efecto. Los argumentos no son nuevos: como se ha dicho antes, Bottéro ha venido dibujando su discurso hermenéutico desde que comenzara su largo trato con el pensamiento

mesopotámico. Lo nuevo es cómo se articula aquí su planteamiento, que ocupa el primero de los tres capítulos de que se compone el libro (“Religiosité et raison en Mésopotamie”, pp. 15-92), y que culmina con el que Vernant dedica a la antigua Grecia (“Ecriture et religion civique en Grèce”, pp. 189-223). Pero la originalidad del plan de la obra radica muy especialmente en lo que constituye el segundo capítulo y eslabón entre Mesopotamia y Grecia, pues el eje Mesopotamia-Grecia no representa en el fondo sino la actualización del mito decimonónico del origen último de Occidente compuesto por Grecia y la Biblia. En “L’écriture entre monde visible et invisible en Iran, en Israël et en Grèce” (pp. 93-188), Clarisse Herrenschmidt, además de reivindicar el papel que desempeñó Persia y lo indoeuropeo en la conformación de la civilización oriental, ahonda en el alcance trascendental que tuvo la escritura, en particular el alfabeto (hebreo-araméo, persa y griego), en el proceso modernizador (occidental), concretamente como instrumento de la razón.

La impronta de Bottéro es patente no solamente en el propio título y subtítulo del libro o en la frase inicial con que François Zabbal presenta la obra (“Cet ouvrage porte sur l’héritage mésopotamien”), sino incluso en las páginas escritas por Vernant y Herrenschmidt. Vernant afirma de entrada que uno de los aspectos saludables del trabajo de Bottéro es el de haber demostrado que la historia comienza en Sumer; Herrenschmidt, por su parte, adopta el punto de vista grafocentrista que desarrollara el propio Bottéro en los años 1980 (siguiendo la estela de los trabajos de Jack Goody) para explicar el impulso que generó la escritura en la configuración de la mente racional y científica de Occidente. El libro mismo está estructurado de forma manifiestamente “progresiva”, comenzando naturalmente por la más antigua civilización de que se tiene noticia, la mesopotámica. *L’Orient ancien et nous* se publicó en 1996 y, aunque reeditado en 2011 (en la serie Pluriel) y traducido al inglés en 2000 (en The Chicago University Press) con el elocuente título *Ancestor of the West*, no ha resistido a la total deconstrucción a que han sido objeto señalado durante los últimos decenios el desde luego controvertido eurocentrismo y su secuela, el grafocentrismo. Definir el tiempo mesopotámico como “protonuestro”, como si la civilización occidental fuera la culminación de épocas anteriores que se suceden “progresivamente”, el tema general y predilecto de Bottéro, no cuenta hoy con serios seguidores. Tampoco ha eludido la crítica la exactitud de sus juicios acerca de la “racionalidad” o la “lógica” de la “ciencia” adivinatoria cuneiforme.

El que escribe “nuestro” puede proponerse dos cosas: bien distanciarse del “otro”, bien acercarse a él. Tanto Bottéro como Vernant decidieron acercarse apasionadamente a sus mundos, el mesopotámico y el griego, y a la vez acercárnoslos con una erudición asombrosa. En este libro, de grata lectura, exponen ambos juntos por fin sus convicciones, resultado de toda una vida dedicada a descubrir y entender los fundamentos intelectuales de mesopotamios y griegos, por medio de una narrativa sencilla pero refinada; solamente Herrenschmidt, encargada de enlazar sutilmente las dos partes capitales, hace uso de notas a pie de página para especificar sus referencias bibliográficas.

Ignacio Márquez Rowe
CSIC - Madrid

Andrew R. George, ed., *Cuneiform Royal Inscriptions and Related Texts in the Schøyen Collection* (Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology, 17. Manuscripts in the Schøyen collection, Cuneiform Texts VI), Bethesda MD: CDL Press, 2011. 310 pp. + CI pls. – ISBN: 978-1-934309-33-9.¹

The series “Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology” (CUSAS) is edited by D. Owen, the curator of the tablet collections at this university. The contributions published so far can be divided into three main subseries. One of them, the most numerous in volumes, is dedicated to the publication and study of cuneiform documentation from the third millennium, mostly from the Ur III Dynasty (2112-2004 BC), but also from the Early Dynastic and Sargonic periods, in the collections of the Cornell University (see CUSAS 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 13, 14, 15, 22). A second, smaller group of volumes is devoted to the publication of cuneiform documents from other periods in the Cornell collections. Old Babylonian cuneiform documents in these collections have been published in CUSAS 8 and 15. Third millennium texts and cuneiform documents from other periods in the Columbia University Libraries (New York) have also found their place in the series (see no. 16).

The third subseries of CUSAS comprises the “Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, Cuneiform Texts”, which started independently of CUSAS, but which have now become part of the series. The first volume with documentation from the Schøyen collection was published by J. Friberg, *A Remarkable Collection of Babylonian Mathematical Texts*, New York, 2007, outside the CUSAS project. The “Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection” contain cuneiform documentation from this Norwegian collection. To date, six volumes containing texts from the Schøyen collection have appeared in CUSAS: a volume with Sumerian proverbs edited by B. Alster (CUSAS 2), one with tablets from the First Sealand Dynasty edited by S. Dalley (CUSAS 9), another with lexical tablets edited by M. Civil (CUSAS 12), and three volumes edited by A. R. George: one on Babylonian literary texts (CUSAS 10), one on cuneiform royal inscriptions and related texts (CUSAS 17 - the volume under review here) and one on divinatory texts (CUSAS 18).

CUSAS 17 contains 107 beautifully edited documents belonging to the genres of the royal inscriptions (nos. 4-7, 11-12, 15-16, 18, 20-95), chronographic texts (nos. 96-102), *kudurru* inscriptions (i.e., inscriptions on stone dealing with fields: nos. 103-106) and a legal document: a cylinder with an exemplar of Ur-Namma's (2112-2095 BC) law collection (no. 107). Inscriptions nos. 1-3, 8-10, 13-14 and 17-19 are not royal *strictu senso*, but commissioned by individuals associated with the royalty (see below). A common feature of all the inscriptions in the volume is that they shed light on historical figures and events. The texts are arranged according to their genre and then chronologically in the volume; they range from the Uruk period (*ca.* 3000 BC) to the Persian period (Artaxerxes I, 464-424 BC). They are issued in thirteen contributions by specialists in each relevant period, and are preceded by the catalogue of the documents (pages xix to xxviii). P. Steinkeller edits 21 third-millennium royal and votive inscriptions (pages 1-28, nos. 1-21). C. Wilcke publishes a votive inscription of Gudea of Lagaš (2122-2102 BC) with Old Babylonian translation (pages 29-47, no. 22). George presents fourteen other third-millennium royal inscriptions (pages 49-57, nos. 23-36). K. Volk studies an inscription of Šin-iddinam (1849-1843 BC), the king of Larsa (pages 59-88, no. 37). George also publishes thirty second-millennium royal and commemorative inscriptions (pages 89-125, no. 38-67). G. Frame presents eight royal inscriptions from the Middle and Neo-Assyrian periods (pages 127-52, nos. 68-75). George edits a stele of Nebuchadnezzar

1. This review was possible thanks to financing by the Gerda Henkel Foundation (Germany) and the Spanish Ministry of the Economy (FFI 2011-25290). To my knowledge, the only review of CUSAS 17 currently available is by A. Livingstone, *BSOAS* 75 (2012) 367-68.

II (604-562 BC) (pages 153-69, no. 76) and other Neo-Babylonian royal inscriptions (pages 171-86, nos. 77-86). Inscriptions from the Mesopotamian periphery are also present in the volume: F. Vallat publishes eight Elamite and Achaemenid historical texts (pages 187-92, nos. 87-94) and M. Weeden edits an Urartian inscription (pages 193-98, no. 95).

The chronographic documentation is also represented in this volume. George publishes five Sumero-Babylonian king lists and two date lists (pages 199-209, no. 96-102). These are followed by four “ancient *kudurru*” inscriptions presented by Steinkeller (pages 211-20, nos. 103-106) and an article by M. Civil with the edition of the Law Collection of Ur-Namma (pages 221-86; no. 107). The volume closes with the bibliographical references (pages 287-310) and the plates.

The 107 documents are presented in photographs and, most of them, with magnificent copies of the inscriptions by George on plates I-CI at the end of this wonderful book. Photographs of the inscriptions published in this volume can be consulted online at the Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative (CDLI) website (see the concordance of CDLI numbers with the text number in this volume on page xxx).

The inscriptions are written in Sumerian, Akkadian, Elamite and Urartean (nos. 92-94 have some lines in ancient Persian and Egyptian). As George points out right at the beginning of the volume (page xviii), the range of media and materials represented is wide. The objects containing the inscriptions can be classified as follows:

Bricks: 7, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 41, 58, 59, 60, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 89,
 Bronze bowl: 18,
 Bronze dagger: 90,
 Bronze statue: 75 (fragment),
 Bronze label: 95,
 Clay barrels: 37, 42, 46, 47, 48, 49, 78, 86,
 Clay brick-stamp: 24,
 Clay cones: 13, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 38, 39, 40, 43, 45, 56, 57,
 Clay cylinders: 50, 72, 77, 107,
 Clay foot: 9,
 Clay hand: 71,
 Clay nail: 44,
 Clay tablets: 4, 8, 10, 20, 21, 22, 51, 52, 53, 55, 61, 68, 69, 74, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102,
 Clay vessel: 67 (fragment),
 Eye-stones: 62, 84, 85,
 Impression on bitumen: 36,
 Silver vessel: 87 (fragment),
 Stone brick-stamp: 16,
 Stone cone: 6,
 Stone mace head: 17,
 Stone objects: 14, 31, 32, 64, 65, 66, 88,
 Stone socket: 5,
 Stone slabs: 70, 73,
 Stone stele: 76,
 Stone tablets: 11, 15, 63, 91, 103, 104, 105, 106,
 Stone vessels: 1, 2, 3, 12, 54, 92, 93, 94,
 Stone weight: 19.

These inscriptions are issued by (dedicated to the life of or inscribed on behalf of) the following rulers, arranged chronologically (the dates follow J. A. Brinkman, "Mesopotamian Chronology of the Historical Period" in: A. L. Oppenheim/ E. Reiner, *Ancient Mesopotamia*. Chicago/London, 1977, 335-47):

En-metena (*ca.* 2410 BC) nos. 4, 5, 23,
 Giššag-kidug (*ca.* 24th century BC) nos. 6, 7,
 Narām-Suen (2254-2218 BC) no. 24,
 Šar-kali-šarri (2217-2193 BC) nos. 11, 12,
 Ur-Bau (predecessor of Gudea) no. 25,
 Gudea (2122-2102 BC) nos. 15, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33,
 Ur-Namma (2112-2095 BC) nos. 20, 21,
 Amar-Suen (2046-2038 BC) nos. 16, 34, 35, 36,
 Idattu I (*ca.* 2000 BC) no. 18,
 Išme-Dagan (1953-1935 BC) nos. 38, 39,
 Lipit-Ištar (1934-1924 BC) no. 40,
 Gungunum (1932-1906 BC) no. 44,
 Būr-Sîn (1895-1874 BC) no. 41,
 Enlil-bāni (1860-1837 BC) nos. 42, 43,
 Sîn-kāšid (*ca.* 1860 BC) nos. 55, 56, 57,
 Sîn-iddinam (1849-1843 BC) nos. 37, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49,
 Sîn-irībam (1842-1841 BC) no. 50,
 Rīm-Sîn (1822-1763 BC) no. 51, 52, 53, 54,
 Hammurapi (1792-1750 BC) nos. 58, 59, 60,
 Kutir-untaš (middle of 14th century BC) no. 88,
 Untaš-Napiriša (*ca.* 1340-1300 BC) no. 89,
 Kurigalzu II (1332-1308 BC) no. 61, 62,
 Šutruk-Nahhunte I (1190-1155 BC) no. 90,
 Tiglath-pileser I (1114-1076 BC) nos. 68, 69,
 Ashurnasirpal II (883-859 BC) nos. 70, 71,
 Minua (*ca.* 810-785 BC) no. 95,
 Erība-Marduk (first half of the 8th century BC) no. 77,
 Sargon II (721-705 BC) nos. 72, 78,
 Ashurbanipal (668-627 BC) no. 73,
 Šutur-Nahhunte (*ca.* 646 BC) no. 91,
 Nebuchadnezzar (604-562 BC) nos. 76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85,
 Nabonidus (555-539 BC) no. 86,
 Xerxes I (485-465 BC) nos. 92, 93,
 Artaxerxes I (464-424 BC) no. 94.

These rulers arranged alphabetically are the following:

Amar-Suen (2046-2038 BC) nos. 16, 34, 35, 36,
 Artaxerxes I (464-424 BC) no. 94,
 Ashurbanipal (668-627 BC) no. 73,
 Ashurnasirpal II (883-859 BC) nos. 70, 71,
 Būr-Sîn (1895-1874 BC) no. 41,
 Enlil-bāni (1862-1839 BC) nos. 42, 43,

En-metena (*ca.* 2410 BC) nos. 4, 5, 23,
 Erība-Marduk (first half of the 8th century BC) no. 77,
 Giššag-kidug (*ca.* 24th century BC) nos. 6, 7,
 Gudea (2122-2102 BC) nos. 15, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33,
 Gungunum (1932-1906 BC) no. 44,
 Hammurapi (1792-1750 BC) nos. 58, 59, 60,
 Idattu I (*ca.* 2000 BC) no. 18,
 Išme-Dagan (1953-1935 BC) nos. 38, 39,
 Kurigalzu II (1332-1308 BC) nos. 61, 62,
 Kutir-untāš (middle of 14th century BC) no. 88,
 Lipit-Ištar (1934-1924 BC) no. 40,
 Minua (*ca.* 810-785 BC) no. 95,
 Nabonidus (555-539 BC) no. 86,
 Narām-Suen (2254-2218 BC) no. 24,
 Nebuchadnezzar (604-562 BC) nos. 76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85,
 Rīm-Sîn (1822-1763 BC) nos. 51, 52, 53, 54,
 Sargon II (721-705 BC) nos. 72, 78,
 Šar-kali-šarri (2217-2193 BC) nos. 11, 12,
 Sîn-iddinam (1849-1843 BC) nos. 37, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49,
 Sîn-irībam (1842-1841 BC) no. 50,
 Sîn-kāšid (*ca.* 1860 BC) nos. 55, 56, 57,
 Šutruk-Nahhunte I (1190-1155 BC) no. 90,
 Šutur-Nahhunte (*ca.* 646 BC) no. 91,
 Tiglath-pileser I (1114-1076 BC) nos. 68, 69,
 Untāš-Napiriša (*ca.* 1340-1300 BC) no. 89,
 Ur-Bau (predecessor of Gudea) no. 25,
 Ur-Namma (2112-2095 BC) nos. 20, 21,
 Xerxes I (485-465 BC) nos. 92, 93.

Some of the inscriptions cannot be assigned to a particular ruler because they are badly damaged: nos. 1, 2, 63, 64, 65, 66, 74, 75. Others do not belong to rulers, but they were commissioned by high status individuals such as princes (Šaratigubišin, no. 14), priests (possibly Ur-Imma (?), no. 13 and Dumunirgalana, no. 19), soldiers (Ur-Numušda, nos. 17) or singers (Šeš-pada, no. 8). No. 9 is an inscription on a clay object depicting a left human foot and does not bear a personal name. This is also the case of no. 67, an inscription on a jar-sherd.

The appearance of some notes commenting on the inscriptions, immediately after the volume was published, is evidence of how interesting the new materials in CUSAS 17 are: P. Attinger, “A. R. George, CUSAS 17 (2011) 111 sq./pl. XLII n° 52:3”, NABU 2011/54; Attinger, “ĝen, agréer”, NABU 2011/55 (on nos. 6, 7 and 13); O. Pedersén, “Tiglath-Pileser I and the city of Pakute”, NABU 2011/81 (on nos. 68-69); P. Michałowski, “On the Margins of the Correspondence of the Kings of Ur. 3) The geographical term *murub^{ki}*”, NABU 2012/6 (on no. 37 iii 47-49); George, “Further additions and corrections to CUSAS 17 (nos. 6–7, 20–21 and 54)”, NABU 2012/16 (also on no. 38); U. Gabbay and C. Wilcke, “The bilingual Gudea inscription CUSAS 17, 22: New readings and interpretations”, NABU 2012/71; George, “CUSAS 17 no. 61”, NABU 2012/72; Z. Földi, “The career of a high-ranking official in Larsa: on CUSAS 17, 54”, *Cuneiform Digital Library Notes* 2012/2; D. E. Roiter, “An Indo-European God in a Gudea inscription”,

NABU 2013/38 (on no. 22). There can be no doubt that the analysis of the materials included in the volume will keep Assyriologists busy in the years to come.

Andrew George, the editor, and the other contributors of this invaluable volume must be thanked for their meticulous work on the inscriptions of the Schøyen collection and for making them available to the rest of the scientific community.

Jaume Llop
Berlin

Jean-Claude Margueron, *Cités invisibles. La naissance de l'urbanisme au Proche-Orient ancien. Approche archéologique*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 2013. 642 pp. – ISBN: 978-2-7053-3870-1.

The first cities are a key theme for understanding the genesis and evolution of the people who lived in ancient Mesopotamia. This means this has been a recurrent topic of research since the very start of archaeology in the Mesopotamian land. Scientific debate has generated a wide collection of publications over the last thirty years and these have attempted to provide an explanation for urbanism in the ancient Near East. A sample of these are, for example: F. Bruschweiler *et al.* eds., *La ville dans le Proche-Orient ancien* (Louvain 1983); M. Liverani, *L'origine delle città* (Roma 1986); J.-L. Huot *et al.*, *Naissance des cités* (Paris 1990); M. van de Mieroop, *The Ancient Mesopotamian City* (Oxford 1997); P. Azara *et al.* eds., *La fundación de la ciudad* (Barcelona 2000); M. Liverani, *Immaginare Babele. Due secoli di studi sulla città orientale antica* (Roma 2013); N.-N. May & U. Steinert eds., *The Fabrics of Cities. Aspects of Urbanism, Urban Topography and Society in Mesopotamia, Greece and Rome* (Leiden-Boston 2014).

Nevertheless, despite the time which has passed since the discovery in 1843 of the Assyrian city of Dur-Sharrukin by French archaeology, the first cities (urbanism and urban life) in the ancient Near East continue to be a problem with numerous aspects which still need to be reconsidered and re-studied from an archaeological and historical point of view. In other words, this is far from being resolved or therefore exhausted for research. Good proof of this is the recent work by Jean-Claude Margueron, which offers the reader a totally renewed vision under the original and significant title *Cités invisibles*. The choice of this title is not a banal matter. This does not merely refer to the fact that ancient cities of the Near East are nowadays found under huge mud-brick hills (*tells*) which make them “invisible”, but it refers above all to the network of “not visible” infrastructures on which they were constructed. This is what the author calls the “infrastructure urbaine compartimentée”, on which the organisation, functioning and longevity of the city depended. This infrastructure, structured like a continuous network, ensured a stable base and the evacuation of water, the greatest enemy of Mesopotamian mud-brick architecture.

Since their appearance, the first cities worked to adapt themselves to geographical and climatic means. The need to eliminate rainwater was one of the most urgent needs to resolve for the Mesopotamians. For the author, the adoption of geometrical plans, like the circle or circular sector and the orthogonal, is directly related to this question and not to esoteric or magical approaches. The circular plan was the best solution for fighting against the destructive violence of water. Cities like Ur, Uruk, Larsa, Girsu or Nippur were large urban agglomerations of a circular plan (1 to 2 km in diameter), built entirely of mud-brick and supplied with navigation canals which were saved by bridges.

The current book is not a casual work but rather a mature work, the fruit of over fifty years' experience in the field of archaeology in Syria and Irak. In fact the research takes the author's field experience as a basis as a director of archaeological excavations in five large sites of different Near Eastern geographical

Aula Orientalis 32/1 (2014) 177-194 (ISSN: 0212-5730)

contexts: Larsa, Emar, Faq'ous, Mari and Ugarit (1969-2004). This accumulated experience allowed him to prove the importance of the infrastructures or foundations of Syro-Mesopotamian cities for which it was necessary to find a general explanation in the frame of the architecture and urbanism of the ancient Near East.

The book is organised in two large thematic sections. In the first, the urbanism of the 59 cities of the Syro-Mesopotamian world is analysed, dated between the 4th (Uruk, Habuba Kabira, Gawra, etc.) and the 1st millennium B.C. (Babylonia, Dur-Katlimmu, Dur-Sharrukin, etc.). Nevertheless, cities of the second urban revolution (3rd millennium B.C.) carry specific weight as this is the period which provided us with the best and greatest number of data. The critical analysis of each of the cities and the author's arguments are based on the rich graphic documentation (plans, photographs, sketch, etc.) which accompany the text. The book contains almost 500 figures and these are very far from being a simple complement but in fact are of vital importance for understanding the author's discourse.

Margueron begins with his experience of direct excavations ("les leçons du terrain", in the author's words) i.e. with his fieldwork in Mari, Emar, citadel of Ashtata, Ugarit and Larsa. Then the reader encounters a selection of 54 Syro-Mesopotamian cities ordered alphabetically (from Adab to Tell Wilaya), whose study is based on new reading of the available documentation: stratigraphy, plans, aerial photography, topography, etc. An example is given from the sample: Ur, the most southern of the Mesopotamian cities. According to the plan published by Ch.-L. Woolley (*Ur, histoire d'une découverte*, Paris 1957, p. 80), Ur was an approximately oval city, a model which was reproduced until very recent times (E.-C. Stone, "The Organisation of a Sumerian Town", in *The Sumerian World*, New York 2013, p. 171). However Margueron offers us a new image of the famous Sumerian metropolis (Ur III phase), in line with the urbanism of other cities of the period. Ur was founded from an almost 2 km diameter circular plan hence great preparatory work was needed to isolate the city from the humidity caused by the sea level. It was crossed by canals and bridges which ensured its function as a port.

In the second section, the various components and aspects of Syro-Mesopotamian urbanism are introduced, namely: sites (urban geography), shape and form (urban morphology), number (dimensions and layouts), conditioning of the urban territory (work to set up the city), water and the city (rivers, canals, rain and urban infrastructure), the protection of the city (walls and fortresses), the functions of the city (power, holiness, economy and men), hygiene (elimination of waste), streets and their function, maintenance of the city, the city as a divine space and finally the history of urbanism.

The book ends with a general conclusion on what is considered the first urban experience of humanity, namely, that which took its first steps in the Syro-Mesopotamian region in the middle of the 4th millennium B.C. with the expansion of the so-called "Uruk culture".

Over six hundred pages make up *Cités invisibles* and these are the result of a meticulous, critical and renewed analysis of the archaeological documentation available on the city and urbanism of Syria and Mesopotamia, now very distant from any pre-established precept. We find, on the contrary, a totally new approach to the first urban civilisation of history. The result is clearly a book of exceptional quality and scientific rigour which will no doubt contribute to changing our conception of Mesopotamian civilisation. I believe, I am not exaggerating, in saying this is an obligatory reference text for all us researchers who work on ancient Mesopotamia. A work of this scope can only have been written by an author with accredited experience in the archaeology of the Near East.

To conclude, it simply remains to congratulate the Professor Margueron and thank him for the precious gift he has given us by publishing this book of synthesis which moves away from usual ways and which opens up a new approach to the lost cities of the ancient Near East from the rigorous and renewed exploration of archaeological data. If research wants to make advances in such critical times for the future of the Near Eastern archaeology, new approaches must open up which are a long way away from old,

Aula Orientalis 32/1 (2014) 177-194 (ISSN: 0212-5730)

fixed and, in many cases, pre-established ideas. *Cités invisibles* is an excellent example, thanks to which the Mesopotamian cities are nowadays more visible.

Juan-Luis Montero Fenollós
Universidade da Coruña

Piotr Michalowski, *The Correspondence of the Kings of Ur. An Epistolary History of an Ancient Mesopotamian Kingdom*, (Mesopotamian Civilizations, 15). Winona Lake IN: Eisenbrauns 2011. XXV + 530 pp. + DVD – ISBN: 978-1-57506-194-8.

Hace ya unas cuantas décadas Piotr Michalowski empezó a trabajar con los textos que se conocen como la correspondencia de los reyes de Ur III. El primer fruto de este interés vio la luz en 1976 con la presentación de su tesis doctoral, dirigida por W.W. Hallo, defendida en la universidad de Yale e intitulada *The Royal Correspondence of Ur* (= RCU). Esta tesis, citada en incontables ocasiones, permaneció inédita pese a las peticiones de muchos y muchas colegas. Y ha sido recientemente, al cabo de más de 30 años, cuando Michalowski ha publicado su esperada monografía *The Correspondence of the Kings of Ur* (= CKU).² La semilla del trabajo, es decir el corpus de 24 cartas escritas en sumerio, es la misma que en su tesis. Pero el resultado es un estudio muy enriquecido y enriquecedor en el que los textos parecen ser la excusa del autor para publicar un compendio de sabiduría, reflexiones y cuestiones que se ha planteado durante sus más de 30 años de investigación. Lo que hoy tenemos en las manos, pues, es un volumen de referencia, excepcional en muchos sentidos.

La obra consta de dos partes claramente diferenciadas, como el mismo autor advierte en el prefacio (p. ix): una sección que él presenta como analítica y otra dedicada a los textos. Esta segunda parte, la edición de las cartas, reconstruidas a partir de 115 tablillas de época paleobabilónica, incluye transliteración, traducción al inglés, matriz textual y comentario. Se trata de una edición rigurosa e impecable que resulta satisfactoria para la comunidad asiriológica pero que, por su formato y por el estilo de la traducción, también permite la aproximación a los textos por parte de especialistas en otros periodos o fuentes, algo que no es muy frecuente en asiriología. También poco frecuente y muy acertado a nuestro entender es el uso de cita americana convencional para la parte analítica, restringiendo así las siempre abundantes y a veces crípticas abreviaturas asiriológicas a la edición de los textos.³ De este modo, Michalowski satisface a los dos públicos potenciales del libro y facilita la consulta de fuentes primarias y literatura secundaria para ambos. Además, la edición se acompaña de un DVD con fotografías de buena calidad de los textos para que la audiencia especializada también pueda consultar las fuentes primarias directamente.

En cuanto a la primera parte, la analítica, aquí consideramos que es excepcional y querríamos destacar una serie de aspectos a los que nos dedicaremos de ahora en adelante. Al leer el volumen, como ya hemos apuntado, da la impresión de que la edición de los textos es una mera excusa para poder discutir sobre algunos temas. Las tablillas a través de las que nos han llegado las cartas son ejercicios escolares y son mayoritariamente de época paleobabilónica, como ya hemos apuntado, aunque tratan sobre asuntos de la

2. Para un comentario del mismo autor sobre tres aspectos tratados en esta monografía y que ha actualizado por algunas discusiones y reflexiones más recientes, véase su nota publicada en *N.A.B.U.* en el número 1 de 2012 (nota 6, pp. 6-9).

3. Sobre el exceso de jerga de la asiriología como una de las trabas para su adaptación al siglo XXI, véanse algunas reflexiones en Aage Westenholz, 'Does assyriology have a future?', *KASKAL. Rivista di storia, ambienti e culture del Vicino Oriente Antico* 3 (2006), pp. 275-283.

Tercera Dinastía de Ur, especialmente de carácter político y militar. Michalowski aprovecha todos y cada uno de los temas que pueden extraerse de la descripción anterior para hablar de cuestiones tan diversas como la carta como género literario, la educación de los escribas en Mesopotamia, la historiografía de los amorreos o los posibles motivos del colapso de Ur III. En siete capítulos y cuatro breves apéndices el autor hace un ejercicio de erudición y crítica historiográfica de un variadísimo elenco de temas que, lejos de quedar inconexos o dispares (algo que sería muy fácil), fluyen con un discurso ameno y bien hilvanado. Este resultado es posible porque, pese a la variedad temática, todos los capítulos tienen algunos denominadores comunes. Entre ellos destacamos en primer lugar el rigor y en segundo lugar la deconstrucción del positivismo y el principio de autoridad, todavía pilares de buena parte de los trabajos asiriológicos. Michalowski en todo momento evidencia el discurso historiográfico que hay detrás de cada propuesta y, aunque siempre explicita su admiración por los trabajos precedentes, los cuestiona cuando es necesario. Denuncia que la asiriología es impermeable, todavía hoy en día, a la discusión teórica y metodológica que se da en otras disciplinas y de la que podría beneficiarse (pp. 84-85). Al respecto es muy elocuente cuando advierte que el esencialismo puede desembocar en “convenient historical fictions” (p. 85).

Y esta cita nos lleva a otro de los aspectos que nos parecen destacables: se trata, como indica el subtítulo (*An Epistolary History...*), de un volumen de historia. Esto también es poco frecuente en asiriología, aunque muy necesario. Los volúmenes dedicados a la historia no suelen presentar un trabajo riguroso y crítico con las fuentes escritas, mientras que, por el contrario, los que se dedican a las fuentes escritas no suelen presentar perspectiva histórica. También en este sentido la crítica historiográfica presente y transversal a todo el volumen creemos que es uno de los ejes fundamentales de la que debería ser la asiriología del siglo XXI. Y es que, de nuevo, esta crítica historiográfica sólo es posible si se derrocan (o al menos cuestionan) el positivismo y principio de autoridad a que nos hemos referido antes. Otro aspecto que llama la atención es que el volumen, aunque explícitamente no bebe de las fuentes de los estudios de género, sí es lo que podríamos denominar como “Gender Friendly”, si se nos permite tal expresión. Trabajar con perspectiva de género no es (o no debería ser) “sólo” hablar de mujeres, sino que implica replantear y cuestionar de raíz algunas de las bases epistemológicas sobre las que construimos nuestros discursos. En este sentido, Michalowski hace hincapié en algunos aspectos que forman parte de la agenda actual de los estudios de género. Entre ellos destacamos la crítica al esencialismo, la crítica de las categorías binarias como categorías de análisis (pp. 85-90) o también el uso específico de pronombres masculinos y femeninos para evitar la ambigüedad del masculino o, en el caso del inglés, de algunos neutros. En este sentido, frases como “the sender of the message is rarely mentioned in the body of the letter but is identified by **his** or **her** seal impression [...]” (p. 15, la negrita es mía) son frecuentes en este volumen y poco habituales en muchos otros.

Especial mención, como compendio de muchos de estos aspectos positivos aquí citados, merece el capítulo 5 intitulado *The Amorites in Ur III times* (pp. 82-121). En él Michalowski presenta un estado de la cuestión de la investigación, destila y lista las principales conclusiones que comparten la mayoría de trabajos y, una a una, las discute y demuestra los puntos débiles de cada una de ellas (pp. 87-88 para la lista y pp. siguientes para la argumentación). Teniendo en cuenta que el trabajo pionero sobre el tema, todavía citado actualmente, es el de G. Buccellati publicado en 1966 es curioso que, por una coincidencia en el tiempo, esta novedosa crítica de Michalowski coincida con un artículo reciente de Lorenzo Verderame,⁴ que no aparece en la bibliografía de Michalowski. Verderame (2009: 242-243) lista algunos puntos coincidentes con Michalowski (2011: 87-88) como por ejemplo el nomadismo o la procedencia

4. Lorenzo Verderame, “Mar-tu nell III Millennio: fonti e interpretazioni”, *RSO* 82, 2009, 229-260.

occidental de los amorreos y ambos, a continuación, hacen una crítica bastante coincidente a nivel metodológico e historiográfico de estas afirmaciones. Pese a algunas diferencias en esta lista inicial y diferencias también en las fuentes (Verderame se dedica a todo el tercer milenio a.n.e. mientras que Michalowski se centra en Ur III), seguro que si la publicación de Verderame hubiera estado disponible antes del cierre de la edición de Michalowski, la discusión de este capítulo se habría visto enriquecida todavía más, si cabe. En este caso, pues, nos encontramos ante un ejemplo más del azar con el que, a menudo, juega la historia, y parece que la investigación también. Como observa Michalowski, y creemos que aquí es especialmente pertinente, “God may not play with dice, but History often does” (p. 177).

Finalmente, sólo nos queda felicitar de nuevo a Piotr Michalowski por, después de tantos años, haber decidido publicar no sólo este conjunto de textos con versiones revisadas y actualizadas, sino sobre todo un excelente volumen de historia e historiografía que se convertirá rápidamente en obra de referencia. Una publicación amena, rigurosa y valiente que es sin duda un gran ejemplo de lo que, a nuestro entender, podría y debería ser la asiriología del presente y de nuestro futuro más inmediato.

Agnès Garcia-Ventura
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Philippa M. Steele, *A Linguistic History of Ancient Cyprus: The Non-Greek Languages and their Relations with Greek, c. 1600–300 BC* (Cambridge Classical Studies). New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013. 296 pp. + 1 ill., 3 maps and 9 tab. – ISBN: 978-1-110-04286-5.¹

The book under review is the published version of the doctoral dissertation of Philippa M. Steele, a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellow in the Faculty of Classics (Cambridge), Fellow of Magdalene College and Director of Studies in Classics at Wolfson College. Steele is also the editor of *Syllabic Writing on Cyprus and its Contexts* (Cambridge 2013), comprising the proceedings of the homonymous conference held in 2008, and therefore is involved in two very recent and groundbreaking works on Cypriot epigraphy.

The volume is devoted to the non-Greek scripts and languages of Cyprus in the period from ca. 1600 through ca. 300 BCE, namely the three that can be discerned with certainty: Cypro-Minoan (Chap. I), Eteocypriot (Chap. 2) and Phoenician (Chap. 3).

The chapter on Cypro-Minoan is divided in four sections, dealing respectively with the corpus (I.1), the “language(s)” underlying the inscriptions (I.2), context (I.3) and the famous Opheltas’ inscribed spit as a case-study (I.4).

It is in the concluding section, however, that we find Steele’s most insightful description of the script’s corpus: “Cypro-Minoan” refers to “a group of inscriptions that have broad chronological, geographical and epigraphic similarities but limited overall epigraphic coherence” (p. 241). With this, and without arguing for a single Cypro-Minoan script, the author moves away from the widely accepted division into four sub-scripts (“archaic CM” or “CM 0”, and CM 1, 2 and 3) as formulated by Émilie Masson⁵ and maintained in *HoChyMin* by Jean-Pierre Olivier⁶. In short, Cypro-Minoan consists of a collection of

1. The writing of this review was made possible by a doctoral degree grant (no. SFRH / BD / 77529 / 2011) from the *Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia* (Portugal).

5. É. Masson, *Cyprominoica: répertoires; documents de Ras Shamra; essais d'interprétation*, Gothenburg 1974.

6. *HoChyMin* = J.-P. Olivier, *Édition holistique des textes chypro-minoens* [Biblioteca di «Pasiphae», VI], Pisa/Rome 2007.

largely unintelligible inscriptions, and the unity vs. the multiplicity of the script is a debate that cannot be fully settled until decipherment.

Actually, Steele makes a pertinent critique of the traditional division, reminding us of Olivier's observation that CM 3 is defined only by its geography (it is restricted to the Syrian coast, namely to Ugarit) and, more to the point, stressing that CM 1 is a "catch-all term" applicable to any inscription of Cypriot or doubtful provenance that "appears to conform generally to the basic Cypro-Minoan repertoire of signs" without fitting into any of Masson's other subdivisions (pp. 46–47). Thus Steele's table of Cypro-Minoan sign variants (Table 3a, p. 27) is not organized according Masson's scheme. Moreover, for her analysis she substitutes the quadripartite scheme with a categorization in six Cypro-Minoan subcorpora: (i) the "very early" inscriptions, (ii) the clay tablets from Enkomi; (iii) the inscriptions from Ugarit; (iv) the late inscriptions from Palaepaphos; (v) the clay cylinders; (vi) and the clay balls (pp. 35–47). Although the criteria for some of these categories may be subject to discussion, the author makes a constructive attempt at dissolving the inconsistency of CM 1 and organizing the corpus into more homogeneous, analyzable units.

As a by-product of this analysis, Steele makes a crucial observation. The subcorpus of CM 2 is comprised of three clay tablets from Enkomi inscribed with relatively lengthy texts containing around 2,000 signs of a very homogeneous style. This sample is both extensive and coherent; thus it is likely that the sixty-two (or perhaps slightly fewer) attested syllabograms of CM 2 closely approximate the total number of signs in this signary. Uninfluenced by previous approaches, which focused on CM 1 as the key signary, Steele notes that "it is in fact the CM 2 texts that give the most stable and reliable information about any part of the Cypro-Minoan corpus, and to some extent we can judge other inscriptions by comparison with them" (p. 31). A salutary example of the benefit of such an approach is provided by Carian, an alphabetic script attested (in different varieties) in both Caria and Egypt. For more than a century this script remained impenetrable, the main cause being the mixed study of different subcorpora of inscriptions, a methodology that discouraged consensus on the issue of whether forms somewhat dissimilar were *different* signs, or merely variants of the same sign. This situation changed only when the Carian inscriptions from Saqqara were finally understood. These texts employed a "very unitary and standardized alphabet", and when the results of its analysis were applied to the other varieties of the alphabet progress was made; at this point, some Carian personal names could be reliably associated with personal names attested in the Greek sources.⁷ A similar approach may prove fruitful with Cypro-Minoan.

The subsection on the inscriptions is in turn comprised of subdivisions on "Lexicology and syntax," "Morphology," "Phonology," "Onomastics" and "Linguistic affinities". The morphological study "involves looking at pairs or sets of lexical items that share a string of three or more syllabic signs in order to ascertain how such pairs or sets differ from each other, with the result in some cases that we can identify something that looks like a kind of morphological marker" (p. 62). It is perhaps the most innovative subsection. However, the focus on sets of three or more signs has excluded from consideration at least one significant group of sequences (noted earlier by E. Masson):

68-25-33-25 (ENKO Atab 004.B.17)
 68-25-75 (ENKO Atab 004.B.11)
 68-25-96 (ENKO Atab 004.A.*lat.sup.*)
 68-25-97 (ENKO Atab 004.B.10)

7. I. J. Adiego, *The Carian Language. With an Appendix by Koray Konuk* [Handbuch der Orientalistik, 86], Leiden 2007, p. 192.

68-25-97-17 (ENKO Atab 003.A.15)

Of these five sign-groups, Steele mentions only the last two as evidence that *-*17* can be added to a self-standing sequence (p. 69). Yet, the whole group is relevant for two reasons. First: four of the five sign-groups occur in the same text, ENKO Atab 004, one in the “heading” and three on side B, strongly suggesting that they are inflected forms of the same word, one closely tied to the semantic content of the inscription. Second: different scholars have formally compared signs **33*, **75* and **97* to Cypro-Greek *re*, *ra* and *ro*,⁸ respectively, and there is therefore a chance that they all belong to a “rhotic” series in Cypro-Minoan (and that we can also include **96* in this series). Very likely we have a stem **68-25-r-*. As the work of Alice Kober on Linear B shows, with syllabaries that represent only open syllables this sort of evidence can yield clues as to which syllabograms share the same consonant. In this sense, however meager the corpus may be, it would have been interesting to see an even deeper analysis of phonology and morphology.

Section I.1.G. is a cautious attempt to enter the world of Cypro-Minoan sound values, and Steele is right in resorting to two independent methods, one internal and statistical, and one comparative. However, her strategy for using the comparative method has one potential shortcoming (with implications also for the phonological section). Citing Billigmeier, she defines her strategy as follows: “if a syllabogram in Cypro-Minoan has exactly the form of a sign in Linear B and one in Classical Cypriot, and the latter two agree closely as to the phonetic value, we are justified in attributing that value to the Cypro-Minoan sign” (p. 53). The preference for comparing the Cypriot scripts with the Mycenaean one is understandable, since the latter is deciphered and fully readable, but a thorough paleographical study of Cypro-Minoan—something which remains a *desideratum* in the field—would also reveal close *formal* matches between Linear A and Cypro-Minoan signs (regardless of the exact degree of kinship linking the two scripts). Importantly, Yves Duhoux demonstrated some time ago that the values of many Linear A signs are more or less known.⁹ Opting to compare the Cypriot scripts with Linear B but not with Linear A means that if a given Cypro-Minoan sign has close formal and phonetic counterparts in Linear A and Cypro-Greek, but the shape of the equivalent sign in Linear B has diverged significantly, this potentially-significant match will be overlooked.

For example, Steele notes the similarities between Linear B *ro* and Cypro-Greek *lo*, but not those between Linear A *ra* (𐀓) and *ri* (𐀔) → Cypro-Minoan **87* (𐀕) and **09* (𐀖) → Cypro-Greek *la* (𐀗) and *li* (𐀘). It is widely accepted that Linear B probably owes to the Linear A script its dual-value liquid series, transcribed *r* but used for both /l/ and /r/. Thus a choice to include Linear A comparanda in the author’s analysis might have led to the conclusion that at least three syllabograms of the Linear A *r*-series survive in Cypro-Minoan and reemerge in Cypro-Greek as *la*, *li* and *lo*—something which could be considered circumstantial evidence that Cypro-Minoan possessed two distinct liquid series, one lateral which is inherited and one rhotic (see above) which is innovated.

In some cases, the author’s paleographical assessments are disputable: for instance, the claim that Linear B *po* (𐀑) and its Cypro-Greek counterpart (𐀒) have no clear equivalent in Cypro-Minoan (pp. 71–73) is not entirely accurate, since some of the variants of sign **12* (𐀓, 𐀔) provide a suitable formal match, as Steele’s table of Cypro-Minoan sign variants shows. Incidentally, the same table is, for some reason, missing sign **62* (𐀕).

8. S. Hiller, “Die kyprominoischen Schriftsysteme,” *AfO* 20, 1985, pp. 63–75, Abb. 1.

9. Y. Duhoux, “Le linéaire A: problèmes de déchiffrement,” in Y. Duhoux, T. G. Palaima and J. Bennet (eds), *Problems in Decipherment*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1989, pp. 66–76.

The contextual section reaches the only possible verdict: archaeology cannot provide conclusive evidence of multilingualism on Late Bronze Age Cyprus, and evidently only decipherment can shed light on the linguistic landscape of the island in this period. The topic of the Greek-speaking settlement of Cyprus brings in the famous inscribed spit or *obelos* of Opheltas, which is the case-study in this chapter and a recurrent subject throughout the book. As is known, it is intensely debated whether this object contains a very late Cypro-Minoan inscription, or a very early Cypro-Greek syllabic one. On one hand, Steele seems to maintain a cautious position (p. 236). On the other hand, she states that it “has more recently been recognised, thanks to Olivier’s research, that it [the Opheltas’ inscription] is not written in the Cypriot Syllabary of the first millennium” (p. 91). In the comparative-paleographical comments on the individual signs of the spit, which ends with an argument that the evidence is ambiguous, Steele asserts that the shape of the last sign, *12 (Λ), “(identified with Paphian Cypriot Syllabic *u*) is closer to some attestations of the Cypro-Minoan sign 012 than to the usual Cypriot Syllabic rendering” (p. 91). This claim could perhaps be attenuated. First, there are cases of Paphian *u* identical to the *u* of the spit. Secondly, it usually goes unmentioned that if Opheltas’ *u* is to be equated with Cypro-Minoan *12, then the latter *should* behave as a V (vowel) syllabogram. That is, sign *12 ought to be relatively frequent, especially word-initially. It turns out that this is not so. Excluding the spit, Cypro-Minoan *12 is attested a total of twenty times in CM 1 and 2, and only six of these occurrences are word-initial. I think most scholars would agree that this distribution renders a monovocalic sign unlikely, while remaining quite plausible for a sign whose value is *po*, as suggested here (see above). What is more, the spit comes from Tomb 49 of Palaepaphos-Skales, whose dromos yielded an inscribed stone block (##189 = PPAP Pblo 001). One of the two signs written on the block is hitherto unattested in Cypro-Minoan and exclusive to Cypro-Greek. On p. 43, Steele acknowledges that this sign “appears very similar to a Cypriot Syllabic *nu*... (a sign not otherwise attested in Cypro-Minoan, unless it is 017, as Olivier suggests)”, although she does not mention this sign in the discussion on the spit. In fact, despite Olivier’s proposal, none of the examples of Cypro-Minoan *17 matches the sign on the block. It would thus seem important for the author to have noted that the same tomb that yielded the spit also contained an object with an undoubtedly Cypro-Greek inscription.

In Chap. 2 Steele puts into full practice the view that a non-Greek Cypriot language ought to be discerned on the basis of *positive* evidence for non-Hellenic linguistic features. The result is the first judicious corpus of Eteocypriot inscriptions, followed by an equally-sensible analysis. Amathus on the south and Golgoi in the east are the most prominent locations with uninterpreted syllabic inscriptions, but it is the first of these that serves as the source of most of the inscriptions in Steele’s Eteocypriot corpus. The main reason is that the Amathusian texts, some of which are bilingual, include word dividers and Greek personal-names with non-Hellenic morphological endings (p. 100). Thus they offer the chance of associating a small number of linguistic features with *one* non-Greek language. Golgoi, on the other hand, is deliberately excluded from the author’s corpus and analysis because it does not seem to contain any of the linguistic features established for the Amathusian and other texts. The criterion is solid, but an inscribed alabaster vase from Golgoi (ICS 295) with two lines of non-Greek text contains the sequence *we-ka-te-ti-po-si-ro-ti*.¹⁰ While the last sign is admittedly doubtful, the possibility that the well-established Eteocypriot suffix *-o-ti* is present is at least worth mentioning. The only bridge the author builds between Eteocypriot and the little we can glimpse of the language(s) underlying Cypro-Minoan involves tentatively linking this suffix *-o-ti* to the fact that sign *23 = *ti*⁷ is repeatedly found in final position in Cypro-Minoan sequences, as if it were a morphological marker (or a part thereof) (p. 67) —a possibility already explored

10. M. Egetmeyer, *Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre. Tome I: Grammaire; Tome II: Répertoire des inscriptions en syllabaire chyprogrec*, Berlin/New York 2010, p. 619.

by Y. Duhoux.¹¹ In conclusion, Steele has substantiated her claim that “Eteocypriot is not an unknown language” (p. 242), and I suspect that in the near future, this part of the book will become the main reference on this scarcely-documented language.

The importance of the chapter on Phoenician derives from the fact that “no corpus of the Cypriot Phoenician inscriptions has been assembled to date” (p. 173). The task of assembling such a corpus is all the more pressing, as over 500 Phoenician inscriptions have been found on Cyprus. Absent from Steele’s study is an archive of about 325 administrative records from Idalion, which were uncovered in the 1990s and 2000s but remain unpublished, and therefore were inaccessible to the author. The structure of this chapter is inevitably different from that of the other two, given that Phoenician is a much better-understood language. The chapter therefore contains only two sections.

The first dwells on the size, nature and chrono-geographical distribution of Cypriot Phoenician inscriptions, paying special attention to the question of whether they show traces of dialectal variation. Steele concludes that the attestation of the Byblian (as opposed to the Tyro-Sidonian) dialect at Larnax tes Lapethou is “problematic”, while the evidence for a Cypro-Phoenician is “largely inconclusive”.

The second section deals with the interaction between Phoenician and Greek according to the evidence of bilinguals and onomastic material, and contains case-studies on the Kition subcorpus and on one important early inscription. Beyond borrowings and personal names, Steele acknowledges that other evidence of contact “might include the equivalence of Phoenician and Greek gods, as seen in the Idalion and Tamassos bilinguals” but does not go into further detail (p. 218). In a book that seeks to investigate language contact, it is perhaps surprising that a feature that could potentially connect all three known languages of Classical Cyprus is not given more emphasis. Steele mentions that in Eteocypriot there are indications of a weakening or loss of /s/ before /i/ (cf. *a-na ta-si* vs. *a-na ta-i*), including at least one example in an Eteocypriot rendition of a Greek personal-name (cf. Onasitimos > *o-na-i-ti-mo*) (pp. 143–144, 152). The evidence is so far restricted to Eteocypriot, making it the likely source of the shift, although the author does not exclude Cypriot Greek. What is significant is that the bilingual from Tamassos (Steele’s Ph 12, p. 204), in which Phoenician *’lhyts* equates with the Cypriot Greek divine name *a-la-si-o-ta-i* (dative), is further evidence of such a phonetic shift, in that the Semitic form contains an /h/ that can only represent a lenited /s/ (though to be fair, Steele hints at this in fn. 135). This lenition is not reflected in the Greek version, as if the Phoenicians borrowed the epithet directly from Eteocypriot. At the same time, it is perplexing that *’lhts* appears to contain the Greek nominative ending *–s*.

Another indication of intercultural contact is provided by the bilingual dedication to L’DNY L[RŠ]P *’LYYT* ‘to Lord Reshep Elyt’ (Phoenician) and *to-i-a-pe-i-lo-ni to-i-e-le-i-ta-i* ‘to the god Apollo in the marsh’ (Ph 13, p. 205). In this case, the epithet was undoubtedly transmitted from Greek to Phoenician. The former merely calques the phonological shape of the latter (notwithstanding a mistake: *’lyyt* instead of **’lyty*),¹² as if its meaning were opaque to speakers of Phoenician.

On p. 229, in what constitutes a very minor lapsus, Cypro-Greek inscription *Kition* 6 is transliterated *ti-ya* instead of *ti-ja*.

Steele’s survey clearly shows that epigraphic evidence for Cypriot Greek, Phoenician and Eteocypriot is currently clustered within the late Archaic and Classical periods, a fact she tentatively attributes to the “cultural or political importance” possibly attached to literacy at this time. Indeed, a long-standing problem is the gap in the epigraphic record between the eleventh and eighth centuries BCE. This leaves scholars, including Steele (pp. 81, 237), with no option but to consider the possibility that writing was

11. Y. Duhoux, “Eteocypriot and Cypro-Minoan 1–3,” *Kadmos* 48, 2009, pp. 39–75.

12. On this epithet, see E. Lipiński, *Itineraria Phoenicia*, Leuven 2004, p. 72, n. 196.

done primarily on perishable supports (such as wood, papyrus, hides, wax, unbaked clay, and so on) during this period, but also that much physical evidence of writing may be missing by chance or due to selective excavation. In any case, this hiatus remains one of the reasons that our understanding of the development of the Cypro-Greek syllabary from Cypro-Minoan remains rather poor.

One of the concluding remarks in this volume worth underlining is the admonition against drawing a “sharp distinction” between the Bronze and Iron Age scripts, or between the second and first millennia BCE (p. 235). Because the uncertainties surrounding the decline of Cypro-Minoan and the dawn of Cypro-Greek blur their chronological boundaries, this warning is entirely appropriate and gives us good reason to avoid using chronological denominations for the two Cypriot syllabic scripts (such as “second-millennium” or “first-millennium” syllabaries, employed by Olivier¹³). This is why, in my opinion, the well-established “Cypro-Minoan” and Egetmeyer’s newly coined “Cypro-Greek” are much less problematic terms.

I hope that the reader takes the observations above as nothing but indications of the thought-provoking nature of this rich volume. The field of Cypriot epigraphy, and in particular of Cypro-Minoan studies, is currently experiencing a revitalization—of which Steele’s book is certainly a part. It is to be hoped that this book will stimulate much productive debate; thus I can do little more than emphasize its relevance. It is not often that one comes across a doctoral dissertation that is pioneering in so many ways: (1) it contains a comprehensive overview of an undeciphered script (Cypro-Minoan); (2) it presents the first well-considered corpus of a poorly-attested language (Eteocypriot); and (3) it includes an updated synopsis of the Cypriot subcorpus of inscriptions in a well-known language (Phoenician). For scholars investigating Cypriot scripts and languages of the Bronze or Iron Ages, this book is indispensable.

Miguel Valério
Universitat de Barcelona

Josef Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik. Zweite, stark überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage* (AOAT 273), Münster: Ugarit-Verlag 2012. 1068 pp. – ISBN: 978-3-86835-069-2.

Doce años después de la publicación de su *Ugaritische Grammatik* (AOAT 273, Münster: Ugarit-Verlag 2000; aquí: UG), Josef Tropper presenta la segunda edición de la misma [UG²], revisada y ampliada. La colocación del adverbio ‘stark’ ante ‘überarbeitete’ y ‘erweiterte’ deja al usuario en la duda de si su acción se refiere sólo al primer participio o a ambos. Creemos que la intención del autor fue lo segundo. En apariencia, la segunda edición es, con sus xxii + 1068 páginas frente a las xxii + 1056 de la primera, una edición ampliada, pero no sustancialmente. Sólo en apariencia.

Las ‘Erweiterungen’ se deben básicamente al tratamiento gramatical de nuevos textos, en especial los 11 publicados por P. Bordreuil y D. Pardee en su *Manuel d’Ougaritique, I y II*, (Paris 2004; trad. inglesa: *Manual of Ugaritic*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns 2009) y los 76 de las campañas entre 1994 y 2002, que estos epigrafistas (con R. Hawley) dieron a conocer en *Une Bibliothèque au sud de la ville. Textes en cunéiforme alphabétique de la “Maison d’Ourtenou”* (Ras Shamra-Ougarit XVIII, Lyon 2012).¹ A ellos hay que añadir 3 textos más que, con las siglas ‘Varia 31-33’, publicaron P. Bordreuil y D. Pardee en 2010 (“Textes alphabétiques inédits du Musée du Louvre”, en: W.H. van Soldt, ed., *Society and Administration*

13. J.-P. Olivier, “The Development of Cypriot Syllabaries, from Enkomi to Kafizin,” in P. M. Steele (ed.), *Syllabic Writing on Cyprus and its Context*, Cambridge 2013, pp. 7–26.

in *Ancient Ugarit*, *PIHANS CXIV*, Leiden, pp. 1-15). En doce años ha aumentado también la nueva bibliografía, de la que Tropper hace un uso juicioso y exhaustivo. El repaso de las 24 páginas del ‘Literaturverzeichnis’ de UG² (pp. 926- 950) nos indica que son sólo 4 páginas más que las de UG. Una lectura más atenta de las fechas de los autores y títulos citados señala que, en el último decenio, asistimos a una disminución del ritmo de publicación en el ámbito estrictamente ugarítico y especialmente en lo referente a la gramática (fonología, morfología, sintaxis). Es evidente que la publicación de la UG en el año 2000 sirvió para calmar los ánimos y –al convertirse en una gramática clásica de referencia– satisfizo de momento las necesidades gramaticales de la Ugaritología. Josef Tropper siguió decididamente en la brecha, de modo que, en UG², contamos 22 títulos posteriores al año 2000 firmados por él, sólo o en compañía de otros (H. Hayajneh, E. Verreet, J.-P. Vita).

Pero la ciencia no es cuestión de más o menos páginas, de modo que la curiosidad del usuario se concentrará más bien en las ‘deutliche Veränderungen’ (p. v) que distinguen esta reedición. Mi asombro, al recibir el ejemplar que aquí comento, fue grande al comprobar la correspondencia estructural entre UG y UG². Los usuarios de UG² tenemos que agradecerle a Josef Tropper la labor –que me imagino ingente– de integrar los párrafos, páginas e incluso líneas de UG² en el diseño de impresión ofrecido por UG.

La historia de la Ugaritología es todo menos armoniosa. Sobre todo, por los momentos de aceleración y ralentización marcados por el ritmo desigual de la publicación de los textos. En los últimos diez años, varios proyectos quedaron retenidos en espera de la publicación –frecuentemente postpuesta– de bloques textuales tan prometedores como los de la Casa de Urtēnu (‘Maison d’Ourtenou’). Previamente a la fecha de su *editio princeps* en *Ras Shamra-Ougarit* 18 [sic!; Tropper: ‘19’], demorada por diversas razones hasta 2012, los textos tuvieron una difusión en los círculos ugaritológicos que podríamos definir de ‘borrosa’. Unos colegas fueron más afortunados que otros, y Josef Tropper pudo hacer uso de ellos desde diciembre de 2008 (UG² p. v) aunque sólo fuese de un modo provisional (‘in ihren wesentlichen Zügen, aber nicht mehr in allen Details’).

Cuando los editores de KTU³ tuvimos acceso a la versión definitiva de los textos y pudimos estudiarlos e incorporarlos en esa publicación (M. Dietrich / O. Loretz / J. Sanmartín, *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und anderen Orten. Dritte, erweiterte Auflage / The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places. Third, Enlarged Edition*, AOAT 360/1, Münster: Ugarit-Verlag 2013), UG² cumplía ya con creces su primer año. Las consecuencias de este adelanto se hacen notar en dos ámbitos:

1. UG² cita los textos con un sistema mixto. Los textos que provienen de CAT (M. Dietrich / O. Loretz / J. Sanmartín, *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places. KTU: second, enlarged edition*, ALASP 8, Münster: Ugarit-Verlag 1995) reciben la numeración de esta publicación, como ocurrió ya en UG (cf. ‘KTU-Belegstellen’, UG² pp. 990-1056). Los demás textos, tanto alfabéticos como *a fortiori* los silábicos (como en UG), se citan según los números de registro de excavación (‘RS-Belegstellen’ / ‘RIH-Belegstellen’, UG² pp. 1057-65), u otros criterios (‘Privatsammlung Sh. Moussaieff’, UG² p. 1065).

En KTU³ pp. 754-755 hay una tabla de equivalencias entre los nos. RS 92. (y otros) y sus respectivos nos. KTU.

2. Lecturas revisables. Como Josef Tropper tuvo que incorporar el nuevo material textual –antes de darse a conocer su *editio princeps*– basándose en impresiones no definitivas o en las predecesoras del *Manuel d’Ougaritique*, algunos datos epigráficos tienen que ser controlados y contrastados:

“Von den ab 1994 gefundenen Texten konnten elf bereits in einen frühen Stadium in UG² eingearbeitet werden (vorläufig publiziert in MOu) [...] – Die übrigen Texte der Kampagnen von 1994 bis 2002 (*editio princeps* RSOu 19 [sic!]) wurden erst in der Endphase der Erstellung von UG² berücksichtigt” (UG² p. 10)

En efecto, KTU³ ofrece lecturas que difieren en algunos casos de las del *Manuel d'Ougaritique* y de las del *Ras Shamra-Ougarit* 18, y por lo tanto de UG².

Por lo demás, el nuevo material textual presenta pocas sorpresas en el ámbito léxico y todavía menos en el gramatical, de modo que Josef Tropper puede integrarlo sin dificultad en el marco de la primera edición.

Hay quien puede cuestionar la oportunidad o la necesidad de reeditar una gramática ugarítica de más de mil páginas una decena de años tras su primera edición, dado que los 90 textos nuevos que intervienen en UG² no añaden nada esencial a la comprensión fonológica, morfológica y sintáctica de la lengua descrita en UG. Quizás un apéndice de 15 o 20 páginas en forma de artículo o un 'Bei- / Ergänzungsheft' hubiera cumplido perfectamente con la misión de integrar el nuevo material en el antiguo marco, de modo análogo a lo realizado por J. Huehnergard en la segunda edición de su *Ugaritic Vocabulary* (J. Huehnergard, *Ugaritic Vocabulary in syllabic transcription. Revised edition*, HSS 32, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2008, pp. 376-406: "Additions and Corrections").

Pero la situación es diferente, puesto que UG ha sido sometida por el autor a un fuerte proceso de revisión e incorpora en UG² buena parte de las sugerencias que le han ido haciendo diversos recensantes (Cf. L. Kogan, „Remarks on J. Tropper Ugaritische Grammatik. A Review Article", *UF* 32, 2000, 717-732.; S. Schorch, *OLZ* 96, 2001, 223-227; M.P. Streck, *ZDMG* 152/1, 185-192; J. Sanmartín, *AuOr* 25, 2007, 328-330) y muy en especial D. Pardee en una reseña 'on line' de más de 404 páginas (<http://www.univie.ac.at/orientalistik/Afo.html#pardee>; cf. *Afo* 50, 2003/04, 417-420), de modo que no hay sección en la que no hayan sido modificados (completados o corregidos) los datos de la primera edición.

W.G.E. Watson, en su recensión, denominó UG "a Ugaritic reference grammar for the 21st Century" (*AuOr* 21, 2003, 87-95). La lengua ugarítica, como las demás del ámbito cuneiforme, nos ha llegado en estado fragmentario: es una 'Trümmersprache'. Con las piedras de esta ruina (onomástica, textos, listas léxicas) es todo un milagro que Josef Tropper haya construido un edificio gramatical tan coherente como lo fue en su día la *Grammar* de C.H. Gordon [UgG], con las diferencias de volumen y complejidad que la diacronía y la historia imponen. Gordon y Tropper son dos clásicos. Bienvenida sea UG², 'stark überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage' de UG.

Joaquín Sanmartín
Universitat de Barcelona-IPOA

i. Los datos bibliográficos sobre esta publicación en UG² pp. v y 925 son inexactos.