

Recensiones

Harry A. Hoffner Jr.-H. Craig Melchert, *A Grammar of the Hittite Language. Part I: Reference Grammar; Part 2: Tutorial*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008. 468 pp. + CD-ROM (part I), 75 pp. – ISBN 978-1-57506-119-1; 978-1-57506-148-1.

Con esta excelente gramática descriptiva del hitita se llena un vacío de más de cuarenta años en los que la única obra de estas características era el venerable *Hethitische Elementarbuch* (HE) de Johannes Friedrich, que sin duda ha desempeñado un papel fundamental para todos aquellos que se han aproximado al estudio de esta lengua anatólica, pero que había envejecido notablemente: piénsese no sólo en las nuevas formas que han ido engrosando los paradigmas y el vocabulario hititas a lo largo de estos años debido a las nuevas adquisiciones textuales, o en los avances en el estudio de la fonología, morfología y sintaxis hititas, sino también en el mucho mejor conocimiento que ahora tenemos de las fases de la lengua hitita gracias a los progresos en el estudio paleográfico de las tablillas, que han permitido una periodización precisa de los textos y, por ende, una más exacta clasificación de las formas como arcaicas, medias o recientes. De estos últimos progresos se beneficia este nuevo manual, aunque, como se declara en el prefacio, se hace un uso prudente de los mismos, lo que resulta a nuestro juicio muy adecuado tratándose de un manual que pretende ofrecer unas bases sólidas de gramática hitita, sin especulaciones ni afirmaciones demasiado frágiles.

Decir que esta obra es el feliz fruto del esfuerzo conjunto de un filólogo (Hoffner) y un lingüista (Melchert) sería injustamente reduccionista, pues el primero ha realizado muy importantes contribuciones al estudio de la lengua hitita y el segundo se ha caracterizado por el empleo de materiales de primera mano con un rigor filológico incuestionable. Sin embargo, sí es cierto que los perfiles de ambos se complementan (Hoffner tiene tras de sí su larga labor al frente del Diccionario Hitita de Chicago en compañía primero de Hans Güterbock y más recientemente de Theo van den Hout; Melchert es en este momento la máxima autoridad en gramática comparada de las lenguas anatólicas) y como es sabido, tal complementariedad suele dar excelentes resultados (recuérdese el caso paradigmático de la colaboración del comparatista Meillet y el latinista Ernout en un diccionario etimológico e la lengua latina aún no superado).

El extenso primer volumen de esta gramática contiene una exposición que sigue muy de cerca, con apenas alguna ligera modificación, el esquema del manual de Friedrich, no sólo en los grandes bloques (ortografía y fonología; morfología nominal; morfología pronominal, morfología verbal, sintaxis), sino también en la forma de subdividir y ordenar las diferentes secciones. Esto permite llevar a cabo un interesante ejercicio de comparación para constatar cómo han cambiado nuestro conocimiento y nuestra visión de la lengua hitita en los últimos años. No abordaremos aquí un análisis detallado, que resultaría demasiado prolijo para una recensión como ésta, pero sí señalaremos, a modo de ejemplo, tres muestras significativas de esta transformación. Así, en la parte dedicada a la fonología, el nuevo manual consagra la validez –escasas excepciones aparte– de la conocida como “Ley de Sturtevant”, según la cual el uso de grafías simples frente a geminadas en posición intervocálica representa un contraste fonológico (p. 35). Aunque la ley fue formulada en 1933, su validez se ha ido imponiendo en tiempos relativamente recientes,

posteriores en cualquier caso a la fecha de edición del *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*, en el que la ley ni siquiera es mencionada y la geminación se considera no sometida a ninguna regularidad (HE p. 28). Tampoco encontrará quien busque en el HE referencia alguna al llamado “caso ergativo”, esto es, la terminación especial *-anza* que adoptan los substantivos neutros cuando son sujetos de oraciones transitivas, una formación detectada por Laroche en 1962 y que recibe ahora un adecuado tratamiento en las páginas 66-67 y 72-73 de Hoffner-Melchert. Finalmente, el empleo de la partícula enclítica reflexiva *-za* en oraciones nominales (con o sin el verbo ‘ser’), que en HE es calificado de “irregular” y debido a “condiciones aún no descubiertas” (HE, p. 133) aparece explicado en el nuevo manual, a la luz de las investigaciones del propio Hoffner publicadas unos años después de la última edición de HE. La oscura irregularidad se aclara brillantemente si se tiene en cuenta la evolución de la lengua: la partícula *-za* o un pronombre reflexivo en dativo es obligatorio en hitita reciente cuando el sujeto de la oración nominal está en primera o segunda personas; en cambio, en hitita arcaico no se utilizaba nunca ni una ni otro en tal contexto y en hitita medio encontramos una situación de transición entre ambos tipos de construcción (Hoffner-Melchert pp. 362-364). Son sólo unos pocos ejemplos de las muchas novedades que el lector interesado descubrirá en las páginas de esta gramática.

Otro aspecto relevante que invita a la comparación –y al contraste– con el HE de Friedrich es la segunda parte de la gramática, encuadrada por separado y mucho más breve: se trata de un *tutorial*, esto es, un curso de hitita que evoca una vez más la estructura del HE, que constaba igualmente de dos volúmenes, uno constituido por la gramática descriptiva y el segundo por una crestomatía, profusamente anotada y con continuas remisiones a la gramática, seguida de tres glosarios (hitita, sumerio y acadio). Las semejanzas concluyen aquí, ya que la concepción llamémosle “pedagógica” del *tutorial* de Hoffner y Melchert nada tiene que ver con la de Friedrich. Recordarán los que, como yo, empezaron a estudiar hitita con el HE, que el segundo volumen de Friedrich se iniciaba ya con una inmersión directa en los textos hititas: se trataba de comenzar con la traducción de los anales de Mursili, profusamente anotados con explicaciones y remisiones al volumen de la gramática. Se podía alcanzar un sólido conocimiento de la lengua, pero los inicios resultaban ciertamente muy lentos y laboriosos. El nuevo *tutorial* apuesta, más acorde con la idea de un verdadero curso de lengua, por la típica estructura de lecciones en las que se introduce paulatinamente la gramática y en la que se empieza por traducir frases breves que vienen acompañadas en cada lección por un vocabulario *ad hoc*. Abundan desde hace muchos años los cursos de esta estructura para las lenguas antiguas, desde el manual de acadio de Caplice hasta el de sánscrito de Coulson, pasando por el Cassidy-Ringler de inglés antiguo, por citar los tres primeros que me vienen a la mente, pero, que yo sepa, no había sido publicado un curso de estas características para el hitita, aunque es de justicia mencionar el excelente manual *Nešili* de Theo van den Hout, que ha circulado de manera privada editado por su autor, primero en holandés y más recientemente, corregido y aumentado, en inglés (versión esta última de la que existe traducción catalana). Una ventaja evidente del manual de van den Hout sobre el *tutorial* de Hoffner y Melchert es que, paralelamente al estudio de la lengua, introduce de manera paulatina la escritura cuneiforme, lo que lo convierte en un método más completo. Una novedad del *tutorial* a mi juicio muy acertada es la forma de tratar la transcripción de las frases hititas: en las primeras lecciones se da el texto en adaptación continua; a mitad del curso se introduce la transliteración filológica (con separación silábica), acompañada de la adaptación; y en las últimas lecciones se prescinde de la adaptación y se dan las frases sólo en transliteración. Creo que es una manera que puede resultar muy efectiva de facilitar el inicio del estudio del hitita, que siempre resulta algo engorroso para el estudiante precisamente por las singularidades gráficas de esta lengua.

En otros aspectos resulta difícil en este momento calibrar qué manual puede dar mejores resultados: eso sólo será posible cuando tengamos la oportunidad de probar el nuevo *tutorial* en las clases. En todo caso, hay tres aspectos de este nuevo curso de hitita que habrá que ponderar en particular. El primero de ellos, el hecho de que la teoría que precede a los ejercicios de traducción en cada lección no se encuentre en el mismo *tutorial* sino que haya de buscarse y consultarse en el volumen de gramática. Por fortuna, el *tutorial* no se limita a remitir sin más a las páginas correspondientes de la gramática sino que da también en cada lección una serie de pautas en apariencia muy útiles para una mejor comprensión de lo que expone en la gramática. De todos modos, el *tutorial* empieza dando por sabidos los capítulos de grafía y fonética del otro volumen, capítulos que constituyen una parte nada desdeñable de la gramática, y expone de manera paulatina sólo la morfología y la sintaxis. En este sentido, no hubiera sido una mala alternativa un modelo más próximo al de *nešili*, en el que cada lección tiene además un apartado de fonética y grafía, así como otro dedicado a las particularidades de los sumerogramas y acadogramas, lo que permite empezar a trabajar en los ejercicios enseguida, sin necesidad de un dominio exhaustivo previo de muchas particularidades gráficas y fonéticas. El segundo aspecto llamativo es que las frases en hitita que constituyen los ejercicios no siempre proceden directamente de auténticos textos hititas. Muchas de ellas, sobre todo en las primeras lecciones, han sido inventadas ad hoc por los autores, mientras que otras han sido sometidas a alguna modificación. Hasta la tercera lección no aparece una frase tomada directamente de los textos hititas, y en la décimocuarta y última lección aún se introduce una larga frase creada por Hoffner y Melchert. Acuña frases ad hoc con finalidades didácticas es una práctica frecuente en los métodos de las lenguas clásicas, pero sorprende un tanto en el caso del hitita, una lengua de corpus, ciertamente, pero de la que no tenemos todavía un conocimiento tan completo y seguro como en el caso del latín, el griego o el sánscrito. En cualquier caso, la alta competencia en hitita de ambos autores permite confiar en la verosimilitud de los ejemplos inventados. Por otra parte, el uso de frases entresacadas directamente de los textos hititas – como ocurre en el curso *nešili* de van den Hout – tiene la contrapartida negativa de que algunas de ellas, fuera de todo contexto, resultan difíciles de traducir e interpretar por parte de los estudiantes. En las frases inventadas cabe esperar que la creación *ad hoc* de las mismas ha permitido controlar al máximo que resulten comprensibles y adecuadas al nivel de cada lección. El tercer y último aspecto del *tutorial* está estrechamente ligado a lo que se acaba de comentar sobre el tipo de ejercicios que encontramos en él: el *tutorial* concluye en la lección 14 sin que se haya pasado de la traducción de frases a la traducción de un texto original de una cierta extensión (algo que sí sucede, por ejemplo, en el curso de van den Hout y que igualmente encontramos en otros cursos de lenguas antiguas que siguen este tipo de estructura por lecciones). El paso de la traducción de frases a la traducción de un texto puede resultar poco relevante en el estudio de otras lenguas, pero en hitita no es una cuestión baladí, ya que delimitar las diferentes oraciones y establecer la relación entre las mismas en un texto presentado en la forma en que se editan habitualmente – sin la introducción de marcas de puntuación u otras ayudas de ese estilo – plantea al inicio ciertas dificultades a los alumnos. A través de la práctica en clase, habrá que comprobar si, una vez concluida la lección 14 el paso a la traducción de textos originales es más o menos fácil.

La mayor o menor efectividad del *tutorial* se podrá calibrar llevándolo a las aulas, pero esto es un asunto menor frente a lo verdaderamente importante: con la “Reference Grammar” que constituye el primer y extensísimo volumen de esta gramática de la lengua hitita, Harry A. Hoffner Jr. y H. Craig Melchert ponen en nuestras manos un “epochemachendes Werk” para el estudio de esta lengua anatolia. Por último, a la Editorial Eisenbraus hay que agradecer no sólo la publicación de este libro y su venta a un

precio razonable, sino que lo haya editado en compañía de un CD-ROM que contiene en formato pdf los dos volúmenes de la gramática.

Ignacio X. Adiego

Kevin M. McGeough, *Exchange Relationships at Ugarit* (Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement 26), Leuven / Paris / Dudley: Peeters, 2007. 438 pp. - ISBN 978-90-429-1935-8.

Michael Astour recordaba en una entrevista publicada con motivo de su volumen de homenaje un consejo que le había dado a su discípulo Gordon D. Young: “don’t come to your research with some pre-conceived notions and try to prove them. Just go along and see how the evidence fits. Modify your notions if you need to, and don’t look for a special defense or apologetic, or aggrandize something that is dear to you”.¹ Podemos estar más o menos de acuerdo con el consejo, pero lo que está claro es que en el caso concreto que nos ocupa aquí (el estudio de la documentación administrativa de Ugarit), muchos investigadores se sitúan en las antípodas de las palabras que Astour dirigió a Young. Así, durante mucho tiempo autores como Mario Liverani o Michael Heltzer estudiaron los textos administrativos de Ugarit bajo una óptica marxista más o menos explícita. Más recientemente David Schloen analizó esos mismos textos a partir del patrimonialismo de Max Weber. Y ahora Kevin McGeough propone en la presente obra estudiar el material ugarítico a partir de “a Network-based model”. Obviamente todos esos autores estaban o están convencidos de que su modelo es el que mejor explica el tipo de documentación que aparece en Ugarit. Sin embargo, no es difícil identificar en esos trabajos un esfuerzo, en ocasiones excesivo, por adecuar los datos al modelo teórico elegido.

La presente obra de McGeough es según palabras del propio autor “a revised version of my 2005 doctoral dissertation at the University of Pennsylvania” (p. xvii). Con todo, repasando la bibliografía parece que la obra no ha sido puesta al día, por cuanto, a pesar de haberse publicado en 2007, no se cita ningún trabajo posterior a 2004.

El trabajo consta de nueve capítulos. En el primero (“The formalist-substantivist debate and a network-based approach to ancient economy”) el autor presenta los fundamentos teóricos sobre los que se asienta su nueva propuesta. En el segundo (“Previous studies of the Ugaritic economy”) realiza un repaso crítico por la bibliografía especializada en el estudio de la sociedad y la economía de Ugarit. En el tercer capítulo (“The language of the Ugaritic economy”) analiza la terminología ugarítica relacionada con categorías sociales, ocupaciones y obligaciones. En los capítulos cuatro y cinco (“The form and function of Ugaritic economic texts” y “Economic modalities at Ugarit: the evidence from the tablets”) McGeough estudia la documentación administrativa diferenciando distintas categorías (listas de nombres propios, listas de ocupaciones, censos, etc.) y tratando de identificar las actividades económicas allí registradas. El capítulo seis (“The archival context of the tablets: the elite architectural complexes at Ugarit”) está dedicado a la reconstrucción del contexto arqueológico en el que aparecieron las tablillas. En el capítulo siete (“The material remains of the Ugaritic economy”) el autor abandona la documentación escrita para

1. G. D. Young / M. W. Chavalas / R. E. Averbeck (eds.), *Crossing Boundaries and Linking Horizons. Studies in Honor of Michael C. Astour*, Bethesda, p. 15.

centrarse en el análisis de los restos materiales relacionados con la economía de Ugarit. El capítulo ocho (“Economics beyond the city”) estudia la periferia interna y externa de Ugarit. El último capítulo (“Conclusions: A network-based model of economic modalities”) sirve para resumir el material y ordenar las conclusiones obtenidas. Allí el autor califica de erróneos muchos de los planteamientos que hasta ahora han ocupado a los investigadores (tipo de modo de producción característico de Ugarit, existencia o no de comercio privado, etc.). Según McGeough, en realidad en Ugarit la economía no existía como una categoría distinta de la sociedad, sino que tan solo era el resultado de “a network of contingent exchange relations” (p. 337). Dentro de este contexto el palacio no debe verse como la institución que controlaba la economía, sino como un agente económico situado en el centro de muchas de las redes de intercambio y de las relaciones sociales. Teniendo en cuenta esos nuevos planteamientos McGeough considera que las preguntas que deben afrontarse son otras, distintas de las tradicionales: ¿dónde se sitúan los puntos de control cruciales en la red?, ¿cómo son las diferentes redes de intercambio existentes?, ¿qué estrategias específicas convierten esta serie de redes de intercambio en poder? Como es de suponer, McGeough señala que su “Network-based model” permite responder a estas y otras preguntas de forma satisfactoria. Sirvan como ejemplo sus palabras acerca del palacio: “in the case of the palace, it is demonstrated that this power was not gained through top-down administration but through a haphazard arrangement of the receiving and distributing goods. This constant arrangement and re-arrangement facilitated the creation and emergence of social relations between the various economic actors at Ugarit” (p. 338).

El libro de McGeough ofrece sin duda una aportación teórica muy importante para el estudio socio-económico del antiguo reino de Ugarit. Con todo, el modelo propuesto por McGeough reviste una notable complejidad (véase una muestra en el diagrama de la página 353). Es por ello que probablemente habrá que esperar durante un tiempo prudencial para comprobar la recepción y la influencia de esas teorías en los posteriores estudios sobre la cuestión.

Para terminar realizaremos algunos comentarios sobre cuestiones puntuales de la obra.

En p. 40ss. el autor denuncia el escaso conocimiento arqueológico del territorio que formaba parte del antiguo reino de Ugarit, un conocimiento que según él se reduce a los yacimientos de Minet el-Beida y Ras Ibn Hani. En realidad, a los dos ejemplos citados por McGeough deben añadirse las excavaciones que desde 1999 vienen realizándose en Tell Tweini (antigua Giba¹),² además de las excavaciones en Tell Siano.

En la bibliografía final no se recoge la cita correspondiente a la referencia Bounni / Lagarce 1997 mencionada en p. 41.

Resulta un tanto sorprendente que McGeough, en p. 58, incluya a José-Ángel Zamora entre los autores “marxistas” que defendían el modelo de los “dos sectores” en la sociedad ugarítica. En realidad, Zamora se ha referido de una forma explícitamente crítica al “uso de métodos de trabajo no ajenos a modelos y esquemas comprometidos con teorías de la evolución general de las sociedades” aplicados al estudio de la documentación administrativa de Ugarit. Así ha apuntado que tales aproximaciones “han contribuido a extender formas apriorísticas de entender los textos, no siempre justificadas”.³

2. Al margen de los informes previos publicados en *UF* 31 (1999): 75-131 y *Ägypten und Levante* 14 (2004): 215-230, ahora debe añadirse J. Bretschneider / K. Van Lerberghe (eds.): *In Search of Gibala. An archaeological and historical study based on eight seasons of excavations at Tell Tweini (Syria) in the A and C fields (1999-2007)*, Sabadell 2008.

3. J. A. Zamora, *La vid y el vino en Ugarit*, Madrid 2000, p. 340.

En p. 117s. al analizar el término *hrd* McGeough señala que la interpretación tradicional del término como “conscripted troops” es insuficiente, apuntando que en realidad debería tratarse de “a general word for military personnel”. Su principal argumento para defender esa posibilidad es que en KTU 4.179 el término *hrd* aparentemente aparece relacionado con otras categorías militares (p.e. *mryn*). Sin embargo, dicho texto ya fue correctamente analizado por Vita, quien desligaba la mención de la milicia *hrd* del resto de categorías profesionales recogidas en el texto.⁴ En ese mismo apartado, McGeough indica que las aportaciones a la milicia realizadas por las distintas aldeas ugaríticas debió ser similar en todos los casos. En realidad, tal y como hemos apuntado en otro lugar,⁵ las aportaciones realizadas por las distintas aldeas variaban en ocasiones de forma muy significativa y, obviamente, dependían del tamaño de cada localidad y no del establecimiento de “a similar scale for other villages”.

Jordi Vidal Catherine Mittermayer, *Altbabylonische Zeichenliste der sumerisch-literarischen Texte* (OBO Sonderband), Fribourg / Göttingen: Academic Press / Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006. xi + 285 pp. - ISBN 978-3-7278-1551-5.

The cuneiformist too often finds himself frustrated by the insufficiency of paleographic tools. If the sign forms of limited periods are sometimes well documented, see for instance Rosengarten 1967 for the archive of Presargonic Lagaš,⁶ this is not true for all periods, and regrettably a field as active as the study of the Old Babylonian Sumerian literary texts has not had so far at its disposal a reliable list of the sign forms for this period. What little is available covers indistinctly all kinds of texts from Hammurabi's code to Akkadian letters and administrative tablets. The shortcomings of the Old Babylonian forms in a text book as popular as Labat's *Manuel* is well-known. Other lists are the handiwork of scholars of limited artistic gifts, or have been compiled in indirect ways. Schneider 1935 (with Ur III, not OB, forms), for instance, is based on rather clumsy drawings of its author, later redrawn by Rudolf Wessely, the untiring amanuensis of *ŠL*, the early volumes of *MSL*, and so many other things. Borger could still say in 2003 (*MesZL* p. 625) that "eine Spezialliste für die sumerische Texte der altbabylonischen Zeit ... existiert nicht." Ms. Mittermayer's book fills thus an important void in the Assyriological research tools, and, as we will see, it fills it very well.

A Foreword (vii-ix) informs about the origin of the project, methodology, ordering criteria, and choice of readings of the signs. The main body of the book (3-190) is naturally the sign list itself with 480 entries. The signs are ordered following a schema clearly exposed on p. ix, and the entry numbers are given accordingly, resulting in a new numbering system.⁷ The structure of each entry is clear, logically and typographically. On the upper right corner are given the corresponding numbers in *ABZ* and *MesZL*. The author collected, whenever possible, fifty instances of each sign, and then collated 60%. One sign form is chosen as *Leitform*, and up to sixteen variants are given, if needed. A textual reference (line number and manuscript siglum) is given for each variant. If a variant is atypical and likely to be confused, it is given separately as *Sonderform*; e.g., BI (079) and GA (201), or BU (265) and SUD (266). At the bottom of the entry, one can find the readings not only of the sign alone, but also of its Diri-compounds,

4. J. P. Vita, *El ejército de Ugarit*, Madrid 1995, p. 141s.

5. J. Vidal, “Ugarit at War (1). The Size and Geographical Origin of the *hrd*-militia”, *UF* 37 (2005): 653-672.

6. A useful bibliography of sign lists can be found in Borger 2004:624-25.

7. I will refrain of commenting on the vexing problem of the proliferation, perhaps unavoidable, of numbering systems; see Borger's supplement "Zu Mittermeyers Zeichenliste des sumerisches literarischen Korpus" in *Or* ** (200*) 385-91.

but only the ones who have the main sign in initial position; thus one will find PA.AN under PA (143), but not under AN (009). The readings are classified as "normal," "rare" (in parentheses), or "not used" in the *Glossaire sumérien* of Attinger-Sallaberger (in square brackets). A Commentary (pp. 193-205) gives extremely brief remarks on some of the readings. At the end of the book, there is a Bibliography (pp.206-211), a List of Abbreviations (pp. 212-223), and Indexes of *Leitformen* (pp. 227-239), of *Verwechslungsformen* (pp.239-248), readings (pp. 249-278), and sign names (pp. 278-285). The book is well organized, and pleasantly printed (without using the *sans serif* font that makes the lecture of some *OBO* volumes such a strain on the eyes). Ms. Mittermayer has provided his colleagues with an efficient and indispensable research tool.

The reviewer feels guilty of finding fault in such a book, but there are some questions, albeit perhaps not too important, that beg for an answer. One misses a justification, if there is one, for the limitations imposed to the corpus from which the signs are extracted. The label "literary texts" in the book's title is obviously a pretext to exclude lexical sources and school exercises, but, for unstated reasons, also some literary materials such as Proverbs are disregarded. Whether this is a wise decision remains questionable. Why disregard the information provided, for instance, by a carefully written lexical text such as *PBS* 5 130? Sources for Proverbs are easily accessible, mostly in photos, in Gordon 1959, and Alster 1997 and 2007. This exclusion results in some loss of information. A couple of examples: some tablets write U/BÛR/ŠU₄ with two superposed Winkelhaken so that the sign looks a bit like GAM (cf., for instance, Ferrara 1973 78:337 "probably a scribal error" [on the variant maš-"U" of maš-gúr]). The, at least partial, confusion of BAD (= AŠ+U) and IDIM (= AŠ+AŠ-*inv.*), cf. *MSL* 13 22, note to 167a, would deserve some comments. And so on. The readings of the signs are a contribution of Attinger, and the values are given in general in a sober and correct form. The concept of "correct" reading as propugated in Attinger 1998, however, applies to the correct choice of a reading in the transliteration of a context, not to the determination of the reading itself. Such determination is a process to arrive, if possible, to the most probable phonological shape by eliminating variants due to local scribal habits, diachronic changes, morphophonemic influences and so on. One example: many values traditionally written in OB and later Babylonian sources with S-signs, are found in Neo-Assyrian syllabaries written with Š-signs. Such readings have become traditionally entrenched in Assyriology because they were the first ones discovered, documented by the Kouyunjik syllabaries, but they must be attributed to local scribal habits. Another case: the information available to determine the reading of KA×SA (KA×KID in ED) "beard" includes (in a somewhat simplified form) several shapes: dun_x, su₆, sùl, sum₄, sun₄:

DÛN	DÛN-bar = S-bar S ^b 1:262a.
su-l	Hh 13:221; Lu 3.3:83; <i>JNES</i> 26 206:20.
su-mu	su-mu-du-ù = KA×KID-dù VE 199.
su-ul	UM 29-13-648 2:9.
su-um	su-um-la-su-la-zu = KA×SA-lá- KA×SA-lá-zu <i>JNES</i> 26 206:20.
su-un	Ea 3:076; S ^b 1:262.
su-C	Hh 13:221, 375.
[s]ú-ul	PAS 16:18.
sú-um	PEa 319.
sum ₆	sum ₆ -mú = KA×KID-mú VE 200.

The initial /s/ presents no problems; the late variant with DÙN can be due either to a semantic interference of dùn "moustache," or the like, or to a possible, but unattested, reading of DÙN with initial sibilant. All sources agree on the vowel. As for the final consonant, the form /sul/ is due to an assimilation (or a graphic elision) in the frequent compound sum₄-lá. The form /sun/ is presumably due to the change /m/ > /n/ before pause. This leaves sum₄ as the basic form (correctly given by Attinger in the book under review), with the allomorphs /sun/ before pause, and possibly /sul/ before /l/. Evidently, the present book is not the place to apply this laborious process to all readings, but at least Attinger refrains from offering a mechanical, uncritical listing of all available variants, as it has been the practice of the authors of some sign lists.

The author avoids the term "paleographic" and with good reasons. There is more to a paleographic study than the listing of the forms: the arrangement of signs on the line, and of lines themselves on the tablet, the angle of the stylus, the sequence of the stylus impressions,⁸ the personal ductus, occasional deformations of signs due to crowding at the end of lines or to abutting signs, etc., etc. The same scribe can use a conservative form of NE at the beginning or in the middle of a line, and use a more cursive form at the end of the same line due to the limited space. The cuneiformists that have had direct access to a large number of tablets can testify that joins are frequently made by the intuitive identification of the hand and style of a particular scribe. When some day the desideratum of a good paleographic study of cuneiform is fulfilled, Ms. Mittermayer's book will have been one of the starting points. Meantime, teachers and students alike will be grateful to her for an extremely practical and useful tool.

Miguel Civil

References

- Alster, B. 1997. *Proverbs of Ancient Sumer: The World's Earliest Proverb Collection*. Bethesda MD: CDL Press.
- Alster, B. 2007. *Sumerian Proverbs in the Schøyen Collection (CUSAS 2)*. Bethesda MD: CDL Press.
- Attinger, P. 1998. "Inanna and Ebih" *ZA* 88:164-95.
- Edzard, D.O. 1982. "Der Aufbau des Syllabars 'Proto-Ea'" in *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I.M. Diakonoff* 42-61. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Ferrara, A.J. 1973. *Nanna-Suen's Journey to Nippur* (Studia Pohl: Series Major 2). Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Gordon, E.I. 1959. *Sumerian Proverbs: Glimpses of Everyday Life in Ancient Mesopotamia*. Philadelphia: University Museum.
- Rosengarten, Y. 1967. *Répertoire commenté des signes présargoniques sumériens de Lagaš*. Paris: De Boccard.
- Schneider, N. 1935. *Die Keilschriftzeichen der Wirtschaftsurkunden von Ur III nebst ihren charakteristischen Varianten*. Roma: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum.

8. See Edzard 1982, based on the Oriental Institute complete photographic archive of the sources of Proto-Ea (ibid. 58, note 2). An over-enthusiastic colleague walked away with the photos shortly afterwards.

Aïcha Rahmouni, *Divine Epithets in the Ugaritic Alphabetic Texts* (HdO I/93), Leiden: Brill, 2008. xxx + 448 pp. - ISBN 9004157697.

La obra (= *Divine Epithets*) tiene como objetivo el análisis de los epítetos de los seres divinos, semidivinos y de carácter demoníaco que se encuentran en los textos alfabéticos cuneiformes de Ras Shamra/Ugarit y de Ras Ibn Hani. Se trata de la revisión y actualización de la tesis doctoral de la autora, redactada originalmente en hebreo (p. xi). La traducción al inglés ha sido obra de J. N. Ford (p. xv), quien también ha contribuido al contenido con algunos comentarios identificados como "JNF" (véanse, a modo de ejemplo, pp. 39 n. 16 y 63 n. 31). La autora había tratado con anterioridad algún aspecto puntual del tema en su artículo "The Term *prz* in Ugaritic-Hurrian Texts: A Possible Ugaritic-Hurrian 'Epithet Component'", *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians* 15 (2005), p. 101-107.

Una introducción general (pp. xvi-xxx) expone los criterios seguidos para la selección o el descarte de los epítetos que debían ser objeto de análisis. Los epítetos finalmente seleccionados alcanzan la cifra de 112, cuyo estudio constituye el cuerpo de la obra (pp. 3-330). Cada epíteto es analizado bajo una entrada propia en forma de ficha con la siguiente estructura (cf. pp. xx-xxii): epíteto con su traducción, análisis de los contextos, paralelos al epíteto, discusión general. La obra se completa con unas conclusiones, cuatro apéndices e índices de términos y textos religiosos (Nuevo Testamento, Antiguo Testamento, Corán) citados. Las conclusiones (pp. 331-357) explotan el material previamente estudiado en los siguientes apartados principales: "The Divine Epithets as a Reflection of the Religious Concepts of Ugaritic Society" (pp. 331-345), "The Composition of the Epithets" (pp. 346-347), "The Use of the Divine Epithets in Poetic Parallelism" (pp. 347-350) y "Parallels to Ugaritic Divine Epithets" (pp. 350-357). Los apéndices son los siguientes: "A Glossary of the Components of the Divine Epithets in the Ugaritic Texts" (pp. 359-379), "A List of the Epithets of Each Ugaritic Deity or Demon" (pp. 380-384), "A Table of the Number of Epithets of Each Ugaritic God Deity and Demon" (p. 385), y "A List of the Unidentified Divine Epithets in the Ugaritic Texts" (p. 386).

La obra aborda un tema de permanente actualidad en los estudios ugaríticos, como muestra, por ejemplo, el reciente artículo de W. G. E. Watson, "Notes on the Use of Epithets in the Ugaritic Mythological Texts", en W. G. E. Watson (ed.), *He unfurled his brow and laughed. Essays in Honour of Professor Nicolas Wyatt*, AOAT 299, Münster 2007, pp. 313-334 (que ya no pudo ser empleado por la autora). Se trata también de un campo de estudio que la edición futura de nuevos textos permitirá sin duda ampliar. Basten al respecto dos ejemplos (que *Divine Epithets* no pudo contemplar). D. Pardee, "Preliminary Presentation of a New Ugaritic Song to ʿAttartu (RIH 98/02)", en K. Lawson Younger Jr. (ed.), *Ugarit at Seventy-Five*, Winona Lake 2007, pp. 27-39, avanza la edición futura de un himno a la diosa ʿAttartu, calificada en este texto de "leona" ("May the name of ʿAttartu be sung. / Let me sing the name of the lioness") y "pantera" ("A mighty panther is ʿAttartu / (As) a mighty panther does she pounce"); los epítetos "leona" (*lbu*) y "pantera" (*nmr*) deberán añadirse, por tanto, a *bilt* "virgen", único epíteto que *Divine Epithets*, con el material disponible, puede recoger para esta diosa (cf. pp. 132s. y 383).

Debemos felicitar a Rahmouni por haber producido con acierto una obra científicamente rigurosa y de gran utilidad para los especialistas de la religión ugarítica y áreas relacionadas. Constituirá sin duda un punto tanto de referencia como de partida para futuros estudios sobre el tema.

Juan-Pablo Vita

Ö. Tunca, A. M. Baghdo (eds.), *Chagar Bazar (Syrie) III. Les trouvailles épigraphiques et sigillographiques du chantier I (2000-2002)* (Publications de la Mission archéologique de l'Université de Liège en Syrie), Louvain-Paris-Dudley (MA) : Peeters, 2008, 402+14 pp. + 93 pl. – ISBN 978-90-429-2089-7.

In 1936 and 1937, M. Mallowan directed an official excavation in the important site of Chagar Bazar, to the east of the Habur triangle in the Syrian Arab Republic northern Jazirah. This short but important archaeological mission was financed by the Trustees of the British Museum and provided interesting results. Its more relevant levels of occupation were dated in the Old Babylonian period thanks to the fortunate unearthing of 113 tablets. These administrative texts of the local authorities are known today as the “Archive for Grain”, published by C. Gadd and later by O. Loretz in different studies. A new edition has been recently presented by Ph. Talon (OBTCB). So, thanks to the efforts of Mallowan and of these remarkable epigraphists, we already had a first glimpse in Old Babylonian Chagar Bazar.

Now the University of Liege, in close collaboration with the General Direction for Antiquities of the Syrian Arab Republic, has renewed in 1999 the archaeological project in Chagar Bazar, and the outcome of this new mission is the noteworthy collection: *Publications de la Mission archéologique de l'Université de Liège en Syrie*, edited by Önhan Tunca and Abd el-Massih Baghdo, who are also the directors of the archaeological project.

The present volume, third of the series, honours the recently passed away Prof Jean-Robert Kupper, and focuses on the publication of the new epigraphic finds in Chagar Bazar: the “Archive for Beer”, which has been unearthed during the three archaeological campaigns from 2000 to 2002. Two documents found in 2003 are also included. The book shows through 402 pages an outstanding presentation of the new 214 tablets to which an illustrative appendix of 93 images is added, most of them photographs of the uncovered documents. The catalogue, however, starts with 4 archaeological illustrations and 13 photographs of the site and the archaeological context of the new finds. It ends with a photographic and archaeological presentation of 19 seals. At the end of the volume, a summary in Arabic of 14 pages can be found.

The book structure is organized in 5 chapters which furnish detailed information concerning the whole research. Ö. Tunca depicts the archaeological context of the new uncovered documents –he also participates in the study of some recovered seal inscriptions in p. 139 and ff.-, whereas Denis Lacambre and Adelina Millet Albà carry out together from chapter II on the complete edition of the texts. To this, they add 3 further high interesting chapters dedicated to those aspects especially relevant for the historical interpretation of the sources: the ancient name of Chagar Bazar, the inner chronology of the documents, the complex internal working of the archive, and finally the role of Chagar Bazar towards the end of the reign of Shamshi-Adad I of Assyria. Independently, Michel Tanret and Dominique Beyer team up in studying the scarce school tablets and seal impressions which were also found (pp. 127-132). Several useful cross-reference appendixes close the volume with chronological order of the tablets, their inventory numbers, stratigraphic records and so on.

The main part of the textual material comes from two rubbish pits pertaining to a so-called palace building located SE to the sector excavated by Mallowan, which was apparently destroyed by fire and is delimited by an important enclosure. According to the contents of these documents, it seems that they correspond to two different archives which were already outdated when Chagar Bazar was still occupied

(layer XIII). In Tunca's still provisional words, (p. 15), it does not seem that a big palace could have ever existed at Chagar Bazar, but rather a kind of palatial complex composed by several buildings which were maybe separated by transit areas. However, the connection of this new unearthed structure to the construction formerly excavated by Mallowan in 1937 is still unknown.

The edition includes throughout useful detailed treatment of the documents, internal prosopographic relationship between Chagar Bazar and Mari during the reign of Shamshi-Adad I, as well as other inside aspects of the rations and expressions of the local Akkadian that can be found in near archives and help out in a better comprehension of the tablets. To the accurate philological treatment of the texts from different points of view, contents and so on, the authors add numerous explaining grids. The work presented is thus an extraordinary one, accurate and outstanding among most recent editions of new tablets appeared in the Syrian Jazirah. It deserves our most sincere congratulation. The chapter dedicated to the harem of Sîn-Iqīšam and prepared by Millet Albà is worthy of especial mention.

We would like now to make just some minor remarks and additional comments:

It seems unnecessary that the edition continually repeats on each chapter the professional institution where both main authors of the volume are working, since, except for the mentioned brief complementary collaborations, the book has been mainly prepared by the two epigraphists of the mission. These, however, apply throughout the book independent edition criteria in line numbers of the texts, especially in the obverse, where the prima-numbering (1'...) is alternatively used for the reverse.

Regarding the Akkadian of the documents, we find especially interesting the frequent use of the capacity term *kinatê* through the formula: "X qa de grain selon la mesure *ina* GIŠ.BÁN *ki-na-te-e*", which is also attested for beer amounts and was already known in Chagar Bazar (see OBTCB 45: 1 (bariga) ŠE *i-na* GIŠ.BÁN *ki-na-te-e*). It is particularly interesting that the text 199:1-4 mentions a second more unusual term *kinatê* depicting a profession name in the ration: 8 ½ qa ŠE-KAŠ ÚS *ma-áš-ti-it* 10+7 LÚ *ki-na-te-e*-MEŠ NÍG-ŠU *ul-lu-ri* (rendered by the authors in p. 121 as: "8 ½ qa d'orge pour (faire de la) bière ordinaire, ration de boisson pour 17 travailleurs service d'Ulluri"). In correlation to the Mari evidence on the *kinattû* men, the term seems to point out unqualified people. No relation between the two terms *kinatê* seems likely, although the authors announce a future specific study (p. 174). It seems that only a possible remote etimological connection could exist. Concerning the first term, since GIŠ.BÁN stands for "Seah-Messgefäß" (ABZ 74; MZL p. 587), GIŠ.BÁN *ki-na-te-e* would point out a kind or a size of glass. This *kinatê* is hence simply to be interpreted as an Assyrian plural *tantum* for economic concepts (see Hecker, *Grammatik der Kültepe-Texte*, 1968, p. 93), so the formula *i-na* GIŠ.BÁN *ki-na-te-e* can simply be translated as "according to the (glass size of the) *right measures*" (substantive plural, see CAD K p. 383), that is to say "according to the standard measures".

On the other hand, the "gouverneur-*šāpiḍum*" cited in the text 192:5 is briefly commented in p. 116 as an official title in the administration of Chagar Bazar, and the reader is referred to III 7.2.1.2, pp. 147-149; 214; 219-220; 306, and p. 385, where the title is just barely discussed. To these references add the comments on the *šāpiḍum* made by M. Anbar, *Les tribus amurrites de Mari*, OBO 108, 1991, p. 133, where it is proposed to be a kind of tribal authority. See also the mention of one "*šāpiḍum* of Hanûm", and the possible restitution of reading *šāpiḍum* in another text from Mari (MARI 5, p. 643). It is interesting

that the authors precisely mention (p. 309) one Mari text (Durand, FM II, p. 91, nn. 20 and 21) referring to the *šāpiḏutum* acquired by a certain Hanean in Qaḏḏunan.

The II part of the book (pp. 19-140) properly presents the edition of the tablets. The III one “Données diverses” (pp. 143-207) analyzes different topics related to the documents and the ancient name of Chagar Bazar, maybe the ancient city of Ashnakkum as likely hypothesis with certainly attractive arguments (pp. 143-154). On the other hand, their estimation of the inner chronology of the tablets within the reign of Shamshi-Adad I sounds rather convincing. However, the grid presented in p. 160 and its additional explanation do not fit well (very likely, a small mistake occurs here in the numbering of the texts: 13 instead of 31).

The IV part (pp. 211-279) studies the local chief Sîn-Iqīšam, a ruler of Chagar Bazar during the reign of Shamshi-Adad I. Since we also find the mention of Apil-Sîn as the *šāpiḏum* “gouverneur- *šāpiḏum*” of Chagar Bazar (texts 192: 5; pp. 116: and III 7.2.1.2; 147-149; 214; 219-220; 306; p. 385) it remains somewhat difficult to understand which was actually the role of Sîn-Iqīšam in the administration of Shamshi-Adad I. The subject is examined more accurately under 11.2.4. (p. 215) where we find an interesting discussion about Sîn-Iqīšam as “LÚ” i.e. “*maître*” of Chagar Bazar, although the texts do not supply evidence enough about him. The discussion under 11.2.6.1 (p. 218) seems a little bit scarce and vague towards the object of study. In my opinion, it would have been very useful here to explain why the text 34 (CB 3304) pp. 32-33 is probably closely related to Sîn-Iqīšam, since the quoted “LÚ” “*maître*” (in line 4) can in all probability be identified with him. But this is of course easier for us to observe as

effortless outsiders, when examining the text material with some distance. Perhaps insufficient arguments in this respect can be also found in the treatment of the texts 40 and 4 (p. 219). The related discussion leaves here again the question open (in comparison for instance with the data from Tuttul), since several hypothesis at this point are somewhat hurriedly discussed to reach the conclusion offered in 11.3: by which LÚ is to be interpreted as the *merfum*, in relation to the *šāpiḏum*, the “governor of Chagar Bazar”, whom the authors consider under the authority of the LÚ. We miss here again –like when ever mentioning the *šāpiḏum*- a whole discussion of the topic, taking into account also the harem texts (infra) before showing the evidence which, in their opinion, could support their hypothesis. The same is true for the “dossier for the inspection of livestock from BEšannum” (based on textual material from Chagar Bazar which was already edited in OBTCB p. 33). The analysis looks consequently somewhat weak at this point, since still short advanced conclusions seem to be a bit premature. In my view, the whole discussion on the *šāpiḏum* could appear more comprehensive as a part of the final historical interpretation of the texts. We have this same impression with respect to the conclusion 12.3. (p. 237) about the beer rations for the beer cellar-*kannum*, that the authors directly attribute to the LÚ, i.e. Sîn-Iqīšam (pp. 228-229).

The V part (pp. 283-322) is brilliantly dedicated to the historical perspective gained from the texts. It tries to understand the historical role of this city, possibly Ashnakkum, as a part of the reign of Shamshi-Adad I. We find especially interesting the discussion contained sub point 14 dedicated to the link between “Chagar Bazar and Shubat-Enlil”.

We would like to point out, however, that in p. 287-289 and ff., when discussing the text terminology of this reign, for instance with respect to the *šibšatum* taxes, it would seem more adequate to preserve faithfully the translation of this term, rather than to look for the related root *šibšum*, because in so doing the authors are unnecessarily modifying the ancient original term used in these documents, in order to

employ the more recent word properly used by the Zimri-Lim administration, which certainly prevails in the Akkadian dictionaries. This can be observed throughout the edition and for instance also in p. 288, when reproducing the text ARMT XXVI/1 265:20 pertaining to the time of Yasmah-Addu. In our opinion, we should faithfully keep the original sense and translate here with the plural expression: “le grain des taxes-*šibšatum* (*še-um ša ši-ib-ša-tim*)”. So, whatever ambiguity is kept away from the actual sense of these “Assyrian” documents, and we do not need to rename a plural feminine record scribal practice with another still unreal and later (Amorite) one, employing the singular masculine. All in all, this linguistic distinction discovered by the authors looks extremely interesting.

The same happens to the translation of the *ebbūtum* (p. 289ff.), where the edition does not distinguish between singular and plural (see general text, or grid and footnote to Tableau 15.2. p. 290). The authors translate the *ebbūtum* as “prud’hommes” and propose (in the light of Middle Babylonian evidence, p. 290) to consider them as “percepteurs”, since they are clearly active in the verifying control of the income taxes *šibšatum*. However, this cannot be easily observed in this textual material. The “trustworthy men” *ebbūtum* (CAD E p. 4) have certainly a direct link to the *šibšatum* taxes not in “plusieurs textes”, but actually only in two texts (162 and 163) among the total of 9 tablets quoted in p. 290. The authors consider that the *šibšatum* taxes could take place during the whole year. In p. 291 it is stated that the text 167 records the income of the *šibšatum* taxes, very probably related to 162. Although we are of course unable to properly assess these arguments, we would like to point out at least two observations:

First, the *šibšatum* taxes could take place solely during the first month (in this case during the year of Nimer-Sîn), as the texts 162, 163 and probably also 161 seem to show. The text 167, however, is dated during the second month but it does not mention these taxes, as well as the rest of the documents also dated to the year of Nimer-Sîn.

Second: After mentioning the *ebbūtum*, the text 167:4-7 actually records an allotment for one royal dignitary when he visits the governor (LÚ) of Chagar Bazar during the second month of Nimer-Sîn, but there is no mention of the *šibšatum* taxes. The discussion follows this line of interpretation also in p. 292 (see under 15.4). So, both texts (162 and 167) appear to be obviously related, but, in our view, mainly because they record abundant amounts from the *karû* to the *ebbūtum* within 3 weeks.

We find more related problems to this interesting issue in the text 165 and its difficult context in ll. 5-7: *i-nu-ma LÚ i-na aš-na-ki iš-BU-Ú*. The authors consider different readings’ possibilities for this difficult line which of course are to be taken into account. Since the text can be collated through a good quality photograph provided in Pl. 67: line 7, we would like to offer a new reading alternative: the scribe could have written here *iš-* (ABZ 212) instead of *uš-* (ABZ 211) in order to express the verbal form *iš-bu-ú*, instead of *uš-bu-ú* (see for instance AHW p. 1482 a 3) β), maybe as an indicative subjunctive preterite form, or maybe as a subjunctive stative of the Assyrian *ušibu* (see GAG, Verbalparadigma 6 and 23) from (*w*)*ašābum*. This solution could reasonably explain the temporal character imposed by the conjunction particle *inuma* in the sentence (see GAG §116 b, §170 d-g). We should keep in mind that the rations seem to be recorded in a present durative, so that the phrase *i-nu-ma LÚ i-na aš-na-ki iš-BU-Ú* could plausibly be understood as: “while the LÚ resides in Ashnakkum”. If this solution is correct, LÚ does not seem to refer here, as usual in title formulas, to the governor of Chagar Bazar, but rather to the person who

receives the ration. So, the verbal form *iš-bu-ú* appears to be a simple scribal mistake rather than a defective or local dialectal deviation of *ašābum*.

The authors are to be deeply acknowledged for the several and full effort made annexes and indexes provided at the end of the volume. This closing part (p. 323ff.) is extremely useful, not only for a rapid location of each document of the collection, but also to find immediately all data provided by the tablets. These useful and practical tools will always allow the reader of this book a quick access to the sources, terms, data or whatever reference included in them. This is even more precious because they establish a close tie not only to the contemporary texts from Chagar Bazar published in OBTCB, but also to other important archives from Syria, especially those from Old Babylonian Mari. We sincerely congratulate both authors and editors for this splendid publication and wish them the best for future campaigns.

Juan Oliva

Klaas R. Veenhof, Jesper Eidem, *Mesopotamia. The Old Assyrian Period* (OBO 160/5), Fribourg-Göttingen: Academic Press / Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008. 383 pp. + 2 maps. - ISBN 9783525534526.

The book under review (hereafter abbreviated as OBO 160/5) is the fifth volume (actually the fourth, because OBO 160/2 has not yet been published) of the very useful and informative series “Annäherungen” edited by M. Wäfler of Bern University. The series, based on the contents of a set of university lectures, provides detailed information on the Uruk and Predynastic (J. Bauer, R. K. Englund and M. Krebernik, OBO 160/1), Akkad and Ur III (W. Sallaberger and A. Westenholz, OBO 160/3), Old Babylonian (D. Charpin, D. O. Edzard, and M. Stol, OBO 160/4) and now, with OBO 160/5, Old Assyrian periods of the Mesopotamian development. This reviewer deeply regrets that this series will not be continued; as Wäfler explains in the “Vorwort” (page 11) to the present volume, due to the “Bologna” reform, the lectures that provided the authors and contents for the series have now come to an end.

The book is divided into two main parts, each written by an expert in the Old Assyrian period (henceforth abbreviated OA, along with MA for Middle Assyrian and NA for Neo Assyrian). Part one, on “the Old Assyrian Period”, is written by Klaas R. Veenhof (pages 13-264, i. e. 251 pages). Part two, under the title “Apum: A Kingdom on the Old Assyrian Route” is written by Jesper Eidem (pages 265-352, i. e. 87 pages). The third part contains the indices arranged according to subjects, text numbers, geographical names, kings and rulers, gods and temples, persons and Assyrian words (pages 353-382). Two folded maps, of Anatolia and the Syrian Jezira, complete this exhaustive and invaluable volume.

After a short preface, Veenhof defines the OA period in his introduction. He deals with the concept “Old Assyrian” (pages 19-27), the chronology of the period (pages 28-34) and the sources available for its study (pages 35-61). In the second part, he summarizes the studies carried out so far. First, he focuses on the early research (that is, studies dated before 1963), publications of texts other than those found in the excavation of Kültepe underway since 1948 and reconstructions of the cuneiform archives (pages 62-75). He then surveys the research according to theme, dividing it into eleven main areas: institutions, caravans and trade routes, goods traded, financing, companies and partners, law and the administration of justice, history and politics, religion, society, language and writing, seals and sealings,

prosopography and personal names, which gives an idea of the diversity of the research of this fascinating period (pages 76-121). This is followed by a short history of the OA before and during the *kārum* Kaneš period (pages 122-146). In the fourth part, Veenhof describes the institutional “landscape” in Anatolia: the main cities, rulers and lands (pages 147-182). The Assyrian trade in the OA period depended on commercial treaties between Assyrians (the concept restricted to the inhabitants of the city of Assur, page 19) and the non-Assyrian powers, and not on the military strength of the Assyrian state, as in the later stages of Assyrian history (see lastly B. Faist, AOAT 265, esp. 77-108 and K. Radner, *Melammu* 5, 152-169). The fifth part of Veenhof’s work is dedicated to these treaties (pages 183-218). The sixth part deals with the Anatolian titles, officials and terms of payment in the Anatolian debt-notes (pages 219-245). In the seventh and last part, Veenhof lists special abbreviations and the bibliography used (pages 247-264).

In his part of the book, Eidem discusses the kingdom of Apum, around the city of Šehnā (Tell Leilan), also known as Šubat-Enlil (under Šamšī-Adad I). After a general introduction (pages 269-289), he gives a summary of the international constellation around Apum (pages 290-305), the relations in war and peace of Apum with its neighbours (pages 306-324), a sketch of the society of this Jezira kingdom (pages 325-336) and how it ended (pages 337-338). Eidem concludes his contribution with two appendices on texts from Tell Leilan.

Our knowledge of the OA period has developed rapidly in recent years. The speed of the process is best illustrated by the recent progress made in the internal chronology of this period. Until 2003 the scholars studying the chronology of the OA period had to collect the eponyms from the cuneiform texts and try to place them in sequences based on prosopography and other types of analysis, as scholars of the MA period are still doing. The publication of the Kültepe Eponym List (KEL) by Veenhof, *The Old Assyrian List of Year Eponyms from kārum Kanish and its Chronological Implications* (Ankara 2003) revolutionized these studies. The OA scholars now have a list of 129 eponyms (i.e. years) which can be combined with further lists to create a set of 230 eponymites, (i.e. years) (OBO 160/5, page 28). They now know that the probable date for the introduction of the eponym system in Assyria can be fixed around 1974 BC, which is also the first regnal year of Erišum I, according to the middle chronology. The Assyrian presence in Kaneš (Kültepe) seems to have begun under his reign (*ca.* 1950 BC, according to Veenhof) and lasted until *ca.* 1837 BC (Kaneš level II). An occupation some 35 years later is attested (level Ib), which lasted until *ca.* 1720 BC (see pages 28-34). All these dates were established only recently. However, certain other aspects remain very difficult to discern, especially concerning the origin and end of the Assyrian trade in Anatolia: “we do not know how it [the Assyrian commercial system] came into being” (page 165); “the archival texts do not offer us a clue for what happened at the end of level II” (page 139).

The need for a new summary of the knowledge assembled on the OA period, more than thirty years after the publication of Larsen’s *The Old Assyrian City-State and Its Colonies* (Copenhagen 1976), is self-evident. As Veenhof recognizes in the preface of his part of the book, OA studies have experienced substantial growth in recent decades. Unfortunately, this progress has not been reflected in the form of extensive and reliable editions of the cuneiform texts (for example K. Hecker – G. Kryszat and L. Matouš, KKT [1998] or Larsen’s OAA 1 = PIHANS 96 [2003]), as one would have desired, but rather in the publication of a multiplicity of articles scattered in journals and special volumes, some of which are hard to track down. Thankfully, C. Michel’s *Old Assyrian Bibliography* (Leiden 2003) imposed some order, but an overall survey of the period was badly needed, and in this regard OBO 160/5 is a most welcome publication.

After reading OBO 160/5, it is evident that the main purpose of the scholars of the OA period should be to concentrate on the publication of whole archives and reliable editions of the texts, as several scholars are currently doing for other Assyrian periods (see for example the publications by H. Freydank in the VS and WVDOG series or E. Cancik-Kirschbaum and W. Röllig in BATSH, all of them for the MA period; K. Radner, S. Parpola, V. Donbaz and B. Faist in StAT; or the SAA series directed by S. Parpola, for the NA period). This editorial work is a hard task, due to the quality and quantity of the material. However, one thing is clear: at the present pace of 448 texts published in regular editions in the last 61 years (the sum from OBO 160/5 pages 68-69), the publication of all the 18380 texts uncovered since 1948 will take *ca.* 2460 years (without taking probable future finds into account).

A book in the style of O. Pedersén's *Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur* (Uppsala 1985-86) with the overview of the archives, in this case, of the Assyrian merchants in Kaneš (Kültepe) would also be very helpful for organizing the OA material. A specialized dictionary or glossary (see for example S. Parpola, AEAD for the NA period) and updated lists of anthroponyms or prosopographies are also lacking for the OA period (see the old listings of F. J. Stephens, YOSR 13/1 from 1928 and W. G. Gwaltney, HUCA 48 from 1977 and compare with other periods: Saporetti OMA, Saporetti and Freydank NAOMA; Parpola, Radner and Backer, PNA). All these desiderata are also stressed by Veenhof in OBO 160/5: the need for the reconstruction of the archives, pages 66-68; the need for a glossary/dictionary, pages 112-113 and note 499, page 129 note 590; the need for a prosopography: page 117. In this regard, that is, making the OA period more accessible to other scholars and students (not only of Assyriology), the publication of OBO 160/5 is also particularly welcome.

OBO 160/5 is bibliographically updated till summer 2006. A further sign of the speed of the progression of OA studies is the increasing volume of publications on this period. H. Neumann, keibi 65 (Or. 76) lists 23 new titles for 2006 and keibi 66 (Or. 77) mentions 13 new publications for 2007 referring to OA studies, which should be integrated into the discussions in OBO 160/5. Additions to these listings are, for example, the two issues of AoF 35 = FS Hecker, PIHANS 111 and 112, which appeared in 2008 and are dedicated entirely to the OA period; or other articles in journals and special volumes such as A. Karaduman, JNES 67, 81-106; Veenhof, FS Stol, 97-119 (already in the bibliography of OBO 160/5, 263); Veenhof, JEOL 41, 179-202 only to cite some examples other than OBO 160/5 itself. Some of the forthcoming publications in the OA field are mentioned in OBO 160/5: a new eponym list by C. Günbattı (page 23 and 143), prosopographical studies by G. Derksen (page 68), a study of the OA geography by G. Barjamovic (page 81), the archive of Kuliya by Veenhof (page 85 and 362), a study of the OA judicial system by T. Hertel (page 95); and see pages 72-73 on possible future publications. Veenhof also recommends certain areas for study such as the trade of gold (page 88), the rules of inheritance (page 94), ancient Anatolian law (page 96), slaves (page 111 and 177), the development of trade (page 131) and the Anatolian countryside (page 148). All this gives a clear idea of how much work is underway, and how much remains to be done.

Although it is obviously a scholarly work, the book is well written and easy to read. I discovered very few typos while reading: "Derksen" for Derksen, page 86; "involment" for involvement, page 133; "laons" for loans, page 147; "Assurern" for (German) Assyrern, page 227; "HoransanlĠ" für Horansanlı, page 253; "GünbattĠ" for Günbattı, "abbreviation" for abbreviation, both on page 255; "Pruszinsky" for Pruzsinsky, page 261; "Tübin+gen" for Tübingen, page 347. I could not find a few bibliographical references in the bibliography of the volume, such as Veenhof 1988 (page 83), Stephens 1928 (page 119), Gwaltney 1977 (page 119), Hirsch 1961 (page 119), Ichisar 1982 (page 119), Neumann

1997 (page 122 note 550), Van de Mieroop 2000 (page 123 note 558), Balkan 1956 (page 124 note 565), Lambert 1985 (page 124 note 563), Balkan 1976 (page 126 note 574), Veenhof 1989 (page 137 note 630) and Hoffner 1974 (page 238); while some of these are publications known from elsewhere, others may be typos. Maeda 1969 belongs to Matouš 1969 (page 258). Some of the abbreviations used to cite text editions (for example: KTH, KTP, KUG, TTC; see indices page 358 ff.) or bibliography (for example: JANESCU, page 255) cannot be found in the list of CAD Š/III to which Veenhof refers (page 247). Nevertheless, these tiny flaws do not diminish in any way the value of this magnificent volume.

In a series like OBO 160 which is characterized by its high prices (ranging from 89 to 230 Eur.), OBO 160/5 (79.90 Eur.) is the cheapest, a fact that should help sales. This reviewer would like to congratulate the authors for their invaluable work and strongly recommends the volume, which is a must for specialists, interested non-specialists, and all students of Assyria. This splendid volume is sure to become a reference book for the period studied.

Jaume Llop