

Trojan war was undertaken. If the war was more than a looting expedition attracted by wealth accumulated in the vaults of the Trojan citadel, the geographical direction of the enterprise must be meaningful. Instead of pushing in the direction of the East Mediterranean shores with their established Levantine city-states, Homer's Achaeans try to conquer an illiterate (?) kingdom which lies near the entrance to the Propontis and the Bosphorus. Should we think of a menace from the Black Sea, and assume that some of the allies of the Sea Peoples ultimately came from that direction? Hittite and Ugaritic texts have produced good new evidence for the battles along the south coast of Asia Minor in the early twelfth century B.C., but whatever may have been the naval activities along the Pontic shores remains undetected so far.

Stubbings might have made more of the Tarsus evidence (quoted indirectly on p. 17), and he did

not yet have access to new discoveries such as the Mycensean cemetery at Müsgebi near Halicarnassus or the Boğazköy and Ugarit texts. The chapter will undoubtedly be brought up to date before it goes between the definitive covers of *CAH* volume II.

[There is more suffering for the reader of footnotes as more fascicles are published. How is one to cope with e.g. footnote 4 on p. 3, which reads "Cf. *C.A.H.* II², ch. XXII(a), sect. 5, p. 19, with refs."? Who tells us which author and title are meant? Not the *CAH* fascicles under Bibliography, nor the list of titles which appears on the back of the bright red cover of each fascicle and which has a numbering system entirely its own, never used elsewhere. Why this consistent avoidance of names of authors in footnotes?]

MACHTELD J. MELLINK

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Lexical Study. By HERBERT BARDWELL HUFFMON. Pp. xvi + 304. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965. Price: \$7.50.

The interest produced by the texts of Mari is well known and it can easily be gauged by the number of studies which they have stimulated. The present book can be aligned with the best among such studies, both for the importance of the topic and the treatment accorded to it. As is made clear in the title, the book offers a linguistic analysis of the Amorite personal names found in the Mari texts (vols. I-IX; XI-XII). There are eleven chapters, which can be grouped into three parts. The *first part* (chapter II, pp. 13-60) is a list of all Amorite personal names from Mari. No precise total is given, except for the incidental remark on p. 8 that there are "about 900 possible Amorite names." I have counted 876 names in the list, to which one should add four new ones from *ARMT* XII, listed by the author in an *Addendum* on p. 304 (*ARMT* XIII was published too late for Huffmon to take into consideration). Names for

which either the reading is doubtful, or a West Semitic interpretation seems too uncertain, are not included in the list, but are referred to in the body of the text (e.g. *Mi-il-k[ā']-an*, p. 231; *Ha-ar-da-nu-um*, p. 204). The *second part* (chapters III-VIII, pp. 61-152) offers an analysis of the names arranged according to structural patterns. It is on this part of his book that the author places most importance. He is the first one to apply in a systematic fashion to the Amorite onomasticon what Noth and Stamm have done for Hebrew and Akkadian. Following especially Noth's classification, Huffmon analyzes the names on the basis of their internal structure, i.e. the laws according to which nominal and verbal elements enter into combination with each other. The *third part* (chapter IX, pp. 153-273) is a glossary listing all the lexical elements which can be isolated in the names. Here too no total is given by the author; I have counted 303 elements. With modesty, Huffmon states the limitations of his glossary by saying that "lexical discussions do not generally carry conviction" (p. 153). But no doubt scholars will be grateful to him for the wealth of material

which he has collected together in a lucid and comprehensive way. At the beginning of the book there is an introduction (chapter I) which gives a short history of the Amorite problem, and at the end the reader will find a well selected bibliography (pp. 281-99).

The author is accurate, a quality of special importance for a book which will largely be used as a reference tool. At times, however, one does not find in the pertinent lists material which is otherwise known to the author and is discussed elsewhere in the book. A few cases are pointed out here. On p. 189 add the spelling *Ab-da-an* after *Ḥa-ab-da-an* (cf. p. 31 and see now also *Ab-da-nu* in *CT* 45 59:6). On p. 135 add the following names to the list of names ending in *-ānum*: *Aw-na-nu-um* (*ARM* III 50: 12), *Ba-aq-qa-nu-um* (cf. p. 152), *Bu-nu-ba-aḥ-la-nu* (cf. p. 131), *Ḥa-sī-da-nu-um* (cf. p. 145). *Ḥa-mī-za-nu* (from *HMS*, cf. p. 198, rather than from *ZN* as on p. 188), *Ya-qī-ra-nu* (cf. p. 145), *Sa-ku-ra-nu-um* (cf. p. 146), *Šu-ḥa-la-nu* (cf. p. 152); and see perhaps also *Bu-uš-ša-nu-um* (*Studia Mariana*, p. 54; cf. *Bu-ši-ya*, Huffmon, p. 151), *Ga-zi-za-nu-[um]* (cf. p. 144), *Ḥa-ar-da-nu-um* (cf. p. 204). It might also have been useful to list other proper names which, even though not attested as personal names, present the same kind of structure, e.g. the divine name *ʿIa-ak-ru-ub-El* (mentioned on p. 76) and tribal names such as *Amnānum* (for the relationship between tribal and personal names cf. pp. 142; 143; 147-48). At times, a simple cross-reference would have made the book considerably easier to use; thus in chapter II a name like *Ḥa/A-aq-ba-an* should have been listed both under *A-* and *Ḥa-*, rather than only under *Ḥa-* (p. 36); for names which do not have an obvious interpretation, it would have been useful to cross-reference the list of names and the lexicon (it is not easy for somebody who is not familiar with the material to find a discussion of *I-zi-a-du-um* [p. 23] under *WS* [p. 185]); where different lexical interpretations are possible, more cross-references should have been given in the lexicon (thus for names with *Ia-si-im-*, listed only under *YSM*, but not under *SYM*, cf. p. 211). Finally there is a slight discrepancy in the lexicon, where one finds listed as separate lexemes

the pronominal suffixes of the second person singular (pp. 218-19) and of the first person plural (pp. 235-36) but not, e.g., the pronominal suffix of the first person singular.

As noted above, the more original part of the book is the study of the structure of the personal names. One may want to question some specific points of this section, but the presentation as a whole is sound and clear. There is one major point on which I would like to take issue with the author, and this is his treatment of morphology. To be sure, there is no lack of observations concerning morphological matters, but one would like to see a more resolute and systematic treatment—*faute de mieux*, one would expect an index on morphology parallel to the one on phonology (pp. 301-2). As a result, the sense of balance suffers a little, especially in view of the author's claim that he is following an "approach . . . much more unified" than that of his predecessors (p. 113); the fact that the subtitle of the book is "A Structural and Lexical Study," without reference to morphology, would not seem a sufficient justification. Considering the amount of material collected in the book, as well as the importance of some of the topics discussed, it is a pity that it should not be made easier for the reader to find the necessary references. To obviate this, at least in part, and as a contribution to the book, it may be of some use to provide here such a morphological index, with the addition of a few occasional remarks (braces are used to include morphemes; the numbers refer to the pages of Huffmon's book):

Pronoun

pronominal suffix of the first person singular {i}, 106, 112, 113 n. 78, 117, 135

pronominal suffix of the second person singular {k}, {ka}, 106, 218-19

pronominal suffix of the third person singular: Huffmon (pp. 107-116, 132-33) does not recognize the existence of a pronom. suff. {hu} in the spelling *-Cu-ū*, against the opinion of most other scholars. Following Noth, Huffmon prefers to consider this spelling as representing "an original (Amorite) nominative case ending, statically treated in a foreign name element" (p. 115).

Huffman's arguments deserve serious consideration, but they do not seem fully convincing. Thus on p. 113 Huffman rejects Gelb's view concerning the *scriptio plena* on the grounds that for some spellings (e.g. *Su-ú-mu*) Gelb's rule does not apply; but then these same spellings are as much against Huffman's interpretation as they are against Gelb's (*Su-ú-mu* obviously does not stand for an original nominative ending); in other words these spellings are true exceptions which do not vitiate the regularity of the principle stated by Gelb. Similarly, the fact that the name of the same person can be spelled with or without *scriptio plena* (p. 114) may easily be explained as a phenomenon of abbreviation, as in Ugarit where an alternation of the type *Sigildānu/Sigilda* for the same person is well attested (cf. M. Liverani, "Antecedenti del diptotismo arabo nei testi accadici di Ugarit," in *RSO* 38 [1963] p. 152; it is difficult to find a similar example in the texts of Mari because paternity is seldom stated there and it is therefore impossible to determine whether an abbreviated PN refers to the same person as a PN which is not abbreviated). Again, Huffman objects that the "pronominal suffix view . . . would imply three-element names," which in turn are "extremely rare among Amorite names" (pp. 112-13): one can turn the argument around and say that three-element names are rare precisely because they are substituted by names with pronominal suffixes at the end. One could suggest in fact that the ending *-úhu* had acquired a special stylistic value, as in the case of the "Stilregel" noticed by J. J. Stamm, *Die Akkadische Namengebung*, Leipzig 1939, p. 72, according to which Akkadian avoids the name types **Illum-iddinam* or **Iš-meanni-illum* in favor of *Ili-iddinam* and *Ili-š-meanni*. The same stylistic consideration may also account for the fact that "the writing *-Cu-ú* is found predominantly with the final element" (p. 112). Finally the objection that certain names would have "two suffixes differing one from the other [e.g. *Ha-li-ša-at-nu-ú*], a phenomenon not known elsewhere in Semitic onomastics" (p. 112), is certainly a serious objection, and yet there are other cases where a unique type of name formation is recognized also by Huffman, as in the case of names with the second person singular of the im-

perfect (cf. also *Su-mu-na-a-bi*, notwithstanding Huffman's doubts on p. 113, n. 78)

pronominal suffix of the first person plural {*na*}, 14, 81, 112, 113 n. 78, 235-36

demonstrative (determinative) pronoun, 121-22
Noun

nominal patterns, 93-94, 96, 98-99, 142-51, 203
declension:

nominative, 104-107, 117, 124-25

genitive, 96 n. 5, 118-23, 128

diptotes, 123-24

absolute case, 62, 100, 119

ending {*a*}, 92, 106-107, 123-24; for the interpretation of this ending as a mark of the genitive note also the following correspondence: *A-bi-a-mu-ti* MAR.TU (L. Legrain, *Les temps des rois d'Ur*, Paris 1912, N. 267: 10.14) and *A-bi-ia-mu-ta* in the new genealogy of Hammurapi, the text of which has been made known by J. J. Finkelstein at the 1965 meeting of the American Oriental Society in Chicago; I interpret the name as 'ab-yamūti/a.

mimination, 95, 100

construct state, 104-107, 117, 118-25.

determination, 107 n. 53: Huffman rejects the view that there may be an ending {*a*} related to the Aramaic post-positive article.

gender: feminine in {*a*}, {*atum*}, {*tum*}, 62, 133-34 (note however that {*atum*} is also used as a hypocoristic ending for masculine names)

Verb

Basic Stem

imperfect:

vocalic classes, 63-73, 74-75

first person singular with prefix {*a*}, 66

second person singular with prefix {*ta*}, 14, 63, 66 (?), 67 (?), 69, 70, 81, 86

second person singular with prefix {*ti*}, 77

third person singular masculine with prefix {*ya*}, 14, 63-73, 132; on p. 77 Huffman says that the elements *ya-šu-uh* and *ya-pu-uh* cannot be considered as imperfect because they never occur initially. It is possible, however, to consider these (theophorous) elements as abbreviations of a divine name of the type *Yakrub-El*, for which see p. 76; if so, the elements would indeed be imperfect

- third person singular masculine with prefix {*yi*}, 74 (?), 82
- third person singular masculine with prefix {*e*} or {*i*}, 76-77, 83
- third person singular feminine with prefix {*ta*}, 14, 66, 86, 133-34
- imperfect passive, 75-76
- present-future of the type *yaqattal*: the existence of such a form is not considered likely by Huffman, pp. 84-85
- perfect:
- in general 87-94
 - first person singular ending in {*ti*}, 91
 - second person singular ending in {*ta*}, 91
 - third person singular ending in { \emptyset }, 90-91
 - stative and transitive forms, 87, 89, 91
 - perfect passive, 75 n. 83, 93
- imperative, 86-87
- precativ with {*la*}, 78-81
- active participle, 79-80, 90, 92, 98, 101
- passive participle, 93, 98, 98-99, 123
- Other stems
- basic stem with infix {*t*}, 81-82, 94
 - intensive stem (D), 82-85
 - causative stem:
 - imperfect, 66-72, 74
 - imperfect passive, 75-76
 - jussive, 71-72
 - precativ, 81
 - participle, 14, 74, 148-50
 - form with prefix {*š*}, 94 n. 217, 268
- Weak verbs*
- primae infirmae, 68-70, 74, 77, 89, 207-18
 - secundae infirmae, 65, 68-70, 90, 101
 - tertiar infirmae, 70-73, 90, 133
 - verbs doubly weak, 64, 65, 70
 - geminate forms, 77-78, 90.

GIORGIO BUCCELLATI

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

New Hebrew Poems from the Geniza. By J. SCHIRMANN. (Publications of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities). Pp. xxii + 538. Jerusalem, 1965.

The Cairo Geniza proved to be an immensely rich repository of medieval Hebrew poetry. A case in point is the early and highly original *paytān*, or liturgical poet, Yannay, an extensive volume of whose creations was assembled by the late M. Zulay from Geniza material. Of a previously unknown poet, Solomon of Sinjār in Upper Mesopotamia, M. Zulay counted about a thousand poems coming from the same source (Schirman, *New Poems*, 47). Since the inception of Geniza research in the 1890's much has been accomplished to bring the vast material under control. But much remains to be done. In this new book Schirmann provides an anthology of hitherto unpublished poems from the Geniza, including some which were printed previously in incomplete form. This great work is the fruit of over thirty years of research in libraries all over Europe and America, in particular at the University Library, Cambridge, where, since 1956, a "New Series" of Geniza material has been made available to scholars, and, as far as poetry

is concerned, was largely identified by Professor Schirmann.

The first section of the book contains the creations of the eastern poets, starting with those from Byzantine times, partly bearing Greek or Aramaic names, and ending with a fourteenth century poet from Bagdad. It was indeed the Geniza which reinstated the eastern branch of medieval Hebrew poetry to its proper place, and the volume under review contributes much in this respect. In the second section we read new—and sometimes very beautiful—poems from the pen of the classical authors of the Spanish period. The third is devoted to *muwashshahs*, or strophic poems, often concluded with an Arabic or Spanish couplet, or one being a mixture of these two vernaculars spoken by Jews in addition to literary Hebrew (p. 323). The fourth contains *maqāmas*, a form of literature popular in Hebrew as in Arabic literature. The concluding section deals with a variety of subjects, such as rhymed maxims and proverbs and poems of historical content. The poems are edited with meticulous care, equipped with full bibliographical details and commentaries, as well as introductions illustrating both the intricate