The main thesis, outlined at the beginning of this review, is contained in chapter II (pp. 55–70).

The following three chapters develop certain corollaries implicit in the main thesis, the most important being in chapter III (pp. 71–93). Here the author analyzes the relationship between the prepositive article and the determinative pronoun in *d*. First he notes that the genitival usage of the determinative pronoun (types 1–3) is incompatible with the prepositive article, and is in fact not attested in languages which exhibit the latter: the reason is that both particles have an identical determinative function. He then studies in detail the parallel usages of determinative pronoun and prepositive article (to pp. 78–9 one may add Akkadian *ša lām abūbi* "the one before the Flood" Gilgamesh I i 6, as parallel to Hebrew *wĕ-he-ᶜālēhā* "and the one upon it"), and concludes (pp. 82–93) with five different phenomena of "renouvellement" of the earlier syntactical system of the determinative pronouns in languages which began to admit the prepositive article. (Hence this section is very interesting for the question of the origin of the article.)

Chapter IV (pp. 95–103) argues in favor of an interpretation of pronouns in *m* and *ᵓay* as non-autonomous, and similarly chapter V (pp. 105–45) with respect to the Arabic pronouns *man mā* and *ᵓayyun*.

In terms of transformational grammar, the author deals essentially with surface, rather than deep-structure. In my view, this reduces the potentiality of the author's inquiry, for reasons similar to those adduced by C. G. Killean in her review of M. Piamenta, *Studies in the Syntax of Palestinian Arabic*, in *JAOS* 89 (1969) pp. 458–60. The limitations of a non-transformational approach are particularly visible because Pennacchietti emphasizes the importance of syntax vs. semantics. Thus the whole usage of the genitive becomes much more meaningful from a syntactical point of view if described in terms of nominalization transformations—a point which cannot be elaborated here, but which I have tried to elucidate, for Akkadian, in a grammar of Babylonian which I am preparing at present for publication. However, this does not invalidate the results obtained by Pennacchietti, since a transformational approach would not run counter, but rather help to develop in a more powerful manner the original and stimulating insights contained in his book.

GIORGIO BUCCELLATI
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

Nairi e Ir(u)aṭri. Contributo alla storia della Formazione del regno di Urarṭu. By MIRJO SALVINI. (Incunabula Graeca, Vol. XVI), Pp. 111, Pls. VIII. Roma: EDIZIONI DELL'ATENEO, 1967. Lire 3,000.

Looking at a map of the Near East, it is almost with disbelief that one realizes that Tušpa, the capital of Urartu on the shores of Lake Van, is only about 130 miles as the crow flies from Nineveh, i.e. about *half* the distance between Nineveh and Babylon. Urartu was, in other words, by far the closest to Assyria of all the powerful foreign countries. No wonder, then, that Urartu should play a considerable role in the accounts of Assyrian wars. In fact, the entire reconstruction of Urartian history leans heavily on Assyrian sources—and so does, too, the present book by Salvini on the origins of Assyria's powerful neighbors. After an introduction with a short history of the problem, the author first discusses the sources (chapters I–III) and then gives a historical reconstruction of the alternating fortunes of the two main regions of Urartu, i.e. Nairi and Uruatri (= Urartu proper in later times) from the 13th to the 9th century (chapters IV–VII). An appendix discusses the localization of Ḫabḫi, which the author places immediately north of Assyria and south of Lake Van. (Another geographical area the localization of which is discussed at some length throughout the book is Tumme, i.e. *Tum₄-me* instead of the traditional reading *Num-me* or *Nim-me*, which is placed south of Lake Urmia = Rezayeh, pp. 2,, 49, 54–58, 75.) Very useful are the four maps which depict the ethno-political geography of the region at various points during the period considered in the book. Indexes of names and sources conclude the book.

Basic to the author's position is the distinction between Nairi and Uruaṭri as two separate and autonomous entities during the period from the 13th to the 9th century, wherein he differs from the conception held by other scholars (e.g. Meyer, Schmökel, Beran, see especially pp. 6, 64) who consider Uruaṭri as a portion of Nairi. Nairi is located west of Lake Van, Uruaṭri or, in its later form, Urartu proper is in the area of Lake Van itself. The geographical extension and the political fortunes of the two regions vary with the times. With the beginning of the documentation in the early 13th century Uruatri is the first one to be mentioned, in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser I; but soon afterwards, Nairi appears with greater prominence in the inscriptions of Tukulti-Ninurta I, an ascendancy which was probably favored by the general demise of Ḫanigalbat around the same time. No sources are extant from the 12th century, but toward the end, under the reign of Tiglath-Pileser I, it is still Nairi which occurs prominently, whereas Uruaṭri is not even mentioned. The latter reappears, instead, under Aššur-bēl-kala, a successor of Tiglath-Pileser I, and this time to the exclusion of Nairi. After another period of darkness from the middle of the 11th to the end of the 10th century, both regions are mentioned again, at first as relatively unimportant entitites; but it seems clear that Nairi had reached the high point of its development at the turn of the 12th century under Tiglath-Pileser I, and that from then on it was the area of Lake Van, beginning then to

be known as Urartu, to be in the foreground as the centralizing influence of the people on the Armenian plateau. This process comes to its climax at the time of Shalmaneser III in the 9th century when Urartu appears as a strong state under king Aramu, the first of the better known line of Urartian kings. By that time Nairi had ceased to exist as an autonomous entity.

In assessing the history of the regions under consideration, Salvini turns his attention to problems of ethnic affiliation, a difficult task given the scarcity of sources available. Thus he stresses the connection of Nairi especially with the earlier Hurrian component on the one hand (see especially pp. 45f., 52f., 65) and on the other with Urartean as known from the period following the lower limit of his research (the 9th century). The relationship with the Hittites (in times earlier than the upper limits of the book) is apparently of no consequence, in spite of the partial overlap of Nairi with regions which had been closely connected with the Hittite empire (seal impressions of Hittite type, containing the easternmost epigraphic evidence of Hittite, have been found by the joint Chicago-UCLA-Amsterdam expedition to Korucu Tepe near El-Aziğ, for which see a preliminary report in *Türk Arkeoloji Dergisi* 17/1, 1969, 79–82; the area of Korucu corresponds to the country Išuwa known from Hittite sources, for which see recently H. Klengel, "Die Hethiter und Išuwa," *Oriens Antiquus* 7, 1968, 63–76).

<div align="right">Giorgio Buccellati</div>

University of California, Los Angeles

---

*Die Lexikalischen und Grammatikalischen Aramaismen
im Alttestamentlichen Hebräisch.* By Max Wagner.
Pp. 176. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann. 1966.

When this book appeared in 1966, time was ripe for a comprehensive monograph which would survey the lexical, phonological, morphological, and syntactic Aramaisms in Biblical Hebrew. Since E. Kautzsch's *Die Aramaismen im AT* was published, over sixty years had passed, and in the mean time the subject was treated by only a few scholars, among whom G. R. Driver should be particularly mentioned.[1] The broadening and deepening of our knowledge of both Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic since Kautzsch's time on the one hand, and the advances achieved in the linguistic study of languages in contact on the other are remarkable. One would, therefore, look forward to a book which would take up again

---

[1] Cf. Hebrew Poetic Diction, *Congress Volume*, Copenhagen 1953 = *Vetus Testamentum, Suppl.* I, pp. 26–39. For other works of Driver which deal with Biblical Aramaisms see the useful references given by James Barr in his review of Wagner's *Aramaismen*, *JSS* 14 (1969), p. 254.

the problem of Aramaisms in Biblical Hebrew and treat it in a way appropriate to up-to-date Semitics and contemporary linguistics. Wagner's book, useful as it might be, does not fulfill these expectations.

The book consists of an introduction (pp. 1–17), a discussion of the lexical Aramaisms (pp. 17–121), a discussion of the grammatical Aramaisms (pp. 121–138), and a concluding chapter (pp. 138–158) in which the author deals with the frequency of Aramaisms in the various books of the Bible, their occurrence in different periods in the history of Israel, and their classification into Semantic fields. As this survey of the structure of the book shows, its main part is devoted to lexical Aramaisms.

One would expect the introduction to contain an exhaustive treatment of a question fundamental for a monograph dealing with Aramaisms in Biblical Hebrew, namely—*how are Aramaisms to be defined?*[2] The author treats this problem (pp. 11–14), but rather briefly, and except for a short presentation of those sound-shifts typical to Aramaic (p. 11) his treatment of the subject consists mainly of an exposition of the difficulties and uncertainties inherent in the very definition of the concept of "Aramaism in Biblical Hebrew." Such an approach is rather disappointing. In this chapter ("sprachwissenschaftliche Voraussetzungen": pp. 11–14), the author should have dealt, at some length, with the features of Aramaic, phonological and morphological, which could serve—in addition to the phonological features that resulted from the well-known sound-shifts —as criteria for regarding a word or a form occurring in the Hebrew text of the Bible as an Aramaism. Other points relevant to the classification of words (and forms) as Aramaisms are the question of the etymological doublets and the problem of the dialectal .structure of Biblical Hebrew. Needless to say, the doublets—those roots which, although having one etymological ancestor, appear in Biblical Hebrew in two forms, e.g. *mḥq/mḥṣ* (for *mḥq* cf. Jud. 5:26) or *ʿwq/ṣwq* (for *ʿwq* see Amos 2:13—twice)—should be dealt with in a study of the Aramaisms that occur in Biblical Hebrew. Not a few of the doublets are distinctly Aramaisms, or forms pertaining to dialects that were subject to Aramaic interference, (see *infra*) and their use may reflect the desire for stylistic variation. To be more explicit: if the forms *mȧḥȧqȧ* and *mȧḥȧṣȧ* are used concomitantly in the Song of Deborah (Jud. 5:26), one may surmise that the use of the former, which is an Aramaism, provides for stylistic variation. True, the author includes *mḥq* in the "lexical Aramaisms" (p. 74), but an overall treatment of the question.of the doublets is missing. Would one neglect a treatment of the doublets in a description of those forms

---

[2] For this question cf. the sound observations made by James Barr in his *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 121–124.