

Buchbesprechungen

HILGERT, MARKUS: *Akkadisch in der Ur III-Zeit.* (Imgula 5). Münster: Rhema, 2002. xlviii, 768 pp. 21 × 29 cm. ISBN 3-930454-32-7. Price: € 98,00.

Reclaiming a place for Ur III Akkadian, Hilgert accomplishes two major goals: to provide the fullest possible documentation for this period of the language, with a synchronic description of its main features, and to situate diachronically this body of data within the development of Akkadian as a whole.

The documentary database for a linguistic study of Akkadian in the Ur III is most slender indeed: 101 texts (out of an immense corpus of some 40,000 Ur III tablets) and 381 personal names. (The latter figure is based on my count of names in transcription given by Hilgert on pp.741–747, considering as a single onomastic occurrence names with slightly different transcriptions. Other interesting figures given by the author include: 1800 linguistic items, p. 95, and 173 verbal roots with 364 verbal forms, p. 158). Its chronological and geographical distribution is also very circumscribed: an effective period of some 40 years from only some five southern cities – Girsu/Lagash, Ur, Umma, Puzrish-Dagan and Nippur (p. 17). And yet, on it the author builds a most extensive treatment, covering more than 800 pages, which include hundreds of footnotes and dozens of excursuses. In this light his caveat, that he could not provide a “complete documentation and discussion” (p. 3), seems almost ironic. The volume is indeed extremely thorough, and the limitations are to be attributed primarily to the nature of the corpus – most notably in the case of syntax, for which adequate pertinent contexts are simply missing.

The greatest contribution of this important volume lies in the thoroughness of the textual documentation and of the philological analysis. The first part is a long introduction in which four major portions stand out. (1) A history of previous research, with reference to both general grammatical works and specific comments on the linguistic position of Akkadian, with particular reference to the conclusions reached by Westenholz and Sommerfeld (pp. 10 and 14–15). – (2) An exhaustive presentation of the sources gives first a full bibliography of the some one hundred texts that can be considered to have been written in Akkadian (pp. 20–49). The bibliographical documentation of the personal names is instead reserved for an index (pp. 537–619), whereas the introduction gives a brief overview of onomastic patterns (pp. 51–54), and a more extensive discussion of orthographic variants (pp. 54–65) and of sandhi and crasis phenomena within names (pp. 65–79). The last type of sources consists of loanwords (listed on pp. 80–82, with some interesting observations of a general cultural and historical nature following on pp. 82–85). – (3) A brief discussion about methodology (pp. 87–96) supports especially the author’s choice to follow the “useful, even if only conventional, systematic and terminological” (p. 93) framework of von Soden’s great work in GAG and AHw., and it describes the author’s choices in his organization of the material. – (4) The major single linguistic conclusion is proposed in the long section on the linguistic position of Ur III Akkadian (pp. 97–170), where

it is argued that there is a major diachronic break between the Old Akkadian and the Ur III periods, with a detailed analysis of orthography and of the morphology of the verb.

The second part of the volume is the largest (pp. 171–500), and it contains a full treatment of the lexicon and morphology of the verb. The material is organized by type of root (strong, weak, irregular and quadriradical), and within that by pattern or stem (G, D, Š, N and derived), and finally by tense/mood. The reason for the great length of this section is that for each subcategory there is not only a list of the relevant items, but also a detailed discussion of the context (whether textual or onomastic) within which the relevant item occurs.

The third part (pp. 501–768) includes a set of most extensive indices: a tabular synopsis of verbal forms, a list of corrections to Gelb's MAD 3, the bibliographical references for the onomastic data bases, a sign list, and a topical index. (A digital publication of the material, to which the author occasionally refers, e.g. on p. 90, would of course make even easier a full utilization of the data base).

Considering how replete with detailed philological information the volume is, it would seem hardly possible to call attention to additional information that has not been considered. One such case is the important addition of one line to the inscription of Atalshen. The author cites this text on p. 49 on the basis of the two editions of FAOS and RIME, both of which inexplicably omit the last line, which reads *Sá-um-si-en DÍM* "Šaumšen made." This was called to attention by M. Salvini, *Le più antiche testimonianze dei Hurriti prima della formazione del regno di Mittanni*, in: *La civiltà dei Hurriti. La Parola del Passato* 55 (2000) 37 f., where one will find a full documentation of the collation, with a discussion of the epigraphic and linguistic details and of the cultural significance of this line. Another case is the omission, in the author's excursus on Tarām-Uram (p. 249f), of a reference to Tar'am-Agade, the daughter of Naram-Sin in Urkesh, for which see G. Buccellati/M. Kelly-Buccellati, *MDOG* 132 (2000) 139f. (and now also in Al-Gailani Werr *et al.* [eds.], *Of Pots and Plans. Papers ... Presented to D. Oates* [London 2002] 13–16). The Urkesh writing suggests that the first element, if interpreted as a verbal form, was in the preterit, hence "She loved Akkad." The subject of the third feminine may well refer to a deity, so that the full version of the name might read, e.g., *DN-*tar'am-Agade*, in which case the divine name would be omitted in the two specific names Tar'am-Agade and Tarām-Uram. This would follow a pattern similar to the one attested by the two names *Iṭib-šīnāt* and *Šū-Suen-iṭib-šīnāt* "He/Šu-Suen became well disposed towards them" (see p. 375 f.). Note that, if one follows this interpretation, the political inferences to be drawn from these particular personal names are of a different nature than if one assumes that the name-bearer is the subject of the verb.

In two respects, the organization of the material might possibly have been handled differently and more efficiently. The 101 texts listed on pp. 20–49 are treated in footnotes to the individual entries, in such a way that individual portions are given in transliteration and translation in function of a variety of topics. Thus a certain juridical text (ASJ 12 56) is first cited in the list of sources (p. 24); then the first four to nine lines are cited verbatim on four different occasions (pp. 419, 454, 484, 486), and the next four lines of the text are again quoted verbatim on three different occasions (pp. 192, 406, 483). One might have welcomed instead having a single citation of the entire text, along with the other texts: given the limited size of the corpus and the profound familiarity of the author with the texts, this would have yielded a very useful anthology which would also have provided a better appreciation of the full context within which each example could be seen. An analogous ad hoc treatment of personal names results in the fact that translations of the names are given in a rather non-systematic way, and one has to hunt them down to see what is

the author's grammatical understanding of a given name as succinctly conveyed by the translation.

The second point has to do with the large number of excursuses, all of which are extremely informative (and some of which are even nested within footnotes, e.g., n. 107 on p. 373). Their impact, however, is lessened by virtue of the fact that their central themes are hidden and wholly subordinated to the philological purpose for which they are introduced at a given particular juncture. Thus for instance an interesting long discussion about a matter of broader phonological relevance (treatment of intervocalic /r/) is buried in an excursus on a particular form of the imperative of verbs from strong roots (p. 195 f.). It is true that the topical index (pp. 684–697) is accurate and complete (the case just mentioned is referred to on p. 692), but such alphabetical listing does not do justice to the richness of the observations that are so laboriously amassed. One might wish to see the material presented in a structural fashion in a single chapter of the book, arranged according to the nature of the material discussed. More simply, the author could at least have given a title to each excursus, and/or provided a topical index arranged according to a logical sequence rather than merely alphabetically. This would have made the consultation of this massively informative work easier and more profitable.

I would like to conclude by considering an alternative interpretation of the differences between the Akkadian of the Sargonic and the Ur III periods, one which is adumbrated in the statements by Sommerfeld to which the author refers (pp. 14–15). Consider the following two points. On the one hand, there is growing evidence in favor of reducing considerably the extent of the chronological gap between the Sargonic and the Ur III period, in other words of the so-called Guti period. On the other, the geographical distribution of the relevant textual and onomastic material for the Sargonic and the Ur III evidence shows that the former is essentially based in central and northern Mesopotamia, and the latter in the south. So rather than a diachronic, we may have here a geographical differentiation. Were we to have more southern evidence in the Sargonic period, and more northern evidence in the Ur III period, the geographical distinction might possibly be shown to have obtained in fully contemporary, rather than in slightly sequential, contexts.

GIORGIO BUCCELLATI – Los Angeles

FLEMING, DANIEL E.: *Time at Emar. The Cultic Calendar and the Rituals from the Diviner's House.* (Mesopotamian Civilizations 11). Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000. xvi, 352 pp. 18 × 26 cm. ISBN 1-57506-044-2. Preis: \$ 48,50.

Das hier anzuzeigende Buch *Time at Emar* fokussiert die kalendarisch verankerten Rituale der Stadt Emar mit dem Ziel, einen lokalen Festkalender zu rekonstruieren. Verf. bietet eingangs (S. 13–47) einen Überblick über das Archiv des Beschwörungspriesters im Gebäude M₁, das nicht mit dem Tempel des ^dNIN.URTA, sondern als „Haus der Götter“ (*bit ili*)¹ zu identifizieren ist. Es enthält vornehmlich akkadische Urkunden, die kultische

¹ Die Bemerkung S. 36: „A temple devoted to the entire pantheon is unexpected“, ist in Hinblick auf die hethitischen Belege für É DINGIR.MEŠ (CHD P 279a) und die archäologischen Evidenzen des Tempels 1 in Ḫattuša zu relativieren, s. schon V. Haas/M. Wäfler, *Yazılıkaya und der Grosse Tempel*, *OrAnt.* 13 (1973) 214 ff.

Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie

Herausgegeben von
Walther Sallaberger
in Verbindung mit
U. Seidl · G. Wilhelm

Sonderdruck



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York