lord, [...]" should be "[by the de]stiny of [the king, my lord, ...]" (l. 10' [ina šîmti'-šâd? L][UUGAL? EN-î x x]).
No. 156: There are several square brackets missing in the translation of 11. 2'-4': "[a]-na TIN ZILMEŠ-Si\H ] / be-li a-na 4 [L][UGUR] / u.ša-d[e] 0 should be "[to] [Nergal] and L[a]ś] for the preservation of [his] life," not "to Nergal and Läš for the preservation of [his] life."

11. Letters from or Relating to Babylon (nos. 158-172).
No. 159: la ("from") in r. 5 is an Aramaism, not the negative particle là ("not"); see no. 112 above. In the glossary, el-lâ at the end of r. 5 is indexed incorrectly as ellâ ("pure, holy"), instead of as elû ("to go up"). No. 161: DUMU "ZALAG-30 ("son of Nur-Sîn") in l. 3 is omitted in the translation.
No. 163: A post-Assurbanipal date is likely given the provenance of the letter (found in or near the throne room area). No. 165: According to the translation of l. 12' ("their fear"), the transliteration should be 'nî-kit-ti'-šû-nu, not 'nî-kit-ti'-šû-nu; note that šunu is written elsewhere in the letter as šâ-nu (l. 3", 5", 6').

12. Letters from Borsippa, Dilbat, and Bit-Dakkuri (nos. 173-191).
No. 175: x[x:x] MES in l. 8 is translated without explanation as "not do-nothings." No. 182: Change "for oath" to "for oath [of]" (r. 2' a-ñ-[a MU-\D] NJ\GIR!). No. 184: Translate [ki-i ap-Ia-hu] in r. 3' as [I was afraid that], instead of [I was afraid that]. No. 187: Change "his (his) royal throne" to "his (his) royal throne" (l. 4 GÎ.GU.ZA LUGAL-ú-ti).

13. Letters from Nippur (nos. 192-204). No. 193: x x x x x at the end of l. 8 is omitted in the translation. It is likely that a-kan-na? at the end of r. 7 should be translated as "here" instead of "there." If so, then Handiya was detained in the sea port, not in the Sealand. No. 197: Change "our watch" to "our watch" (l. 11 EN.NUN-[i-nî]). No. 201: LÜ.GU.EN.NA (l. 1) is translated elsewhere in the volume as the "sandabakku," not as the "governor of Nippur."

SAA 18 is a professional treatment of the Neo-Babylonian correspondence of Esarhaddon and letters to Assurbanipal and Sinšarru-iskun from northern and central Babylonia. Reynolds deserves our deepest gratitude for all of her hard work in providing reliable, up-to-date editions. The volume has benefited greatly from the high calibre research standards of its editor, namely her attention to detail and meticulous collation of the originals. The Babylonian Correspondence of Esarhaddon is not only an important and useful contribution to the field of Neo-Assyrian studies, but a much needed companion to CT 54.

Toronto, September 2004

Jamie R. Novotny

KORTE AANKONDIGINGEN


The main basis for this book are the royal inscriptions listed in J.A. Brinkman, MSKH, and those presented by G. Frame, RIMB 2. Discussed are orthography and phonology, morphology and syntax. Two excursuses: "Die Zeichenfolge E-A und Verwandtes" (p. 27 f.), and "Der Wortauslaut in den Texten des frühen 1. Jahrh." (p. 48-51). The Anhang gives formulas in royal inscriptions, all verbal forms, and a corpus of the Kassite inscriptions (including that of Agum-kakrime).


* * *


In 1862, Dresden bought London Assyrian reliefs, a purchase described in this book by K. Knoll. The reliefs were in the Soviet Union between 1945 and 1958. Only a few years ago, they were unpacked and a lost relief of the Vorderasiatisches Museum was found in the crates. The conservation of these monuments is described by R. Thiel. J. Marzahn, the main author of the book, gives a description of Kalach, modern Nimrud, and its buildings, where 460 orthostats were found in the palace of Assurnasirpal II. In Dresden there are now four inscribed reliefs and their backsides, invisible to the beholder, could also be inscribed. (p. 80). A careful description of these reliefs and the one from Berlin is given, with clear photos of details (p. 60-78). The standard inscription of Assurnasirpal appears on the reliefs and is given in translation (p. 78-81). At the end of the book follows a survey of inscribed foundation inscriptions on bricks, cones, wallknobs, etc. Examples from Berlin are illustrated and described in a catalogue.

HETTITLOGIE


Anatolisch und Indogermanisch contains the printed versions of the lectures given at the colloquium referred to in the title, the main theme of which was the relationship between the Anatolian language branch and the Indo-European proto-language.

The contributions are rather diverse, ranging from synchronic semantic research (e.g. S. Zeilfelder’s very interesting Zum Ausdruck der Finalität im Hethitischen (395-410)) to diachronic formal issues (e.g. J.E. Rasmussen’s thorough Redefinition of Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation: Problems of Reduplication (355-68)). From very detailed surveys (e.g. J.T. Katz’ rather fantastic Hittite ta-pa-ka-li-ya<s>n</s> (205-38)), to very general statements (e.g. W. Euler’s noninformative Hethitisch und Rumänisch — zwei Außenseiter
I.-J. Adiego's *Lenición y accent en protoanatolica* (11-18) looks closely at the lenition rules in Hittite as formulated by Eichner, who established that lenition of intervocalic /p, t, k/ took place after the accented long vowel (1973: 79) and between unaccented vowels (1973: 100). Adiego argues that if we would assume that Hittite had a pitch accent (high (H) vs. low (L) tone), in the latter position the lenited consonant would stand between two vowels (moraic) that have L pitch. He further assumes that the accented long vowel probably consisted of two morae of which one was H, the other L. Consequently, the accented long vowel was either HL (falling tone) or LH (rising tone). If we assume that the first situation was the case (HL = falling), then in both leniting positions (after long accented vowel = HL-T-L (T = any voiceless stop) and between unaccented vowels = L-T-L), the lenition would be due to the fact that the consonant is surrounded by two L (unaccented) morae. A typological parallel, Adiego argues, can be found in the Tibeto-Birman language Jingpho, where intervocalic consonants are voiced when the surrounding vowels both have a low tone. Although Adiego's line of thought would nicely lead to one single formulation of both Eichner's vocalic consonants are voiced when the surrounding vowels are not quite (e.g. M. Negri's superfluous *Further Observations on Indo-European 'Long' Sonants* (291-300)).

In this review I will discuss only a few contributions in detail.

J. Furlan's *Hethitische Direktivendung -a und inodieuropäische Quellen* (93-118) deals with the origin of the Hittite directive (allative) ending -a, -a. The origin has been much debated and Furlan gives an overview of the several suggested origins: *-a* (Dunkel 1974), *-uh* (Melchert 1994: 51ff.), *-e* (Kurylowicz 1935: 145, 147), *-eh* (Hajnal 1992: 213ff.). All of these reconstructed endings seem to have parallels in other IE languages, which all would semantically fit the Hittite directive. Furlan now tries to argue for one common origin of all these endings, which, in his view, yielded these outcomes by phonetic rules. His assumption is that the original locative ending was *-h2, which was preceded by either *-e- or *-o-. The phonetic rule that Furlan now enthusiastically applies is Kuiper's rule, which is interpreted by Furlan as an unconditioned loss of the postvocalic laryngeal (*-VHV > -VH conditionally)*. The scenario that he proposes runs as follows, taking the root *pr-* as an example. The PIE forms *preh2 and *proh2, which are equal in function, sometimes lost their final laryngeal (Kuiper's rule), yielding *pre and *pro, but sometimes kept their laryngeal and remained *preh2 and *proh2. The latter forms, after the coloration by the laryngeals, yield * pra h and *pro h. In these forms then, Kuiper's rule sometimes took place again. Therefore, either their laryngeal is lost, yielding *pra and *prö, or their laryngeal was retained and the forms yielded *pra and *prö. In this way, Furlan is able to explain the outcomes *pré, prö, pra, prö and prö* out of the two original locative forms *prech2 and *proh2.

This scenario is totally illicit. Kuiper's rule (1961) was formulated as an explanation of some forms in Sanskrit that showed short final vowel instead of the expected long ones. Kuiper established that these forms stood in pause or were followed by words beginning with a vowel, in which positions Kuiper assumes occasional loss of wordfinal postvocalic laryngeal. The only general PIE rule we perhaps could extract out of it is the loss of final laryngeals in vocative forms, as these always stood in pause. Furlan's proposal to use Kuiper's rule on such a wide scale, even applying it twice within a chronology, is methodologically totally unjustified.

T.V. Gamkrelidze's *Anatolian in light of the Glottalic Theory* (119-28) is a more serious piece. Gamkrelidze first explains the needs of typological arguments in reconstruction. This leads him to accept the Glottalic Theory, which in his definition is that PIE *p* actually was /p/, *b = /p/ and *bh = /bh/, etc. He then uses these interpretations to look at the Anatolian state of affairs. The fact that *p* in intervocalic position is written with geminate consonant, whereas *b* and *bh* are written with a single consonant, leads him to assume that *p = /p/ had become distinctively aspirated. This aspiration is then expressed in the geminate spelling. This would imply that *b* = /bh/ had lost its aspiration at an early stage. Gamkrelidze further argues that the three series (TH, T' and D) were still separated in pre-Hittite, as we can conclude from the different outcomes of the dentals before *i: *ti > Hitt. zi, *di > Hitt. si, and *di > Hitt. ti. For the latter development no examples are given, however. To my knowledge, the only form that could justify the development *di > ti is *it 'go!' from *hi*di, although we do not know at what stage the final -i was lost. To base a conclusion about the three series in pre-Hittite on this form alone perhaps is a bit too rash. Gamkrelidze regards the non-assibilation of *di* as a fact, however, and offers a possible explanation for it. He assumes that the assimilation was blocked by the aspiration between the stop and the vowel. This is in contradiction, however, to his first assumption that in pre-Hittite the voiceless series (which he interprets as *TH*) had become distinctively aspirated (which is expressed in the geminate spelling of these stops): why did assimilation take place in these series if it was more heavily aspirated than the D-series, where it supposedly was blocked by aspiration? Gamkrelidze's assumption could only be valid if we assume that this assimilation took place before the rise of distinctive aspiration in the TH-series, but this is contradicted by the facts as found in the other Anatolian languages: CLuw. shows geminate spelling of PIE voiceless stops as well (which, according to Gamkrelidze, reflects the distinctive aspiration of the voiceless series), but does not show assimilation of dentals before *i: CLuw. *tiya-at 'sun-god' ~ Hitt. siti 'day' *diya-t. *situ-at, *siti 'sun-god' ~ Hitt. *siti > Hitt. *siti < *ti. The assimilation therefore must be a specific Hittite development and consequently cannot antedate the assumed rise of distinctive aspiration of the voiceless series, which must be already Proto-Anatolian as is shown by the geminate spelling of it both in Hitt. and CLuw.

Further, Gamkrelidze assumes that the outcome s of *di indicates that *d = /t/ was still voiceless at the time of assimilation, as it yielded a voiceless s. I do not think this argument is valid. The consonant s is used in spelling for a voiceless as well as a voiced sibilant. The opposition between e.g. (unlenited) 3pl. *hassanz* 'they procreate' vs. (lenited) 3sg. *häzi 'he procreates' must be interpreted as one of tense =
voiceless (-ss-) vs. lax = voiced (-s-). A spelling s- at the
beginning of words (where no gemination could be written)
cannot be used as proof for voicelessness.

To sum up: although I do believe that the Glottalic The-
ory in principle is right\)\), I do not think that Gamkrelidze's
article will establish proof for it on the basis of the Anatol-
ian material.

E. Rieken's *Enige Beobachtungen zum Wechsel u/(u)ya
in den hethitischen Texten* (369-80) gives an over-
view of several alternations in Hittite of -ur- vs. -(u)ya-. Although
many of her observations are convincing, I do not agree
with all of the examples she cites. On p. 371, it is stated
that the form 3sg.pres. urani\) of the verb yar- 'to burn'
however, are 'fraglich ob zu auri-' (HW 632), and are
syntactic rule that neuter plural subjects have corre-
sponding nominal pred-
ates in the singular, which is often considered as reflecting
voicelesness.

To sum up: although the quality of the articles varies
strongly, the overall impression is that this book contains
enough interesting articles and new insights to be worth con-
Semi-irregulars are much more frequent in the hi-conjugation, is an impor-
tant one. Unfortunately, she is not able to answer it.

The title and outer appearance of the book clearly refer to
the much celebrated 1979 volume *Hethitisch und Indoger-
manisch (Hul)* in which many important articles were
published. Unfortunately, the over-all quality of the present
volume cannot touch the latter work. The first thing that
attracts attention when only superficially looking at the book's
contents, is its bad typesetting. We would expect that in the 20
years between *Hul* and the present volume the methods of
printing would have evolved to a great extent, but almost the
opposite seems to be the case. Not only are the fonts often
unattractive to read (especially the italics), we encounter
many printing errors as well: in Furlan's article, all y's have
turned into l (e.g. a-lu-la-an-zi), in Katz' article we find o
instead of i (Ya-zöykaya), whereas in Negri's article n appears
as *Tm* (Tmā-tā*).