lord, [...]" should be "[by the de]stiny of the k[ing, my lord, ...]" (l. 10' [*ina ši*]*m-ti* ⌜*šá*?⌝ L[UGAL? EN-*iá x x x*]). **No. 156**: There are several square brackets missing in the translation of ll. 2'–4'; ⌜*a*⌝-*na* TIN Z[I.MEŠ-*šú*] / *be-lí a-na* ᵈ[U.GUR] / *u* ᵈ*la-a*[*ṣ* 0] should be "to [Nergal] and La[ṣ] for the preservation of [his] li[fe]," not "to Nergal and Laṣ 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 *lā* ("not"); see no. 112 above. In the glossary, *el-li* at the end of r. 5 is indexed incorrectly as *ellu* ("pure, holy"), instead of as *elû* ("to go up"). **No. 161**: DUMU ᵐZALÁG–ᵈ30 ("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 throneroom area of SW Palace of Kuyunjik) and historical information given in the text. **No. 165**: According to the translation of l. 12' ("their fear"), the transliteration should be ⌜*ni-kit-ti*⌝-*šu-nu*, not ⌜*ni-kit-ti*⌝ *šu-nu*; note that -*šunu* is written elsewhere in the letter as -*šú-nu* (ll. 3', 5', 6').

12. *Letters from Borsippa, Dilbat, and Bit-Dakkuri* (nos. 173–191). **No. 175**: *x*[*x x*]*x*.MEŠ in l. 8 is translated without explaination as "not do-nothings." **No. 182**: Change "for oath" to "fo[r oa]th" (r. 2 ⌜*a*⌝-*n*[*a* MU–DI]NGIR!). **No. 184**: Translate [*ki-i ap-la-hu*] in r. 3' as "[I was afraid that]" instead of "[Afraid that]." **No. 187**: Change "(his) [royal] throne" to "(his) royal throne" (l. 4 GIŠ.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 Nippur, not in the Sealand. **No. 197**: Change "our watch" to "[our] watch" (l. 11 EN.NUN-[*i-ni*]). **No. 201**: LÚ.GÚ.EN.NA (l. 1) is translated elsewhere in the volume as "the *šandabakku*," not as "the governor of Nippur."

SAA 18 is a professional treatment of the Neo-Babylonian correspondence of Esarhaddon and letters to Assurbanipal and Sîn-šarru-iškun 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

STEIN, Peter. — Die mittel- und neubabylonischen Königsinschriften bis zum Ende der Assyrerherrschaft. Grammatische Untersuchungen. (Jenaer Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient, 3). Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2000. (24 cm, 187). ISBN 3-447-04318-0. DM 118,00.

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 É-A und Verwandtes" (p. 27 f.), and "Der Wortauslaut in den Texten des frühen 1. Jahrt." (p. 48-51). The Anhang gives formulas in royal inscriptions, all verbal forms, and a corpus of the Kassite inscriptions (including that of Agumkakrime).

Reviews of this book are: G. Deutscher, ZA 91 (2001) 303-305; M.P. Streck, OLZ 96 (2001) 515-518; H. Schaudig, WZKM 91 (2001) 411-418.

*

*

MARZAHN, Joachim, et al. — Könige am Tigris. Assyrische Palastreliefs in Dresden. Katalogbuch zur Ausstellung der Skulpturensammlung im Albertinum, Dresden. 20. März – 29. September 2004. Verlag Philipp von Zabern GmbH, Mainz am Rhein, 2004. (23,5 cm, 120). ISBN 3-8053-3355-2: 3-8053-3357-9 (Museumausgabe).

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.

HETTITOLOGIE

CARRUBA, O., W. MEID (Hrsg.). — Anatolisch und Indogermanisch. Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Pavia, 22.-25. September 1998. Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, Innsbruck, 2001. (24 cm, 425). ISBN 3-85124-679-9. € 116,-.

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 *From the Realm 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-<aš> (205-38)), to very general statements (e.g. W. Euler's noninformative *Hethitisch und Rumänisch — zwei Außenseiter*

in ihren Sprachfamilien (57-68)). Some are of high quality (e.g. Th.P.J. van den Hout's *Neutral Plural Subjects and Nominal Predicates in Anatolian* (167-92)), while others 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.

I.-J. Adiego's *Lenición y accento 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, k*^{w} 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 (morae) 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 lenition rules, viz. lenition of a consonant when it is surrounded by two unaccented (low tone) morae, it involves a number of presumptions that are difficult to prove. Hardly anything is known about the Hittite accent, let alone whether it was a pitch accent and contained contours.

M. Furlan's *Hethitische Direktivendung* -ā̆ *und indoeuropäische Quellen* (93-118) deals with the origin of the Hittite directive (allative) ending -a, -ā. The origin has been much debated and Furlan gives an overview of the several suggested origins: *-o* (Dunkel 1994), *-oh₂* (Melchert 1994: 51f.), *-e* (Kuryłowicz 1935: 145, 147), *-eh₂* (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 wordfinal laryngeal (*-VH#* > -V# unconditionally). 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 *prah₂* and *proh₂*. In these forms then, Kuiper's rule sometimes took place again. Therefore, either their laryngeal is lost, yielding *prǎ* and *prǒ*, or their laryngeal was retained and the forms yielded *prā* and *prō*. In this way, Furlan is able to explain the outcomes *prě, prǒ, prǎ, prā* and *prō* out of the two original locative forms *preh₂* 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 pausa 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 pausa. 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 /pʰ/, *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* = /pʰ/ had become distinctively aspirated. This aspiration is then expressed in the geminate spelling. This would imply that *bʰ* = /bʰ/ had lost its aspiration at an early stage. Gamkrelidze further argues that the three series (*Tʰ, T'* and *Dʰ*) 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 *dʰi* > Hitt. *ti*. For the latter development no examples are given, however. To my knowledge, the only form that could justify the development *dʰi* > *ti* is *īt* 'go!' from *h₁idʰi*, although we do not know at what stage the final -*i* was lost. To base a conclusion about the preservation of the three series in pre-Hittite on this form alone perhaps is a bit too rash. Gamkrelidze regards the non-assibilation of *dʰi* as a fact, however, and offers a possible explanation for it. He assumes that the assibilation 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 assibilation take place in these series if it was more heavily aspirated than the *Dʰ*-series, where it supposedly was blocked by aspiration? Gamkrelidze's assumption could only be valid if we assume that this assibilation 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 assibilation of dentals before *i*: CLuw. ᴰ*Tiuat*- 'sun-god' ~ Hitt. *siuat*- 'day' < *diu-ot*-, CLuw. 3sg. ending -*ti* ~ Hitt. -*zi* < *-ti*. The assibilation 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 assibilation, 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. *hassanzi* 'they procreate' vs. (lenited) 3sg. *hāsi* '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 voicelesness.

To sum up: although I do believe that the Glottalic Theory in principle is right[1]), I do not think that Gamkrelidze's article will establish proof for it on the basis of the Anatolian material.

E. Rieken's *Enige Beobachtungen zum Wechsel* u/(u)ụa *in den hethitischen Texten* (369-80) gives an overview of several alternations in Hittite of -*u*- vs. -*(u)ụa*-. 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. *urāni*[2]) of the verb *ụar*- 'to burn' must be more original than the also attested *ụarāni* since middles originally had zero-grade in the stem. This implies that Rieken takes the form *ụarāni* as reflecting a full grade form. This is improbable, however, as full grade middles (e.g. *esa(ri)* 'to sit', *kīsa(ri)* 'to become') always show **e*-grade. We rather have to interpret both spellings, *urāni* as well as *ụarāni*, as attempts to write [u₍ₐ₎rāni] from the zero grade form **urH-ó*. On p. 375-6, regarding the word *auri-/auụari*- 'lookout, watchtower', a derivative of *au(s)-/u*- 'to see', Rieken states that the form *auụari*- must be primary as it occurs written thus twice in ŌS texts and is more common than the spelling *a-ú-ri*- in MH originals. She concludes that, besides the well-established suffix -*ri*- (*edri*- 'food' from *ed*- 'to eat', *esri*- 'shape, form' from *es*- 'to be'), we here are dealing with a suffix -*ari*-: *auụ-ari*-. Rieken's alleged OS attestations (KUB 39.49 i 9', iv 1'), however, are 'fraglich ob zu *auri*-' (HW² 632), and are spelled *a-ụa-ri*- instead of the regular form *a-ú-ụa-ri*- which we find in NH texts. Moreover, in my corpus of MH originals, I was not able to find a spelling *a-(ú-)ụa-ri*-, but did find the spelling *a-ú-ri*- 6 times. I therefore conclude that *auụari*- is not primary to *auri*-: we are dealing with the -*ri*-suffix, and the etymology *auri*- < **h₁óụ-ri*- (from *au(s)-/u*- 'to see') still stands.

Th.P.J. van den Hout's *Neuter Plural Subjects and Nominal Predicates in Anatolian* (167-92) beautifully deals with nominal plural nouns and their grammatical corresponding verbal and nominal predicate. Van den Hout shows that the syntactic rule that neuter plural subjects have corresponding verbal predicates in the singular is common Anatolian and must be inherited from PIE. In Hittite, it is also found that neuter plurals sometimes have corresponding nominal predicates in the singular, which is often considered as reflecting the PIE state of affairs, too. In this article, however, Van den Hout shows that the latter cannot be the case. The oldest state of affairs in Hittite is that neuter plural nouns correspond with nominal predicates that are in the plural. The rise of correspondence with singular predicate can be followed within the Hittite corpus, which implies that this is an inner-Hittite innovation.

B. Schulze-Thulin's *Zur* ḫi-*Konjugation von Fortsetzern urindogermanischer* -*o-éịe/o-Kausativa/Iterativa im Hethitischen* (381-94) deals with the fate of PIE causatives **CoC-éịe*- in Hittite. It is generally accepted that the *mi*-verbs

ụasse-[mi] 'to dress' and *lukke-*[mi] 'to lit' reflect the causatives **ụos-éịe*- and **louk-éịe*-. Schulze-Thulin remarks, however, that many **CoC-éịe*-formations are found in the Hittite ḫi-conjugation as well: *kānk-*[ḫḫi] 'to hang' ~ ON *hengja* 'to hang' < **konk-éịe*-; *lāg-*[ḫḫi] 'to bend' ~ Goth. *lagjan* 'to lay', OCS *ložiti* < **logʰ-éịe*- etc. Her concluding question, why some **CoC-eịe*-verbs are found in the Hittite *mi*-, and others in the *ḫi*-conjugation, is an important one. Unfortunately, she is not able to answer it.

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 consulting.

The title and outer appearance of the book clearly refer to the much celebrated 1979 volume *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch* (*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 *ụ*'s have turned into *1* (e.g. *a-ru-1a-an-zi*), in Katz' article we find ° instead of *ı* (*Yaz°ı°kaya*), whereas in Negri's article *ñ* appears as ™ (*ṭ*™*ātá-*).

Leiden University,   Alwin KLOEKHORST
January 2005

References

Hul = *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch. Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der Indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens* (edd. E. Neu, W. Meid), Innsbruck, 1979.
HW² = Friedrich, J., Kammenhuber, A., *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Zweite völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der editierten hethitischen Texte*, Heidelberg, 1975ff.
Beekes, R.S.P. 1994: Who were the laryngeals?, *In Honorem Holger Pedersen, Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 25. bis 28. März in Kopenhagen* (ed. J.E. Rasmussen), Wiesbaden, 449-454.
Dunkel, G.E. 1994: The IE Directive, *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch. Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich* (edd. G.E. Dunkel, G. Meyer, S. Scarlata, Ch. Seidl), Wiesbaden, 17-36.
Eichner, H. 1973: Die Etymology von heth. *mehur*, *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 31, 53-107.
Hajnal, I. 1992: Grieschisch χαμαί — ein Problem der Rekonstruktion, *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie. Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Leiden, 31. August - 4. September 1987* (edd. R.S.P. Beekes, A.M. Lubotsky, J.J.S. Weitenberg), Innsbruck, 207-20.
Kuiper, F.B.J. 1961: Zur kompositionellen Kürzung im Sanskrit, *Die Sprache* 7, 14-31.
Kuryłowicz, J. 1935: *Études Indoeuropéennes I*, Krakow.
Melchert, H.C. 1994: *Anatolian Historical Phonology*, Amsterdam - Atlanta.

---

[1]) We rather have to assume that voicedness was the default feature of the stops, so **t* = /t/, **d* = /t'/ and **dʰ* = /tʰ/, cf. Kortlandt apud Beekes 1994: 451f. The fortisness of /t/ vs. the laxness of /t'/ and /tʰ/ as reflected by the Anatolian geminate vs. single spelling, probably was PIE already.
[2]) The forms *urāni* and *ụarāni* show dissimilation from **u(a)rāri*.