Zusammenhang stand, lässt sich aus der Tatsache ableiten, dass Asarhaddon die Babylonier zur Anlage von Gärten und Bewässerungskanälen aufforderte.

Die Kapitel III und VIII untersuchen die Aussagen der Rechts- und Wirtschaftstexte sowie der Urkunden. Die mittelassyrischen Gesetze enthalten zwei Paragraphen (§§ 17 und 18), die die Bewässerung von Feldern durch Brunnenbzw. Regenwasser regeln. Dadurch wird erneut unterstrichen, dass beide Arten in Assyrien von Bedeutung waren. Als Bewässerungsverfahren diente die Überstauungsbewässerung, also das Sammeln des Wassers und die Überflutung der Felder. Briefe und Urkunden berichten über Instandhaltungsarbeiten an Kanälen, das Graben von Brunnen und das Bewässern der Felder. Sie unterscheiden zwischen Feldern, die durch Gravitationsfluss bewässert wurden (*bīt šīqi*) und solchen, bei denen Wasserschöpfeinrichtungen zum Einsatz kamen (*bīt dalu*). Leider sind wir über diese Einrichtungen nur schlecht informiert, da Kanäle nur selten erwähnt werden und Schöpfgeräte gar nicht. Die Methoden des Wasserhebens scheinen sich aber nur marginal von jenen unterschieden zu haben, die heute in der traditionellen Landwirtschaft Vorderasiens zum Einsatz kommen: Riemenscheiben oder Seilwinden bei Brunnen, daneben auch Zugrollen und Göpelräder sowie Schöpfbäume und Wasserräder an Flüssen. Als Wasserquellen dienten in erster Linie Brunnen, daneben Quellen und Zisternen, aber auch Sammelbecken und Teiche. In den Anlagen des Buches findet sich ein reicher textkritischer Apparat. Auf den Seiten 287-358 wird das relevante Textmaterial in Umschrift Übersetzung und Kommentar geboten. Warum die in standardisierten Bearbeitungen in RIMA 1 und RIMA 2 vorliegenden Königsinschriften im Volltext angeführt werden, bleibt unklar. Diese Vorgangsweise stellt gleichsam die Sinnhaftigkeit von Großprojekten wie des *Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Projects* in Frage. Wozu werden Standardeditionen publiziert, wenn man sie nicht bei derartigen Untersuchungen verwendet? Hier hätten Übersetzungen der relevanten Textpassagen im Fließtext gereicht, allenfalls mit Erläuterungen, was anders zu deuten ist als in RIMA. Das Glossar auf den Seiten 359-382 erweist sich als äußerst nützlich, vor allem bei Fragen der diachronen Verteilung von Lexemen. Auf 84 Tafeln findet sich das gesamte im Text angeführte Bild- und Kartenmaterial. Ausführliche Register und Konkordanzen erschließen den Band und machen ihn zu einem leicht verwendbaren Referenzwerk.

Graz, September 2002   Hannes D. GALTER

KORTE AANKONDIGINGEN

TCHERNICHOVSKY, S., D.P. JACKSON. — The Epic of Gilgamesh. A Myth revisited. Bolchazi-Carducci Publishers, Wauconda, 2001. (34 cm, 192). ISBN 0-86516-527-0. $79.99.

The lavish book was inspired by the Epic of Gilgamesh. An essay by D.S. Kahn, "The Epic of Gilgamesh as a Journey of Psychological Development", introduces the book, an "appreciation" by J.G. Keenan follows. After this, an English verse rendition by D.P. Jackson is given, and a Hebrew rendition by the poet S. Tchernichovsky (1875-1943). The paintings made by Zeev Raban (1890-1970) in 1954 reproduced in the book are commented by G. Ofrat.

HETTITOLOGIE

PUHVEL, Jaan — Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Vol. 4: Words beginning with K. (Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 14). Verlag Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1997. (23 cm, 333). ISBN 3-11-014919-2 DM 248,-.

PUHVEL, Jaan — Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Vol. 5: Words beginning with L. Indices to Volumes 1-5. (Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 18). Verlag Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2001. (23 cm, X, 187). ISBN 3-11-016931-2 DM 256,-.

With the two volumes under review Jaan Puhvel has added two more letters to the series of his impressive *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*.[1]) The K-volume is especially welcome since it fills one of the much felt gaps in the lexicographic tools in the field of Hittitology: with A through Ḫ (in part) covered by the München-based Hethitisches Wörterbuch (HW²), L through Š (in part) by the Chicago Hittite Dictionary (CHD), and T by Tischler's Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar (HEG), Hittitologists had only the glossaries by Friedrich and Tischler to consult for K and U-Z. For K that situation has been remedied for now and the volume in question "seems fated to be the one extensive K-lexicon for some time to come" as Puhvel himself notes in the Preface. For the letter L Puhvel could draw on the CHD for his material and provides an occasion for some updates and corrections. Useful are the cumulative indices for vols. 1-5 at the end of the L-volume (pp. 147-187, from Adygh to Welsh) of words referred to from languages other than Hittite. Hopefully, an index of Hittite words not included in the head words will be given once the entire alphabet has been covered.

The format of these two volumes largely remains that of the previous ones and I refer to my earlier reviews in BiOr. 44 (1987) 727-733 (vols. 1-2), and ibid. 54 (1997) 727-734 (vol. 3) for pertinent remarks on the lay-out and related matters. The only real flaw is the persisting confusion in the K-volume of correct and incorrect readings of the Hieroglyphic Luwian (HLuw.) signs HH 209-210 *i* and *ia* (used to be *a* and *ā*) as well as 376-377 *zi* and *za* (used to be *i* and *ī*): compare the lemma *ka-* "this (one)" etc. where on p. 11 after the Cuneiform Luwian demonstratives *zinzi*, *zinza* (nom. and acc.pl.c.) and *zā* (nom.-acc.pl.n.) the corresponding HLuw. forms are given as "*zai*" and "*zā*" (instead of the correct *zanzi* and *zaya*), with the "newer reading *za* for "*ī*."" However, the overall high quality of the work has been maintained and having had to write the K-volume practically from scratch the author deserves our greatest admiration and gratitude. The following remarks are therefore merely marginal and do not in any way intend to disparage the overall high praise for this accomplishment.

kaena- (K 12): the famous punishment of Šarmaššu and Nunnu in the so-called Palace Chronicle (*š⸗an ᵐŠarmaššui ᵐNunnūi⸗ya ša-ku-wa-aš-ma ḫuēkta*) is perhaps less cruel in Puhvel's rendering ("and [the king's spearman] stuck his (i.e. Nunnu's relative by marriage; tvdh) eyes and those of S.and N.") but makes less sense in the larger context and is

grammatically impossible with an alleged "zeugma of partitive apposition and dative of reference." The nom.-acc.pl.n. of the possessive pronoun of the third person pl. is -*šme/it* and not -*šma*. Emendation and parsing into *šakuwaš≈šma‹š›* is the only solution: "and he slaughtered him before Šarmaššū's and Nunnū's eyes" (cf. P. Dardano, L'aneddoto 32f., 86).

kaka- (K 14): for the "unclear" *ga-ag-ga-aš-za* in KUB 19.20 rev. 18 see ZA 84 (1994) 80f.

kaluti- (K 33): KUB 30.51 rev. 30 correctly reads: 3 *ka-l[u-t]i-uš-ša-kán* ŠA [...].

kalwes(se)na- (K 35): a nom.sg. is attested in KUB 59.15 i 6 *kal-ú-i-iš-ša-ni-š(a-kán)* and KUB 58.34 iii 19 *kal-ú-i-ša-né-eš-š(a-kán)*.

ganes(s)-, kanes(s)- (K 43): in the quote from KUB 30.10 (3rd line from top) it should say *šakḫi* (instead of "sakki").

kanka(n)ti- (K 52): KBo 34.96 obv. 3 offers a further spelling variant *ka-an-ga-a-ti*.

kapart-, kapirt- (K 59): the "]UZU *kapirtas* ŠA É.NA₄ 'mouse-meat of the mortuary shrine'" probably does not exist and the passage has to be interpreted differently because of the -*i[a* following É.NA₄ in KBo 31.27 ii 10. The entire passage may have to be read as follows: HSM 3644:8-10 (cf. H.G. Güterbock, JCS 19 (1965) 33) + KUB 30.45 ii 1-2 (dupl. KBo 7.74 + KBo 31.27 ii 9-11) [x *ṬUP-PU ma-]ʹaʹ-an* UN-*aš Ú-UL šu-up-pí-iš* K[A₅.A (dupl. K[A₅!) ...] / ʹUZU MÁŠ?ʹ.x [(or: ʹANŠEʹ.x?) o?] UZU *ka-pí-ir-ta-aš* ŠA É.NA₄-*i[a* ...] / *na-aš-ma-aš* ʹ*šu*ʹ[-*u]p-pí-iš nu-uš-ši ku-iš-k[i (ki-i a-da-an-ʹnaʹ) pāi]* "[x-th tablet: W]hen an unclean person [eats] f[ox meat(?), ...], meat of a ..., meat of a mouse/rat an[d ...] of the mausoleum [?] or (if) it is a clean person but someone [gives] him this to eat, [...]." For a possible dat.-loc.sg. *ka-pár-ti* see now KBo 31.107:7 (MS), already quoted by E. Rieken, StBoT 44, 153 (as 607/d).

kapina- (K 65): a further verb form is now attested in KBo 31.91:9 *ka-pí-na-at-tén*.

karat- (K 76): for another acc.sg. see now *ga-ra-da-an* KBo 31.221+:8.

kar(a)p-, karapp-, karpiya- (K 92f.): a 3.sg.pres. *kar-ap-pa-zi* is attested in KUB 59.60 iii 6.

karuhala- (K 115): compare ᴳᴵˢ*kaʹ-a-ru-ʹúʹ*ʼ[- KUB 59.41 iii 8 = ᴳᴵˢ*ka-a-ru-ú-ʹhaʹ*[(-) KUB 59.42 rev. 3.

katter(r)a- (K 133): the existence of the adj. *katterizzi-* "lower" etc. (so too P. Cotticelli in M. Ofitsch/Chr. Zinko, *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz* (Graz 2000), 35) is doubtful. In its sole occurrence KBo 24.71:11 (*kat-te-ʹriʹ*[o]x) the sign rest after the break does not look like ZI. The restoration to [DIN]GIR.MEŠ by N. Boysan-Dietrich, THeth. 12, 128f. seems more attractive: "[... in/at the u]pper [door socket], in/at the lower door socket the gods in the dark earth [...]."

genu- etc. "knee" (K 150): a nom.pl.c. *ginušarriranteš* is attested in KBo 17.105 iv 11 *g]i[-n]u-šar[-r]i-an-te-eš*.

genu- etc. "open (up)" (K 151): a 1.sg.prs. is now attested in KBo 38.237:11 *ki-i-nu-mi*.

kuk(k)ul(l)a- (K 233): a dat.-loc.pl. is attested in KBo 10.27 iv 31 *parā≈ma ku-ʹgul-li-iaʹ-aš* "furthermore to/in the *k*. she (i.e., the NIN.DINGIR priestess)(pours a libation)"; for the immediately preceding context cf. S. Pierallini/M. Popko, Eothen 9, 122. The form is important, since it proves the reality of an *i*-stem *kugulli-*, which suggests that the nom.pl. [URUD]U?*ku-ku-li-e-eš* (KBo 21.1 i 29) is not "*kukulēs*" but *kukuliēš*. For the phenomenon see E. Rieken, HS 107 (1994) 42-53.

kurak(k)i- (K 262): in further support of the equation *kurakki-* = ᴳᴵˢDÌM one could point at the occurrence of the latter in the MUŠ oracle fragment KUB 49.1 i 23 and *kurakki-* in KUB 49.2 i 11, 12, 23, 28. Although Hoffmann, HS 113 (2000) 176-180, is right, that the texts KUB 7.2 (w. dupls.) and KUB 41.3 (w. dupl.) are parallel versions rather than duplicates, the passages in which dat.-loc. *šarḫuli* (KUB 7.2 i 13) and *ANA* ᴳᴵˢDÌM (KUB 41.3 obv. 18) occur respectively, match like normal duplicates including the inversion of ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ and ᴳᴵˢGIGIR.MEŠ=ŠU (KUB 7.2 i 12 = KUB 41.3 obv. 16). Otten's, IM 19/20 (1969-1970) 85-91, equation *šarḫuli-* = ᴳᴵˢDÌM therefore also still stands and the latter could apparently be used for both Hittite words.

kuway(a)- (K 302): for the Hluw. stem as *kwis-* instead of "hwis" see already, J.D. Hawkins/A. Morpurgo Davies, Kadmos 32 (1993) 56.

kurutawant- (K 286f.): see also BiOr. 52 (1995) 565-569.

lah(h)u(wa)- (L 16-25): one of the surprises of the Hurrian-Hittite Bilingual was the unequivocal evidence (for another passage already known cf. E. Neu, StBoT 32, 144 n. 96) that this verb could also be used for pouring metals to cast objects as duly noted by Puhvel. One wonders whether we should now reinterpret likewise the curse formula in the Šaḫurunuwa-Urkunde (*kuiš≈ma kī ṬUPPU ANA* ᵈU ᵁᴿᵁ*Hatti peran arḫa dā[i ...] / našma≈at arḫa laḫūwai* "but whoever takes this tablet away from before the Stormgod of Hatti [...] or 'pours' it away/out") as the melting down of a metal tablet as a means of destruction. Referring to J. Friedrich's, HW 125 ("durch Begießen vernichten") F. Imparati, RHA 32 (1974) 39 (cf. her commentary ibid. 147) translated "ma colui che ... la alteri umettandola"; cf. similarly R. Haase, THR 72 ("indem er sie durch Befeuchten vernichtet"). This would mean that the "original" of the Šaḫurunuwa-Urkunde, or "engrossed copy" in archival terms, had been cast in metal and deposited in the temple before the Stormgod as the immediate context of the curse formula says. The clay copies that we have from the nearby store rooms surrounding the Temple building must have been either drafts or transcripts. For a 1.sg.pres. *la-a-ḫu-mi* see KBo 32.176 obv. 16.

lak-, lakai- (L 34 and 35): the well-known passage from one of the benedictions for the Labarna (*nu≈z≈apa utniyanza hūmanza iškiš≈(š)met* [Puhvel's emendation to ‹š› is unnecessary] *anda* ᵁᴿᵁ*Hattuša lagan ḫard[u]*) is translated by Puhvel: "may every land lie supine ... within [the realm of] Hattusas." Although his interpretation of *iškiš≈(š)met* as a partitive apposition may indeed be better than the CHD translation (L-N 17f.), the overall understanding of the passage calls for a bending forward rather than an inactive lying supine. The best interpretation of the difficult passage from the Royal Funerary Ritual, KUB 30.19+ i 14 *n≈an≈šan ANA* ᴳᴵˢBANŠUR *akkantaš anda laknūwanzi* (Puhvel: "they lay it at the bier of the deceased", CHD L-N 17f. s.v. *laknu-* "They bend (i.e. train) it in and around the table of the deceased") may be that of A. Kassian et al., AOAT 288, 478f. ("and they lean it against the table of the deceased"). Certainly, at any rate, we are dealing with a table and not the bier here.

laman, lamn- (L 52): instead of a "suffixless locative" for the variant *lamman(≈ma≈mu)* in KUB 31.127 iii 6 (cf. KUB 30.11+ iii 16f. *namma≈mu≈ššan lamni≈mi šer aššu[l / natt]a išduwari* "over my name divine favor is [n]o longer manifest") an acc. of respect "as far as (my) name is concerned, over me divine favor etc.) seems more attractive in view of the relative rarity of the endingless locative and the fact that

they are mostly if not exclusively found with words already themselves denoting a place in time or space.

le (L 74-77): a "'genetic' or typological tie between Hitt. *le* and the Uralic prohibitive" sounding far-fetched, the most likely explanation for the Hitt. prohibitive particle in my opinion is N. Oettinger's proposal, GsPedersen 310, of a dissimilation of two subsequent nasals as in **naman › laman* "name." Oettinger mentions the frequent collocations *lē∻man* and *lē∻mu* as the forms triggering the change of **nē › lē*.

lelhu(wa)- etc. (L 81): a 1.sg.pres. may be attested in *li-i]l-ḫu-u-wa-mi* KBo 35.184 rev.? 19 (compare the likewise *-mi* conjugation form *lāḫumi* quoted above).

leliwant-, liliwant- (L 83f.): add the 1 and 2.sg.pres. *li-li-wa-aḫ-ḫ[a-a]ḫ-ḫi* and *li-li-wa-aḫ-ti* in KBo 32.202 rev. 20 and 11 respectively.

leti-, liti- (L 98): unp. 139/d is now published as KBo 31.106.

lukkatt- (L 108-111): the new Middle Hittite (MS) attestation *lu-uk-ki-it-ta(-ma)* KuT 50:27, 40 (ed. G. Wilhelm, MDOG 130 (1998) 184, 186 w.n. 30) pleads against Puhvel's purely nominal interpretation through a noun *lukatt-* "(day)light, daybreak, dawn" etc. Note that until now all spellings but one were written with the KAT sign which, however, also has a KIT₉ reading esp. frequent in *∻ške*-forms. The one exception *lu-uq-qa-ti* KBo 13.208 r.col. 2 (NS) could be read *-kat!-ti* and is anyhow too late and too much of an exception to be taken very serious at this moment. The new MS form with *-ki-it-* is of great importance and seems to confirm the verbal interpretation of the form (see Puhvel for details). The apocopated form *lukat*, which is attested in NS texts only, must have been formed in analogy to *šiwat*/UD-*at* "by day."

luli(ya)- (L 111f.): a nom.sg. *lu-li-ia-aš* is attested in KUB 52.91 iii 3, cf. CHD L-N 421a s.v. (:)*naduwant-*.

lumpasti-, lup(p)asti- (L 118f.): one should add here (and to H.C. Melchert, CLL) the Luwian 𒀉 *lu-up-pa-aš-du-wa-li-in-zi* KUB 60.137:11.

lupan(n)i-, luwanni- (L 120): note the new acc.(?)pl. *lu-pa-an-ni-uš(-ma ŠA* LUGAL) KBo 40.339 rev. 8.

Chicago, November 2002   Th.P.J. VAN DEN HOUT

OUDE TESTAMENT

WITTE, Markus. — Die biblische Urgeschichte (BZAW 265), Verlag Walter de Gruyter & Co, Berlin 1998. (23 cm, XII, 388). ISBN 3-11-016209-1; ISSN 0934-2575. DM 198,-.

The purpose of this study is to examine the redactional relationship between Jahwistic and Priestly parts in the history of origins, Genesis 1-11. It is argued that both parts were not simply put together, but that a redactor-author edited these parts by adding quite a number of passages in order to harmonize or to tie together the J and P narratives. After an introductory chapter (Ch. I, pp. 1-52), Ch. II presents a detailed redaction critical analysis of Gen. 1-11 (pp. 53-229). It forms the basis for the following ones: Ch. III, about the theology of the final redactor (pp. 231-286), and Ch. IV, about the question to which passages in the Old Testament the theology of the final redactor might be related, and about the question of historical references in the passages which

were formulated by the final redactor (pp. 287-331). The redaction critical analysis results in the following hypothesis: some passages are considered as "endredaktionelle Brücken" (2:4; the addition of *elohim* to the divine name in 2:4-3:32; 4:25-26; 6:1-4), whilst others are seen as "endredaktionelle Erweiterungen" (3:22, 24b; additions in 9:19ff.; in ch. 10, and in 11:1-9). The same chapter (II) further offers a discussion of the P narratives as a literary source, and of the J-strand. The latter which is only to be found in Gen. 2:4b-8:22*, is characterized as "eine weisheitliche Lehre vom Menschen" (p. 200). The theology of the final redactor is dealt with in Ch. III. It is suggested, among other things, that the paradise story contains hidden allusions to the temple of Jerusalem. In Ch. IV, the final redaction is dated to the end of the fourth century B.C., on the grounds of OT parallels (Chronicles, Qoheleth) and of historical references (the Japheth saying in Gen. 9 and the story of Gen. 11:1-9 are taken as referring to the time of Alexander the Great [for Gen. 11: cf. the unsuccesful attempt of Alexander to reconstruct the tower of Babel]).

The argument of Witte is based on a very detailed analysis of several passage in Gen. 1-11, mainly passages which have been ascribed to J. It is not possible to discuss the many arguments involved. A few comments may suffice. One of the texts which, according to Witte, belongs to the "third" hand (the final redactor), is Gen. 2:4. His primary argument is that v. 4a originally was a heading (cf. the other *toledot*-clauses in Genesis), and not a kind of subtitle as it is now. One could also argue that the priestly author put v. 4a at the end of his creation story on purpose, in order to create a connection with the beginning of the J-story of 2:4bff. This option has the advantage of making things less complicated. Another passage which is ascribed to the final redactor, is Gen. 3:22, where it is said that man has become "like one of us, knowing good and evil". In this case too, one wonders whether this passage should be seen as a later addition, because it fits the story very well: Someone who eats of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, will, of course, get the all-embracing knowledge involved, the result being that man is like "one of us", i.e. like one of the heavenly beings (not "gottähnlich", as Witte puts it [p. 80]) (cf. 2 Sam. 14:17, 20). It thus seems to be part of the logic of the story, which at the same time confirms the wisdom of the serpent.

The redaction critical analysis, which forms the basis of the whole argument of the study under review, is based on a very strict view of coherence and consistency in a given text. One wonders whether such a strong emphasis on coherence reflects more a "western" than an "eastern" idea. Be this as it may, the method applied raises questions since the resulting theory is of such a complicated nature that it is less likely to be plausible. One would prefer, therefore, a more sober type of redaction criticism, combined with a stronger emphasis on a narrative or rhetorical analysis of a given text. In addition, as Gen. 1-11 contains so many motifs and traditions from Mesopotamia, a discussion of the stories involved also ask for a reading of them against a wider religio-cultural background. As I have argued elsewhere, such a reading of Gen. 11:1-9 makes good sense, which also favours the idea of this story as being a coherent text.[1]

---

[1] A. van der Kooij, The Story of Genesis 11:1-9 and the Culture of Mesopotamia, BiOr 53 (1996), cols. 28-38.