

Marek I. Baraniak, *Zjawisko targumizacji na podstawie Targumu do Pieśni nad Pieśniami. Krytyczna edycja tekstu z manuskryptu M 1106 z analizą egzegetyczno-hermeneutyczną i tłumaczeniem* [The Phenomenon of Targumization based on the Targum to the Song of Songs. A Critical Edition of the Manuscript M 1106 with Exegetical and Hermeneutical Analysis and Translation], Elipsa, Warszawa 2013, 356 pp.

Codex *M 1106* in the collections of the Wrocław University Library was given on September 19th, 1703, by Wit Ferdinand Mudrach to the Gymnasium library of the Evangelical church of St. Magdalene in Wrocław (Breslau) and it was transferred in 1865 to the city's Municipal Library. Then, in 1947, it was passed on to the Wrocław University Library. The colophon states explicitly that the manuscript was copied by Meshullam, a cousin of Rab Yosef, son of Kalonymus, and that it was vocalized and provided with the *masorah* by Yosef, son of Kalonymus, who completed his work in [4]998, i.e. in 1237/8 A.D. The codex contains the Torah with the Targum Onqelos, the *haftarot* without Aramaic version, the Five Megillot, the Psalms, the Book of Job, and the Book of Proverbs, all with their Targum, then the Book of Daniel, the Book of Ezra-Nehemiah, and the Chronicles, without any Targum. The description of the codex, which was never published, is given by M.I. Baraniak in an article written in English, “*Advortite animum lectores – hic Deus habitat*”. *The Manuscript M 1106 from the Collections of the Wrocław University Library*, “*Studia Judaica*” 13 (2010), pp. 221–235, and in the book under review (pp. 84–98).

The critical edition of the Targum to the Song of Songs with its full vocalization (pp. 108–172) is a unique achievement in recent Polish Semitics. It is preceded by a history of the interpretation of the Song of Songs (pp. 15–46), by a presentation and discussion of the Targumic practice, of the aim of the Targums, of the translation techniques, and of the relation between the Targums and the Christian exegesis of the Bible (pp. 46–71). The chief characteristic of the Targums to the Five Scrolls, the Song of Songs in particular, is their extensive use of periphrases and comments. We certainly should not impose our criteria of proper translation upon the ancient translators, especially when they offer an allegoric reinterpretation of the original work.

The Targum to the Song of Songs is known in two traditions. The Western one is recognizable by the Palestinian genitive particle *dy* and by the accusative mark *yt*. It is closer to the original version, which was most likely Palestinian. A text belonging to this tradition was already published by Jacob b. Ḥayyim in Bomberg's Rabbinic Bible (1524–1525) and by Paul de Lagarde, *Hagiographa chaldaice*, Leipzig 1872, pp. 145–163. An edition of the Paris *BN Hébr. 110* was issued by C. Alonso Fontela, *El Targum al Cantar de los Cantares*, Madrid 1986, and a facsimile edition of the Codex Urbinati 1 was provided by E. Levine, *The Targum of the Five Megillot*, Jerusalem 1977. The Eastern tradition is represented mainly by Yemenite manuscripts from the 14th or 15th century with supralinear vocalization.

M.I. Baraniak deals with the history of the Targums to the Song of Songs, listing and classifying the various manuscripts and editions (pp. 73–83). Then he describes the

codex (pp. 84–98) and presents the parallel versions of the Targum in the Paris manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale, *Hébr. 110*, in the Ms. *Or 1302* and Ms. *Or 2375* of the British Library, in the *Urbinates Ebr. 1* of the Vatican Library, and in de Lagarde's edition in *Hagiographa chaldaice* (pp. 98–106). A short explanation of the diacritical signs in the printed text (pp. 106–107) precedes the edition with a full *apparatus criticus* referring to the manuscripts presented on pp. 99–104 and to the de Lagarde's edition (pp. 108–172). Baraniak's edition is followed by a detailed study aiming at classifying the Targum of the codex *M 1106* (pp. 173–186). It belongs undoubtedly to the Western tradition, generally different from the Yemenite one. The Author places it in the *stemma codicum* before *Urbinates Ebr. 1*.

The third part of the book offers a Polish translation of the Targum with a rich commentary presented in the footnotes (pp. 187–253). Finally, the phenomenon of the Targum to the Song of Songs is discussed at large and the allegoric interpretation of its various parts is explained (pp. 255–325). A detailed examination is not possible here and would be pointless. The Targum, as it stands in *M 1106*, appears as a literary composition rather than a simple writing down of an oral, synagogal tradition.

An important question is the date of the Targum. M.I. Baraniak notes that all the commentators situate the Targum to the Song of Songs between the 5th and the 8th century A.D. However, the opinion of authors is no scientific argument, what some young historians of Antiquity do not seem to grasp. One ought to examine the validity of the reasons why a determined opinion is formulated. M.I. Baraniak thus examines the external and internal arguments, philological, religious, literary, and historical (pp. 269–273). The *terminus ante quem* at the end of the 11th century is provided by a quotation in the *Aruch* of Nathan ben Jehi'el of Rome and by the use of the Targum by Tobias ben Eliezer of Castoria (Bulgaria) in the midrash *Leqaḥ tōb*, both from the early 12th century. A *terminus post quem* is suggested by the synagogal reading of the Targum, attested among the Karaites in the 8th century, but its earlier use is quite possible.

The linguistic argument is not used by the Author, because he considers the language of the Targum as a late, mixed Aramaic dialect (pp. 263–265). However, a detailed and systematic analysis is required here, what was not done until now, although Philip S. Alexander rightly noticed that the text is basically written in Galilean or Palestinian Aramaic. Author's grammatical observations on pp. 184–185 do not characterize the dialect.

The probable reference to the Talmud in 1:2 may allude to the Palestinian Talmud, achieved toward the end of the 5th century. If the Babylonian Talmud was meant, a *terminus post quem ca. 800 A.D.* should be proposed. The loanwords may be useful for establishing the chronology, if they appear to be borrowed recently. The Author refers to them on pp. 265–267, but without examining their first appearance in Aramaic. Now, some borrowings go back to the first millennium B.C. Arabic loanwords are more significant, but they are concentrated in 5:14 (p. 267, cf. pp. 279–293), with a possible case in 1:12. It is a weak basis for the dating of the whole composition. Also religious and literary subjects like the mention of the Messiah, son of Ephraim, and of the Messiah, son of David (4:5), may come from earlier traditions. Only the reference to Jewish wanderings

between the sons of Esau and the sons of Ishmael in 1:7c can imply the division of the Levant between the Byzantine and Arab Empires in the 7th/8th centuries B.C. The origins of the Targum may thus be looked for in Palestine, in the ambient of the Tiberias Academy, most likely in the early period of Islam, i.e. around the 8th century A.D., when Aramaic was still a spoken language in Palestine.

The summarizing conclusion of the book (pp. 327–331) is followed by a bibliography (pp. 332–346), an index of quoted authors (pp. 347–350), and a substantial English summary (pp. 351–356). Notwithstanding the somewhat scant linguistic approach to the text, M.I. Baraniak's book is, no doubt, a high standard scientific work, for which its Author and the editor Elipsa should be congratulated. The reviewer only regrets that the internal margins of the printed text are too narrow, especially in the pages of the text edition, and that there is no photograph of a folio of the codex itself.

Edward Lipiński

Eleftheria Pappa, *Early Iron Age Exchange in the West: Phoenicians in the Mediterranean and the Atlantic* (Ancient Near Eastern Studies. Supplement 43), Peeters, Leuven-Paris-Walpole MA., 2013, XX + 373 pp.

The book under review is an important contribution to the history of the relations between the Levant, Northwest Africa, and the Iberian Peninsula from the 9th to the end of the 7th century B.C., as attested in archaeological records. The work is based on a doctoral thesis submitted in 2010 at the University of Oxford. Its double aim was investigating the reasons behind the historical process of the so-called Phoenician 'expansion' in the Western Mediterranean and examining the social, cultural, and commercial exchange networks in the Phoenician settlements of North Africa and Iberia through the 9th–7th centuries B.C. The discussion is very detailed and takes into account recent archaeological discoveries, along with previously unpublished material. The available data leave no doubt that the Phoenician expansion goes back to the 9th century B.C., as shown by recent research at Huelva, in south-western Spain, and in the nuragic 'village' of Sant'Imbenia, in Sardinia. This up-dating of the Phoenician expansion leads to a re-examination of the reasons behind the Phoenician expeditions to the West in search of precious metals, often viewed as a result of excessive Assyrian tribute demands.

The Author would date the beginning of the Phoenician activity in the Western Mediterranean to the last third of the 9th century B.C., within the period of decline of the Assyrian Empire, ca. 824–744 B.C. She regards commerce and search for a new homeland as the main incentives for this expansion and emigration from the narrow Lebanese coastal strip, possibly in several waves.

After presenting the state of research (pp. XIII–XX), the Author first offers an overview of the historical and archaeological context of this expansion (pp. 1–8), then examines the

theoretical approaches to the problem, paying attention to cultural contacts and to trade in colonial settlements (pp. 9–14). Pre-colonial trade and early exchange of gifts in the Western Mediterranean are described in Chapter 3 (pp. 15–47) with a special attention to Sardinia and southern Iberia. The investigation of social organization in Phoenician ‘colonies’ in Chapter 4 mainly rests on examination of settlement patterns, burial customs, and cult records (pp. 49–82). The following chapter deals in a similar way with Northwest Africa, i.e. Algeria and Morocco (pp. 83–96). Trade patterns in the concerned areas are then examined in Chapter 6 (pp. 97–138). The Phoenician society in central North Africa, i.e. in Tunisia and Tripolitania, is the subject of Chapter 7 (pp. 139–164), which is focused on Carthage, Utica, Hadrumetum, and Leptis Magna. Trade patterns are then examined in the same area (pp. 165–176). The Author’s historical synthesis is presented in Chapter 9 (pp. 177–188), which explains the origins of the Phoenician expansion by the driving force of trade, the main agents of which were guilds of merchants and temples. The short conclusion (pp. 189–192), summarizing the results of the research, is followed by a very useful appendix, which offers a detailed description of archaeological findings at the more important sites of the concerned areas and periods, i.e. in Sardinia, Spain, Portugal, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya (pp. 193–229). Then come comparative tables and figures with the main ceramic forms, excavated tombs, and radiocarbon dates (pp. 231–238). They are followed by excellent maps, plans, and illustrations (pp. 239–316), to which the Author refers constantly in the apposite chapters. A rich bibliography, containing mainly recent publications, is offered on pp. 317–373. What is missing is an index, especially of place names.

The Author is unfortunately no epigraphist and her rare allusions to Phoenician written sources refer sometimes to incorrect or fancy translations, as on p. 25. This does not distort the general picture and the historical synthesis, which is based on archaeological data, but a correct use of epigraphic and cuneiform records could have enriched it and shaded some of its aspects. For instance, a Phoenician graffito on a pottery fragment from Huelva, found in 1998, bears the name Achab characterized by a *bēt* with a backward tick in place of the foot; such a *bēt* is known only from Byblian inscriptions of the early 9th century. This suggests dating the Phoenician presence at Huelva to the second third of the 9th century. This date is not contradicted either by ceramics or radiocarbon analyses and it nearly follows the probable date of the Huelva hoard, *ca.* 950 B.C. (p. 28). It is not very likely that the latter is an ‘accumulation of objects deposited in the river over a long period of time’, as opined by the Author (p. 28), since remains of beams probably pertaining to the ship’s carcass were found in 1923 with the hoard. The latter was a freight destined to export, exchange with foreign goods or reprocessing, as suggested by Phoenician metal-working activities at Huelva.

Neglected but important information is provided by Asarhaddon’s claim to reign on the Mediterranean as far as Tarshish. The text states that “all the kings from the middle of the sea, from the land of Iadnana (Cyprus) and the land of Iaman (Greeks), as far as the land of Tarsisi, bowed at my feet”. This implies an active role of the Phoenician vassals and an impact of Assyrian tribute demands on the Phoenician quest for metals, at least in

the 7th century B.C. Epigraphic sources, neglected or misunderstood by the Author or her sources, suggest a much higher date for this impact, following a campaign of Ashurnasirpal II between 875 and 865, when the Assyrian king reached the Mediterranean and received tribute from such coastal cities as Tyre, Sidon, Byblos, and Arwad. A similar campaign was conducted in 858 by Shalmaneser III, but he did not reach Phoenicia proper, although he claimed to have received the tribute from all the kings of the seacoast. The first items listed by Ashurnasirpal II in the tribute received from the inhabitants of Phoenicia were 'gold, silver, tin, copper, copper containers'. The need of larger quantities of these metals was thus felt and search for them must have started without delay.

The Author rightly notices that cultural heterogeneity is a salient characteristics of the Phoenician expansion and that Carthage, as well as several foundations on the southern coast of Iberia, seem to have been intended from their earliest days as establishments of a permanent nature. Both observations acquire a concrete shape in light of epigraphic and cuneiform information. Baal Hamon and Tanit were no solar deities, as stated erroneously on pp. 152–153. Tanit appears in Carthage only towards the middle of the 5th century, thus after the period studied by the Author, but Baal Hamon was the Baal of Mount Amanus and his role as the main god of Carthage indicates that a large segment of its initial Levantine population emigrated not from Phoenicia proper, but from the area of Lower Orontes and north-western Syria, where Sea Peoples had established an important kingdom in the 11th–10th centuries, known as Patin in Assyrian sources. Repeated invasions by Ashurnasirpal II and Shalmaneser III, followed by a heavy tribute paid in 848, may have encouraged the native population of that region to look for another homeland.

No military activity is implied by the Nora inscription, as fancifully stated in quotations on p. 25, but the Corinthian helmets of the 7th century B.C., one found in 1930 at Huelva, the other one discovered in 1938 in Río Guadalete, seem to be remains of a Greek attack in the 7th/6th century, as possibly recorded by Justin 44:5 (cf. p. 133). The enclosure walls of the Phoenician settlements at La Fonteta, Toscanos, Tavira, Tejada la Vieja were undoubtedly protective systems, but they do not imply *per se* hostilities between native Iberians and Phoenician immigrants. The Phoenician name of Cádiz, *Gadir*, means 'enclosure wall' and the same name was given later to the site of the present-day Agadir in Morocco, where the initial *a-* is the normal prefix of the Libyco-Berber *casus patiens* of substantives.

The Nora stele, dated *ca.* 800 B.C., shows the important role of Cyprus in the Phoenician expansion, since it is dedicated to the Cypriote god Pumay, but it also reveals that a Cypriot monarch, possibly a king of Amathus, was indirectly involved in the process. In fact, the stele is dedicated by a *nāgir*, a title born at Ugarit by a royal official dealing also with maritime trade (OLA 127, pp. 240–241). In Cyprus, there was at least a souvenir of direct or indirect contacts with Sardinia towards the end of the Late Bronze Age and in the beginning of the Iron Age. This is shown in particular by the Cypriot type of the 'ox-hide' copper ingots found in Sardinia. In an important article, not quoted by the Author, H.-G. Buchholz listed about 65 ingots or fragments of the kind found in Sardinia by 1985 (OLA 23, pp. 210–212). Further researches at the

important site of Sant’Imbenia, renewed in 2008–2010 (cf. *L’Africa Romana* 19, Roma 2012, pp. 1753–1844, and M. Rendell, in *Phéniciens d’Orient et d’Occident*, Paris 2014, pp. 533–548), will probably provide more information, since it appeared that the nuragic settlement was likely to have a considerably greater extent than previously thought and to be closer to the ancient coastline. These results of the geophysical survey conducted in 2010 thus have implications also for understanding the interconnections between the nuragic ‘village’ and wider Mediterranean culture, as well as trading networks.

Going back to epigraphy, one cannot induce from a graffito with the theophorous element Ashtart of a personal name, scratched on a pottery fragment from Mogador, that Ashtart had a cult place there (p. 90). Neither can Mogador be identified with the island of Cerne in Hanno’s *Periplus*, confused by the Author with Pseudo-Scylax (pp. 90, 109, 121). She obviously did not read the text stating that Hanno reached Cerne proceeding eastward from the coastline (OLA 127, pp. 438–441). Instead, Mogador lies to the west of the coast and was no island at that time, but the tip of a long and narrow peninsula (pp. 86, 95). The Author also confuses the Garamantes with the Giligamae of Herodotus IV, 169–170 (p. 142) and seems to be unaware of the incompatibility of her dating of the earliest Phoenician expansion with the alleged commercial partnership of Hiram I and Solomon (pp. 2, 14, 36, 46). Contrary to the Author’s statement on p. 2, there is no allusion to such relations between Tyre and Israel in the Assyrian annals. A computer’s joke is probably responsible for placing ‘Rashgoun in Iberia’ (p. 120) instead of Algeria.

Such mistakes and the lack of some correct cuneiform and epigraphic information bear no serious consequences for the value of this excellent piece of work, for which Mrs. Pappa should be warmly congratulated. As for the publisher, we must thank him for the high quality of the presentation and print, especially of the numerous tables, maps, and illustrations.

Edward Lipiński

Marek Piela, *Hebrajski zaimek osobowy i jego polskie odpowiedniki – analiza kontrastywna* [The Hebrew Personal Pronoun and Its Polish Equivalents – A Contrastive Analysis], Wydawnictwo Antykwa, Kraków 2014, 512 pp.

“The Hebrew Personal Pronoun and Its Polish Equivalents – A Contrastive Analysis”, such is the subject of a very detailed grammatical study by M. Piela from the Philological Faculty of Jagellonian University in Cracow. The research is based on a corpus of some two hundred books written in Israeli or Modern Hebrew, read and analyzed by the Author, as well as on extracts from an even larger amount of publications scanned in the ‘Google. Books’.

If Hayyim Nahman Bialik (1873–1934) is only represented in the corpus by an anthology of his ‘Stories’ (*Sippūrīm*), issued in Tel Aviv in 1953, nine publications of

the novelist Hanoach Bartov are listed, among them the *Piṣ'ei Bagrat*, published in 1965 and translated into English in 1968 (*The Brigade*). Its subject is the Jewish Brigade during World War II and the conflict between Jewish ethics and the wish to revenge the Holocaust. Fourteen books of Moshe Shamir entered the corpus (three of them through the 'Google. Books'), among them the novel *Hū' hālak ba-šādōt*, first issued in 1947. Its hero, Uri, a young Israeli, became a central figure in Shamir's works and crystallizes the ideals and goals of the country. These examples give some idea of the Author's qualitative selection of his sources, listed alphabetically on pp. 501–512 and each time referred to, when a sentence is quoted.

All the quotations are printed in Hebrew characters and translated into a correct Polish language, occasionally twice in order to show different translation possibilities. Sometimes, an existing Polish translation is referred to as well to illustrate the various ways in which a Hebrew phrase or sentence can be rendered in the Polish language. When possible, the Author keeps to the Hebrew sequence of the words in the clause, even if a Polish reader would spontaneously chose another sequence of the terms, for instance on p. 27, §1.3d.

The Author pays a due attention to various syntactical Hebrew constructions, inherited from older phases of the language or resulting from the influence of a foreign idiom, which was the first language of various segments of the Israeli population: Yiddish, a Slavic language, a modern Arabic dialect. He also distinguishes Hebrew constructions, which are rightly labelled 'incorrect', from commonly accepted idiomatic speech or from a high-style language, occurring in books. The study not only improves the grammatical understanding of some Hebrew syntactical features, but also brings a few Polish syntactical characteristics to light, especially the function of the relative clause introduced by *co*, 'what'.

The work is divided into four chapters, subdivided in many sections and paragraphs, duly listed in the table of contents on pp. 3–7. Chapter I provides an introduction explaining the nature and aim of the work, the method followed, and the use of sources (pp. 9–22). Chapter II deals with the Polish personal pronoun and its Hebrew equivalents, which include independent personal pronouns and the pronominal suffixes, either added to a verb or introduced by a preposition. Their different functions are discussed and analyzed with several examples and their translations (pp. 23–110). Chapter III compares the Polish possessive pronoun with its Hebrew equivalents which are either synthetical or analytical, while literary variants continue to use ancient Hebrew constructions with the sole pronominal suffix (pp. 111–270). All the possible variations and functions are examined with examples and translations. In Hebrew constructions, also the article *ha-* plays a role. When a pronominal suffix is used, the noun is employed without the article, but when the possession is expressed in an analytical way, the noun must have an article, because it is determined. Of course, no article is added to proper names. For instance, we find on p. 113 *qwlk*, 'your voice', and *h-qwl šly*, 'my voice'. The Author seems to neglect this grammatical feature characterizing the use of the article, probably because the article does not exist in the Polish language and because its presence or absence in

Hebrew has no influence on the translation. Yet, from the point of view of a correct Hebrew speech, this is an important difference.

Chapter IV deals with the Polish relative pronoun and its Hebrew equivalents (pp. 271–489). This long chapter takes various constructions into account, either in Hebrew or in Polish, but more attention should have been given to the origins of the Hebrew relative pronoun, like done for the origin of the Polish relative pronouns. They were originally interrogatives, ‘who?’, ‘what?’, and this explains their peculiar use, excluding negation and coordination, as amply shown by the Author. The situation in Hebrew is quite different: the relative pronoun was either an indefinite (*mh, my*) or a demonstrative ($zh < \underline{d}, \check{s} < \underline{t}$), as noticed by the Author on pp. 290–291 and 302, or a substantive (*’šr*). The relative clause was thus initially asyndetic. This kind of relative clauses, still used in Modern Hebrew literature and press, is discussed by the Author on pp. 290–302. The construction with *zh* is exactly the same as in *zh Syny* (Judg. 5:3; Ps. 69:9), ‘He of the Sinai’, but a clause is then used instead of a single noun.

In Biblical or ‘Classical’ Hebrew, the usual relative pronoun is *’šr*, which is a noun meaning ‘place’. It was used initially in apposition to a place name and its construct state was followed by a relative asyndetic clause (cf. E. Lipiński, *Semitic Languages*, §36.56). However, in grammars of Biblical, Rabbinic, and Modern Hebrew, these relative clauses are no longer considered to be asyndetic.

Each chapter ends with a conclusion summarizing the results of the analyses and a general conclusion closes the work (pp. 491–493). It is still followed by a bibliography (pp. 495–499) and by the list of sources used (pp. 501–512). Piela’s book is undoubtedly an important contribution to the grammatical study of Modern Hebrew; besides, it sheds new light on some Polish relative clauses. It can be useful also to people translating older Hebrew texts, giving examples of a faithful and correct translation.

To the knowledge of the reviewer, this is the first work of the kind among Polish publications, although a comparable research was undertaken by Elżbieta Górka for Modern Literary Arabic and Polish syntax. There is no English summary, although it could have presented the aim, the method, and the results of Piela’s research. As said already, the study can be useful also to people translating older Hebrew texts, especially the Bible and the Mishnah. The Author deserves congratulations for this excellent piece of work.

Edward Lipiński

Rafał Rosół, *Frühe semitische Lehnwörter im Griechischen*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt a/M 2013, 310 pp.

“Early Semitic Loanwords in Greek” is the topic of a minute work re-examining many older studies, several dating from the 19th century. A short survey of earlier research and the presentation of the criteria used in the work (pp. 9–19) are followed by a study

of 65 Greek words regarded as certainly or possibly borrowed from a Semitic language (pp. 21–111). They are presented in the Greek alphabetic order. The names of the letters in the Greek alphabet, certainly going back to the Phoenician consonantal alphabet, are presented separately (pp. 113–132), as well as two Egyptian and five Iranian loanwords, probably transmitted by a Semitic language (pp. 133–135 and 137–142). Seven words of unknown oriental provenance, unlikely Semitic, are dealt with in a different chapter, (pp. 143–152), as well as two supposed Semitic-Indogermanic isoglosses (pp. 153–154). A larger chapter lists and briefly presents some 300 Greek words, the Semitic origin of which is generally discarded (pp. 155–215).

Several Semitic loanwords listed by the Author have been recognized as such long ago. Some have been added more recently, but their relation to Semitic is often questionable. Such is the case of ἑρμηνεύς (pp. 38–40), the discussion of which seems to show an inadequate knowledge of the Semitic languages. The verb *ragāmu* in Akkadian and *rgm* in Ugaritic means “to call”, “to speak”. Its derivative *targūm* with a *t-* prefix means “interpretation” or “translation”, and the additional *-ān* suffix qualifies the “interpreter” or “translator”, thus *targumānu*. This word was borrowed by Hittite in the second millennium B.C., but no reasonable connection appears so far with ἑρμηνεύς, which seems to be a contracted accusative form ἑρμῆν with the Greek suffix *-εύς*. It must be related to the noun ἑρμα, “heap of stones”, and to its divine spirit Ἐρμῆς, the messenger of the major gods. In the classical period, when ἑρμηνεύς is first attested, Hermes was the god of the merchants and others who used roads. To engage in long-distance trade, they had to know some foreign languages and their holy patron, being a messenger, was likely to provide the basis of the title ἑρμηνεύς, “interpreter”, “translator”. The addition of the *-εύς* suffix goes a step further than a simple antonomasia. Ἐρμηνεύς is certainly no Semitic loanword.

A different situation occurs in the case of λαμπάς, said to be a possible Semitic loanword (pp. 57–59), because it would appear as *lappid* in Hebrew. The word is not attested in any other Semitic language, except in Jewish Aramaic, and it should be regarded as a Greek loanword in Hebrew, as noticed already by W. Gesenius in 1815. The same negative judgment must be expressed concerning λέσχη (pp. 60–62), borrowed in Hebrew as *liškā* and unknown in other Semitic languages. It is obviously related to λέχος, “bedding”, where *σ* was lost. The basic meaning of λέσχη is shown by its use in *Odyssey* XVIII, 329 and in an inscription from Rhodos, dating from the 5th century B.C. (*IG* XII/1, 709). The Author’s questionable method appears also in the case of παλλακίς, “girl friend” (pp. 76–79), borrowed in Hebrew as *plgš*; it lacks a Semitic etymology and is unknown in other Semitic languages. The word should obviously be connected with Latin *paelex*. It entered Hebrew through the Greek dialect of the Philistines, like other Greek loanwords in early Hebrew texts.

The cases mentioned here above witness a preposterous approach to lexicographic problems. If a word or its root occur only in one Semitic language, spoken in a country which is much closer to Greek-speaking areas than other regions with speakers of a Semitic language, it is a priori likely that the word in question was borrowed from Greek, not the opposite.

More problematic cases could be listed, what shows that a critical approach to the book under review is necessary. The work provides opinions expressed by various scholars, but the arguments – when recorded – and their conclusions should be judged in each case on their own merits with particular attention to the equation of the Greek and Semitic consonants. They are sometimes attested only in the word allegedly borrowed, as $\varsigma = \sigma\tau$ (p. 97) or $s = \tau$ (p. 100).

The Author seems to be unaware of A.M. Gazov-Ginzberg's distinction of four types of word formations by onomatopoeia or imitation of natural sounds and of Georges Bohas' theory on the "matrix" and the "etymon", explaining the similarity of some basic roots in different language families. Greek $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\mu\pi\alpha\nu\omicron\nu$ derives from a root of this kind (contrary to pp. 101–102). The lack of such basic considerations gives the book a somewhat old-fashioned aspect. The pre-Hellenic and pre-Semitic languages of the area around the Mediterranean sea are hardly taken into consideration, although they probably explain Greek $\lambda\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, "lion" (contrary to pp. 66–67). In prehistoric times, the modern lion was distributed over the greater part of Europe, and within the historic period it inhabited Africa, western Asia and, very probably, Greece. The same can be said about $\tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\theta\omicron\varsigma$, a subspecies of aurochs or urus which were widely distributed in Europe, western Asia and northern Africa in prehistoric times.

Considering the case of $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$, which is regarded by the Author as a Semitic-Indogermanic isogloss, one should notice that the horned crown of Amon is called *kr.ti* in Egyptian, what is a feminine dualis of *kr*. This noun may belong to the same root, although it is no usual Egyptian word for "horn" (cf. Gardiner F 16). One should also record Omotic *qaro*, "horn". Instead, the alleged Mycenaean *ke-ra* seems to be Greek $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$, "badge of honour". The context is as important as the spelling.

A number of languages distinguish a grammatical gender comprising the names of the parts of the body. In Semitic languages, this gender may be indicated by the postpositive determinant *-n*, like in *qr-n*, and it appears also in Latin *cornu*. It is probable therefore that the word *kr/qr* should be listed as an example of a widely used pre-Afrasian lexeme, not only as a Semitic-Indogermanic isogloss. The determinant *-n* also has a very wide application, since it occurs in Afrasian and Indo-European languages. The examination of its use should be extended, but this question goes beyond the scope of the book of R. Rosół, who offers the reader a wide range of possible further research.

Greek $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$ is probably borrowed from a Semitic language (pp. 109–111), but it is doubtful whether this is an originally Semitic lexeme. The Author is apparently unaware of Hurrian *ḫiyaruḫḫe*, attested in Mittanni texts of the mid-second millennium B.C. As noticed by H. Limet (*RHA* 36 [1978], pp. 141–147), final *-(uḫ)ḫe* is a Hurrian suffix giving to the word the meaning "golden". The root is *ḫiyari-* and it looks as if it was somehow related to *ḫurāṣu* and to Sanskrit *ḫiranyam*, but it is difficult to explain the differences and the additional morphemes. In any case, "gold" is not called *ḫurāṣu* or *ḫārūs* in South-Semitic languages. It is called *dahab* in Arabic and South-Arabian, and this name occurs also in Hebrew (*zḥb*) and in Aramaic (*dḥb*), while *wāraq* and *zəqəḫ* are

used in Ethio-Semitic. The reviewer would list $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$ among the words of unknown oriental provenance transmitted by a Northwest Semitic language.

The conclusion of the work classifies the loanwords (pp. 217–222), presents the phonetic changes observed in them (pp. 222–231), as well as the morphological adaptations (pp. 231–235). A list of abbreviations (pp. 237–241), a bibliography (pp. 243–274), and indices of Greek and Semitic words (pp. 275–310) close the book, which is redacted in a clear and orderly way. It reveals an intensive research work but, as expected in this kind of topic, its results can often be questioned. However, the book may be very useful to help finding all the hypotheses collected in a single volume with bibliographical references and key arguments.

Edward Lipiński

Stefan Zawadzki, *Neo-Babylonian Documents from Sippar pertaining to the Cult*, Instytut Historii UAM, Poznań 2013, 334 pp.

The book under review contains the *editio princeps* of 244 cuneiform tablets from the Neo-Babylonian period kept in the British Museum. The texts are published with copies, transliteration, and English translation. The material included in the book is divided into two parts. The first one comprises 131 texts related to *šalām bīti* ceremonies at Sippar. The second part presents 113 documents concerning religious practices in the broadest sense of the word. They concern barley, dates, oil, sesame, and silver for offerings and as prebendary income. The bibliographical abbreviations and the bibliography (pp. 11–18) are followed by a chapter explaining the *šalām bīti* ceremonies (pp. 21–43).

There is no extant detailed description of the ritual, but a large number of economic and administrative documents refer to the *šalām bīti*, and some ritual texts are also known. The tablets dealing with these ceremonies come from Babylon, Borsippa, Dēr, Dilbat, Sippar, Uruk, and Agade, showing that they were taking place over the whole country during the middle centuries of the first millennium B.C. The name of the festival, *šalām bīti*, is usually translated “greeting of the temple”, but *šalām* should rather be understood in the sense of “well-being” or “well-functioning”. However, even such a name does not provide an adequate understanding of the meaning and purpose of the ceremonies. They were celebrated in Sippar at least three times in the month of Aiaru and the list established by A. Bongenaar (*The Neo-Babylonian Ebabbar Temple in Sippar*, Leiden 1997) for the Sippar temple comprises fourteen ceremonies annually; the new texts increase their number to sixteen or eighteen yearly. Only a few texts concern offerings of animals, bulls or sheep sacrificed during the festival. Most texts refer to cereals, mainly barley flour used for baking bread or cakes and for producing beer.

The edition, transliteration, and translation of the texts with comments are followed by an index listing the references of the British Museum with their corresponding numbers

in the edition (pp. 316–319). Indices of personal names (pp. 320–326), of titles and professions (pp. 327–328), place names, watercourses (pp. 328–329), and temples (p. 334) follow suit, as well as a glossary of the words occurring in the texts edited in the volume (pp. 330–334).

The exemplary edition of these cuneiform texts by St. Zawadzki provides a lot of new material for the study of religious practices, of personal names, and of lexicography, especially for Assyriologists dealing with the Neo-Babylonian period, from the 7th to the early 5th centuries B.C. Let us hope that the Author will be able to continue his study and edition of new cuneiform texts housed in the British Museum.

Edward Lipiński

K. Aslihan Yener (ed.), *Across the Border: Late Bronze-Iron Age Relations between Syria and Anatolia. Proceedings of a Symposium held at the Research Center of Anatolian Studies, Koç University, Istanbul, May 31–June 1, 2010* (Ancient Near Eastern Studies. Supplement 42), Peeters, Leuven-Paris-Walpole MA. 2013, VIII + 542 pp.

The volume under review offers twenty-three contributions to the Koç University's symposium organized in 2010 by the Research Center of Anatolian Studies. The importance of the work requires a presentation of the single papers, most of them closely related also to the early Aramaean and Philistine history and culture. The collapse of the Late Bronze Age empires and the rise of smaller principalities on both sides of the present border between Turkey and Syria constituted the central topic of the conference, mostly of archaeological nature. The papers are grouped in three sections dealing respectively with excavations in Levantine Turkey and Levantine Syria, in South-Eastern Turkey and North-Eastern Syria, and with funerary practices, texts, and the arts. They are introduced by K.A. Yener who briefly explains the basic question and presents the single papers under the general motto *Imperial Demise and Forging of Emergent Kingdoms* (pp. 1–8).

The first section of the proceedings begins with the *New Excavations at Alalakh: The 14th–12th Centuries BC*, by K.A. Yener himself (pp. 11–35). The excavations conducted in 2000 and 2003–2010 seem to show that most of the city was abandoned around 1300/1290, while only the temple and perhaps its immediate surroundings continued to be used in the mid-13th century. After a period of abandonment, the site was reoccupied briefly ca. 1140 B.C. by a group utilizing Late Helladic IIIC-Middle Developed Ware and handmade Burnished Ware. Excavations at the site are going on and the history of Alalakh in the Late Bronze II and Early Iron Age is thus in the process of being recovered. Chapter II by Murat Akar deals with *The Late Bronze Age Fortresses at Alalakh: Architecture and Identity in Mediterranean Exchange Systems* (pp. 37–60). The Author deals mainly with construction techniques, revealing a possible Egyptian influence.

Tayinat in the Early Iron Age is the subject of Timothy P. Harrison's paper (pp. 61–87). The ongoing archaeological research by the Canadian team points to the foundation of a new settlement at Tayinat in the Early Iron Age. The site is located some 700 m. northwest of Alalakh, its Bronze Age sister settlement. The preliminary results of the excavations, combined with the epigraphic Luwian records of the Storm-god's temple at Aleppo and other Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions, allow inferring the existence of an Early Iron Age kingdom of considerable size, extending east as far as Aleppo, west to the bay of Iskenderun, and south as far as middle Orontes valley, downstream of Hama. The name of the kingdom appears to be *WaDAsatini* or *PaDAsatini*, comparable, according to T.P. Harrison, to the Egyptian appellation *Peleset* of the Philistines.

Some linguistic observations are required here to avoid a chain of possible erroneous inductions. Hieroglyphic Luwian does not distinguish voiced and voiceless consonants. The sign PA can thus stand also for *ba*, which is probably the correct reading, as indicated by the variant spelling WA. The alternation of the initial *b/pa* and *wa* reflects a hesitation in rendering a spirantized *b*. Such a pronunciation of *b* is well attested in ancient Greek: A. Meillet, J. Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*, 3rd ed., Paris 1960, p. 64, §88. Concerning the signs DA, the recent reevaluation of *d/ta*₅ (Laroche 172) as *lá/i* and that of *d/ta*₄ (Laroche 319) as *la/i*, both used in the name of the kingdom in question, confirms, as a matter of fact, the well-known Anatolian alternation *d//* or *t//*, attested by a growing number of cases. As example, one can compare the cuneiform spelling ^m*Da-di-ba-ni* with the Hieroglyphic Luwian *La-tá-pa-nu* (Laroche 175-29-334-395) of the seal legend impressed on the same tablet from Emar: H. Gonnet, *Les légendes des empreintes hiéroglyphiques anatoliennes*, in D. Arnaud, *Textes syriens de l'âge du Bronze Récent*, Sabadell-Barcelona 1991, p. 202, No. 31. If one thus reads the concerned name of the land *B/Pa-d//i-sà-ti-ni* or *Wa-d//i-sà-ti-ni*, one easily discovers a (πέδον) βαδιστόν, a “passable (ground)” or “terra firma” in opposition to the sea and the Amuq swamps. To appreciate this interpretation at its just value one must also remember that the actual transcription of Hieroglyphic Luwian does not distinguish a particular set of signs with the vowel *o* and that the signs are syllabic, not alphabetic. Therefore, the interpretation of *-sà-ti-ni* as *στόν* creates no problem. The later Assyrian name KUR *Pat-ti-nu* or KUR *Pa-ti-na* of the same area confirms this interpretation, since this country name records πέδον, albeit transcribed from Hieroglyphic Luwian. The assumed Βαδιστόν has nothing in common with Egyptian *P-r-š-t*, Hebrew *Plšt*, and Assyrian *Palastu* or *Pilišta*, contrary to M. Liverani's mention of the “kingdom of Taita, the Philistine”, in the volume under review (p. 360). T.P. Harrison rightly noticed that Egyptian *P-r-š-t* is written with the determinative of foreign country. This spelling is quite understandable, since the Philistines belonged to peoples invading Djahi also by land, having set up a camp in Amurru, as reported in the Medinet Habu inscriptions. In any case, they were no nomads or half-nomads, indicated by the determinative of people, like “Israel” on the Merneptah stele, or by the determinative of man, like the “Shasu”.

T.P. Harrison also refers to C. Steitler's recent suggestion that Taita, king of the assumed Βαδιστόν, bears the same name as Toi, king of Hamath according to II Samuel

8:9–10 and I Chronicles 18:9–10 (p. 63). C. Steitler even identifies the biblical Toi with *Tá-i-tá-*: *The Biblical King Toi of Hamath and the Late Hittite State 'P/Walas(a)-tin'*, “Biblische Notizen” 146 (2010), pp. 81–99. One should first record that the name of the biblical Toi is spelled *T'y* or *T'w*, the latter spelling being followed also in the Septuagint which transcribes the name Θου, but also Θωα. Now, there is no Luwian sign corresponding to *'ayin* in the name of *Tá-i-tá-* and the latter's second *t* has no counterpart in Hebrew. Such damaging comparisons should therefore be avoided. The names of Toi and of his son Joram, Ιεδδουραυ, Ιδουραυ or Hadoram could rather be regarded as misinterpretations and be related to “the land of Tahayata” and “the land of Hamayara”, mentioned in the Luwian inscription HAMA 7. This possibility was already considered almost ten years ago by E. Lipiński, *On the Skirts of Canaan in the Iron Age*, Leuven 2006, p. 212. As for *Tá-i-tá-*, his name seems to be identical with Greek Τῆτώ, “dawn”. This is an ancient Greek noun, as stated by P. Chantraine, *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, Paris 1933, p. 115, and A. Meillet, J. Vendryes, *op. cit.*, pp. 397–398, §595. It is attested as personal name on Samos: P.M. Fraser, E. Matthews, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names I*, Oxford 1987, p. 447b. Such a *nomen omen* is suitable for the ruler of a country.

The excavations of Tayinat show an amalgam of Aegean, Luwian, and Bronze Age West Syrian cultural traditions. Late Helladic IIIc pottery is predominant, being largely of local manufacture, but it is gradually replaced by the Red Slipped Burnished Ware. There are besides various local wares, described by T.P. Harrison, who also deals with loom weights, spindle whorls, and metal artifacts. The findings of Iron Age II, including Neo-Assyrian cuneiform documents, are presented in another article by T.P. Harrison and J.F. Osborne, *Building XVI and the Neo-Assyrian Sacred Precinct at Tell Tayinat*, “Journal of Cuneiform Studies” 64 (2012), pp. 125–143.

Chapter 4 by Marina Pucci presents *Chatal Höyük in the Amuq: Material Culture and Architecture during the Passage from the Late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age* (pp. 89–112). The paper is based on the study of the Chatal Höyük materials in the Museum of the Chicago Oriental Institute, collected during the 1930–1938 surveys and excavations. They mainly concern the Phases M and N of the site, revealing Anatolian and Mycenaean influences. The beginning of Phase N can be identified with the sudden and massive appearance of local imitations of Late Helladic IIIc Middle pottery. The transition from Phase M to N was smooth and can be dated in the second half of the 12th century B.C. Mycenaean imports become then extremely rare. All this suggests the arrival of immigrants who settled down, mixing with the indigenous population and subsequently creating a new local tradition.

The Crisis of Qatna at the beginning of the Late Bronze Age II and the Iron Age II Settlement Revival: A Regional Trajectory towards the Collapse of the Late Bronze Age Palace System in the Northern Levant, thus the title of the paper by Daniel Morandi Bonacossi (pp. 113–146), director of the Archaeological Mission of Udine University to Mishrife/Qatna. The archaeological evidence presented by the Author indicates that the Early Iron Age marks a break in the occupation of the Mishrife site, which is settled

again at the end of Iron Age I or at the beginning of Iron Age II in a radically changed political, socio-economic, and cultural context.

Tell 'Acharneh, an important site of the Orontes valley, is believed to hide the ruins of the ancient city of Tunip. It is the subject of the following paper by Michel Fortin and Lisa Cooper: *Shedding New Light on the Elusive Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages at Tell 'Acharneh (Syria)* (pp. 147–171). The Canadian team excavating the ancient mound found substantial remains of the Late Bronze Age and of the Early Iron Age during the 2009 and 2010 campaigns. This is undoubtedly a significant discovery, for no remains of these periods have been uncovered previously at the site, although written sources refer then to Tunip as to an important city. The paper describes the historical context and presents the archaeological evidence of the campaigns 1998–2004 before giving the first assessment of the discoveries of the campaigns 2009–2010 on the main mound of Tell 'Acharneh.

The less known site of Sabuniye in the Orontes delta, about 6 km. inland from the Mediterranean coast, is presented by Hatice Pamir: *Sabuniye: A Late Bronze-Iron Age Port-Settlement on the Northeastern Mediterranean Coast* (pp. 173–194). The site provided significant amounts of imported ceramics, especially Cypriot, but also local adaptations of Mycenaean models. The findings are important for a reinterpretation of the Al-Mina excavations of the years 1936–1949 by Sir Leonard Woolley. Chapter 8 deals with ancient Tarsus. Serdar Yaçın thus proposes *A Re-evaluation of the Late Bronze to Early Iron Age Transitional Period: Stratigraphic Sequence and Plain Ware of Tarsus-Gözlükule* (pp. 195–211). The analysis of the pottery, especially of jar and bowl forms, reveals a combination of Hittite traditions with emerging foreign elements, especially Cypriot and Aegean. This situation witnesses the arrival of a new population from the Aegean, which settled in Cilicia. Another Cilician site is examined by Ekin Kozal: *Exploring Sirkeli Höyük in the Late Bronze Age and Its Interregional Connections* (pp. 213–225). A selection of Late Bronze Age pottery and artifacts is presented to show the interregional relations of this large site, where renewed excavations are taking place since 2006. Fabrizio Venturui deals then with *The Transition from the Late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age at Tell Afis, Syria (Phases VII–III)* (pp. 227–259). He describes the main characteristics of the architecture and the pottery, showing the same trends as in Cilicia and in the Amuq.

In the first chapter of the second section, Peter V. Bartl and Dominik Bonatz look *Across Assyria's Northern Frontier: Tell Fekheriye at the End of the Late Bronze Age* (pp. 263–292). They present the results of the renewed excavations at Tell Fekheriye, progressing since 2006 at the western slope of the mound. The ongoing research yielded important remains from the Mittanni and Middle Assyrian periods, including many seal impressions on clay sealings and cuneiform tablets from different occupation phases. The importance of the site in the Middle Assyrian period and the remains of the Mittanni settlement with some sort of administrative function prior to the arrival of the Assyrians suggest to identify Tell Fekheriye with Waššukkanni, one of the Mittanni capitals. According to the Authors, this “strong possibility” (p. 268) must still be confirmed by archaeological evidence. In fact, G. Wilhelm, *The Hurrians*, Warminster 1989, p. 27,

had suggested some site to the north or northwest of Tell Fekheriye. However, the toponymic evidence favours an identification of this site with Waššukkanni. Twenty years ago, the reviewer relied on this criterion in order to reject this identification, because the old Semitic name of the site was Sikkān, attested on an Ur-III tablet as well as in Neo-Assyrian documents (*Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics II*, Leuven 1994, pp. 20–21; *The Aramaeans*, Leuven 2000, p. 120). He did not notice then that the place name was preserved through the whole Mittannian period, because it was not only used by indigenous population, but was even contained in the very name (*Waš*)-*šukkanni* of the Mittannian chancellor. It is hard to find a Hurrian explanation for this toponym, but an Indo-European word might be hidden behind *waš*, namely **uesā*, “gold”, attested in Tocharian A as *wäs*. (L. Isebaert, *De indo-iraanse bestanddelen in de tocharische woordenschat*, Leuven 1980, p. 251, §242). The Indo-Arian names of the Mittannian rulers and gods (*RIA VIII*, Berlin 1993–97, pp. 292–293) favour such an interpretation, which would give the city the prestigious name “Golden Sikkān”. City names beginning with “gold” are attested in Slavic languages: Zlatoust (Russia), Zlatopol (Ukraine), Złotoryja (Poland).

The paper of P.V. Bartl and D. Bonatz, presents the epigraphic and archaeological evidence of the Middle Assyrian presence at the site before examining the transition from the Late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age. The evidence comes here from the area of House I and House II on the western terrace of the mound. Their abandonment was followed by a scattered occupation with workshops and a burial ground. In the Authors’ opinion, the declining settlement size can possibly be explained by a population shift to the neighbouring Tell Halaf, where an Aramaean kingdom was established after the early Iron Age, in the 10th century B.C. However, Tell Fekheriye remained a religiously important centre with the cult of the Weather-god of the Habur. The early history of Tell Halaf is then presented by Mirko Novák, *Between the Mušku and the Aramaeans: The Early History of Guzana / Tell Halaf* (pp. 293–309). He deals with the results of the renewed Syro-German excavations, started in 2006, the main goal of which was the reconstruction of the history of the site during the Iron Age. The findings show that the first inhabitants of Tell Halaf were immigrants from the southeast of the collapsed Hittite empire. They were settled by the Assyrians in the early 11th century near Tell Fekheriye. The Aramaeans, who gained control over the region in the 10th century, moved the administrative centre of the region from Tell Fekheriye to Tell Halaf.

In the next chapter, Geoffrey D. Summers deals with *Some Implications of Revised C14 and Dendrochronological Dating for the ‘Late Bronze Levels’ at Tille Höyük on the Euphrates* (pp. 311–328). The site was excavated between 1979 and 1990, before Tille Höyük was submerged by the waters of the Atatürk Dam. The new dates, provided by dendrochronology combined with AMC C14 dating techniques, are by 50/60 years lower than the old dates. This implies important changes in the historical reconstruction of the events of the Middle Euphrates region. Timothy Matney then presents *The Late Bronze Age to Early Iron Age Transition: A Perspective from the Upper Tigris River* (pp. 329–347). The paper thus deals with the area to the north of the Ṭūr ‘Abdīn, called by the Author

“Bismil-Batman-Corridor”. During the Early Iron Age, this region was most likely home to a significant Aramaean population. The model of this society, labelled “Upper Tigridian”, is that of pastoral nomads, who came to places abandoned by the Assyrians along the river, but did not build permanent villages, although they planted, harvested, and even stored crops in silos dug in the mounds of Middle Assyrian settlements.

Marcella Frangipane and Mario Liverani deal then with *Neo-Hittite Melid: Continuity or Discontinuity?* (pp. 349–371). The paper concerns Arslantepe, located near the village of Orduzu, 7 km. northeast of modern Malatya, which inherited the name of Melid, the ancient site of which was precisely Arslantepe. The results of the survey and of the excavations conducted in 2003–2010 are thus presented with the assumption, based on a small excavated area, that the main crisis of the city was not contemporary with the collapse of the Hittite empire *ca.* 1180 B.C., when the “Imperial Gate” of Melid was destroyed by a huge fire. It happened only *ca.* 1070 B.C. Some new building activity started again around 900 B.C. and the site attained high level architectural standards by 830 B.C. The main collapse is attributed to the spread of Aramaean tribes *ca.* 1070–1050 B.C. The next chapter by Federico Manuelli also refers to Arslantepe: *Pottery as an Indicator of Changing Interregional Relations in the Upper Euphrates Valley: The Case of the Late Bronze-Iron Age Assemblages from Arslantepe/Malatya* (pp. 373–391). The influence of the Hittite material culture is evident in layers of Period IV dated by the Author to the 14th–13th centuries B.C. (p. 382), while levels of Period III are dated between the later 11th and the 9th century B.C. This dating involves an absence of the 12th–11th centuries, while Tiglath-pileser I (1114–1076 B.C.), returning in his 4th year from a campaign to the Black Sea, received the submission of Melid. Later in Tiglath-pileser’s reign, Allumari of Melid paid homage to the Assyrian king. The chronological frame is thus puzzling, the more so because the main crisis of the city would have happened *ca.* 1070 B.C. according to M. Liverani (p. 359). In short, the situation is not clear. A larger area should perhaps be excavated or the dating revised.

Chapter 17 by Gül Pulhan and Stuart R. Blaylock presents the *New Excavations at the Late Bronze Age and Iron Age Site of Gre Amer on the Garzan River, Batman Province* (pp. 393–419). The paper mainly concerns the pottery collected during the 2009 season of excavations, although architectural remains have been uncovered as well. A continuity of pottery traditions appear thorough the levels of the second and first millennia B.C.

The third section of the proceedings begins with Aline Tenu’s study of *Funerary Practices and Society at the Late Bronze-Iron Age Transistion: a View from Tell Shiukh Fawqâni and Tell an-Nasriyah (Syria)* (pp. 423–448). The Author deals with two cremation graveyards discovered in 1997 and 2008 at Tell Shiukh Fawqâni (Syria) in the Euphrates valley, some 20 km. north of Tell Aḥmar, and at Tell an-Nasriyah (Syria), on the eastern bank of the Orontes, downstream of Hama. Respectively, about 150 and 50 graves have so far been recognized there. The Author presents the results of her careful examination of the funerary spaces and of the cinerary urns. Valuable information is provided about the internal organization of the necropolis, the composition of the tombs, the choice of grave goods, and the deceased themselves. These data allow the Author to reconstitute

the funerary practices from the pyre to the burying of the cremation jars. It appears that these societies were taking care of their dead members collectively and that death concerned the entire group. Archaeological material and radiocarbon dates indicate that both cemeteries go back to the end of the Late Bronze Age and continued to be used until the 8th century B.C. One should recall here to mind that cremation was no genuine Semitic practice.

Annie Caubet deals thereafter with *Working Ivory in Syria and Anatolia during the Late Bronze-Iron Age* (pp. 449–463). One of the changes observed between the end of the Late Bronze Age and the revival of the Iron Age is the disappearance of the hippopotamus ivory, although hippopotamus survived in the Levant during the Iron Age. Instead, the elephant ivory was further worked, even on a very large scale. A careless use of the tusks is appearing then, while debitage and carving techniques remain on the whole unchanged. *Arts and Cross-Cultural Communication in the Early 1st Millennium: The Syro-Anatolian Contact*, thus the title of Stefania Mazzoni's paper (pp. 465–492). The Author distinguishes two stages in the early Syro-Hittite art. The first stage (12th–10th centuries B.C.) is characterized by monumental stone sculptures integrated in architecture, the second one (9th–8th centuries B.C.) shows an increased diffusion of minor arts. Among the examples illustrating this artistic production is the relief with the Phoenician inscription of Kulamuwa, as the name should be vocalized (p. 492, Fig. 12). J. David Hawkins then presents *The Luvian Inscriptions from the Temple of the Storm God of Aleppo* (pp. 493–500). A more detailed study is provided by J.D. Hawkins, *The Inscriptions of the Aleppo Temple*, "Anatolian Studies" 61 (2011), pp. 35–54. The Author wonders whether the designation of Taita's kingdom as "Palistin/Walistin" can be related to the Philistines. The reviewer's negative opinion is explained above in the presentation of T.P. Harrison's paper: the country name should probably be understood as (πέδον) Βαδιστόν, "Terra firma".

Qadesh, Sea Peoples, and Anatolian-Levantine Interactions is the title of Karl Strobel's paper (pp. 501–538). The presence of Anatolian troops at Qadesh shows that the Hittite vassal states still fulfilled their military obligations in 1274 B.C., although Ramesses II had to fight against the Sherdana on sea already in 1278 B.C. The "Sea Peoples" fought by Merneptah in 1208 B.C. are then presented, but the Shagalasha (Š-k-r-š) are confused with the Sikalayu of a letter from the king of Hatti to the prefect of Ugarit (p. 511). Somewhat outdated is the presentation of the evidence from the reign of Ramesses III. The Author does not refer to the Louvre Papyrus N 3136, a literary composition based on historical records from the time of Merneptah and Ramesses III, already discussed in this context more than ten years ago by A. Spalinger and C. Manassa (cf. E. Lipiński, *On the Skirts of Canaan*, p. 45). K. Strobel still writes about the Tjekker (T-k-r), decisively identified with the Sicals by G.A. Lehmann, *Die šikalaju – Ein neues Zeugnis zu den "Seevölker" Heerfahrten im späten 13. Jh. v. Chr. (RS 34.129)*, "Ugarit-Forschungen" 11 (1979), pp. 481–494. However, this has no direct bearing on the events in 1278 B.C., discussed by K. Strobel. The last chapter by Hasan Peker consists in the publication of *An Amulet with the Names of Ramesses II from the Roman Baths at Ankara* (pp. 539–542).

All the chapters of the volume under review start with an abstract, they are provided with an introduction and a conclusion, a bibliography, sometimes quite an extensive one, and they are illustrated by excellent quality photographs, drawings, and maps. There is no synthesis. It could have pointed out the main results of recent excavations in the Syro-Anatolian border areas and eventually relate them to the situation at other sites with similar problems, like Ugarit, Rās Ibn Hani, Zincirli, the Philistine cities. Indices would have been useful as well, listing the place names and the personal names. A subject index could have indicated the various categories of pottery, the main architectural and artistic items, and other elements of the material culture. In particular, the Late Helladic III C Middle pottery is important, since it is typologically related to the Mycenaean III C:1 ceramics of Philistia. This shows the cultural and chronological relationship between the appearance of these wares in Philistine cities and in the contemporary culture of the Amuq region and the surrounding areas.

Nevertheless, these proceedings of the symposium on recent Late Bronze-Early Iron Age excavations in the Syro-Anatolian border areas provide an important tool for archaeologists and historians dealing with that region and period, also for those working on Ugarit, the early Aramaeans or the Philistine history and culture, where similar questions are rising. Aslihan Yener should be congratulated for having organized such a stimulating symposium and warmly thanked for arranging this impressive volume of proceedings in a systematic and careful way. One can add finally that the volume under review is very well produced, in accordance with the high standards we expect from Peeters.

Edward Lipiński