

Buchbesprechungen

The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago, Vol. 20: U/W. **Martha T. Roth** (editor-in-charge), with the assistance of Timothy J. Collins, Hermann Hunger, Remigius Jas, Jennie Myers, Erica Reinert, and Joan Goodnick Westenholz; Manuscript Editor: Linda McLarnan. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 2010. xxxii, 411 pp. Preis: \$ 105,00. ISBN 1-885923-43-0.

Besprochen von **Michael P. Streck**

DOI 10.1515/za-2014-0006

This is the last volume of the CAD! The first volume, H, was published in 1956, the last, 54 years later. Truly “an adventure of great dimension”.¹

It may be seen as a sign of the great appreciation of the reviewer towards this magnificent achievement that this last review of the CAD in this journal is written in English,² not in German as all the previous ones by D. O. Edzard³ and the present reviewer.⁴ The lexicon statistics below follows the tradition of these reviews.

The letter U counts 753, the letter W 72 lemmata. Hence the volume U/W is of medium size among the entire dictionary. The longest lemmata are *ūmu* A, *uššuru*, *uznu* and *uzuzzu*.

602 lemmata of U and 47 lemmata of W have an Akkadian etymology.

77 words of U (none of W) have a Sumerian etymology; this is ca. 10 % of all words, a value above the average (see the summary statistics below). 14 of these words only occur in lexical lists (marked by L): *ubsaharakku*, *ubšukkinakku*, *udazallū*, *uddakam*, *uddam*, *uddasiggū* (L), *uddatušū*, *uddeš*, *udutilū*, *ugallu*, *ugāru* (but see the remarks below), *ugu* C (L), *ugudilū*, *ugulamartū*, *uḫḫu* A, *uḫulgallu*, *uḫušgallu*, *u’illu* (L), *ukurgidū* (L), *ukurigū*, *uluḫḫu* A, *ummu* F, *umunnedukku* (L), *umunnū*, *unkennu*, *unnedukku*, *upillū*, *uppu* B, C, *uqūpu* (but see the remarks below), *urdimmu*, *urgulū*, *uriggallu*, *urinnakku*, *urinnu* A, B, *urīnu*, *urmahḫu*, *urmahḫullū*, *urraduddū* (L), *urrāku*, *uršāntu*, *uršānu* A, B, *ūru* A, C, D, *urudū*, *urzababītu* (L),

usaggū, *usandū*, *ussangu* (L), *ūsu* A, B, *ušallu*, *ušgidū*, *uškū*, *ušmadū* (L), *ušmedū* (L), *ušparu*, *uššu* B, C, *ušū*, *ušubbū*, *ušumgallatu*, *ušumgallu*, *uttukku*, *utukku*, *utulgallu*, *utullu* A, *utullūtu*, *utūmahḫu* (L), *utūnu*, *uṭṭū* (L), *uzagalalū* (L), *uzalāqu* (L), *uzallu*.

The second largest group are loans from Hurrian; 29 lemmata in U and 17 in W: *uanta*, *uḫnu?*, *uḫuludena*, *uḫulunašše*, *ulmu*, *umzarḫu*, *undu*, *unuššu?*, *unuššuḫuli*, *uppasannu*, *upura’ena*, *urḫiniwe*, *uriḫaše*, *uriḫullu*, *uritanu*, *urparinnu*, *urpu*, *urqanuḫlu* (not designated as Hurr.), *urriwuhlu*, *urru* B, *uruḫlu*, *uruḫulše*, *urultannu*, *urunzannu*, *urutḫu*, *utatiti*, *utēna*, *uzzipatu*, *uzzulikarū*. – *wadurānni*, *waku*, *wašaššiwa*, *waštena*, *watiḫuru*, *watirītu*, *wazuḫru*, *wiradušḫu*, *wirrarikkuni*, *wismawirru*, *wizza’ena*, *wurni*, *wuruḫli*, *wurundu*, *wurupatham*, *wuṣru*, *wutru*.

The third largest group are loans from Northwest Semitic. 6 (U) + 4 (W) loans, attested in Amarna and Emar, and in one case (*ulmatu*) a loan from Ugarit also attested in NA, are designated with the general term West Semitic: *ūbilu*, *ubudu*, *ulmatu*, *ummuqu?*, *upru* B, *uwuwū*. – *warāšu*, *warrāšu*, *wašḫazu*, *wattu*.

Ugaritic 3 (U): *umbūbu*, *upsu* (attested in Amarna), *urubānu*.

Aramaic 2 (U): *unqu* B, *uṣṣāru*.

Old Persian 9 (U): *umasupitrū*, *uppadētu*, *uppajātu*, *ustarbar*, *usuttabarra*, *uštabari*, *uštajammu*, *uwarzana-pāta*, *uzbarra*.

Hittite 2 (U): *ubadinu*, *urijannu*.

Egyptian 2 (U) + 3 (W): *upṭa*, *uruššu* A. – *wathā*, *we’u*, *wizza*.

Elamite 1 (W): *walša?*

7 words are designated as foreign without further specification: *udru*, *ulḫaḫ*, *urukmannu*, *ušrijānu* (“The word may be Hurrian or Semitic”), *uḫharu*, *utuplu*, *utuppu*.

It may be useful to give a summary here of all statistics in the above mentioned reviews. The column “Hurrian” does not contain the loans designated as “Subarean”, although

¹ E. Reiner, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 92/3 (Philadelphia 2002).

² I thank Richard James Essam for correcting my English.

³ See Edzard’s bibliography in ZA 91 (2001) 13–20.

⁴ ZA 97 (2007) 149–152 (P) and ZA 99 (2009) 135–140 (T, Ṭ).

Table: Lemmata and loanwords in Akkadian according to the CAD

	Lemmata in total	Sum.	Hurr.	Aram.	Other Sem.	Elam.	Hitt. and other Anatol. and other Indo-Iran.	Old Pers.	Egypt.	Kassite
A	1.315	120	70	9	22	2	3	9	7	5
B	570	37	–	8	12	1	–	4	1	–
D	380	22	–	–	3	–	–	4	1	1
E	630	47	22	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
G	480	121	10	6	8	1	–	6	1	2
Ĝ	1.250	40	73	9	38	11	1	3	5	–
I/J	600	85	27	–	–	–	5	1	1	1
K	1.170	132	50	12	13	–	–	2	5	8
L	431	31	1	6	7	3	–	–	–	1
M	1.662	67	19	20	51	2	1	4	5	3
N	1.170	51	20	4	13	1	–	–	6	–
P	850	29	23	7	2	4	2	7	5	3
Q	424	2	2	10	8	–	–	–	–	–
R	480	1	–	2	15	–	–	1	1	–
S	860	77	23	14	10	6	–	1	1	5
Š	285	–	–	4	7	–	4	–	–	–
Š	1.560	126	72	7	15	6	2	1	4	3
T	1.116	51	46	5	2	4	2	–	3	4
Ṭ	143	9	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	1
U	753	77	29	2	9	–	2	9	2	7
W	72	–	17	–	4	1	–	–	3	–
Z	325	32	2	5	1	–	3	–	3	–
Total	16.526	1,157 = 7%	529 = 3.2%	132 = 0.8%	240 = 1.5%	42 = 0.3%	23 = 0.1%	52 = 0.3%	54 = 0.3%	45 = 0.3%

this name most probably refers to Hurrian.⁵ Under “Other Semitic”, Northwest Semitic loans from sources other than Aramaic (Amorite, Ugaritic, Canaanite in Amarna, Northwest Semitic in Emar) and the few loans from Arabic are included. The column “Hittite” also covers the very few loans from other Anatolian languages (Indo-European languages or Hattic). The column “Old Persian” also records the rare borrowings from other Indo-Iranian languages attested in the Mittanni period. The very few loans from Greek, Urartian, “Cypriotic”, “Tilmunite” are not counted, and the same is true for the dozens of “foreign” words for which no certain etymology has been given so far.

The figures given cannot be totally exact: see Edzard’s “own scepticism on the exactitude of these figures”.⁶ The reasons for this are manifold: the question “what is a lemma?” can sometimes be (and is indeed, if one compares CAD and AHW.) answered differently; the etymology

of some words is doubtful; later research has discarded some lemmata and added new ones.

Nevertheless, such a survey can provide us with a general impression of the size of the Akkadian lexicon, its composition and the imprint the contact between Akkadian and neighbouring languages during its long history has left on the Akkadian lexicon.

As has been well known for a long time, by far the largest group of loans is Sumerian: 1,157 = 7% of the entire lexicon.⁷ A surprise is that loans from Hurrian are the second largest group: 529 = 3.2%.⁸ Given the long and intensive contact between Aramaic and Akkadian, the number of loans from Aramaic is relatively low, and, according to the new analysis of K. Abraham/M. Sokoloff,⁹ it is even lower (but see the critical remarks of the reviewer).¹⁰ The

⁵ For Subarean = Hurrian see C. Michel, Šubartu §§ 3.1. and 3.2, RIA 13 (2012) 226.

⁶ Sumerian Grammar. HdO 72 (Leiden 2003) 178.

⁷ The same percentage was already given by Edzard, Sumerian Grammar, 178.

⁸ See for this material also T. Richter, Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen (Wiesbaden 2012).

⁹ Aramaic Loanwords in Akkadian. A Reassessment of the Proposals, AfO 52 (2011) 22–76

¹⁰ In S. Weninger [et al.] (ed.), The Semitic Languages. An International Handbook (Berlin 2011) 419f.

number of loans from other languages (Elamite,¹¹ Anatolian languages,¹² Indo-Iranian languages, Egyptian, Kassite) is comparatively small.

Of course, a deeper analysis of loans would have to take into account further parameters beyond the mere figures, such as the number of attestations, the form and the position in the Akkadian lexicon: does it fill a semantic gap, replace an older word, coexist with a synonymous word?¹³

It is also interesting to compare the total of 16,526 lemmata with some lexica of other ancient languages. The AHW. contains ca. 13,300 lemmata,¹⁴ considerably less than the CAD, in part due to the fact that W. von Soden had the tendency to subsume references under one heading whereas the CAD has the tendency to split them under different entries. The “Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache” counted 16,000 lemmata, roughly the same as in the CAD.¹⁵ The Oxford Latin dictionary, which covers Latin literature up to 200 AD, offers 40.000 lemmata, more than twice as in the CAD,¹⁶ although the ancient Latin text corpus (up to 300 AD) only has roughly the same size as the Akkadian one.¹⁷ Since the Greek text corpus is much more extensive than the Akkadian one,¹⁸ it is no surprise that “An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon” of H. G. Liddell/R. Scott¹⁹ contains 36.000 words. “A Syriac Lexicon” of M. Sokoloff²⁰ books ca. 18.300 lemmata.²¹ The dictionaries of Biblical Hebrew list some 5.700 lemmata (proper names not counted) in the Hebrew section and ca. 700 in

the Aramaic section.²² The “Sabaic dictionary”²³ presents ca. 2.700 words.²⁴

Some remarks on individual entries:

û: To the lit. mentioned in the head of the lemma add W. R. Mayer, Review of CAD Š₂ and Š₃, Or. 66 (1997) 171–173 with the conclusion that the base of the word written še must end in /e/.

ugāru: To my mind, the question whether *ugāru* was borrowed from Sumerian a. g àr needs a discussion. AHW. already mentioned a possible relation with Greek *agrós*, and D. R. Frayne, BCSMS 25 (1993) 27 with previous lit., assumed an Indo-European connection. A “Kulturwort”, at least, does not seem impossible.

uqūpu “a kind of monkey”: I don’t see a good reason why this word, only attested in 1st mill. texts and without long vowel at the end, should be a loan from Sumerian *u g u b i* as is stated with question mark. Note also that monkeys are not native to Mesopotamia. Therefore, J. Klein, JCS 31 (1979) 157–160, concluded that the most probable source for both the Sumerian and the Akkadian word is Egyptian *gjf*. According to W. Schenkel, Greek *kēb/pos* is a loan from Egyptian *gjf*.²⁵ Cf. also AHW. 1427: < Sanskrit *kapi*.

urbī: To the lit. mentioned in the disc. section add E. Frahm, Einleitung in die Sanherib-Inschriften. AfO Bh. 26 (Wien 1997) 104f.: appears to designate mercenaries that perhaps belong to an Arab tribe called ‘*Urbu*.

wuddi: See now N. Wasserman, Most Probably. Epistemic Modality in Old Babylonian (Winona Lake 2012) 64–81: expresses past certainty.

It is appropriate to finish this review with a short outlook on the future of Akkadian lexicography. The completion of the CAD is a landmark. However, the first volumes were published more than half a century ago. The AHW. was already finished in 1981. In the meantime innumerable new Akkadian texts from all periods have been published. Many of these texts contain new references for words hitherto only sparsely attested, and, in some texts, even entirely new words show up. New editions of old texts as well as numerous books, articles and reviews have discussed and clarified the meaning, form or etymology of

¹¹ See for loans from Elamite M. Krebernik, Philologische Aspekte elamisch-mesopotamischer Beziehungen im Überblick, Babel und Bibel 3 (2007) 59–99.

¹² For Anatolian loan words in OA texts see G. Dercksen, ZA 97 (2007) 26–46.

¹³ See the reviewer in his article: Innovations in the Neo-Babylonian Lexicon, in: L. Kogan [et al.] (ed.), Languages in the Ancient Near East. CRRAI 53 (Winona Lake 2010) 647–660.

¹⁴ R. Borger, Altorientalische Lexikographie. Geschichte und Probleme. Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 1984/2 (1984) 107, estimated the number of lemmata in the AHW. as 19.000, which is much too high. This wrong figure was also quoted by the reviewer in: Sprachen des Alten Orients (Darmstadt 2007) 66.

¹⁵ See Borger, Altorientalische Lexikographie, 77.

¹⁶ See Borger, Altorientalische Lexikographie, 77 n. 7.

¹⁷ See the reviewer, Großes Fach Altorientalistik. Der Umfang des keilschriftlichen Textkorpus, MDOG 142 (2010) 35–58.

¹⁸ See the reviewer, MDOG 142, 35–58.

¹⁹ Founded upon the seventh edition of Liddell and Scott’s Greek-English lexicon (Oxford 1889). If have been unable to find a figure for the “big Liddell” itself.

²⁰ Winona Lake/Piscataway 2009.

²¹ See *ibid.* p. xv n. 48.

²² I thank S. Arnet for these figures.

²³ A. F. L. Beeston [et al.], (Louvain-la-Neuve 1982).

²⁴ I thank P. Stein for this figure.

²⁵ In: G. Moers [et al.] (ed.), *jn.t Dr.w.* Festschrift für Friedrich Junge, vol. 2 (Göttingen 2006) 566. I thank Marco Stockhusen for this reference.

many Akkadian words. It will be a most rewarding and for the time being never ending task of Ancient Near Eastern studies to collect and study this lexical material and thus

to constantly supplement the two main Akkadian dictionaries.²⁶

Olivier Rouault: *Terqa Final Report 2. Les textes des saisons 5 à 9 (Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 29)*. Malibu: Undena Publications, 2011. 158 pp. 22 × 29 cm. Preis: \$ 35,00. ISBN 978-0-9798937-1-1.

Besprochen von **Shigeo Yamada**

DOI 10.1515/za-2014-0007

The volume publishes the cuneiform texts uncovered at Tell Ashara (ancient Terqa) in the five (fifth to ninth) seasons of the American Joint Expedition, which were undertaken in 1979, 1981–83, and 1985 under the direction of G. Buccellati and M. Kelly-Buccellati. The author, O. Rouault, served as the chief epigraphist of American Joint Expedition up to the last (tenth) season of 1986. He has previously published 56 late Old Babylonian cuneiform texts originating from the ‘archive’ of Puzurum, son of Namišum/Namašum, which were also excavated at Tell Ashara in the third and fourth seasons in 1977–78 (Terqa Final Report 1: *L’Archive de Puzurum*. *Bibliotheca Mesopotamica* 16 [Malibu 1984] [henceforth TFR 1]). Rouault has also published all the other epigraphic finds discovered in different archaeological contexts during the same two seasons; a part of them were published previously in 1979 (Rouault, *Terqa Preliminary Reports*, No. 7: *Les documents épigraphiques de la troisième saison*. *Syro-Mesopotamian Studies* 2/7), and the others were included in the above-mentioned TFR 1 (texts 57 and 58). Another administrative text found on the surface in 1976 has been published by G. Buccellati in: *Terqa Preliminary Reports*, No. 2: *A Cuneiform Tablet of the Early Second Millennium B.C.* *Syro-Mesopotamian Studies* 1/4 (1977). The present volume of Rouault has thus completed the publication of all the texts discovered by the American Joint Expedition. Following the Joint Expedition, however, the excavation at Tell Ashara continued further with French missions, with O. Rouault as the director, until it ceased with the unfortunate turmoil and internal strife in Syria that began in 2011. The French excavations uncovered a number of new epigraphic materials, including 25 tablets of special significance discovered in two jars in the 12th season (1989), which shed a new light on the history and culture of Terqa

and its vicinity during the 17th–14th centuries BC. The essential historical data and characteristics of those tablets have been reported and discussed by Rouault in a number of his articles,¹ though the full publication of them is still being awaited.

In contrast to Terqa Final Report 1, which was composed of the texts stemming from the single ‘archive’ of Puzurum (with a few exceptions [see above]), the composition of Terqa Final Report 2, here under review, is heterogeneous and includes epigraphic remains discovered in different stratigraphic contexts, i.e., the earlier strata of the *šakkanakku* and Old Babylonian periods from the administrative sector uncovered in Area (*Chantier*) F and the later strata assigned to the so-called ‘Ḫana’ period excavated in the residential sector in *Chantier* C, the area where the house of Puzurum was found burned with the above-mentioned ‘archive’. Rouault classifies three scribal traditions from a chronological-stylistic viewpoint, i.e., those of (1) *šakkanakku*, (2) *paléobabylonien* (Old Babylonian), and (3) Ḫana (pp. 7–8). He dates the period of ‘*šakkanakku*’, which is the title of the governors of Mari, toward the end of the third millennium BC in parallel to the beginning of the Yaḥdun-Lim dynasty; that of

²⁶ Since mid-2013 the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft has been funding a long-term project “Etymological Dictionary of Akkadian”, edited by L. Kogan, M. Krebernik and the present reviewer. Within this project the foundations for a supplement of the AHW and the CAD shall be laid.

¹ O. Rouault, *Cultures locales et influences extérieures*. *Le cas de Terqa*, *SMEA* 30 (1992) 247–256; idem, *Quelques remarques sur la société de Terqa*, in: O. Rouault/M. Wäfler (eds.), *La Djéziré et l’Euphrate syriens*. *De la protohistoire à la fin du IIe millénaire av. J.-C.* *Tendances dans l’interprétation historique des données nouvelles*. *Subartu* 7 (Turnhout 2000) 265–266; idem, *Chronological Problems Concerning the Middle Euphrates during the Bronze Age*, in: H. Hunger/R. Pruzsinszky (eds.), *Mesopotamian Dark Age Revisited*. *Proceedings of an International Conference of SCIEEM 2000 (Vienna 8th-9th November 2002)* (Vienna 2004) 51–60.

Shigeo Yamada: Institute of History & Anthropology, University of Tsukuba, E-mail: yamada.shigeo.gu@tsukuba.ac.jp