

or “storm-day,” unless context is the only factor taken into consideration. That in certain cases u_4 is a destructive force is not in dispute. Indeed, the present reviewer would go as far as to claim that in specific cases such an entity must be viewed as a demonic force. This seems to be suggested by LUr II. 400–404, where u_4 is described as having no mother, no father, no wife, no child, no neighbor, and no friends. This is reminiscent of the *galla*-demons who hunt Dumuzi in *Dumuzi and Geshtinana* (l. 49: “The *galla*-demons have no mother; they have no father, no mother, no brother, no sister, no spouse and no child”). Similarly, the family of demons including creatures like Ardat-lilī is often connected with lack of spouse and progeny (Farber 1987: 24).

These are however minor quibbles. Nili Samet has produced an accessible volume on a complex composition. This book is a welcome addition to the library of Assyriologists and Biblicists alike and the new critical edition Samet has given us will aid scholars in furthering our understanding of the *Lament over Ur* and related texts.

ALHENA GADOTTI
TOWSON UNIVERSITY

REFERENCES

- Farber, W. 1987. Lilū, Lilitu, Ardat-lilī. A. *Philologisch. RIA* 7: 23–24.
 Michalowski, P. 1983. History as Charter: Some Observations on the Sumerian King List. *JAOS* 103: 237–48.
 Steinkeller, P. 2003. An Ur III Manuscript of the Sumerian King List. In *Literatur, Politik und Recht in Mesopotamien: Festschrift für Claus Wilcke*, ed. W. Sallaberger, K. Volk, and A. Zgoll. Pp. 267–92. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Lamaštu: An Edition of the Canonical Series of Lamaštu Incantations and Rituals and Related Texts from the Second and First Millennia B.C. By WALTER FARBER. Mesopotamian Civilizations, vol. 18. Winona Lake, Ind.: EISENBRAUNS, 2014. Pp. xiii + 472, 91 pls. \$99.50.

After many decades, Walter Farber’s magnum opus on Lamaštu has now finally been completed. The study under discussion presents all texts concerning the notorious demoness Lamaštu ranging from the third millennium to the first millennium BCE, in both incantations and rituals. Although a brief introduction to Lamaštu and her background is offered in “Lamaštu, Daughter of Anu: A Sketch” (pp. 1–6), it is clearly stated by the author that he is not presenting a full investigation of the persona of Lamaštu, but concentrating solely on the philological record.

“The Lamaštu Texts: An Ancient History” (pp. 7–38) contains a general discussion of the corpus of Lamaštu texts, noting the interesting features and peculiarities of each period, outlining the evolution of some earlier incantations into the later series. In his introduction to the texts of the third and second millennia BCE, Farber states that Sumerian incantations have been incorporated only if they show a direct relation to the known SB texts, the result being that only TIM 9, 63: 17’–23’//OECT 5, 55 is included, with TIM 9, 63, “obv.” 1’–5’ and 6’–16’; MLVS II pp. 9f. (LB 1005); YOS 11, 89; AMD 1, 278 and 287; and MCL 1614 “obv.” being excluded from this edition. YOS 11, 86, 29–38; YOS 11, 88; and CT 42, 36 have also been left out based on their troublesome identification.

The Akkadian evidence of the OB and OA periods is relatively plentiful, containing eight relevant incantations. Farber carefully postulates that starting from the second millennium BCE, the concept of belief in Lamaštu was likely rooted in Mesopotamian culture itself. References to Lamaštu as a dangerous foreign woman (i.e., Amorite, Sutean, or Elamite) are in his view better explained from within Mesopotamian social and magico-religious beliefs rather than by resorting to the concept of Lamaštu as a product of importation (pp. 8–9).

Regarding the MB period, a helpful schematic sketch of the tablet RS 25.420+ (= “Ug”) is offered (pp. 11–12). Farber argues, contra Arnaud 2007: 11 and 62, that RS 25.513 (= “RS”) cannot belong to the same tablet as RS 25.420+, since it was written in a quite different hand. Note that of both tablets,

besides the excellent copies by Farber (plts. 68–74), reasonable photos can now be found in Del Olmo Lete 2014: plts. XIX–XX and XXIII, which support Farber’s statement.

Farber states that Arnaud’s hypothesis contra Nougayrol 1969: 405 n. 93 that both “RS” and “Ug” must have been imported along with other texts from Ḫattuša to Ugarit cannot be proven or disproven, and thus remains questionable. Since its first publication by Nougayrol in 1969, it has been clear that RS 25.420+ has an important position, since it contains the first collection of Lamaštu incantations preceding the canonical Lamaštu series of the first millennium BCE. The possibility of the existence in the thirteenth century BCE in Babylonia of a canonical version is now suggested by Farber, following the suggestion by N. Heeßel that VAT 10353 (“Ee”), an excerpt tablet containing “Lam. I” 44–61 with an accompanying ritual, is supposedly to be dated to the MB era (instead of NB) and might therefore be regarded as spoils from Tukulti-Ninurta’s war against Babylon.

The motif of Lamaštu being thrown out (*napāšu*) of heaven—known from BIN 4, 126 (= “OA₂”): 10–13 and from the later series “Lam. I” 112 with the verb (*w*)*arādu* (Š)—is also found in a difficult MA incantation against an unnamed great female evil attacking various layers of society found on the reverse (iv. 1–32) of a collection of incantations (Rm 376) from Kalḫu, first published by Lambert in 1965:

21. DINGIR^{mes} GAL^{mes} dXXX u dU.GUR e-tī-ru-tu d^é-a EN TU₆ d[ASAL.LÚ.ḪI]
22. EN n^é-me-qi d^{gu}-la a-su-gal-la-at DINGIR^{mes} GAL^[mes] . . .]
23. i-ta-ap-šu i-na pa-ni AN-e AN-e ša d^a-nim e na ‘x’ [. . .]

The great gods Sin and Nergal, the saviors, Ea, lord of the incantation(s), Asalluḫi, lord of wisdom, Gula, the chief physician of the great gods, [. . .]
have thrown (her) out of heaven, the heaven of Anu . . .

Concerning the material of the first millennium BCE, Farber distinguishes between the “*pirsu* recension” (Nineveh and Sultantepe) and the “*tuppu* recension” (Assur and Babylonia), named after the colophons of the two recensions, of which he offers a schematic juxtaposition (p. 19) containing several improvements on Farber 2012: 229 fig. 1. Additionally, Farber adds a discussion of possible other recensions, Ni 2675 (+) Si 883 (= “a”), SpTU V 239 (= “y”), and K 10984 (= “W”). Considering the possibility that Ni 2675 (+) Si 883 belongs to the “*tuppu* recension,” a tentative reconstruction of the reverse is offered in fig. 11 (p. 24). The fact that the Lamaštu incantations and rituals could also be found outside the settings of the Lamaštu series, e.g., on the Lamaštu amulets, is outlined by Farber in a brief discussion of the excerpt texts and adaptations of passages from the canonical series (pp. 26–34). A group of twelve SB non-canonical incantations and rituals that were not included in the series, which either mention Lamaštu directly or contain ritual matter closely related to the Lamaštu corpus, are also incorporated (pp. 34–38).

In “The Lamaštu Texts: Recent History” (pp. 39–44) a synopsis is presented of the history of research on the Lamaštu corpus. Of special interest are the discoveries made since 1977, which are clearly rendered in the specific overview on “Manuscript Sources” (pp. 45–66), where one can easily observe the abundant number of tablets published here for the first time by Farber beside tablets recopied for this study, as well as previously published texts. Table 1 (pp. 53–56) lists all previous publications of the aforementioned tablets, Table 2 (pp. 57–63) offers a catalogue of museum and excavation numbers, Table 3 (pp. 64–65) provides a useful concordance between “Lam. I-II” and “Lam. III,” and Table 4 (p. 66) gives an index to separate transliterations, transcriptions, and translations of parallels and related texts.

“The Texts: Edition” (pp. 67–342) is divided into three main parts, separating the canonical series (“Lam. I-III”), the Lamaštu incantations and rituals that are not part of the SB series, and a small group of three unidentified SB fragments with possible connections to the Lamaštu corpus. Farber offers a sophisticated traditional edition of all texts, i.e., transliteration (in *Partitur*), transcription, and a detailed philological commentary.

Some minor comments: P. 97 “b” II 8’: contra Farber’s IGI *šab-b[u]-re-e*, read *ši-pir*(ERIM) *b[u]-re-e*. P. 248 “MB” 18: Farber interprets the adverb *tura(m)* “again,” which has so far only been attested in BAM 396 ii 2, and translates “she keeps stopping by time and again.” The construction of this line

is parallel to the following ll. 19–20, where Lamaštu is pictured in relation to various architectural elements. Therefore I would suggest the noun *ṭurru* B (*turru*), which is a well-known architectural feature (CAD Ṭ 165b ff.), but remains difficult to translate. Pp. 290–91: “*Emar*” 1: I prefer to see here an anticipatory genitive construction ‘DUMU’.MUNUS *a-nim* DUMU.MUNUS *a-nim* *ša* ^{i-li} DINGIR-*li* *na-a-li* *a-bu-ša* “Daughter of Anu, Daughter of Anu, of the gods Nāli is her father!” Pp. 292–93 “*Emar*” 37: *šu²-uk-na* is most probably an imperative pl. (*šuknā*) denoting a possible ritual action instead of sg., where *šukni(m)* is expected addressing Lamaštu. Pp. 324–25 “*Emar*” 8: Concerning further evidence for the prefix *ti-* used for the 2.f.sg. in western peripheral Akkadian without feminine marker *-i*, note *ti-ka-as-su-us-ma* in an incantation addressing fever from Ugarit (AuOr Suppl. 23, 14:4).

In conclusion, it must be stated that a milestone has been reached by Farber, providing a complete overview of all Lamaštu texts, containing expert transliterations, transcriptions, elaborate commentaries, and excellent copies which will serve research for many decades to come.

ELYZE ZOMER
UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG

REFERENCES

- Arnaud, D. 2007. *Corpus des textes de bibliothèque de Ras Shamra-Ougarit (1936–2000) en sumérien, babylonien et assyrien*. Barcelona: Editorial Ausa.
- Del Olmo Lete, G. 2014. *Incantations and Anti-witchcraft Texts from Ugarit*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Lambert, W.G. 1965. A Middle Assyrian Tablet of Incantations. In *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on His Seventy-fifth Birthday, April 21, 1965*, ed. H. G. Güterbock et al. Pp. 283–88. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Nougayrol, J. 1969. La Lamaštu à Ugarit. *Ugaritica* VI: 393–408.

He Has Opened Nisaba's House of Learning: Studies in Honor of Åke Waldemar Sjöberg on the Occasion of His 89th Birthday on August 1st 2013. Edited by LEONARD SASSMANNSHAUSEN and GEORG NEUMANN. Cuneiform Monographs, vol. 46. Leiden: BRILL, 2014. Pp. x + 319, illus. \$162.

The present volume honors Åke Sjöberg for having “opened Nisaba’s house of learning” through his research and through nurturing others in the “house” (p. vii). Articles celebrate Sjöberg’s interests and achievements in Sumerology by presenting new texts or updated editions, by offering lexical studies, or by treating topics such as the structure of the Sumerian debate poems or the Early Dynastic lexical tradition. M. Cohen publishes a new Sumerian lamentation to Inana or Dumuzi (correct the tablet number published as CUNES 53-08-060 to CUNES 52-08-060). B. Alster offers an edition of two bilingual Neo-Assyrian proverbs, re-edited in light of new evidence. J. Bauer re-interprets two problematic texts from Fara/Abu Salabikh as personal name lists. J. Klein and Y. Sefati provide a lexical study of the terms *mul* and *mul-an* in Šulgi B 305–19 and Šulgi E 242–57, arguing against the conventional interpretation that these are “poetic expressions for cuneiform writing” (p. 85). B. Foster investigates diorite and limestone “as case studies in how the Sumerian poet of *Lugale* explained and understood their use” (p. 52; for a similar investigation of the hematite stone see Simkó 2014). This review comments only on contributions for which there is new evidence or for which further investigation is required.

In “Two Lullabies,” M. Jaques publishes one text from the Old Babylonian period (note CT 58, 22 is BM 38099 not BM 96936) and another from Kassite Nippur, both of which bear resemblance to the lullaby Šulgi N (p. 61). Jaques addresses the genres of texts concerning babies, incantations and lullabies, in order to differentiate between them, and to determine the occasions for which they were composed (pp. 68–70). She suggests that lullabies, which “use a literary language,” were part of the Old Babylonian Sumerian scribal curriculum (p. 70) and speculates that their inclusion in it “could have been [due to] their literary qualities and historical importance” (p. 70). Jaques posits that Šulgi N