

P. 142: Zu “nš” “aus Stadt vertreiben” vgl. V. Altmann, *Die Kultfrevl des Seth: Die Gefährdung der göttlichen Ordnung in zwei Vernichtungsritualen der ägyptischen Spätzeit (Urk. VI)* (Wiesbaden, 2010), 146.

P. 159: Zu “ph.ti” “Stärke” in Verbindung mit Month vgl. J.-Cl. Goyon, *BIFAO* 75 (1975): 372.

P. 163: Zum Osten als Strafort der Feinde vgl. J. Assmann, *Sonnenhymnen in thebanischen Gräbern, Theben I* (Mainz, 1983), 293; D. Kurth, *Edfou VII: Die Inschriften des Tempels von Edfu, Abteilung I, Übersetzungen, Band 2* (Wiesbaden, 2004), 520.

P. 197: “ḥšbd tp” besser “lapislazuliköpfig”!

P. 302: Zu “ikk” “klagen” vgl. Y. Barbash, *The Mortuary Papyrus of Padikakem, Walters Art Museum 551* (New Haven, 2011), 124; zu “ik” “klagen” vgl. D. Meeks, *LingAeg* 13 (2005): 241.

Der Rezensent hat die Lektüre des Buches als inspirierend empfunden. Der Autor weist sich als versierter Kenner der Materie aus. Der gediegene Eindruck der Übersetzungen ist besonders lobend hervorzuheben. Die sichere Beherrschung der Sekundärliteratur tritt als weiterer Pluspunkt hinzu. Dass nicht jede philologische Frage bis in alle Einzelheiten diskutiert wird, kann dem Autor bei einer solchen Stofffülle kaum zum Vorwurf gemacht werden.

STEFAN BOJOWALD
UNIVERSITÄT BONN

Conditional Structures in Mesopotamian Old Babylonian. By ERAN COHEN. Languages of the Ancient Near East, vol. 4. Winona Lake, Ind.: EISENBRAUNS, 2012. Pp. x + 198. \$44.50.

This book is dedicated to the analysis of conditional structures in three major literary genres of Old Babylonian Akkadian: the letter corpus (chapter 2: mainly those of AbB), the law collections (chapter 3: mainly CH and LE), and the omnia (chapter 4: mainly from YOS 10). The author starts out with an introductory methodological chapter that also contains relevant information about other ancient and modern Semitic languages, notably Biblical and modern Hebrew, Gəʿəz, and Classical Arabic. The book is rounded out with a general conclusion summarizing the patterns found in the various genres from a comparative perspective and presenting the *šumma* structures in a cross-genre comparison.

Even though the author specifically mentions readers versed in Akkadian as well as linguistic typologists (Cohen refers to Xrakovskij 2005) as the audience of the study, comparative Semiticists will also profit from the work. While aware of specific approaches to subject matter in the realms of (formal) philosophy and even psychology (e.g., Snitzer-Reilly 1986), the author sticks to a strictly descriptive linguistic approach. In order not to prejudge the multifaceted functions of the Old Babylonian tense/aspect system, the author always cites the verb forms in their abstracted surface forms (e.g., *iprus* instead of “preterite”). This approach allows for an array of particularly clear charts illustrating the various conditional structures, notably in the summary on p. 173. “Values” (tense, aspect, position in the clause) and “categories” (absolute vs. relative tense, aspect, modality) are—in the context of Cohen’s study—assigned only in a genre-specific way (epistolary, legal, omen-related) to the various verb forms (summarized in chart 5.2, p. 180).

Less intuitive, at least to this reviewer, is the representation of what Cohen terms the “hypotheticality scale” in a circular model (p. 174). Where meaningful (regularly in the summaries), the author provides interlinear transcriptions of his copious examples.

In general, the discussion of conditional structures is often complicated by the circumstance that different language families encode tense and aspect in such structures in different ways. From a “Western” (e.g., English or German) perspective, a non-past form in the protasis or apodosis of a real (factual) condition is to be expected; in contrast, Semitic languages allow for a much broader array of possibilities, mainly in hypotactic, but also in paratactic structures. In both cases, forms exhibiting completed (apocopate = preterite, overlapping with the jussive; imperative) aspect are found in both the protasis and the apodosis. Two Arabic examples may serve to illustrate this point:

uṭlub *tajid*
 search:IPT.M.SG find:APOC.2M.SG

“if you search, you will find” (literally: “search [and] you will/shall find”)

^ʔ*in taṣbirū . . .* *yumdid-kum*
 if be_patient:APOC.2M.PL help:APOC.2M.SG-you.M.PL

rabbu-kum
 lord.NOM-you.M.PL

“if you are patient, your Lord will grant you help” (Q 3:125)

Logically, the completed aspect of the verb in the apocopate (reflecting the old Semitic preterite) is intuitive in these examples.

Cohen well illustrates the issue of conflation of the categories in the object language (Akkadian) and the metalanguage (English) in discussing the (seemingly) different shades of *iprus* vs. *iptaras* in the protases of laws. The problematic statement to the effect that *iprus* in the protasis corresponds to the present (GAG §161, older editions) reflects precisely that issue. Taking the example of §§146 and 147 in the Codex Hammurabi (pp. 130–31 in Cohen’s analysis), all of the *iprus* forms *iḫuz* “he took,” *iddin* “she gave,” *uld-u* “she gave birth” (subordinated), and *lā ulid* “she did not give birth” have past (completed) reference. The fact that only the first two forms are idiomatically translated in the present tense in European languages does not necessarily behoove us to assume a different temporal/aspectual reference in the source language.

The author gives an overview of different attempts in the Assyriological literature to assign specific values to *iprus* and *iptaras* in *iprus-ma iptaras* clauses, starting with Goetze 1936, via Hirsch 1969 and Maloney 1982, to Streck 1998, Metzler 2002, and Loesov 2004, all of whom have specifically investigated the *t*-form (*ip-t-aras*) in Akkadian (the semantic connection between perfect(ive) and reflexive in this form plays no role in this context). From this reviewer’s perspective, the differences in interpretation of the opposition in question are not dramatic, though, with different focus on anteriority vs. posteriority (Streck 1998, Metzler 2002), background vs. foreground (more salient facts) (Maloney 1982), and different (macro-)syntactic domains. Loesov (2004) argues for *iprus* representing the “narrative” part of the law (cf. also Cohen 2012: 7).

The author himself is quite careful in assuming—in view of the lack of a general context in the laws—“general unmarkedness with regard to temporal reference,” as far as *iprus* and *iptaras* are concerned, and opts for a solution where *iptaras* is basically assigned the role of ending a chain [of events in the protasis], without any further temporal and/or aspectual assumptions. This is all the more important in the light of the negative form of *iptaras* in this context, which regularly surfaces as *lā iprus* (cf. also Hirsch 1969). Typologically, such an assumption (i.e., of a special chain-ending form) is perfectly plausible in Semitic context. In Ethio-Semitic, for instance, chains of events are often coordinated in such a way that only the last event is encoded in a finite verb form, whereas the preceding events appear as gerunds (or converbs), e.g., in the following example taken from Appleyard 1995:

taksi *ṭärtäw* *täsaffäräw* *kä-ṭəqit* *gize* *bāhwala*
 taxi call:CVB.3PL get_in:CVB.3PL of-little time after

məgəb *bet* *yədärsallu*
 food house arrive:IPF.3PL

“they call a taxi, get in, and after a while they arrive at the restaurant” (“having called . . . , having gotten in, . . . , they arrive . . .”)

The author, who had already published an important study on the modal system of Old Babylonian (Cohen 2005), is to be congratulated on the completion of this meticulous descriptive-analytical study. The three genre-related case studies form a harmonious set. This reviewer would have been curious as to Cohen’s opinion regarding “elliptic” *šumma* (*lā*) clauses, a type of counterfactual modal clause (cf.

Edzard 2012), a topic not covered in this study, even though Cohen devotes some space to conditional structures with modal and asseverative particles.

A minor technical quibble concerns the at times irregular interlinear transcription. Morphemes separated by hyphens should always be represented by corresponding elements separated by hyphens in the transcription, e.g., *šum-im* = name-GEN, not *name.GEN (p. 179); conversely, portmanteau morphemes should be rendered as such, e.g., *apāl-am* = buy.INF-ACC, not *buy-INF-ACC (p. 178). Also highlighted (bold print) verb forms and other elements in the original Akkadian should also be marked in this way in the translation. But these minor points in no way affect the high overall quality of this study. A very readable summary of Cohen's study can be found in his contribution to the *Festschrift* for John Huehnergard (Hasselbach and Pat-El 2012).

REFERENCES

- AbB = *Altbabylonische Briefe in Umschrift und Übersetzung*. Leiden: Brill, 1964–.
- CH = *Codex Hammurabi*.
- GAG = W. von Soden. 1995. *Grundriß der akkadischen Grammatik*, 3rd ed. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- LE = R. Yaron. 1988. *The Laws of Eshnunna*, 2nd ed. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- YOS 10 = A. Goetze. 1947. *Old Babylonian Omen Texts*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.
- Appleyard, D. 1995. *Colloquial Amharic: A Complete Language Course*. London: Routledge.
- Cohen, E. 2005. *The Modal System of Old Babylonian*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- . 2012. Functional Values of *iprus* Forms in Old Babylonian *šumma* Protases. In Hasselbach and Pat-El. Pp. 1–11.
- Edzard, L. 2010. Conditional Clause. *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics Online*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2012. The Hypotaxis-Parataxis Dichotomy and Elliptic Conditional Clauses in Semitic. In Hasselbach and Pat-El. Pp. 13–25.
- Goetze, A. 1936. The *t*-form of the Old Babylonian Verb. *JAOS* 55: 297–334.
- Hasselbach, R., and N. Pat-El., eds. 2012. *Language and Nature: Papers Presented to John Huehnergard on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- Hirsch, H. 1969. Zur Frage der *t*-Formen in den keilschriftlichen Gesetzestexten. In lišān miṭḫurti: *Festschrift Wolfram Freiherr von Soden*, ed. W. Röllig. Pp. 119–31. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Loesov, S. 2004. T-perfect in Old Babylonian: The Debate and a Thesis. *Babel und Bibel* 1: 83–182.
- Maloney, J. F. 1982. The T-Perfect in the Akkadian of Old Babylonian Letters, with a Supplement on Verbal Usage in the Code of Hammurapi and the Laws of Eshnunna. PhD Diss. Harvard Univ.
- Metzler, K. A. 2002. *Tempora in altbabylonischen literarischen Texten*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Snitzer-Reilly, J. 1986. The Acquisition of Temporals and Conditionals. In *On Conditionals*, ed. E. C. Traugott et al. Pp. 309–31. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Streck, M. 1998. The Tense Systems in the Sumerian-Akkadian Linguistic Area. *Acta Sumerologica* 20: 181–99.
- Xrakovskij, V. 2005. *Typology of Conditional Constructions*. Munich: Lincom.

LUTZ EDZARD
UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

Seven Generations since the Fall of Akkad. Edited by HARVEY WEISS. *Studia Chaburensia*, vol. 3. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 2012. Pp. viii + 299, illus. €64 (paper).

This volume presents the results of a workshop held during the 8th ICAANE conference at Warsaw in 2012. It was edited by the organizer of this workshop, Harvey Weiss, and was published with admirable speed and in good quality only a few months after the conference.