

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.

The subject of the workshop was the cultural development of the Khabur plains in what we used to call northeast Syria between c. 2300 and 1900 B.C. The flourishing and densely inhabited urban network of the mid-third millennium experienced a critical development towards the end of the millennium. Some sites were completely abandoned while others shrank significantly. The post-Akkadian, Ur III, and Isin-Larsa periods (in terms of the traditional Mesopotamian chronology) or EJZ 4c–5 and OJ I periods (in terms of the ARCANÉ project) are not well attested and are difficult to grasp in archaeological terms.

While these basic facts are more or less agreed upon by all researchers dealing with this period, there has been much and sometimes fierce argument over the extent, nature, and causes of the crisis. Harvey Weiss, director of excavations at the site of Tell Leilan, has argued for a total collapse in the Khabur region, caused by a “megadrought” and the effects of Akkadian imperialism, which resulted in a settlement hiatus of more than two centuries. Weiss uses the “Seven Generations,” which, according to a building inscription of Shamshi-Adad from Nineveh, had passed between the Fall of Akkad and the reign of this ruler, as a label for the period of collapse he proposes; hence the title of the book.

On the contrary, the excavators of several other sites in the region have argued against Weiss’ thesis of total collapse and have insisted on the existence of layers from the critical period at their sites.

The Warsaw workshop brought together many of the archaeologists working on material from this critical period from the Khabur region; the relevant regional sites are represented in this book. Most contributors present material from their site and try to put it into the framework of the regional development as they reconstruct it.

Three articles deal with Tell Brak. A. McMahon presents ceramic material from this site and that of Chagar Bazar. Comparisons with ceramic assemblages from central and southern Mesopotamia are used to date the Brak/Chagar Bazar pottery to the post-Akkadian and Ur III periods. She therefore emphasizes the existence of late third-millennium layers at both sites, but recognizes a hiatus in the early second millennium (c. 2000–1850 B.C.).

C. Colantoni presents data from a survey in the sustaining area of Tell Brak. Combined with excavation results at the main site, he sees a “less dense and less monumental urban fabric,” but a continued occupation at Brak and its vicinity in the post-Akkadian and Ur III periods. Like McMahon, he sees the lowest point of the development at and around Brak after the Ur III period, in the early second millennium. He, however, considers a continued occupation of a small settlement core at Brak in this period to be possible.

G. Emberling, H. McDonald, J. Weber, and H. Wright present the results from the excavation of the so-called Pisé Building in area TC of Tell Brak. This is a low-status residential complex which is dated by means of pottery comparisons and radiocarbon dates to the post-Akkadian period (EJZ 4c in ARCANÉ terminology). Area TC was completely abandoned after this phase and not resettled later.

Material from Tell Barri is presented by V. Orsi, who dates phase Q of the long area G sequence of that site to the Akkadian period, phase P to the post-Akkadian period (including Ur III, i.e., EJZ 4c–5), and phase O to the early second millennium. She cites stratigraphy and ceramic typology and considers the possibility of a short hiatus between phases Q and P. Even though she never states it explicitly, Orsi obviously assumes continuity between phases P and O at Barri. She defines a “pre-Khabur” ceramic assemblage at Barri and Mozan, which she dates as contemporaneous to the Isin-Larsa period in southern Mesopotamia.

R. Koliński takes the generation metaphor of the book’s title literally and presents results from his excavations in Sector P of Tell Arbid according to thirteen generations. His Arbid generations are, however, just conventional labels for the different levels of this excavation area without any specific chronological meaning. After the (short?) abandonment of an Akkadian level the area was resettled. The so-called “main building,” interpreted as a caravanserai (but probably rather a large private house), is dated to the post-Akkadian period. Sometime after the abandonment of the “main building” a series of pits were dug, which Koliński dates to the Late post-Akkadian (i.e., Ur III/EJZ 5) period. After another hiatus (Koliński estimates a duration of about a century) the area was resettled in the OJ I period.

Ch. Nicolle presents results of the excavations at Tell Mohammed Diyab, which was abandoned during the EJZ 3b and 4a (late ED and early Akkadian) periods and resettled only late in the Akkadian

period (Phase MD XI; EJZ 4b–c). The size of the settlement shrank in the post-Akkadian phase, but it was not abandoned. After a period of abandonment (MD X) there follows phase MD IX with substantial buildings made of pisé walls. This phase did not contain any Khabur ware pottery and is thus tentatively dated to the EJZ 5 (Ur III) phase.

The development of private households at several regional sites during the EJZ 4–5 periods is the subject of P. Pfälzner's contribution. Referring also to several publications by himself and his team from Mozan (e.g., Pfälzner 2012), he emphasizes a model of two "socio-political turns" in the Khabur region, dated to the EJZ 5 and OJ I periods. In his eyes, these turns caused a crisis and a fundamental change of the urban system, but no general collapse. Unfortunately Conrad Schmidt, whose work on the pottery from the Puššam house at Mozan (see now Schmidt 2013) is crucial for the understanding of the EJZ 5 period, was not present at the Warsaw workshop. His earlier publications on the subject (e.g., Schmidt 2012) are, however, regularly quoted throughout the volume.

The Tell Leilan team, led by Weiss, presents results from excavations in the Acropolis NW area of the site. A monumental structure of period IIb is labelled the "Akkadian Administrative Building." After its abandonment, an isolated building was erected on top of the old wall stubs. This building is dated to period Leilan IIc, contemporary with EJZ 4c. It was used for only a short period before the area, and most probably the entire site, was abandoned until the OJ II period. A long series of radiocarbon dates is used to emphasize the duration (c. 250 years) of the hiatus at Leilan.

Three other articles deal with Leilan finds: P. Quenet and L. Ristvet discuss the pottery from the Acropolis NW excavation. The material from the Akkadian Administrative Building fits well into the spectrum of EJZ 4a–b pottery defined by the ARCANE group (Rova 2011). Contrary to Quenet's own former opinion (Quenet 2011: 35), the Leilan IIc material is now dated to EJZ 4c and is thus clearly separated from EJZ 5. A. McCarthy adduces the lack of recognizable post-Akkadian (in the sense of glyptic styles) seals from the whole Khabur region (with the notable exception of Mozan), which he sees as an indication of a collapsed administrative system.

A. Smith has analyzed plant remains from the Akkadian and post-Akkadian levels at Leilan and has found some indications for an adaptation of agriculture to drier conditions in the post-Akkadian period.

L. Ristvet and M. Arrivabeni discuss the results of the Leilan Regional Survey in two contributions. Ristvet deals with periods IIa and IIb (EJZ 3b and 4a–b), when the Leilan region was densely settled. Arrivabeni has reanalyzed the post-Akkadian and Early Khabur periods IIc and I and argues that the diagnostic types of EJZ 5 are completely absent from the Leilan region. Contrary to earlier interpretations of the same survey material, Arrivabeni sees now a complete settlement void between c. 2150 and 1900 B.C.

The site of Hamoukar is discussed by C. Reichel, T. Paulette, and K. Grossman. They present results from excavations in areas C and H. In both areas the latest third-millennium strata were ransacked and a lot of pottery was found smashed on the floor. The most likely dating of this ceramic is post-Akkadian (EJZ 4c).

In the first chapter of the volume, Weiss assembles his arguments for a settlement collapse of more than two centuries. Besides the climate proxies, he uses the data of the Leilan Regional Survey. Based on the analysis of Leilan IIc pottery by Arrivabeni, he drastically reduces the time-span for the IIc period of the survey from 300 to 30 years (compare Fig. 3 on p. 8 with Ristvet 2012: 42, Fig. 5.). The very short duration of the post-Akkadian settlement at Leilan does not mean, however, that all eighteen survey sites were occupied that briefly. At least the site of Mohammed Diyab, which was part of the survey, was definitely occupied at some time in the critical period, as Nicolle has shown.

In his preface, Weiss presents his perspective ("megadrought," regional settlement collapse between c. 2200 and 1950 with the exception of Mozan, which even he cannot explain away) as the verdict of the workshop and continues: "To be sure, several contributors to this volume do not share in these perspectives." What follows are the names of the authors of six (out of eight) contributions not dealing with Leilan material. The words he uses to dismiss their arguments show that he does not consider their arguments as scientific. This is neither fair nor, in the eyes of the reviewer, justified: There was definitely a severe crisis of the regional settlement system at the end of the third millennium, but the total absence of settlement at Leilan between c. 2200 and 1900 B.C. appears to be rather an exception than the rule.

This book did not resolve its topic, but it has assembled contributions from most relevant researchers and deals with almost all relevant sites. Whoever wants to deal with this matter should consult it.

ALEXANDER PRUSS  
UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ

## REFERENCES

- Pfälzner, P. 2012. The Question of Desurbanisation versus Reurbanisation of the Syrian Jazirah in the Late Third and Early Second Millennium BC. In *Looking North: The Socioeconomic Dynamics of the Northern Mesopotamian and Anatolian Regions during the Late Third and Early Second Millennium BC*, ed. N. Lanieri, P. Pfälzner, and S. Valentini. Pp. 51–80. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Quenet, Ph. 2011. Stratigraphy. In *Associated Regional Chronologies for the Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean*, vol. I: *Jezirah*, ed. M. Lebeau. Pp. 19–47. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Ristvet, L. 2012. Resettling Apum: Tribalism and Tribal States in the Tell Leilan Region, Syria. In *Looking North*. Pp. 37–50.
- Rova, E. 2011. Ceramic. In *Associated Regional Chronologies*. Pp. 49–127.
- Schmidt, C. 2012. The Late Third and Early Second Millennium BC Pottery Tradition in the Syrian Jazirah and Beyond. In *Looking North*. Pp. 163–74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2013. *Ausgrabungen 1998–2001 in der zentralen Oberstadt von Tall Mozan/Urkeš 4: Die Keramik der Früh-Ġazīra V- bis Alt-Ġazīra II-Zeit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

---

*Die Lebermodelle aus Boğazköy*. By AN DE VOS. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Beiheft 5. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 2013. Pp. 274, 56 pls. €76.

As has long been known, one of the primary methods by which the ancient Mesopotamians, as well as the participants in peripheral cultures partaking of cuneiform civilization, elicited information from their deities was the examination of the internal organs of sacrificial sheep—haruspicy or extispicy. Within this method of divination, inspection of the liver (hepatoscopy) played a major role. Instruction in the reading of the future from livers was undoubtedly predominantly oral, from master to apprentice, but written documentation—a “reference library”—also developed. It is from the surviving scraps of this professional literature that modern scholars have derived their still rudimentary understanding of this ancient “science.”

Two basic types of text comprise this arcane genre: extensive lists of individual observations in casuistic format—“If X is to be seen, then Y will occur”—and clay models of the liver, displaying the particular physical features of the organ in question, each often accompanied by (sometimes abbreviated) inscriptions of the oracles (a better designation than the usual “omens”) thereby indicated.

Hittite culture adopted the cuneiform writing system and along with it various features of Mesopotamian religion, literature, etc. Indeed, excavations at the Hittite capital Boğazköy/Hattusa have yielded the greatest number of model livers (CTH 547) from a single site—fifty-eight, easily eclipsing runner-up Mari with thirty-two. The book under review, the revised version of a 2010 Würzburg dissertation written under the direction of G. Wilhelm, is a full edition of these objects, each presented in excellent photographs and those published here for the first time also in hand-copies (by G. Wilhelm and H. Otten).

De Vos transliterates and translates each model, assigning new sigla (Bo 1 to Bo 58) and providing extensive references to previous studies where relevant. Her philological commentaries are exhaustive and contribute to progress in our knowledge of the technical details of the underlying system of inquiry, the current state of which she conveniently illustrates in a sketch (p. 235, appendix 2). She also establishes that, as in Mesopotamia, the features were interpreted at Hattusa in a fixed, counterclockwise, order (p. 46).