

- Pardee, Dennis. 2003–2004. Review of Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik*. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 50; online: [http://orientalistik.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/documents/Rezension\\_Tropper\\_AOAT273.pdf](http://orientalistik.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/documents/Rezension_Tropper_AOAT273.pdf).
- Pat-El, Na'ama. 2009. The Development of the Semitic Definite Article: A Syntactic Approach. *JSS* 54: 19–50.
- Tropper, Josef. 2001. Replik: Themen der ugaritischen Grammatik in der Diskussion. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 33: 621–39.
- Wilson-Wright, Aren. 2014. The Word for ‘One’ in Proto-Semitic. *JSS* 59: 1–13.

JOHN HUEHNERGARD  
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

---

*Hieroglyphic Luwian: An Introduction with Original Texts, 3rd Revised Edition*. By ANNICK PAYNE. *Subsidia et Instrumenta Linguarum Orientis*, vol. 2. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 2014. Pp. xiv + 217. €29.80 (paper).

Hieroglyphic Luwian Studies have a growing importance not only in Hittitology, but also in ancient Near Eastern studies in general. Thus an introductory textbook to this writing system and dialect is clearly a must and the earlier editions of the book under review represent a widely used and acclaimed introduction. Nevertheless, not only this importance but also the rapid growth of our knowledge of Hieroglyphic Luwian necessitate continuous revisions of even this book, which is the goal of the third edition reviewed here, even though the adaptation of current research has not always been successful (see below), and while the observations of Giusfredi's review (2012) of the second edition have been taken into account, those of Janda's review (2011) have not.

The book has maintained its original structure: the preface and the abbreviations are followed by the introduction containing general information (pp. 1–11) and by a relatively detailed grammatical overview (phonology [meaning here, however, orthography], morphology, and syntax [pp. 13–42]), where all topics are amply illustrated by examples. References to secondary literature keep a healthy balance between general and specialized works, though there could have been more references to new readings of particular signs (p. 10), since this is a quite crucial matter.

The main part consists of twelve sample texts presented with a short introduction, original drawing of the inscription, transliteration (the first six texts provided with a sign-by-sign explanation), grammatical interpretation, translation with short commentary, and a recapitulation with consecutive transliteration and translation (pp. 43–142), thus enabling an easy step-by-step learning of Hieroglyphic Luwian and its writing system. The book closes with a glossary (pp. 143–60), a sign list with an index (pp. 161–206), and a bibliography (pp. 207–26).

Noteworthy is the caution of the author in *not* adopting (only accurately noting, if necessary) the new values of <ta<sub>4</sub>> and <ta<sub>5</sub>>. The only structural change is an unfortunate one: the map of the find-spots of Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions has been omitted, although it obviously would have been more useful than the one-page fictive Luwian poetry of unknown function at the end of the book (p. 217). Despite the complicated typesetting, misprints are rare (<á> has often not been italicized in Luwian words [*á-sa-tá*, p. 29; *á-mu*, *á-sa-tá*, p. 30; *á-pa-na*, p. 36; *á-mi-ia-za*, p. 134; “KÖT-KALE” [p. 31]; “one postpositions” [p. 37]; “need be used” [p. 40]; “active participial” [p. 85]; “Old-Assyrian” [p. 135]).

While this book represents in general a trustworthy and up-to-date introduction and as an instructor I can only praise it from a pedagogical point of view, some inconsistencies and inaccuracies must nevertheless be pointed out:

*P. 2*: “Hattusa (modern Boğazköy)”: the village has been called Boğazkale since 1960.

*P. 11*: Meriggi 1953 is missing from the bibliography (since the first edition!).

*P. 13:* The signs <a> and <á> are not doublets, since they originally stood in complementary distribution until approximately the middle of the ninth century, and <á> is not used only word-initially (*contra* p. 19), although its non-initial usage is indeed highly restricted. For all this see Kloekhorst 2004: 27–35; Melchert 2010; and Simon 2013: 2–9.

*P. 16:* Payne shares the widespread view that Luwian aphaeresis was a common phenomenon. In fact, Melchert 2010 has already demonstrated that there was no aphaeresis in Luwian; see there for his explanation of Payne’s alleged examples (pp. 24, 26).

*P. 28:* Although until now indeed only three numerals have been attested, as Payne herself later notes (p. 129); a fourth, namely ‘one’, can be partly reconstructed from the acrophonic sign UNUS <sa<sub>8</sub>>.

*P. 30:* The reading of INFRA-*ta* is not \**kata*, but *zanta* (Goedegebuure 2010).

*P. 33:* For a more precise rule governing agreement with cardinal numbers see Bauer 2011.

*P. 36 n. 33:* The preposed postpositions are not exceptions; they underwent fronting, a kind of topicalization; cf. Melchert 2003: 201.

*P. 39:* Regarding negatives, Hawkins and Morpurgo-Davies 2010 should now be cited.

*Pp. 39, 56:* For a more precise rule for the position of relative pronouns in subordinate clauses see Melchert 2003: 207–8.

*P. 47:* The appropriate form of the ethnic suffix is *-wann(i)-*, not “*-wan-*”.

*P. 59:* Although Payne believes that “further excavations are no longer possible” in Karkemish, they have been resumed beginning in 2011.

*Pp. 71, 77:* The first syllable in the name of the Karkemishean Great King X-pazitis is no longer unknown: his name is Sapazitis as revealed by a new stela from Karkemish; see already Dinçol et al. 2012: 145.

*P. 135:* That “the lead documents from Assur and Kululu are in fact the only surviving examples of hieroglyphic handwriting” is no longer correct. Add at least the KIRŞEHİR-letter (Akdoğan and Hawkins 2007–2008 / 2010; with or without a new fragment, Weeden 2013), if other texts that (may) reflect handwriting are not taken into consideration.

*P. 216:* The book of Yakubovich appears in the bibliography as a dissertation, but with the publication year of the revised, book version.

Finally, Yakubovich 2013, which argues for the existence of an analytical superlative (*contra* p. 23), and demonstrates (p. 62) that *kumaza-* does not mean ‘priest’ (*contra* p. 19), was probably published too late to be included.

Notwithstanding these minor quibbles, Payne’s book is an excellent and enjoyable tool for both learning and teaching Hieroglyphic Luwian and the author deserves the gratitude of the scholarly community for continuously updating it.

## REFERENCES

- Akdoğan, R., and J. D. Hawkins. 2007–2008. Kırşehir-Yassıhöyük’ten ele geçen luvi hiyeroglif yazılı kurşun levha. *Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi’nin Yıllığı 2007–2008*: 7–14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. The Kırşehir Letter: A New Hieroglyphic Luwian Text on a Lead Strip. In *VII. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum 25–31 Ağustos 2008*, ed. Aygül Süel. Pp. 1–16. Ankara.
- Bauer, A. 2011. Counting in Hieroglyphic Luwian. *TPS* 109: 220–31.
- Dinçol, A., et al. 2012. A New Inscribed Stela from Karkemish: At the Origins of the Suhi-Katuwa Dynasty. *NEA* 75: 145–47.
- Giusfredi, F. 2012. Review of A. Payne, *Hieroglyphic Luwian, 2nd Revised Edition*. *WZKM* 102: 367–69.
- Goedegebuure, P. 2010. The Luwian Adverbs *zanta* ‘down’ and \**ānni-* ‘with, for against’. In *VII. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum 25–31 Ağustos 2008*, ed. Aygül Süel. Pp. 299–318. Ankara.
- Hawkins, J. D., and A. Morpurgo-Davies. 2010. More Negatives and Disjunctives in Hieroglyphic Luwian. In *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of H. Craig Melchert on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. Ronald Kim et al. Pp. 98–128. Ann Arbor.

- Janda, M. 2011. Review of A. Payne, *Hieroglyphic Luwian, 2nd Revised Edition*. *OLZ* 106: 180–81.
- Kloekhorst, A. 2004. The Preservation of \**h*<sub>1</sub> in Hieroglyphic Luwian: Two Separate *a*-Signs. *HS* 117: 26–49.
- Melchert, H. C. 2003. Language. In *The Luwians*, ed. id. Pp. 170–210. Leiden.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Spelling of Initial /a-/ in Hieroglyphic Luwian. In *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, ed. Itamar Singer. Pp. 147–58. Tel Aviv.
- Simon, Zs. 2013. Once Again on the Hieroglyphic Luwian Sign \*19 <á>. *IF* 118: 1–21.
- Weeden, M. 2013. A Probable Join to the “Kırşehir Letter.” *AAS* 18: 15–17.
- Yakovovich, I. 2013. The Degree of Comparison in Luwian. *IF* 118: 155–68.

ZSOLT SIMON

LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT, MUNICH

---

*Babylonian Poems of Righteous Sufferers: Ludlul Bēl Nēmeqi and the Babylonian Theodicy*. By TAKAYOSHI OSHIMA. *Orientalische Religionen in der Antike*, vol. 14. Tübingen: MOHR SIEBECK, 2014. Pp. xx + 572, 65 pls. €139.

“The main objective of this monograph is a new critical text edition of both *Ludlul Bēl Nēmeqi* (‘Let Me Praise the Lord of Wisdom’), known also as the ‘Babylonian Job’ or ‘Poem of the Righteous Sufferer’, and the so-called *Babylonian Theodicy*” (p. 1).

Readership of the book will be constituted by Assyriologists, but, more generally, by students of theology, biblical studies, and comparative religious studies. To engage this varied audience, Oshima attempts to translate these ancient texts to convey both the literal meaning of each phrase and an understanding of the general conceptions behind it.

Despite the broad appeal of these poems, Oshima has concentrated his efforts on philological work. He does not provide a comprehensive comparative literary analysis of the poems nor an in-depth discussion of the Babylonian views of divine judgment over humankind and its effects on their *Weltanschauung*. Oshima hopes to take up these topics, and the relationship of the Babylonian “pious sufferer” poems to the biblical book of Job, in future publications.

The book is divided into six parts: 1) Chapters I–II include introductions and the transliterations and translations of the composite texts of these poems. The composite text is set out on opposing pages with the Akkadian transliteration on the left, the English translation on the right. 2) Chapter III provides detailed philological and critical notes on the poems. These copious notes converse with other Mesopotamian texts and modern interpreters. 3) Chapter IV gives an arrangement of all manuscripts of the poems, both those published beforehand and those previously unpublished, like a musical score. In listing the manuscripts of *Ludlul*, Oshima does not follow any previous system, but has assigned a new set of sigla to all the manuscripts. 4) Chapter V offers critical editions of texts related to these two poems. 5) The book includes an extensive bibliography, a glossary, and eight indices, and 6) hand copies and photographs of the cuneiform manuscripts.

Oshima avoids using the term “wisdom literature” to refer to the poems in question, but prefers to restrict the use of that label to a particular group of books within the Hebrew Bible (Proverbs, Job, Qohelet, and some Psalms). Oshima favors the term “didactic texts” to designate these Mesopotamian texts.

### *Ludlul Bēl Nēmeqi*

This monologue recounts one man’s suffering and his miraculous recovery from illness with the help of the god Marduk. The poem was composed for the narrator himself, a man named Šubši-mešrê-Šakkan (III, 44 and V, 111 and 119), to praise Marduk’s saving power and to warn others of the dire consequences of sinning against the god and his temple. From indications in other texts, Šubši-mešrê-Šakkan probably lived around 1300 B.C.E., during the reign of King Nazimarutšaš (1307–1282), and