

There is some unevenness in the quality and importance of the articles in the volume, as one often finds in conference proceedings. A few are general surveys while others focus on more detailed subjects. However, if I may be permitted one quibble, the study of ancient magic (however defined) has advanced in the last couple of decades beyond the point where authors should feel compelled to discuss the hackneyed methodological problems posed by definitions of “magic” and the inherent polemic in distinguishing magic from religion. More than a few of the articles travel this well-worn path in their introductions. Notwithstanding this minor criticism, the volume contains many useful contributions and belongs in the libraries of students of ancient magic.

SCOTT NOEGEL
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Wandering Arameans: Arameans outside Syria: Textual and Archaeological Perspectives. Edited by ANGELIKA BERLEJUNG, AREN M. MAEIR, and ANDREAS SCHÜLE. Leipzig: Altorientalistische Studien, vol. 5. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 2017. Pp. x + 298, illus. €58 (paper).

This volume contains updated versions of the papers presented at a workshop held in October 2014 at Leipzig. In recent years, many volumes have been published on ancient Arameans, but the scope of this volume is somewhat different from that of the previous publications. Instead of focusing on the specific characteristics of the Arameans, this collection directs its research to the cultural and linguistic interactions between the Arameans and neighboring cultures during the first millennium BCE.

The volume includes twelve contributions divided into two parts: “Syria and Palestine” and “Mesopotamia and Egypt.” The distribution of the contributions in the second part of the volume is rather inconsistent, since only one article deals with the Arameans in Egypt. Furthermore, the impression of a certain fragmentation of the general theme cannot be avoided, as some papers, although very interesting, are highly specialized.

Jonathan Greer’s “The Cult at Tel Dan: Aramean or Israelite?” opens the volume by dealing with the question of the ethnic determination of the Iron Age temple complex in Area T at Tel Dan. Due to the site’s location in northern Israel, Tel Dan presents a multiethnic picture. Some scholars suggest that this temple complex was an Aramean sanctuary, but Greer claims that the temple structure and its cultic practices are archaeologically congruent with other Israelite religious practice, so that the affiliation of the Area T sanctuary to a Yahwistic cult cannot be excluded.

In the next paper, “New Light on Linguistic Diversity in Pre-Achaemenid Aramaic,” H. Gzella offers some remarks on the linguistic diversity in the Aramaic textual sources of the seventh and sixth centuries BCE. Having already dealt with this subject in his recent book, *A Cultural History of Aramaic: From the Beginnings to the Advent of Islam* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 104–56, he claims once more that the Aramaic texts from the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian periods lack high linguistic standardization. The Aramaic texts of this era have some linguistic features that contrast with those of Syrian Aramaic of earlier times as well as the standard Aramaic of the Achaemenid period. All these variations demand a more nuanced understanding of the complex social and political processes that led to the origin of official Achaemenid Aramaic.

In a highly speculative contribution entitled “‘My Father Was a Wandering Aramean’: Biblical Views of the Ancestral Relationship between Israel and Aram,” Y. Levin tries to understand the expression *’rmy ’bd ’by*—usually translated as “A wandering Aramean was my father”—in the light of some traditions about Aram in Genesis. Attributing historical value to these, in my opinion, recent literary traditions, Levin suggests that the “fathers” of Israel and Aram shared a long part of their ancient history.

A. M. Maier’s “Can Material Evidence of Aramean Influences and Presence in Iron Age Judah and Israel Be Found?” deals with the possible cultural influences of the Arameans on the regions of Israel, Judah, and Philistia during Iron Age II. While he suggests caution in identifying an Aramaic phase at

Tel Dan as well as at Hazor, Tel Kinrot, and Deir ʿAlla, on the other hand he asserts that the destruction of Gath (Tell es-Safi) is related to a military campaign of Hazael (cf. 2 Kings 12:18).

The alleged Aramaic traditions of the Deir ʿAlla plaster inscription are discussed by A. Schüle, “Balaam from Deir Allā: A Peripheral Aramean?” He concludes that neither the content nor the language of this inscription can be associated with the culture of Aram-Damascus. It would be preferable to consider the Balaam tradition of Deir ʿAlla as a local one that does not conform with other religious traditions of that time.

The essay of O. Sergi, “The Battle of Ramoth-gilead and the Rise of the Aramean Hegemony in the Southern Levant during the Second Half of the 9th Century BCE,” tries to reconstruct the historical circumstances surrounding the battle of Ramoth-gilead, i.e., the fall of the Omride dynasty, the breach of the alliance between Aram and Israel, and the rise of the Aramean hegemony. He bases his historical reconstruction on four written documents: the Tel Dan royal inscription; 2 Kings 8:28–29; 9:14–16; and the questionable 1 Kings 22:2b–4, 9–37. Based on these written documents, Sergi suggests that Joram first abandoned the anti-Assyrian coalition and then attacked Ramoth-gilead, attempting to take advantage of the Assyrian campaign against Damascus in 841 BCE, but instead bringing about the Aramean hegemony over Israel in the following decades.

The second part of the book opens with the well-informed contribution of A. Berlejung on the social conditions of the Judean exiles in rural Babylonia (“Social Climbing in the Babylonian Exile”). Based on the large group of recently published cuneiform tablets from Al-Yahudu, she shows how some “ordinary” Judeans exploited their opportunities in Babylonia: Over the course of two or three generations these Judeans integrated into the Babylonian economic system and succeeded in greatly improving their economic standing. This paper will be of great interest to biblical scholars.

In the next article, entitled “Babylonian Scribal Practices in Rural Contexts: A Linguistic Survey of the Documents of Judean Exiles and West Semites in Babylonia (CUSAS 28 and Bar 6),” J. Hackl analyzes the aberrant lexical and grammatical forms of the written documents of the Judean exiles in Babylonia. Since many of these aberrant forms that diverge from “classical” Babylonian used in legal documents can be reconciled with the linguistic traits of contemporary letters, Hackl supposes that these forms do not derive from the influence of Aramaic speakers, but are rather due to the introduction of vernacular traits into the formal language of contracts.

T. Oshima, “How ‘Mesopotamian’ Was Ahiqar the Wise? The Search for Ahiqar in Cuneiform Texts,” asks whether there is anything specifically Mesopotamian in the legend and the sayings of Ahiqar. Although the name Ahiqar appears in many cuneiform texts, Oshima thinks that it is not possible to identify any historical figure with the sage Ahiqar. On the other hand, due to some of Ahiqar’s sayings being rooted in Mesopotamian literature and the absence of any criticism of the Assyrian court, Oshima believes that the Ahiqar composition could reflect an Assyrian scribal tradition.

In the next contribution, “Late Babylonian in Aramaic Epigraphs on Cuneiform Tablets,” M. P. Streck, in updating two earlier studies by R. Zadok and J. Oelsner, examines the corpus of almost 300 Aramaic epigraphs on Late Babylonian cuneiform tablets (from 626 BCE onward). After listing and giving transcriptions of all the Aramaic epigraphs along with their Akkadian parallels, Streck provides some interesting phonological, morphological, and lexicographical observations on the Late Babylonian language.

In his contribution entitled “Tiglath-Pileser I and the Initial Conflicts of the Assyrians with the Arameans,” K. L. Younger Jr. takes up themes already studied in chapter 3.2 of his recent book, *A Political History of the Arameans: From Their Origin to the End of Their Polities* (Atlanta: SBL, 2016). Here he provides a deep historical interpretation of many Assyrian texts pertaining to Tiglath-pileser I’s conflicts with the Arameans and Babylonia. After a detailed and critical treatment of many Assyrian texts, Younger concludes that Tiglath-pileser I could conduct his campaigns against the Arameans only during his first two decades of reign, before he needed to fight against Babylonia. Consequently, at the end of Tiglath-pileser I’s lengthy reign, Arameans could not be removed from the core of Assyrian territory.

In the final contribution to the book, “Arameans in Egypt,” G. Vittmann makes a lengthy survey of the Aramaic documents from Egypt dated to the Persian Period. In his detailed treatment, Vittmann centers his analysis on the relations between Egyptians and Arameans. Moreover, examining the occur-

rences of Egyptian personal names in Aramaic texts, he illustrates various degrees of cultural contact between Egyptian and non-Egyptian families.

Three useful indexes (Bible Quotations, Places and Proper Names, Subjects) close the volume.

PAOLO MERLO

PONTIFICAL LATERAN UNIVERSITY, ROME

Les Chants du monde: Le paysage sonore de l'ancienne Mésopotamie. By ANNE-CAROLINE RENDU LOISEL. Toulouse: PRESSES UNIVERSITAIRES DU MIDI, 2016. Pp. 276, illus. €24 (paper).

Ce volume est une version remaniée de la thèse de doctorat de l'auteur soutenue à l'Université de Genève en 2011. Il est divisé en huit chapitres qui traitent des thèmes suivants: 1–3) les sons en tant que messages divins dans les traités divinatoires; 4–5) la voix humaine et les émotions qu'elle dévoile; 6) les sons démoniaques; 7) les utilisations rituelles de la musique; 8) les pouvoirs de la voix humaine en contexte rituel.

L'intitulé même de l'introduction ("Pour une anthropologie des sons dans les textes cunéiformes," pp. 19–27) présente l'objectif principal que l'auteur souhaite atteindre, à savoir décrire au plus près les "paysages sonores" et leur perception par les habitants de l'ancienne Mésopotamie. L'un des sons au cœur de l'investigation de l'auteur est la voix, qu'elle soit humaine, divine ou animale. Afin d'ouvrir le plus possible son champ d'étude, l'auteur décide d'examiner "tous les types de textes" dans une "perspective de longue durée, de l'époque paléo-babylonienne ... à l'époque séleucide" (p. 26). On pourrait, dans un premier temps, s'inquiéter des références faites ici et là à "la culture mésopotamienne" (p. 27), alors qu'il faudrait, me semble-t-il, parler plutôt de "cultures mésopotamiennes" dans toute leur diversité, la Mésopotamie ne constituant pas un bloc culturel homogène aussi bien à travers le temps que dans l'espace. Cependant, tout au long de son ouvrage, l'auteur prend grand soin de présenter brièvement la datation et l'appartenance culturelle de chacun des extraits qu'elle cite.

Le premier chapitre ("Entendre et interpréter les sons: Les paysages sonores de l'ancienne Mésopotamie," pp. 29–49) examine la série divinatoire *šumma ālu* qui mentionne plusieurs événements sonores. L'auteur fait aussi le point sur les formes verbales onomatopéiques qui reflètent la perception des Anciens des sons ainsi désignés. Le concept d'*egirrû*, c'est-à-dire de présage sonore, est ensuite décrit. Deux textes provenant d'horizons chronologiques différents (l'un est néo-assyrien, l'autre est séleucide) témoignent de la possibilité de solliciter rituellement un *egirrû*.

Le tonnerre et les cris d'oiseaux forment l'objet du deuxième chapitre ("Les chants de la nature: Tonnerre et cris d'oiseaux," pp. 51–74). Le tonnerre est, comme attendu, perçu comme la voix du dieu de l'orage, notamment dans les traités divinatoires. Quant aux oiseaux, ils sont par nature d'excellents messagers divins. Concernant la pratique hittite de l'ornithomancie, l'auteur indique: "Le terme IGI. MUŠEN 'celui qui observe les oiseaux' est attesté dans les textes hittites du milieu du II^e millénaire av. J.-C.: c'est d'ailleurs à partir du règne de Muršili III (XIII^e siècle av. J.-C.) que la pratique connaît son développement maximal, (introduite peut-être par les Hourrites)" (p. 60). L'auteur résume ici un passage de l'article de Gilbert McEwan, qu'elle cite en note (voir McEwan, "A Seleucid Augural Request," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 70 [1980]: 62 et non pas 61). Dans ce passage résumé par Rendu-Loisel, McEwan lui-même résume en partie ce qu'Annelies Kammenhuber écrivait en 1976 (*Orakelpraxis, Träume und Vorzeichenschau bei den Hethitern*, 1976, 20 et 204), mais en déformant au passage le nom de Muršili II en Muršili III (ce dernier désignant Urhi-Tešub, un roi qui n'a laissé que très peu de textes derrière lui en raison de son très court règne), déformation que Rendu-Loisel reproduit derrière lui. Il aurait été souhaitable de remonter à la source et, surtout, de se tenir informé des publications plus récentes en hittitologie: j'ai, précisément, réalisé une étude sur l'ornithomancie hittite en collaboration avec Ian Rutherford. Cette étude, publiée en 2013, contredit Kammenhuber: nous y soulignons que la première attestation d'augure anatolien remonte au règne de Hantili I^{er} (première moitié du XVI^e siècle) et que le vocabulaire technique de l'ornithomancie "hittite" illustre une origine louvite, et non