"gentile times", mentioned by Jesus in Luke 21:24, began; thus Adventists in the nineteenth century. They lasted 2,520 years according to J.A. Brown's calculations (in 1823) and ended in 1914 AD. When positing the Jewish return from exile in 537 BC and when taking seriously Jeremiah's prophecy that the exile was to last seventy years (Jer. 29:10), one arrives at 607 BC. The author adduces many ancient sources to show that 607 is impossible. Important is the cuneiform evidence which is studied in much detail in the chapters on the length of reigns of the Neo-Babylonian kings (Chapter 3) and the absolute chronology of the Neo-Babylonian era (Chapter 4) (p. 89-190). The two oldest astronomical diaries give a firm basis for the absolute chronology (p. 84 f., 157-168); texts on lunar eclipses are studied (LBAT 1417, 1419-1421). Historical texts like chronicles, king lists and royal inscriptions (Nabonidus) are scrutinized; and the many dated Neo-Babylonian documents. Contemporaneous Egyptian chronology is adduced (p. 139-147). The appendix on this chapter comments on scribal errors in Babylonian texts. Here, collations made by C.B.F. Walker are presented and the overlaps of the reigns are investigated (p. 321-329, cf. 129-136). The author corresponded with a number of Assyriologists and gives their opinions (H. Hunger, A.J. Sachs, C.B.F. Walker, D.J. Wiseman).

HETTITOLOGIE

ZEILFELDER, S. — Hittite Exercise Book. English Version by Esther-Miriam Wagner. (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 17). Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2005. (24 cm, VIII, 309). ISBN 3-447-05206-6. ISSN 1619-0874. € 29,-.

This book is the English translation of the original German *Hethitisches Übungsbuch* (= *Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie* 9). It is intended as "a practical exercise book [...] for Hittite classes", treating "those parts of grammar which have proven to be the most problematic for the translation of texts" (p. V).

The book contains about 30 chapters that each treat certain aspects of Hittite grammar, like '*u*-stems', 'Present active', 'Personal pronouns' or 'Relative clauses'. Each chapter consists of a small introduction to the subject (often no more than a schematic overview of endings), and several sample sentences that function as an illustration to the specific matter. The sentences are taken from many different Hittite texts, and of each sentence a reference to its attestation place is given. In total, the book contains 924 sample sentences and translations[1]) of each one of them can be found at

the back of the book (p. 140-206) where we also find an alphabetic glossary (p. 207-300) containing all words that occur in the sentences. With this wealth of material the *Hittite Exercise Book* will certainly be a helpful tool to any teacher who easily wants to find examples of certain grammatical elements of Hittite. The question is, however, whether this book is a book with which students will be able to learn Hittite. I am afraid that this is not the case: to my taste the book is too un-linguistic.

Hittite is known from texts that date from about 1600-1180 BC. Within these four centuries Hittite, like any living language, underwent (sometimes drastic) linguistic changes: it is clear that the language from the oldest texts is quite different from the language attested in the youngest texts. Within Hittitology, it is therefore common to distinguish between an Old-Hittite (OH) and a Neo-Hittite (NH) language stage.[2]) Nevertheless, Zeilfelder has chosen to largely ignore these different stages in her book, claiming that "the restriction to "old" and "young" forms of speech [...] is still disputed" and that "a synchronous approach seems more tenable and reasonable" (p. 6). Just as one cannot treat the language of Shakespeare and modern-day English as one and the same linguistic stage of which a "synchronous" grammar could be written, any student who wants to learn Hittite should be clearly explained the differences between the OH and the NH linguistic stages.

The Hittite syllabary contains several signs that are ambiguous regarding their vowel: they can be read with either *e* or *i*: e.g. the sign BI can be read *pí* as well as *pé*; the sign IR can be read *ir* as well as *er*; etc. In the beginning of Hittitology this has led to the idea that the vowels **e* and **i* are merging throughout the Hittite period. Melchert (1984: 78-156) has meticulously shown that this is not the case, however, and that *e* and *i* are distinct phonemes at all stages of Hittite. This means that in most cases in which a sign is used that is ambiguous regarding its vowel, there are linguistic arguments to transliterate either *e* or *i*. Zeilfelder states that because "an actual sound change *e* > *i* cannot be ruled out [...] the "neutral" reading with *i-* has been chosen throughout this exercise book". Apart from the fact that there is no such thing as a "neutral" reading of a sign[3]), this leads to unnecessary complicated situations. For instance, on p. 66 the 3pl.pret.act.-ending *-er* is illustrated by the forms *ša-al-la-nu-uš-kir, pa-a-ir, da-i-ir, ku-en-nir, e-še-ir, ti-i-e-ir* and *e-ku-ir*, which on the basis of linguistic knowledge should have been transliterated *ša-al-la-nu-uš-ker, pa-a-er, da-i-er, ku-en-ner, e-še-er, ti-i-e-er* and *e-ku-er*. Similarly on p. 76, where the 2pl.imp.act.-ending *-tten* is illustrated by the forms *e-ip-tin, ú-wa-te-it-tin, e-eš-tin* and *pa-ah-ha-aš-tin*, which in fact should be transliterated *e-ep-tén, ú-wa-te-et-tén, e-eš-tén* and *pa-ah-ha-aš-tén*.

All sample sentences are given in transliteration, but the first 90 sentences (p. 9-22) are accompanied by a sort of bound transcription. The status of this transcription is unclear, however, and Zeilfelder does not account for it. She seems

---

[1]) Although I have not checked every translation, it seems to me that often Zeilfelder just copied the translations as given in the edition of the text from which the sentence stems. This does not always give a good result. Sometimes the translation is too unprecise. For instance, sentence 1 (p. 9), ^{GIŠ}*lu-ut-ta-a-uš kam-ma-ra-aš IŠ-BAT É-ir túh-hu-iš IŠ-BAT* is translated "The windows were filled with stench, the house was filled with smoke" (p. 140), which may have worked fine in a more literary rendering of the full text, but does not serve the purpose of teaching students Hittite. A better, literal translation might be 'Fog (stench) seized the windows, smoke seized the house'. In other cases the translation is not up-to-date. Sentence 36 (p. 14) *tup-pu-uš ša-kán-da šu-un-na-aš nu* DUMU^{MEŠ}*-ŠU an-da-an zi-ki-e-it* is translated "She filled containers with faeces and put her sons inside" (p. 142), which does not take into account Hoffner 1994 who showed that we should rather translate 'She filled (= smeared) the baskets with grease and placed her sons inside'.

[2]) For the problematic status of a Middle Hittite (MH) language stage, cf. Melchert fthc.

[3]) Just as one cannot state that the sign RI/TAL, which can be read *ri* as well as *tal*, has a "neutral" reading — one must always explicitly choose for either transliterating *ri* or transliterating *tal*, a choice that is based on linguistic knowledge —, the readings *pí* and *pé* of e.g. the sign BI are both **equally** possible and therefore **equally** neutral: one must choose one of them on the basis of linguistic knowledge.

to have tried to give a semi-phonetic rendering of the sentences, which is apparent from the fact that she represents geminate spelled stops with voiceless stops and single spelled stops with voiced stops (e.g. *ut-tar* becomes "utar" and *wa-tar-na-ah-hu-un* "wadarnahhun"), sometimes writes clusters where graphic vowels are written (*pár-aš-ta* becomes "parsta") and 'translates' sumero- and akkadograms into Hittite (e.g. INIM^MEŠ becomes "utar"). The result is inconsistent and does not meet up to academic standards. For instance, sentence 5, *nu ne-ku-uz me-e-hu-u-ni hu-u-da-a-ak GAM pa-it-tin* is transcribed "nu neguz mēhūni hūdāk kata paitin", which is neither a scholarly bound transcription (which would have been *nu nekuz mēhūni hūdāk GAM (katta) paitten*) nor a real phonological interpretation (which could have been e.g. /nu neg^wt^s mehoni Hodāk kata paiten/). Apart from these three unfortunate choices, the book contains several inadequate or plainly incorrect pieces of information. I have therefore made a list of additions and corrections.

p. 1: For the "history and cultural history of the Hittites" Zeilfelder refers to Goetze 1957, whereas e.g. Bryce 1998 and Bryce 2004 are more up-to-date.

p. 1: It is unfortunate to use *išpand-* / *šipand-* 'to libate' < **spend-* as an example of an initial consonant cluster that has been broken up by a graphical vowel because this is exactly the only case whose interpretation is unclear.

p. 2: Zeilfelder calls 'Sturtevant's spelling rule' (which observes that an intervocalic etymological tenuis is spelled with a geminate stop whereas an intervocalic etymological media is spelled with a single stop in Hittite) "optional". This is incorrect: although it does occasionally occur that due to simplified spelling an etymological tenuis is not spelled with a geminate, Sturtevant's rule is in principle always valid.

p. 2: The word *eššar* does not mean 'blood' and therefore cannot be used as an argument in favour of loss of *-h-* in *ēšhar* 'blood'.

p. 5: The explanation of IBoT as "Istanbul Boğazköi textlerindı" and ABoT as "Ankara Boğazköi textlerindı" is incorrect: IBoT is the abbreviation of "İstanbul Arkeoloji Müzesinde Bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri"; ABoT stands for "Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde Bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri".

p. 7: It is stated that "*a*-stems [are] always commune". This is incorrect, cf. e.g. *peda-* (n.) 'place', etc.

p. 9: *I!-BAT*: read *IŠ-BAT*.

p. 9: *nekuz* is not nom.sg.c., but an archaic gen.sg.

p. 18ff.: Texts from Maşat Höyük are cited with their excavation number (in this case Mşt. 75/17) and not with their publication siglum (in this case HKM 38), which is nowadays standard.

p. 31: On diphthongal stems see especially Weitenberg 1978.

p. 47: The endings *-hi, -ti, teni* and *-tani* are in fact *-hhi, -tti, -tteni* and *-ttani*. For the original 2pl.pres.act.-ending of the *hi*-conjugation *-šteni, -štani*, see Kloekhorst fthc.

p. 47: Note 31 is incorrect: the form *paršiya* is 3sg.pres.midd., showing the ending *-a*.

p. 48: I do not understand why sentence 261 is used as an example: it contains the form *ú-wa-a-mi*, which is fully aberrant within the paradigm of *uwa-* 'to

come': this spelling occurs only once, whereas the normal spelling *ú-wa-mi* occurs dozens of times.

p. 54: The endings *-ha, -hari, -ta, -tati* and *-tari* are in fact *-hha, -hhari, -tta, -ttati* and *-ttari*.

p. 54: The distinction made between a *mi-* and a *hi*-conjugation within the endings of the medium is incorrect: although the middle paradigm indeed has disposition over two sets of 3sg.-endings, namely *-a* / *-ari* vs. *-tta* / *-ttari*, the choice of a certain verb to use one of these sets has nothing to do with whether this verb uses the *mi-* or the *hi*-conjugation in its active inflection.

p. 60: The representation of the endings of the preterite active is far from perfect. (1) *-hun, -ta* and *-ten* are in fact *-hhun, -tta* and *-tten*. (2) It should be made clear that the 3sg.pret.act.-endings of the *mi*-conjugation "*-t, -ta*" are in complementary distribution, namely °V-*t* vs. °C-*ta*. (3) The 2sg.pret.act.-endings of both the *mi-* and the *hi*-conjugation as well as the 3sg.pret.act.-ending of the *hi*-conjugation need a diachronic presentation. The 3sg.pret.act.-ending of the *hi*-conjugation is *-š* in the oldest texts. Due to phonotactic reasons it is being replaced by its *mi*-variant *-ta* from the OH period onwards. Occasionally a conflation of *-š* and *-ta* yielded *-šta*. The 2sg.pret.act.-ending of the *mi*-conjugation is *-š* in the oldest texts. Again, due to phonotactic reasons, this ending is being replaced by its *hi*-variant *-tta* from the OH period onwards. The occasional NH 2sg.pret.act.-forms that have an ending *-t* are due to a very late merger of 2sg.- and 3sg.-forms. The 2sg.pret.act.-ending of the *hi*-conjugation is *-tta* throughout the Hittite period. Only in a very few cases in late texts the endings *-š* and *-šta* are used in this function due to a merger between 2sg.- and 3sg.-forms. (4) The original *hi*-ending of 2pl.pret.act. is *-šten*, for which see Kloekhorst fthc.

p. 68: The endings *-h(a)hat, hati, -tat, -ta, -tati* and *-tat* are in fact *-hhat, -hhati, -hhahat, -ttat, -tta* and *-ttati*.

p. 68: Same remark as for p. 54: there is no "*mi-* and *hi*-conjugation" difference in the medium paradigm.

p. 76: The form *e-hu* 'come!' is falsely given as an example of a 3sg.imp.act.-form of the *hi*-conjugation in *-u*. The form in fact is 2sg.imp.act. and reflects **h₁éi-h₂ou*, litt. 'go hither!'.

p. 78: The endings *-haharu, -hut* and *-taru* are in fact *-hhaharu, -hhut* and *-ttaru*. The ending *-hharu* should be added in the overview (cf. the examples *ú-wa-ah-ha-ru* and *za-ah-hi-ya-ah-ha-ru* given on the same page). Cf. the comments on p. 54 and p. 68 about the *mi-*: *hi*-distinction.

p. 83: The representation of the ablauting verbs is far too simplistic. I would at least have expected Zeilfelder to explain that *mi*-verbs originally show an ablaut *e/a* (e.g. *epzi* / *appanzi*), whereas (some) *hi*-verbs show an ablaut *a/e* (e.g. *ašāši* / *ašešanzi*, so exactly opposite). Moreover, there is no mention of the fact that in OH texts the strong stem of *hi*-verbs is consistently spelled with plene *-ā-* (*šākki, ārhi*, etc.).

p. 85: The representation of verbs like *dai-* / *ti-* 'to put' and *pai-* / *pi-* 'to give' as having an ablaut "*ā:e:i*" is fully incorrect. The original ablaut was *-ai-*: *-i-*, of which the diphthong *-ai-* monophthongizes to *-e-* in

front of -*h*- (note that the spelling *pihhi* is incorrect in view of spellings like *pé-e-eh-hi* that clearly show that spellings like PÍ/PÉ-IH/EH-*hi*, which Zeilfelder apparently reads as *pí-ih-hi*, should be read *pé-eh-hi* = *pehhi*). It should be noted that -*ā*- is not original in these verbs: it spread from MH times onwards out of 3sg.pres.act.-forms like *dāi* and *pāi* where it is the result of the contraction of *dai-i and *pai-i.

p. 89 The 'durative'-suffix -*annāi*- should be cited as -*anna*- / -*anni*-. The 'fientive'-suffix "-*ēš*-" in fact is -*ēšš*-.

p. 91 The suffix "-*šk*-" in fact is thematic: -*škela*-. The examples *me-mi-eš-ki-iz-zi, ti-it-hi-iš-ki-it-ta, za-ah-hi-iš-ki-iz-zi, pí-eš-kir, me-mi-iš-ki-te-en, píd-da-iš-ki-it-tin, tar-ah-hi-iš-ki-nu-un, pár-ši-ya-an-ni-iš-ki-it, ša-ku-iš-ki-iz-zi* and *še-eš-ki-it* therefore should rather be cited as *me-mi-eš-ke-ez-zi, ti-it-hi-iš-ke-et-ta, za-ah-hi-iš-ke-ez-zi, pé-eš-ker, me-mi-iš-ke-te-en, píd-da-iš-ke-et-tén, tar-ah-hi-iš-ke-nu-un, pár-ši-ya-an-ni-iš-ke-et, ša-ku-iš-ke-ez-zi* and *še-eš-ke-et*.

p. 101 The enclitics =*ta* and =*tu* in fact are =*tta* en =*ttu*. The enclitic =*naš* is usually spelled =*nnaš*.

p. 105 The enclitic =*ši* in fact is =*šši*. In OH texts we also find =*šše*.

p. 105 The following diachronic remarks should be added: the OH nom.pl.c. =*e* is replaced by =*at* in NH times. The form of nom.-acc.pl.n. in OH texts is =*e* as well, which is also being replaced by =*at* in NH times. In NH times, the acc.pl.c. can, besides with =*uš*, also be expressed with =*aš*.

p. 108 The nom.-acc.n.sg.-form "*kā*" does not exist: the form is *ki-i* (*kī*). The OH form of nom.-acc.pl.n. is *ke-e* (*kē*), which is being replaced by *ki-i* (*kī*) in NH times. Although dat.-loc.sg. *kuedaniki* occasionally does occur, the normal spelling is *kuedanikki*.

p. 117 Zeilfelder states that "the fusion of -*ašta* with *nu* shows *a*-vocalism which probably happens in analogy to the OldHitt. sentence introductory particle *ta*". This is nonsensical: the form *n=ašta* is completely regular according to the rule that in particle chains the vowel -*a*- is dominant over a preceding -*u*-, but is lost when -*e*- or -*i*- precedes (therefore *n=aš, n=an, n=ašta* but *nu=šše=šta*).

p. 117 The particle =*pat* does not "only occur at the end of a nominal phrase". It can be attached to every word (including verb forms) that need emphasis.

All in all, the *Hittite Exercise Book* will serve as a very convenient tool for every teacher of Hittite, in which sample sentences for different aspects of Hittite grammar can easily be found, but personally I would not recommend this book to my students: it is too unscholarly and confusing and contains too many mistakes.

References

Bryce, T. 1998: *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, Oxford.
Bryce, T. 2004: *Life and Society in the Hittite World*, Oxford.
Goetze, A. 1957: *Kleinasien*, München.
Hoffner, H.A. Jr. 1994: The Hittite Word for "Oil" and its Derivatives, *Historische Sprachforschung* 107, 222-230.
Kloekhorst, A. fthc.: The Hittite 2pl.-ending -*šten(i)*, to appear in *Atti del 6° Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia* (edd. A. Archi & R. Francia), Roma.

Melchert, H.C. 1984: *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*, Göttingen.
Melchert, H.C. fthc.: Middle Hittite Revisited, to appear in *Atti del 6° Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia* (edd. A. Archi & R. Francia), Roma.
Weitenberg, J.J.S. 1978: Einige Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Diphthong-Stämmen, *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch. Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeografischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens* (edd. E. Neu & W. Meid), Innsbruck, 289-303.

Leiden, March 2007   Alwin KLOEKHORST

OUDE TESTAMENT

TSUMURA, D. — Creation and Destruction. A Reappraisal of the Chaoskampf Theory in the Old Testament. Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, 2005. (23,5 cm, XVIII, 214). ISBN 1-57506-106-6. $ 32,50.

This is a revised edition of *The Earth and the Waters. A Linguistic Investigation*. Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, 1989 (JSOT Suppl. 83), which was review in *BiOr* 52 (1995), 107-109. Whereas Tsumura restricted his evaluation of Gunkel's Chaoskampf theory in his 1989 monograph to a discussion of the interpretation of Genesis 1-2 against the background of ancient Near Eastern mythology, he has now followed the suggestion of one of the reviewers, J.C.L. Gibson, to add a discussion of the function of waters and flood in biblical poetry. In this second part, which takes a good quarter of the total length, he investigates the alleged influence of especially Ugaritic conceptions on Psalms 18, 29, 46 and Habakkuk 3.

In the first part of the book Tsumura has — compared to the edition of 1989 — rephrased some statements, slightly reordered the chapters (making it more easy to follow his reasoning by offering more translations of the ancient texts and recapitulations of his arguments) and added references to recent secondary literature. In some cases he also takes up the discussion, for instance on p. 86, n. 5 about the in his view wrong translation of Hebrew '*ed* with 'dew'. In other cases he merely mentions some of the many studies that have been published in this field since 1990. Some of these certainly deserved more attention. Tsumura refers to the article on Tiamat by B. Alster in the *Dictionary of Deities and Demons* (citing from the first edition of 1995 and not from the extensively revised edition of 1999). He reckons Alster to his supporters by quoting his statement that "the parallels are not sufficiently specific to warrant the conclusion that *Enuma Elish* was the source of the biblical account" (p. 53). However, Tsumura fails to note that — opposed to his own theories — Alster sees many parallels between the Mesopotamian and Biblical accounts of creation and also remarks that Hebrew *tehom* is translated 'the deep' and is etymologically related to Akkadian *tiamat* (*DDD*, 2nd ed., p. 867). One would have expected at least some kind of criticism by Tsumura on this opinion ventured in a recent authoritative handbook.

The most important thing Tsumura added in the first part of his monograph is a short and compared to the rest of the book rather superficial discussion of the exegetical problems of *ruach elohim* in Genesis 1:2 (pp. 74-76). His conclusions, primarily on etymological and linguistic grounds, remain the