

Maier's alternative account (p. 17) is not remotely credible (Hittite *aggala-* 'furrow' reflects a virtual **ok-olo-* to the root of Latin *occa*, German *Egge*, etc., 'harrow'). Likewise *nadānt-* 'possessing a drinking straw' (cited p. 111 n. 628) is directly denominal to *nada-* 'reed; arrow'. Recognition of possessive *-ant-* explains possessive *paraššuwant-* to *paraššu-* (p. 119) and *tarzuwant-* to *tarzu-* (p. 166), since possessive *-want-* could only have led to †*paraššumant-* and †*tarzumant-*.

Selected remarks on individual topics:

P. 23: Important and illuminating is Maier's observation regarding secondary *u*-stem derivatives to thematic stems (in Hittite terms *a*-stems).

Pp. 38–40: Maier's account of ^{NINDA}*haršupanni-* and ^{NINDA}*har(a)špawant-* is morphologically and phonologically attractive (but the PIE root remains **h₃ers-*; Hittite *ārra-* 'buttock(s)' and cognates can only reflect **h₁órs-o-*).

Pp. 111–13: Maier correctly rejects Puhvel's account of Hittite (or perhaps Luvian) *naduwant-* as an Indic loanword; his own derivation from a root noun is possible, but less than assured.

P. 122: All the offered translations of the passage KUB 12.58 iv 3–6 are quite impossible. Maier is correct to reject an active reading of the past participle, since this never occurs with an expressed object. The meaning is passive, with "twelve body parts" as an accusative of respect. The presence of the reflexive particle *-za* in a nominal sentence forces either a first- or second-person reading. A second-person reading makes no contextual sense, but as per Goetze (1938: 21, 101), the subject of the action and the speaker in the preceding §32 must be the ritual client (despite the self-reference to "this ritual client"), and likewise in the following §34 (1938: 102). Therefore we may reasonably interpret the address to the two deities in §33 as being in the first person: "I have been scrubbed and purified of the impurity with respect to (my) twelve body parts by your own hand/with the clay of the spring."

P. 131: The participle *šakuwān* in the Laws §50 in Old Script cannot belong to the verb *šakuwaye/a-* (*sic!*), since the contraction of the latter stem to *šakuwā(i)-* is post-Old Hittite. See now CHD Š: 52.

Pp. 146–47: The interpretation of *šuppištuwarant-* as a hypostasis of *šuppi išduwa-*, allegedly 'shimmer brightly' is impossible semantically. The adjective *šuppi-* means 'sacred', not 'bright', and *išduwa-* means 'become known', not 'shine'. The evidence of the Hurro-Hittite Bilingual shows that *šuppištuwar-ant-* is another possessive adjective in *-ant-*, 'possessing bosses, protuberances, appliquéés' from the noun *šuppištuwarali-* 'boss, protuberance, appliqué' (also spelled once *išpištuwarāš* at KUB 42.64 Vo 2). We are dealing with a derivative of the PIE root **spei-* referring to various pointy objects: cf. English 'spit' or 'spire'.

P. 156: Neither the previous interpretation 'fever-plagued' nor the new one 'sky-blue' is semantically likely as an epithet of a field, and both ignore the consistent spelling of *ta-pa-šu-wa-an-t^o* with both single *-š-* and single *-t-*. A convincing interpretation of this word has yet to be presented.

Pp. 158–59: Kloekhorst's cited interpretation of Hittite *tar-uh-/tar-ḫu-* as */tar^{w-}/* is contra Maier the only viable one for the Hittite verb 'conquer'. The active sense of the participle in the name of the Anatolian Storm-god is noteworthy, but not remarkable for a past participle.

Pp.171–73: Hittite *tekri-* does not mean 'shame'. It is clear from a new occurrence that it refers to a verbal act (see Miller 2008: 122).

P. 175: The interpretation of the passage KBo 3.21 iii 19–20 is seriously flawed. One should *not* emend *gulašša*, which is the quite regular direct object, collective plural 'fate', a figura etymologica with the verb *gulašta* (likely translating Akkadian *šimta šāmu*): "Enlil fated a joyous fate for it, the beloved (city) of Anu." For *gulašša* 'fate' see in the same text KBo 3.21 ii 3–4: *n=ašta* ANA DINGIR. MEŠ GAL-TIM *tuliya anda tuel=pat gulašša tarranut* "And among the great gods in the assembly he made powerful *your* fate." Compare for the thought Samsuiluna C 73–74: ⁴EN.LÍL *šimātika ušarbi* "Enlil made great/exalted your fate."

The specific criticisms in the preceding do not adversely affect the overall positive impression: Maier has given us a definitive and most useful treatment of the Anatolian evidence for this important PIE suffix which should serve as the input for all future discussions of its form and function.

REFERENCES

- Atterer, Maria. 2011. *Typologische Analyse hethitischer Mythen: Schlange und Wettergott*. Hamburg: Kovač.
- CHD Š = Hans G. Güterbock†, Harry A. Hoffner, and Theo P. J. van den Hout. 2002. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Volume Š, Fascicle 1. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Čop, Bojan. 1964. Zur hethitischen Schreibung und Lautung. *Linguistica* (Ljubljana) 6: 37–76.
- Goetze, Albrecht. 1938. *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Miller, Jared. 2008. Joins and Duplicates among the Boğazköy Tablets (31–45). *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 98: 117–37.
- Oettinger, Norbert. 1988. Hethitisch -uant-. In *Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae: Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Erich Neu and Christel Rüster. Pp. 273–86. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Plath, Robert. 1994. *Der Streitwagen und seine Teile im frühen Griechischen: Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den mykenischen Texten und zum homerischen Epos*. Nürnberg: Carl.

The Verbal Tense System in Late Biblical Hebrew Prose. By OHAD COHEN. Harvard Semitic Series, vol. 63. Winona Lake, Ind.: EISENBRAUNS, 2013. Pp. xiv + 304. \$49.50.

The work under review, an English translation of the writer's Hebrew University of Jerusalem Ph.D. dissertation, originally written in Hebrew (under the supervision of Steven E. Fassberg), is a methodical and detailed study of the Biblical Hebrew (BH) verbal system as reflected in a limited corpus of Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH) prose material—Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the non-synoptic parts of Chronicles—unanimously considered products of the post-Restoration period (thus leaving out such works of debated datation as Jonah and Ruth as well as the almost certainly late Wisdom composition Ecclesiastes). The study is significant because it offers not only a synchronic description of the LBH verb system, but a systematic diachronic comparison between the latter and the verb system of Classical Biblical Hebrew (CBH), succinctly summarizing views and offering cogent critiques of accounts and theories relevant to both. The author also judiciously relates to extra-biblical Hebrew, including Qumran and Mishnaic Hebrew.

The discussion ignores the ongoing debate involving the feasibility of the linguistic periodization of BH works, but the approach assumes the possibility of at least relative linguistic dating, its conclusions—which center mainly on morpho-syntax, and to a lesser extent morphology—unambiguously confirming the reality of the linguistic development that distinguishes post-exilic Hebrew sources from their pre-exilic counterparts.

The book is divided into two parts: the first, consisting of two chapters, presents Cohen's research methodology; the second contains eight chapters, each furnishing a thorough discussion of a verbal form (*qatal*, *wayyiqtol*, participle, *iqtol*, *weqatal*, infinitive construct, volitive forms, and infinitive absolute) from the perspective of use and meaning vis-à-vis other forms in the LBH system and in comparison to CBH.

In chapter 1 the author briefly discusses problems of text, literary development, vocalization, and genre. He goes on to summarize the prevailing view of BH diachrony, according to which, broadly speaking, the Babylonian Exile serves as the watershed separating First-Temple CBH and Second-Temple LBH, noting such challenges as dialect and listing a few of the major relevant scholarly works.

Chapter 2 embodies the author's linguistic account. Central to Cohen's explanation of the BH verbal system in general is Reichenbach's (1947) concepts of *reference time* and *relative tense* (see also Comrie 1985: 36, 58), in the application of which to BH Cohen follows Hatav (1997). The explanatory power of such concepts is subsequently demonstrated in brief with reference to the *qatal*, *iqtol*, and *waw*-conversive forms. The discussion next turns to the complicated and much-debated nature of the BH verbal system, i.e., whether it marks tense, aspect, mood, or some combination thereof. After critically surveying scholars and theories representative of several approaches, Cohen opts for one that combines relative tense and mood, the latter dimension subsuming aspect.