

- p. 113: The last sign is not DUN but šubur (x 6).
- p. 117, no. 6: "El padre del vendedor" should be "el hijo del vendedor" (*Contenido*, l. 2).
- p. 120, no. 8: "Nimud, son of Nana" is omitted and should be placed before "Nimud hijo de Gubi" (iii 2–viii 3).
- p. 121, no. 10: Before "Dada, el . . ." two lines are omitted: "Mesag, brother of Ur-mega, the foreman" (r. 4–15).
- p. 123, no. 12: "Her name is Šarrūa" should be placed after "una esclava" (a. 1–5).
- p. 135, no. 23: For Nin-MAR.KI (also in pp. 139f., no. 29), see R. W. Whiting, *ZA* 75 (1985): 1–3.
- p. 140, no. 30 is not Falkenstein *NSGU* no. 15, but no. 17.
- p. 141: *du g₄-g a-n a* is not "la declaración (de los testigos)" but "his statement," referring to Lugal-Kigala, the father of the woman who was going to marry (a. 11).
- p. 149, no. 37: "(Todo ello perteneciente a) la parte de la herencia (original) de Alala" is found in two places—at the end of the third paragraph (a. i 12–ii 20) and at the middle of the fourth paragraph (a. ii 21–r. i 23')—of which the first should be removed.
- p. 153, no. 40: A witness "Ursu, the builder" should be placed before Ur-Inanna (r. 1–5).
- pp. 158f., no. 46 is a *di-nu-tiil-la*, where no final verdict is given. It would be better to give a brief remark on the reason why the lessor denied that he had lent a boat after the wreckage of that boat was returned to him (see Falkenstein, *NSGU* no. 62, pp. 100f.).
- p. 172: ITT 5 stands for *Inventaire des tablettes de Tello conservées au Musée Impérial Ottoman 5: Époque présargonique, époque d'Agadé, époque d'Ur* (Paris, 1921).
- My comments concern only minor points and by no means detract from the value of this book and its rich contents. The translation is fine and well thought-out, and the texts are adequately supplied with the proper amount of necessary information. This book will be very much appreciated by the student of the ancient Near East as well as the Spanish-speaking public in general. The reader is invited to discover another fascinating aspect of ancient Mesopotamian society.

FUMI KARAHASHI

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

textual sources. The core of the book is a systematic analysis of how Tocharian uses nominal cases (chiefly the oblique, perlativ, allative, and locative) and adpositions to express local (and temporal) relationships. The analysis is based on an effectively exhaustive survey of the available Tocharian text corpus. The book closes with a chapter on the reconstruction of the Proto-Tocharian case system, an English summary, bibliography, and useful indices of verbs and passages cited.¹

The introduction to Tocharian case syntax is lucid and succinct, and the theoretical apparatus brought to bear is both relevant and adequate to the task (not merely paraded for show). Carling reads the texts carefully and sensitively and for the most part resists the temptation to force recalcitrant passages into her overall system, honestly confronting the fact that some examples remain problematic or obscure. She initially organizes the data in terms of the most likely factors that might influence the choice of a particular local case for a given example (chiefly the matrix verb and the nature of the spatial/reference object), *not* along the lines of her own functional analysis. This unprejudiced presentation of the data has the great merit of allowing readers to judge easily the basis for and validity of her eventual analysis and to suggest possible revisions or alternatives.

As to her analysis, Carling confirms earlier claims that the directional use of the oblique case in Tocharian is an archaic and recessive usage reflecting the PIE "accusative of direction." Her most important original contribution is to have largely untangled the very complex functions of the Tocharian perlativ and its relationship to the locative. She shows that the perlativ expresses a tangential (in her terms "incoherent") relationship to the reference object ("at, by, over, along, through") versus the locative ("in"). Also useful is her suggestion that the perlativ tends to be used with *unbounded* spaces ("earth") vs. the locative with bounded ("house"). I suggest, however, that the more important distinction is rather that the perlativ is used for spatial objects with significant *surface extension* (see p. 257) and the locative for those without. This contrast will not only cover the cases just cited, but also explain the use of the locative, not the perlativ, with words meaning "place" and with abstracts, which Carling finds puzzling (pp. 186 and 264). I do not find convincing any of her examples purporting

Die Funktionen der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen. By GERD CARLING. Berlin: MOUTON DE GRUYTER, 2000. Pp. xxii + 442. DM 178.

The author begins with a sketch of the entire Tocharian case system, a brief summary of the conceptual framework and associated terminology that she employs, and an overview of the

¹ Proofreading appears to have been excellent, and I have found almost no significant typos, with one glaring exception that will badly confuse general readers: in the table on page 1 the Tocharian forms for the genitive must be inserted in the row labeled "Gen." (*yukas, yukašši, yäkwentse, yäkwents*), and the five lines printed beginning with "*yuk-yo yukas-yo—*" must be transposed down one line (with elimination of the ditto-graphy of *yäkwemeṃ yäkwemeṃ* under B).

to show a contrast between the perlocative for non-permanent and the locative for permanent position, but this is a minor point.

The one major weakness is Carling's treatment of the allative. She insists throughout that this case expresses only direction towards in Tocharian, *without* attainment of the goal, a claim contradicted by many of the examples she cites. The most egregious are those with the Tocharian A verb *tsit-* "touch" (pp. 88f.). Carling is forced to claim that when the text says someone touched their forehead they were actually merely moving their hand towards their forehead. But the very meaning of "touch" is inevitably terminative: one cannot touch something without reaching it. The use of the allative with verbs such as "bind" and "fasten" (pp. 73-77) is likewise straightforward if one admits, against Carling, that the allative can express attainment of a goal. Finally, she is forced repeatedly to deny that examples with the allative plus motion verbs such as *i-* "go" and *käm-* "come" ever express reaching a goal. In many cases this is implausible and in some simply not credible: she herself (p. 162) translates *kapilavästä riyac śmäl* correctly as "will arrive in the city of K." while still insisting that the example is "directional."

Carling herself has provided the basis for the correct distinction between allative and locative with motion verbs in Tocharian. In her definition of local functions (p. 39) she distinguishes DIRECTIONAL (movement towards a goal) from TERMINATIVE (movement towards and attainment of a goal) and crucially subdivides the latter into ILLATIVE (crossing of a boundary *into*) and ALLATIVE (without such specification). The issue then is how a language like Tocharian expresses the three functions DIRECTIONAL, ALLATIVE, and ILLATIVE with just two cases, allative and locative. What her own data shows is that Tocharian uses the locative case for ILLATIVE and the allative case for ALLATIVE and DIRECTIONAL. That the contrast ILLATIVE:ALLATIVE is marked at the expense of that between DIRECTIONAL and ALLATIVE is typologically unremarkable (despite the fact that this violates the seemingly more fundamental contrast DIRECTIONAL:TERMINATIVE). The Tocharian contrast of locative *riyaṃ/rine* vs. allative *riyac/riš* matches exactly that of English "into/to the city" or German *in die Stadt/zur Stadt*. All three languages naturally have the means to explicitly express DIRECTIONAL if needed (oblique case, "towards," *nach*).

Confirmation that the locative expresses ILLATIVE and the allative ALLATIVE/DIRECTIONAL with motion verbs comes from the usage with nouns referring to people (pp. 227-38), where predictably the locative is unattested except with plurals, where it is used equivalently to "among, *unter*."

Carling's treatment of the use of the local cases to express temporal relationships is excellent. She finds some evidence for contrasting use of the perlocative and locative along the lines we would expect from their basic functions, but she concedes that there is considerable variation and idiomatic usage. I must pass

over the very useful survey of adpositions. I find her sketch of the prehistory of the Tocharian local cases plausible in its overall outline, though obviously one can envisage other scenarios for some aspects of the development.

This book represents an important contribution to our understanding of Tocharian syntax and makes the Tocharian data accessible to those interested in broader typological issues regarding the use of case to express local relationships.

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Testi cuneiformi neo-Sumerici da Umma, Nn. 0413-0723, parte I: *I testi*. By ALFONSO ARCHI and FRANCESCO POMPONIO; parte II: *Le impronte di sigillo*. By GIOVANNI BERGAMINI. Catalogo del Museo Egizio di Torino, vol. 8. Turin: MINISTERO PER I BENI CULTURALI E AMBIENTALI, 1995. Pp. 420, illus., tables.

Le musée égyptologique de Turin, outre les objets égyptiens, contient des tablettes cunéiformes. Un premier volume fut publié par G. Bason et G. Rinaldi. Ce second volume est de Archi, Pomponio et Bergamini et présente 310 tablettes de la troisième dynastie d'Ur en provenance d'Umma. Translittérations, traductions et commentaires sont de Pomponio. Les copies sont dues à Archi et enfin le travail des sceaux revient à Bergamini. Bien que les textes de cette dynastie soient fort bien connus de par leur grand nombre et les innombrables publications dont ils sont l'objet, il n'en reste pas moins qu'on trouve toujours encore des signes cunéiformes ou des expressions sumériennes dont le sens nous échappe. Je voudrais attirer l'attention sur des expressions difficiles et faire quelques suggestions de lecture pour les textes et les sceaux.

Les textes

- No. 413. *gīr Na-di KA-X*, peut-être *Gīr-na sá-du₁₁ X*.
 No. 419. *Lú-sig₅ lú-e; lú-e*, l'homme (responsable du flux d'eau dans) la rigole est nouveau pour moi.
 No. 420. *E-AN-AN-AN*, je lirai *E-mul*. Dans l'index on lit *E-AN-AN-AN-AN*.
 No. 422. Le traditionnel *sig₇-a* et *sig₇-giš* est devenu *sa₇-a* et *sa₇-giš*.
 No. 432. Je note le NP *Á-nin-gá-ta* avec le signe *din-gir*: *Á-d^dnin-gá-ta*, par le bras ou la force de ma (divine) dame.
 No. 435. *lú-bu₆-bu₆*. Je ne pense que *Bu₆-bu₆* soit un nom propre. Je pencherai pour une profession.