

author's conclusion says that "at the very least it's clear that the Greek conception of an Anatolian mother goddess may represent the superimposition of several different goddess-schemata borrowed at different periods" (p. 183). One can accept this "minimalistic" conclusion which makes obvious that we often cannot reach firm ground in precisely defining the religious interactions between Anatolians and Greeks. Surprisingly few borrowings of divine names are available, and the comparisons between festival traditions made by the author are not very strong in my opinion. Hittite texts provide much information about state and local "non-state" festivals, but as festivals are religious universals, similarities between local festivals are often too general to be taken as examples for mutual contacts (cf. p. 246). In the final chapter, on sacrifices and offerings (pp. 247–71), we find a great deal of important information about Hittite sacrificial practices, which have not yet been deeply studied. Therefore, Rutherford's overview is a very welcome contribution to this field of "Hittite religion" and a stimulus for further studies.

In conclusion: "So there was contact, but little sign of borrowing, at least by the Greeks from the Hittites. If that was all there was to it, this would be a disappointing end to our inquiry. However, the Greek and Hittite religious systems may be able to illuminate each other in other ways, because they are in many respects so similar" (p. 273). The author has presented such mutual illumination, by differentiating well between cases which are obvious on the one side and highly improbable on the other side of a scale. An interesting point – left open for future detailed research – would be an ongoing study of "Greek" religion in Anatolia in "Hellenistic" times – from the point of view how Anatolian traditions continued and how Greek traditions thereby were influenced or changed when they took the "local Hellenistic" form in Anatolia (cf. p. 73–6). This remains a task for the future.

Manfred Hutter

University of Bonn, Germany

KAIRA BODDY:

The Composition and Tradition of Erimḫuš.

(Cuneiform Monographs 52.) xv, 468 pp. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2021. ISBN 978 90 04 43816 3.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X21000604

Erimḫuš is an advanced Sumerian–Akkadian–Hittite lexical text which includes many passages that remain obscure to modern scholarship. Boddy's study is by far the most detailed and meticulous treatment of this text yet written, and it is a welcome contribution to the growing scholarly literature on lexical lists that has appeared in recent years.

This book takes the form of an analysis of Erimḫuš. It does not attempt to offer a full new edition, although a comprehensive treatment of the manuscripts from Hattusa is included in the form of an appendix. A new edition would be warranted, since the available treatments of Erimḫuš (MSL 17, 1–128; for the Hattusa manuscripts, T.S. Scheucher, *The Transmissional and Functional Context of the Lexical Lists from Hattusha and from the Contemporaneous Traditions in Late-Bronze-Age Syria*, PhD Dissertation, Leiden, 2012, 610–55) are not sufficiently detailed and comprehensive. The online edition of Erimḫuš (<http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/dcclt/corpus>) includes

transliterations of the manuscripts in score form; however, this online resource is not intended to replace a full critical edition. Boddy's work needs to be read in conjunction with the Digital Corpus of Cuneiform Lexical Texts (DCCLT) in order to verify the relevant line discussed, and to consult the score transliterations. However, in order to locate Boddy's discussion of each line one must use the book's index of citations. Some passages of *Erimḫuš* are cited up to three different times in different parts of the book; indeed, there are several repeated statements throughout. One may well argue that a score edition combined with a critical commentary would be easier to use, and it may also have aided in the book's concision.

Erimḫuš is known from manuscripts dating to the latter half of the second millennium BC and the first millennium BC. (However, an Old Babylonian fragment has recently been identified, for which see D.O. Edzard et al., *Keilschrifttexte aus Isin*, Munich, 2018, no. 201.) It was originally composed in Sumerian and Akkadian, and when it was transmitted from Mesopotamia to Anatolia, Hittite and syllabic Sumerian columns were added. In its first millennium form *Erimḫuš* contains six chapters. Due to the differences between the chapters, Boddy suggests that chapters 4–6 are later additions to the series (p. 136). Furthermore, Boddy states that the order of entries in the first millennium version is closer to the original, in comparison with the Hattusa version, due to its internal logic (p. 159). Since *Erimḫuš* is not widely attested in Old Babylonian manuscripts, as many lexical texts are, its date of composition remains uncertain. Boddy argues for *Erimḫuš* as a product of Middle Babylonian scholarship, partly on the basis of its affinity with the academic, artificial form of Sumerian which is characteristic of this period (pp. 200–08). Indeed, it was almost certainly in the Middle Babylonian period that selected Sumerian literary and liturgical texts were first provided with Akkadian translations; *Erimḫuš* reflects the concerns of such Babylonian scholars with Sumerian–Akkadian equivalents and translations. The fact that *Erimḫuš* quotes extensively from the Sumerian literary text *Ininšagura* surely supports this conclusion.

Erimḫuš is usually considered together with *Antagal*, *Nabnītu* and other lexical texts, as “group vocabularies”. These texts are arranged in the form of groups of related entries. However, Boddy questions the association, emphasizing the unique characteristics of *Erimḫuš* (p. 95). *Erimḫuš*, together with *Nabnītu*, is almost always organized by the Akkadian column, as opposed to the usual organization of lexical texts according to the Sumerian. Boddy illustrates why this organizing principle of *Erimḫuš* is yet more evident than previously assumed (pp. 188–94). A further peculiarity of *Erimḫuš* is that entries are not necessarily read “horizontally” (i.e. from left to right, corresponding to the Sumerian and Akkadian entries), but may be read “vertically” (i.e. according to the entries in the Akkadian or Sumerian column within a group). In the analysis of “horizontal” entries the Sumerian may be a translation of a homonym of the corresponding Akkadian entry (see e.g. p. 184).

This book is focused especially on the Hattusa version of *Erimḫuš*. In this recension the Hittite column is usually a translation of the Akkadian column, not the Sumerian (p. 245). However, the Sumerian was clearly of importance at Hattusa due to the fact that a syllabic Sumerian column was included in some manuscripts. Following Veldhuis, Boddy considers such syllabic writings as evidence of an academic context; according to this interpretation such writings may represent the oral instruction of a teacher (p. 284). Indeed, this seems convincing, and it may possibly be compared to a very different context, namely Old Babylonian *Emesal* in Babylonia, where syllabic Sumerian seems to have functioned as a means of rehearsal and/or memorization in a performative context (see P. Delnero, *How to Do Things With Tears. Ritual Lamenting in Ancient Mesopotamia*, Boston/Berlin,

2020; incidentally, I know of no evidence in support of Boddy's statement on p. 187 that the "syllabic spelling of Sumerian is typical of later periods").

Boddy's central thesis regarding the Hattusa recension of Erimḫuš is that it represents advanced Hittite scribal scholarship. This interpretation, which follows Veldhuis, contrasts with earlier studies which have considered the sometimes quite radical transformation of the text at Hattusa as a product of the various mistakes which Hittite scribes made in the process of its transmission. In one often cited example, Akkadian *šiddu* "mob" is read as *šītu* "exit", suggesting either a mistake, or a deliberate reading of an Akkadian homonym (p. 252). Whether or not the case for a Hittite school of hermeneutics is wholeheartedly accepted, it seems clear that the Hittites' appropriation and transformation of Erimḫuš functioned as a means of "legitimising a local scholarly culture" (p. 307).

This book contains numerous valuable insights, and it will serve as the main resource on Erimḫuš for many years to come.

Sam Mirelman

SOAS University of London, UK

ALEXANDER AHRENS:

Aegyptiaca in der nördlichen Levante. Eine Studie zur Kontextualisierung und Rezeption ägyptischer und ägyptisierender Objekte in der Bronzezeit.

(Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 41.) xi, 451 pp.

Leuven: Peeters, 2020. ISBN 978 90 429 4369 8. €135.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X21000574

In this interdisciplinary study, based on his PhD, Alexander Ahrens examines Egyptian objects found in the northern Levant.

The first chapter offers an introduction. In chapter 2 the author describes the period of the study, which starts with artefacts dating to the Early Bronze Age 2500/2300–2000 BCE, when there were close relationships between Egypt, Byblos and inland Syrian Ebla. The main corpus focuses on finds from the Middle and Late Bronze Ages, corresponding to the 12th–20th Egyptian Dynasty (c. 2000–1150). The geographical range of the study covers the modern states of Lebanon, Syria (only briefly mentioning northern Israel), and the southern parts of Turkey. I find this division influenced by the current political borders. I see no difference between the sub-region of Damascus, which is extensively discussed in the study, and Hazor, or northern Jordan, which were also vassal kingdoms under Egyptian dominion during the New Kingdom, unlike the northern kingdoms, which were under the influence of the empires of Mitanni and later Hatti.

Chapter 3 summarizes the history of research and excavations in the northern Levant, in the periods before the First World War, during the French mandate (1920–1946), and following the Second World War until today.

Chapter 4 gives a historical perspective of the relations between Egypt and the northern Levant based mainly on the textual evidence.

Chapter 5 deals with the question of Egyptianizing objects and local elite emulation, and the secondary use of Egyptian objects in the Levant. The accumulation and presentation of Aegyptiaca, including the adoption of foreign Egyptian