

First, the CUNES texts illustrate the “flexibility” inherent in the OB lists. “Flexibility is a by-product of the curricular setting” (p. 202), meaning that lexical texts are identified easily as belonging to known compositions, but often are not exact duplicates. For example, fifty CUSAS tablets contain words for trees or wooden items, as in chapter 1 of the six-part thematic list Ura. Four of the 50 have sequences that fully parallel those from Nippur Ura 1. However, the majority (40 texts) only partially parallel the sequences found in Nippur Ura 1, deviating either by adding or omitting an entry in a sequence, or switching the order of a sequence. Only six have no entries that are also attested in Nippur Ura 1, four of which are mostly broken.

Second, the CUNES texts support the conclusion that the order of the Ura chapters themselves was relatively fluid. Although Veldhuis suggests that the order “was more or less recognized all over Babylonia” (p. 155), he points to examples of multi-column tablets and prisms that “tend to have rather idiosyncratic combinations and selections of themes that do not correspond to a single chapter in Nippur Ura” (p. 155). Likewise, the CUNES prisms that contain entries from more than one Ura chapter do not preserve the Nippur order: one contains Ura 3 followed by Ura 5 (52–10–161), while another has Ura 3 followed by Ura 5 and then Ura 4 (52–10–145). Given the evidence, it is tempting to suggest that, at least in some instances, the order of the chapters may have been left to the discretion of the teacher, an approach to the curriculum that we find in the advanced literary phase, and in the Neo- and Late Babylonian periods (p. 415).

Overall, the CUNES sources provide a larger data set than has been available previously to strengthen Veldhuis’s assertions that “underlying all the variation there is a good deal of similarity between educational practices throughout the Old Babylonian period” (p. 225). It is significant that this is the case even though education was a private matter, not under state or temple control. As such, Veldhuis proposes that “the scribal elite that performed the education may be described as a ‘community of practice’”, in which there was a well accepted notion of what defined a “proper education”, and this education was required for acceptance into the community (p. 225).

As a final note, a few additions can be made based on the CUNES material: to the list of sources of the Early Dynastic Fish List (p. 89) add CUNES 48–09–190 and 48–10–016 to the OB unknown sources; and to the list of sources of the Early Dynastic Food List (p. 93) add CUNES 49–13–153 to the OB unprovenanced sources. All three CUNES texts are exercise tablets (lentils), providing further evidence that the OB curricular lexical texts and those ED lexical texts, which were still in circulation during the OB period, did not (always) exist independently of each other (see p. 218).

Alexandra Kleinerman
Cornell University

PETRA GOEDEGEBUURE:

The Hittite Demonstratives: Studies in Deixis, Topics and Focus.

(Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten.) 56, xv, 610 pp. Wiesbaden:

Harrassowitz, 2014. €98. ISBN 978 3 447 10228 5.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X15001056

The book under review represents a pioneering study of the Hittite pronominal system undertaken from the functionalist perspective. Not so long ago it was firmly believed that Hittite featured an opposition between the two basic demonstrative pronouns *kā-* ‘this’ and *apā-* ‘that’, plus a number of peripheral demonstratives

with unclear functions (see e.g. S. Luraghi, *Hittite*, Munich 1997, 25–6). The starting point for the revision of this view was the long-neglected insight that the pronouns *e-*, *aši-*, *eni-* and *uni-* can be brought together in one paradigm in the majority of Hittite texts (E. Laroche, “Anaphore et deixis en anatolien”, *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, E. Neu and W. Meid (eds), Innsbruck, 1979, 147–52). In diachronic terms, the new deictic pronoun represents a cognate of the well-known Hittite clitic anaphor *-a-*, but its direct case forms acquired the *i*-extension, e.g. nom. sg. c *a-š-i*. Although less frequent than the forms of *kā-* and *apā-*, the members of the new paradigm are so numerous that they could no longer be relegated to the periphery of the Hittite grammatical system.

The existence of a triple opposition among Hittite demonstratives obviously required functional interpretation. Was it distance-oriented, as, for example, in Spanish, or person-oriented, as, say, in Latin? The answer to such a question can be difficult to find when one is dealing with an extinct limited-corpus language that precludes the possibility of running standard tests on informants. Goedegebuure had to develop her own methodology, selecting those genres and contexts in the Hittite corpus that are conducive to discriminating between the two options. The Hittite letters proved to be especially helpful for showing that the demonstrative pronoun *apā-* and its derivatives can specifically refer to the objects in the proximity of the addressee. The proximal *kā-* ‘this’ is obviously a natural candidate for the first person demonstrative, but one specific function that helps to corroborate this conjecture seems to be its systematic cataphoric use in lists (e.g. “This is his gift: 50 breads”). At the moment when a new entity is referred to but not yet defined, it remains familiar to the speaker alone.

The demonstrative pronoun *aši+*, originally translated as distal ‘yon’ in Goedegebuure’s thesis, is now more accurately described as referring to the objects lying outside the immediate reach or cognitive sphere of either the speaker or the addressee. As such, it represents a suitable device for anaphoric use. Since the clitic personal pronoun *-a-* is likewise normally used in the anaphoric function, this distribution offers, in my opinion, a new argument for the genetic relationship between the two pronominal forms. A connotation occasionally conveyed by the anaphoric use of *aši+* is the negative emotional attitude of the speaker. This is different from the situation in Latin, where the same connotation is reserved for the second person demonstrative *iste* “that one of yours”. This is perhaps why no reflexes of *aši+* are attested in the Anatolian languages of the first millennium BC, whereas the Latin third person demonstrative *ille* represents a ubiquitous source of articles in the Romance languages.

The second part of Goedegebuure’s monograph is devoted to the pragmatics of the stressed personal pronoun *apā-* ‘that (one)’. The current consensus on its use is limited to the recognition that it represents an “emphatic” counterpart of the clitic personal pronoun *-a-*. The only scholar to go a step further was J. Boley (*IF* 108: 163), who claimed that the free-standing *apā-* was used for discourse topics with marked emphasis. Goedegebuure takes issue with this hypothesis, convincingly arguing that the pragmatic function of *apā-* in “emphatic” contexts is that of the narrow focus. The discussion of pragmatic configurations is naturally impossible without relying on some theoretical framework, and so the author follows Knud Lambrecht’s distinction between the predicate focus, argument focus, and sentence focus constructions, where the notion of argument focus is roughly equivalent to the narrow focus of other works. But the way to illustrate the author’s point without engaging in any technicalities is the frequent co-occurrence of the “emphatic” *apā-* with focus particles, such as *=pat* ‘only’ (exclusive focus) and the geminating *=a* ‘also, even’ (inclusive focus).

The emerging system is admittedly rather complex. In contrast with the logically connected functions of *aši+* and *-a-*, there is no obvious semantic link between the uses of *apā-* as second person demonstrative and narrow focus marker. I would see it as a reason why the demonstrative *apā-* becomes rare in New Hittite and completely disappears in the Late New Hittite period. As a result of this, the system of Hittite demonstrative becomes distance-based by the mid-thirteenth century BC, the proximal pronoun *kā-* ‘this’ contrasting with its distal counterpart *aši+* ‘that’. A different development apparently took place in the history of the related Luwian language, where *apā-* was generalized as a distal demonstrative, while *anna/i-*, a likely Luwian counterpart of *aši+*, is only found as a loanword in Middle Hittite texts.

The book under review is clearly structured and user-friendly. Those instructing in Hittite will find it helpful for teaching issues related to deixis and discourse structure, while specialists in general pragmatics have gained a reliable reference tool on Hittite (although the lack of morphologically annotated Hittite examples will represent a bit of an obstacle for the latter group). Philologists can deploy it for a refined understanding of a number of Hittite passages, in particular, those belonging to the Hittite Laws. And from the perspective of an Indo-Europeanist, the person-based system of deixis reconstructed for Hittite emerges as functionally comparable to the situation in Latin and some Indo-Iranian languages (see e.g. N. Sims-Williams, “The triple system of deixis in Sogdian”, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92/1, 41-53). This increases the likelihood that a similar system also existed once in Proto-Indo European.

Ilya Yakubovich

Russian State University for the Humanities / Philipps-Universität Marburg

LIDIA NAPIORKOWSKA:

A Grammar of the Christian Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Diyana-Zariwaw. (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 81.) xiii, 599 pp. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015. €181. ISBN 978 90 04 29032 7.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X15001068

This interesting and well-researched monograph is published in the Brill series Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics. It specifically deals with one tiny part of the vast academic tapestry depicting a virgin field of linguistic research. The focus is on the Christian Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Diyana-Zariwaw (CDZ), one dialect of a plethora of Christian Neo-Aramaic dialects spoken along the Mesopotamian corridors and deep into the mountainous region to the eastern bank of the biblical Tigris river.

The weighty book is based on the author’s doctoral thesis, submitted to the University of Cambridge in 2013. It is a welcome addition to the Christian Neo-Aramaic linguistic library, especially since it provides the opportunity to expand on the data and fieldwork presented in the thesis by the inclusion of more essential research data such as the Glossary and Texts, which can be consulted for further research. Had such important data not been included in this book, it would have been lost to research for ever.

The book is divided into five parts: part 1 deals with phonology, part 2 morphology, part 3 syntax, part 4 text corpus, and part 5 is a glossary. The author begins with a description of the Neo-Aramaic dialects and their speakers, stepping into the