

Behistun rock inscription in which Weisberg concludes 'Darius is lying . . . For it is only there that we read of the existence of two kings named Nebuchadnezzar in 522/1'. It would be premature to judge the weight of this inference since the author promises a future study on this subject, but such royal display inscriptions should not be set aside easily.

The suggestion that an unusually dated text in 15 Ab, year 43 of Nebuchadrezzar, concerning the hire of a *šerku* at Nār Harri šá ¹MU-a (an otherwise unknown place) is evidence for the king's death before 29 August 562 B.C. should be treated with caution. The phrase ⁹GAŠAN šá UNUG.KI LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI ('The Lady of Uruk: King of Babylonia', 9:2) could, as suggested, be attributed to a scribe, waiting to see who the royal successor might be, opting for this as an interim dating. This is unlikely, however, since no other dating by deity is attested elsewhere in first millennium texts. There is evidence for the interim dating by continuance with the existing royal name or with the *arki* formula and this date is followed on the left edge by the phrase *šá taršēti šá* ¹⁴AG.DIN?[.X] written across the corner (could it be 'in the times of Nebu(chadrezzar?)' rather than an otherwise unknown personal name?).

This well researched and published edition will certainly enlarge the evidence for this great king's rule. It is to be hoped that it may encourage the publication of the several hundred economic texts of this reign in museums and from recent excavations in Iraq still unavailable.

D. J. WISEMAN

HELLMUT RITTER: *Türöyo: die Volkssprache der syrischen Christen des Tür Abdin. B: Wörterbuch. Das Autorenmanuskript zum Druck in Faksimile gebracht von Rudolf Sellheim.* 23, 589 pp. Beirut: Orient-Institut der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft in Kommission bei Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, Wiesbaden, 1979. DM 56.

It is sad to read this posthumous volume by Hellmut Ritter, especially in the light of Rudolf Sellheim's preface. It tells of a great Islamic scholar who, at an advanced age, when most scholars continue their work only with difficulty, was active enough to open up an entirely new field for Semitic linguistics. With an energy that would command respect even in a much younger man, he succeeded in publishing two volumes of the Türöyo texts. The third volume was published shortly after his death on 19 May 1971. The fifth volume, his massive grammar, comprising over 1400 pages of typescript, awaits publication. Only this present, fourth volume had not been finally prepared for publication.

It is easy to imagine Ritter's feelings on 24 April 1971—less than a month before his death at the age of seventy-nine—when he at last completed the typescript reproduced in

this volume. What happened to the manuscript after its completion was no less dramatic than the events which preceded it. Ritter belonged among those scholars who do not deliver their manuscripts to the publisher in the form in which they intend them to be printed. In many senses, for them, the real work only begins at the editing stage.

As a result, even the idea of dividing the dictionary off from the grammar is open to criticism. In his grammar, Ritter included, in the main, a detailed description of the Türöyo verbs, with countless examples and paradigms, including dialectal variations. He therefore limited the dictionary to the other parts of speech (although even in this he was not wholly consistent: thus, for example, the verb *kallaf* is included there, occurring, of course, in a quotation from Arabic). Even if no Boswell could be found to undertake the tremendous task of completely revising the dictionary and grammar, one might have expected to find a scholar ready to organize the manuscript and eliminate the many minor inconsistencies with which it is replete. One can readily admit an objective obstacle, in that the number of scholars with even a limited, passive knowledge of Türöyo is very restricted. However, the main reason that no one was found to revise the manuscript even in a technical sense is, no doubt, linked to the very nature of the world of modern scholarship, its competitiveness, and the harsh 'publish or perish!' edict it imposes.

Thus, even the lemmata have not been rearranged into alphabetical order, except where they had to be transferred to other pages. The manuscript is reproduced as it was presented by Ritter, apart from the introduction of two additional systems of pagination: the editor's stamped page numbering, and the new pagination which arose from the transfer of lemmata from page to page. Ritter's typewritten manuscript, with these three pagination systems, was photographically reproduced, together with his many handwritten emendations and additions which are often almost illegible. It represents an important contribution to Aramaic and Semitic scholarship, but it also serves as a sad witness to the extent of a scholar's isolation in academic life.

The following observations are largely aimed at bringing more consistency to the manuscript. It goes without saying, given its special nature, that these observations could easily be augmented.

Ritter attempted to mark loanwords as such. Arabic loanwords are marked by *ar*, yet in many, many cases this is missing, as s.vv. '*alaf*' (in the form '*älöfo*' adapted to the structure of Türöyo), '*amal*', '(*a*)*māra*', '*ambar*' (ultimately Persian; here one misses a separate entry for the plural '*anēbir*', which is not easily found because of the interchange *n/m*), '*asabi*', '*asriye*', '*ašan*', etc. In some cases the history of such an Arabic loanword is not without interest. Thus *hālbāt* 'certainly' ultimately stems from Arabic *albatata*. It was borrowed into Turkish, where it was dialectally pronounced with initial *h* (for this feature in Turkish cf. e.g. J. Dény, *Grammaire de la langue turque*, Paris,

1921, 1099), and from there it penetrated both modern Arabic dialects and Tūr̄yo.

Words continuing the ancient Aramaic heritage are marked by AS, i.e. Altsyrisch, Old Syriac. Again, because of the nature of the manuscript, this mark is often missing, as 'al'ōlo (a word which penetrated later Hebrew, v. Ben Sira 43, 17, now also attested in the Masada Scroll, and the Talmudic dictionaries s.v.; it would also occur, according to Grätz's famous emendation, in Job 36: 33, although this proposal, despite, or perhaps because of, its ingenuity, is rather doubtful), 'am, 'āmo, 'amro, 'arbōlo, 'aṣmo, 'āwōdo, 'mōdo, 'ōbugro/'ubbugro (which is especially interesting in the light of the Old Syriac doublet 'uq̄bārā/'aq̄bārā; cf. as early as the 1920s, A. Siegel, *Laut- und Formenlehre des nearamaischen Dialekts des Tūr Abdin*, Beiträge zur semitischen Philologie und Linguistik, Heft 2, Hannover, 1923, p. 52, § 25a; however, he mentions Old Syriac 'uq̄bārā only), afšōte, etc. In many cases it stands to reason that a word stemming from Old Syriac has been influenced by its Arabic pendant. Thus, in the light of a passage like B.Mq 11/151 'ōmre kibe hamšī išne 'he is about fifty years old', 'umro/'ōmro has clearly been semantically influenced by Arabic 'umr. In some cases phonetics, morphology, and syntactic behaviour suggest complex derivation: the Arabic comparative formation *azrab* 'worse' synchronically belongs to *harbo* '(ruin) bad', yet diachronically (and synchronically) to *xarāb* 'bad', originally Arabic (cf. the Kurdish borrowing *xarabīr* 'worse'). Thus in this case, the Syriac and Arabic cognates have built a new synchronic paradigm, in which (originally) Arabic *x* and Syriac *h* alternate. The fact that *xarāb* is invariable also proves its foreign origin.

Among the Old Syriac words (which are marked as such in the dictionary) is *admo* 'blood', exhibiting a prosthetic vowel, as is frequent in this dialect. T. Nöldeke, with his usual acumen, postulated this form for our dialect (v. *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Strassburg, 1910, 118) and indeed Siegel mentioned it (*ibid.*, p. 83, independently of Nöldeke).

The origin of loanwords from Arabic dialects is not always accurately stated here. 'ayān is marked as an Egyptian-Arabic word, which is correct, but much less relevant than its occurrence in Syrian Arabic (for which cf., e.g., A. Barthélemy, *Dictionnaire arabe-français*, Paris, 1935-54, s.v. 'yy).

Interesting is the change of an original glottal stop to 'ayn in loanwords, as 'amālikān 'Amerika(!)', 'miro, 'išāra, etc. Less frequent is the supersession of an original 'ayn by the glottal stop, cf. the doublet 'aqār/'aqār.

There are a number of clerical errors: p. 163, read: fōtīro m; p. 244, line 6 from foot: an dieser frau.

JOSHUA BLAU

ABRAHAM TAL: *The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch: a critical edition. Part I: Genesis, Exodus.* (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and

Related Studies, 4.) xiii, 399 pp., 4 plates. Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, 1980.

The previous editions of the Samaritan Targum—from that of the J. Morinus Polyglot, vi (Paris, 1645), reproduced with arbitrary corrections in B. Walton, *Biblia sacra polyglotta* (London, 1657), and in Hebrew script in A. Brüll, *Das samaritanische Targum zum Pentateuch* (Frankfurt a.M., 1973-), to the first attempt at a critical edition begun by H. Petermann and completed by K. Vollers under the misleading title *Pentateuchus Samaritanus ad fidem librorum manuscriptorum apud Nablusianos repertum* (Berlin, 1872-91)—have all been inadequate. The first three editions cited were based on a single, late and corrupt MS, namely, the Aramaic column of the Hebrew-Aramaic-Arabic Triglot of the Samaritan Pentateuch of 1514, acquired by Pietro della Valle from the Samaritans in Damascus in 1616. For want of a better text, this was regarded as a *textus receptus* of the Targum, and its strange and awkward linguistic forms, which differed so radically from any other Aramaic or Semitic idiom, were not seen as obvious mistakes, corruptions, and miscopyings, but as genuine Samaritanisms which therefore needed a linguistic explanation. From these unfortunate beginnings, a theory of so-called Cuthaeen words (from Cuthah, 2 Kings 12: 24) in Samaritan Aramaic was developed, and scholars undertook the laborious task of explaining all the corrupt expressions which fell into this category through any remote language offering some distant phonetic similarities. This dubious theory, also reflected in the best lexicographical works of the period (e.g. E. Castellus, *Lexicon heptaglotton*, Londini, 1669, and F. Uhlemann, *Institutiones linguae Samaritanae . . . Glossario locupletata*, Lipsiae, 1837) constrained European Samaritan studies for over two centuries; it was, however, vigorously contested and discredited, in part even before Petermann's attempt at a critical edition, by S. Kohn in his numerous Samaritan writings esp. 'Samaritanische Studien' (*Monatsschr. f. Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, 1866; repr. Breslau, 1868), and *Zur Sprache, Literatur und Dogmatik der Samaritaner* (Leipzig, 1876, AKM 5.).

Petermann's edition brought only a relative improvement to this deplorable situation. Its main shortcoming was not primarily the small number of MSS (A, B, C and, for the beginning of Genesis, also a fragment D), discovered by Petermann in Nablus, and supplemented by variants of the Samaritan Aramaic column of the Polyglot Bible (Ed. = Editio). It was, rather, Petermann's methodological error in using a recent copy made *ad hoc* at his own request as a basis for his edition. This copy, designated by him as Apographon (Ap.) merely consisted in an arbitrary collation and miscopying of his other MSS. Vollers, who continued the edition after Petermann's death, and published the books of Leviticus-Deuteronomy, added variants from the Petersburg fragments collated by Harkavy, and fragments published by Nutt, but the whole edition