rather than ᴋᴜʀ for the final sign. Yamada points out that "*mina* of the king" is attested in Akkadian on lion weights whereas "*mina* of the land" is not. It should be noted, however, that *šarru* is written with the ᴍᴀɴ sign in line 2 of the same inscription.

M. Streck, *ZA* 89 (1999): 152–54

Ann. 9:9 = RINAP 1 5: Yamada incorporates Streck's suggested restoration of [*ša šat-ti-šam-ma*] at the beginning of the line and confirms through collation of the original that the first damaged sign that follows the break is *a-* (not *aṣ-* as suggested by Tadmor), permitting the present form *aṣabbata*.

Ann. 11:11 = RINAP 1 7: Yamada agrees with Streck (and CAD N/1, p. 121 s. v. *nagû* A 1 1′) that the phrase *ana lā sapāḫ nagîšu* is part of the preceding sentence and not part of what follows.

Ann. 17:15′ = RINAP 1 9: Yamada adopts Streck's conjectural restoration that it was implements of war and not tents that Tiglath-pileser burned with fire.

Ann. 14:8 = RINAP 1 15: Yamada retains Tadmor's restoration of ᴇɴ-*ia* rather than adopt Streck's proposal of ᴇɴ-*a* based on Layard's manuscripts.

Ann. 16:11 = RINAP 1 17: Yamada follows Streck in reading *e*]-⌜*te*⌝-*ep-pu-šú* as a Gtn preterite and not a Gtn stative.

Ann. 23:6′ = RINAP 1 20: Yamada selects Streck's suggested restoration of ᴀɴš[ᴇ ɢìʀ.ɴᴜɴ.ɴᴀ] on the basis of RINAP 1 19:4.

Ann. 18:6′ = RINAP 1 22: While Tadmor's transliteration has only ᴜʀᴜ.*Sa-*⌜x⌝-[. . .], Streck points out that Layard's copy has ᴜʀᴜ.*Sa-*⌜*si*⌝-[. . .], ruling out the cities proposed in Tadmor's footnote. Yamada also does not restore where Layard saw ⌜*si*⌝, but notes that there were scratches across the sign and that it could also be read ⌜*ru*⌝. The reading of the sign as ⌜*ru*⌝ would support Forrer's suggestion of Saruna for this city, a possibility mentioned in Tadmor's note to this line.

Stele I A:6–8, 10, 25 = RINAP 1 35 i 6–8: Though Yamada does not normalize Sumerograms in his transliterations, his translation of line 6 follows Streck's suggested normalization of *immaḫḫaru*. Yamada's restoration in line 7 follows Streck's suggestion. Yamada is also correct to prefer Streck's translation of "sovereignty" over Tadmor's "my sovereignty" in line 8. Yamada adopts the reading of ⌜*kul-lat*⌝ with some hesitation, though Streck states that the signs are apparent in the photograph.

Stele I B:32′ = RINAP 1 35 i 32′: Yamada includes the final -*ma* in the line without half brackets.

Stele I B:41′f. = RINAP 1 35 i 45′f.: Yamada's translation ". . . kissed my feet (with a plea) not to destr[oy] the land of [Gur]gum" follows Streck's observation that the *ana* + infinitive phrase is part of the preceding clause, just as it is in Ann. 11:11.

Stele II B:31′ = RINAP 1 35 ii 31′: Yamada rejects Streck's reading of the final sign in the GN as -⌜*ri*⌝ and retains Tadmor's ᴜʀᴜ.*Si-sa-*⌜*ad*⌝-x.

Summ. 6:4 = RINAP 1 46: Yamada elects to retain Tadmor's reading of *sa-pan* rather than read the second sign as ᴋɪʙ for *sa-kip* on the basis of the same sign in line 17.

Summ. 7:4 = RINAP 1 47: Yamada follows Streck and correctly emends Tadmor's translation to reflect the subordination of *ibēluma ēpušu* to the *šá* in line 3.

Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age. Papers read at a symposium in Leiden, 17–18 December 2009. Edited by Elena Devecchi. PIHANS 119. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2012. Pp. xii + 266. €47 (paperback).
Rᴇᴠɪᴇᴡᴇᴅ ʙʏ Mᴀᴜʀɪᴢɪᴏ Vɪᴀɴᴏ, *York University**

This book collects written versions of the papers presented at the International Symposium held in Leiden between December 17th–18th, 2009.

"Écriture dextroverse/sénestroverse: quelques réflexions sur l'histoire de l'alphabet cunéiforme d'Ougarit" (pp. 1–18) by Pierre Bordreuil is an overview of the inscribed material in the cuneiform al-phabet, in both left-to-right and right-to-left script, discovered at Ugarit and in the Levant. Some left-to-right documents show features—a reduced number of letters compared to the classical cuneiform alphabet or a different phonetic-graphic system—that predate the linear right-to-left alphabet systems. This study leads the author to conclude that the Ugaritic cuneiform alphabet, containing thirty letters, was adapted to a phonetic system of twenty-two phonemes. This would first appear in some alphabetic cuneiform tablets, datable to the end of the thirteenth century ʙ.ᴄ., which

could reflect a cuneiform transcription of a linear southern alphabet.

In "Middle Assyrian Administrative Documents and Diplomatics: Preliminary Remarks Towards an Analysis of Scribal Norms and Habits" (pp. 19–32), Eva Cancik-Kirshbaum focuses on the procedures governing the creation of administrative texts in the Middle Assyrian period. Attention is drawn to the potential of diplomatics for Assyriological studies through its methodological and taxonomic tools, and the different factors leading to the constitution of a document are investigated (p. 25). Even though no formal treatises on rules and norms for creation of documents existed (or survived), the author concludes that "Middle Assyrian administrative texts exhibit a certain bureaucratic awareness. . .an awareness of the administrative body as a specialized, to a certain degree autonomous and self-organizing elite, which defines and shapes these rules in its own right" (p. 29).

Yoram Cohen, in "An Overview on the Scripts of Late Bronze Age Emar" (pp. 33–45), offers a very helpful panorama of almost thirty years of studies of Emar palaeography. This article explores the various scripts in use or discovered at Emar in relation to their employment in different text genres and to their respective chronological distribution, especially regarding the Syrian and Syro-Hittite script.[1]

In "The So-Called 'Mixed Ductus' in the Akkadian Texts from Boğazköy" (pp. 47–63) Elena Devecchi focuses on a peculiar script employed for Akkadian texts at the Hittite capital Hattusa, which shows a mix of Hittite and non-Hittite palaeographic traits. The main question is whether the so-called mixed ductus simply reflects a mixture of earlier and later Hittite sign-forms, or instead is a mix of Hittite and non-Hittite variants (p. 49). This question arises due to the fact that non-Hittite sign-forms (i.e., Assyro-Mitannian) attested in the mixed ductus correspond to the very late Hittite script of the thirteenth century. Through a remarkable list of signs in KBo 1.8++[2] the author is able to show that the majority of sign-forms can be traced to segments of the Hittite scribal tradition and only a very limited number of signs can

be identified as non-Hittite. Among these the author indicates the sign TI/3 as "a typical Old Babylonian variant"; however, it is in fact known also from the Middle Babylonian documentation,[3] even though not listed in BE XIV,[4] but not from Syrian, Assyro-Mitannian or Middle Assyrian texts.[5] This might indicate that non-Hittite palaeographic features in the so-called mixed ductus cannot be traced back only to the Syrian and Assyro-Mitannian milieu. Having also addressed the syllabary and the language of KBo 1.18+, evidencing the presence of Hurro-Akkadian and Assyrian elements,[6] the author concludes that "the mixed ductus of KBo 1.8++ witnesses the attempts of a Hittite scribe at mastering a foreign language and its script" (pp. 55–56).

In "Les signes I, IA et TUR dans le textes juridiques d'Ougarit" (pp. 65–78), Françoise Ernst-Pradal shows that the different logic of associations among shapes of the signs I, IA and TUR relates to certain patterns. It emerges that the respective distribution of shapes of these signs in dated texts has different tendencies in the periods before and after the king Ammistamru II (p. 73). Data from undated texts and partially from the economic texts show similar association patterns to dated texts.

In "Literarische sumerische Texte aus den hethitischen Archiven aus überlieferungsgeschichtlicher Sicht. Teil I" (pp. 79–93), Jörg Klinger offers a preliminary overview of the Sumerian literary material discovered at Hattusa.[7] Due to space limitations I will only comment on one point. Discussing the unorthographic texts,[8] the author states: "es gibt keinen Fall einer un-orthographischen Fassung eines

---

[1] For an alternative terminology, see D. E. Fleming and S. Démare-Lafont, "Tablet Terminology at Emar: 'Conventional' and 'Free Format,'" *AuOr* 27 (2009): 19–26.

[2] Pictures and drawings of each variant are provided, but an alphabetical arrangement instead of one according to the sign numbers in *HZl*, or at least a cross-referenced alphabetic list of signs, would have better fitted the purpose of the article.

[3] See van Soldt in the same volume on p. 175.

[4] Cf. Nr. 33.

[5] See D. Schwemer, *Akkadische Rituale aus Ḫattuša. Die Sammeltafel KBo XXXVI 29 und verwandte Fragmente*, THeth 23 (Heidelberg, 1998); W. H. van Soldt, "Naḫiš-Šalmu, an Assyrian Scribe Working in the 'Southern Palace' at Ugarit," in *Veenhof Anniversary Volume: Studies Presented to Klaas R. Veenhof on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. W. H. van Soldt (Leiden, 2001), 429–44, and Weeden in this volume.

[6] Note that the use of Assyrian independent pronouns *šūt* and *šīt* is also common at Emar, cf. S. Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, MVS 6 (Rome, 1998), 239–40.

[7] On this topic see my forthcoming monograph study on the Sumerian literary tradition in the Western regions.

[8] On unorthographic writings see M. Viano, "Writing Sumerian in the West," in *Tradition and Innovation. Proceedings of the 57th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Roma 4/7/2011 – 8/7/2011*, ed. A. Archi, M. G. Biga, and L. Verderame (Winona Lake, in print).

sumerischen Textes, die in Hattusa selbst entstanden wäre" (p. 91), but this does not take into account differences in format, typology and find spot of the unorthographic texts, even though these features are recognized in the article. A basic distinction has to be made between monolingual Sumerian unorthographic texts (e.g., CTH 800) which are correctly considered tablets imported from Mesopotamia,[9] and unorthographic versions added in a parallel column to texts in normal orthography. The latter typology, i.e. multicolumn tablets containing versions (from left to right) in normal orthography, phonetic orthography, Akkadian and eventually Hittite, is unknown from the Mesopotamian documentation, either OB, MB or MA, in which orthographic and unorthographic versions of the same text are usually inscribed on different tablets[10] and are also separated both geographically (i.e., provenance) and in terms of literary tradition. Conversely, this typology is typical of the Western periphery (i.e., Emar and Ugarit) where it was utilized as a high-level scribal exercise.[11] The trilingual Hymn to Iškur-Adad, CTH 314, discussed on p. 90, was indeed discovered in the Haus am Hang, where a scribal school was probably located, and furthermore is preserved in several copies, contrary to texts found in Büyükkale, which are only known in single manuscripts. Moreover, the reason for the presence of a number of unorthographic texts cannot be attributed to popularity or a greater ease of reception (p. 91). Rather, it entailed historical processes and reflects a particular segment of the Sumerian literature.[12]

Jared L. Miller, in "The Palaeography and Orthography of Six Rituals 'Redacted' in the Manner of Arusna" (pp. 95–109), analyzes a group of Luwian-influenced Hittite rituals dating to the second half of the thirteenth century. These very fragmentary rituals[13] display a number of unique and uncommon characteristics, in terms of ductus (p. 96) sign-forms (pp. 101–102), orthography (pp. 102–108) and formal features of the tablets (pp. 96–99). The author was able to restore a complete colophon containing the indication that the tablet was drafted 'in the manner of the city of Arusna' (pp. 99–100), a city in south-central Anatolia. This might indicate that the oddities of these rituals reflect the scribal practices in use in Arusna. The author also provides interesting speculations on the origin of this corpus and of its scribe 'Attanali' (pp. 108–109).

"{g} as a Palaeographic Indicator in Ugaritic Texts" (pp. 111–26), by Dennis Pardee, is an analysis of particular scribal habits in alphabetic Ugaritic texts that may lead to the attribution of some texts to certain scribes (pp. 111–15) and represent a dating criterion. In particular, the author focuses on the letter {g}, which in some texts from Ugarit and Ras Ibn Hani, dating to the reign of Ammistamru II, shows a two-wedged form. As there are no later attestations of two-wedged {g}, this may be assumed to be a general indicator for dating a text to this king (pp. 123–24).

The Palaeographic Syllabary A, namely a version of Syllabary A to which a column dedicated to archaic sign-forms is added, is the focus of the article "On the Palaeographic 'Syllabary A' in the Late Bronze Age" (pp. 127–46) by Carole Roche-Hawley. Late Bronze Age manuscripts of the Palaeographic S[a] have only been found at Emar, Ugarit, and Assur, and are differentiated by the presence or absence of certain signs, the format of tablets,[14] the number of palaeographic variants for each sign, and sign-forms. Contrary to the author, who seems to accept a common tradition for the manuscripts,[15] variants between Ugarit manuscripts (pp. 131–33) point to the presence of different versions of Palaeographic S[a] in Syria during the Late Bronze Age. At Ugarit different text traditions are attested for other school texts such as Gilgameš[16] and

---

[9] This is clear on palaeographical grounds.

[10] To my knowledge, the only Mesopotamian example of both orthographic and unorthographic versions inscribed on the same manuscript is UM 29-15-174, an OB bilingual tablet from Nippur in parallel column format, containing *Diatribes against woman* (cf. DCSL website), which in the left column under the Sumerian version in normal orthography has glosses in phonetic Sumerian, cf. M. Civil and R. D. Biggs, "Notes sur des textes sumériens archaïques," *RA* 60 (1966): 5–7. Due to the uniqueness of this text, which, however, does not have a column dedicated to the phonetic version, it is highly improbable that texts already written in this format were transmitted to the western regions.

[11] Unorthographic versions were likely elaborated on the basis of lexical lists, which contain pronunciation entries in Mesopotamia as well, cf. A Cavigneaux, "Lexikalische Listen," *RlA* 6 (1980–83), 616.

[12] I identified this segment in the Northern Babylonia tradition (Viano, "Writing Sumerian in the West").

[13] Some forty-three fragments are preserved.

[14] Note that RS 25.128+ (Ugarit 1), differently from any other extant manuscript, lists first the palaeographic sign and then the local/contemporary form.

[15] P. 131: "even though these two Ugarit manuscripts derive from the same corpus—and thus *a priori* reflect the same scribal tradition—they do show a greater number of differences between them than do the two Emar manuscripts."

[16] A. R. George, "The Gilgameš Epic at Ugarit," *AuOr* 25 (2007): 237–54.

the Ballad of Early Rulers.[17] The closeness of the MA text to the canonical recension, pointed out by the author, finds parallels in the rest of the MA school texts.[18] One may note that of the inscribed objects and texts with archaizing script (pp. 135–39), the only ones written with sign-forms comparable to those attested in Palaeographic Sᵃ are the Weidner God List from Ugarit and the colophons of some tablets from Emar.[19] Moreover, all of these colophons are from literary or lexical texts only.[20] Therefore, we may conclude that the 'practical' use of Palaeographic Sᵃ was restricted to the realm of the school. This list was part of a stream of tradition spreading to the Western Periphery, which found its purpose within the school and its curriculum in terms of "prestige," as pointed out by the author: an intellectual game limited to scribal elites.

Theo van den Hout, in "The Ductus of the Alalaḫ VII Texts and the Origin of Hittite Cuneiform" (pp. 147–70), presents a palaeographic analysis of Alalaḫ VII texts following H. Güterbock's hypothesis that the Hattusa ductus resembles that of Alalaḫ. This analysis[21] reveals that the Alalaḫ script[22] presents, in terms of Hittite script, both older and later variants of sign-forms, with a prevalence of older shapes; even though a reduction of later forms occurred, the Old Hittite

Script resembles the Alalaḫ script (pp. 163–64). Referring to the inverse relationship between older and later forms occurring in the Hittite script in comparison to the general development in the cuneiform world (i.e., Mesopotamia), the author states "this deviation from the Babylonian norm characterizes Alalaḫ as peripheral" (p. 164). This is, however, a circular argument, as it is based on the Hittite perspective and nothing proves that this deviation occurred at Alalaḫ. It is more reasonable to think that at Alalaḫ older Babylonian shapes were still in use when later forms were adopted, and consequently these became the Old Hittite Script. Later Hittite shapes might instead originate later from different influences such as Assyro-Mitannian and Babylonian, especially through the diffusion of school and literary texts, which can present older Babylonian forms.[23] Demonstrating that the Hittite script originated from a script using a combination of older and later sign shapes and consequently that Old Script was not a clean and pure phase, the author is able to invalidate the assumption that the presence of a single later sign on a tablet written in Old Script automatically forces one to date that tablet to the late Hittite period.

In "The Palaeography of two Ugarit Archives" (pp. 171–83), Wilfred. H van Soldt discusses palaeography, orthography and grammar of texts, mostly school texts, discovered in the Lamaštu archive,[24] where many tablets show MB sign-forms and orthography.[25] One point deserves comments. On page 176 the author indicates the value mam_2 (SAL) in RS 25.130,[26] in the word mam_2-ma,[27] as Ugaritic, but it is in fact

[17] Note also that the Ugarit sources for the Ballad of Early Rulers come from different scribal schools, namely the Lamaštu Archive (RS 25.128+) and the House of Urtenu (RS 86.222+). The Emar manuscripts were instead written by the same scribe, Šaggar-abu, and look closer to one another.

[18] MA school texts are closer to their canonical version than the Emar and Ugarit sources; this clearly reflects the later date of the MA texts (namely Tiglath-Pileser I).

[19] Note that the archaizing script of the so-called Ninurta Seal from Emar, as pointed out by Cohen in the same volume, does not depend on "the lexical lists, but on a tradition of seal engraving in the area stretching back to the Old Babylonian period" (p. 39).

[20] Two further examples of archaizing colophons are given by the author on p. 143, both from school texts: the Palaeographic Sᵃ source from Assur, and a lexical list from Ugarit.

[21] The analysis is undertaken from a Hittitological perspective with a selection of signs that are diagnostic for Hittite texts (p. 151). For comparison, two Akkadian documents from the seventeenth century approximately dated to the first two Hittite kings, Hattusili I and Mursili I, are taken into consideration.

[22] Note that attestations for Alalaḫ variants provided in footnotes do not always match with numbers in Table 3 on p. 154 (e.g., LI); moreover, *total* is obtained by the sum of '*older*' and '*later*' numbers which "refer to texts in which the signs occur, not to the total attestations of each individual sign" but as the author himself states in footnote 31, some texts contain two or more variants. However, a refined calculation does not substantially modify the outcome of Table 3.

[23] The recovery of earlier sign-forms for royal inscriptions is typically Kassite (N. Veldhuis, "Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription," *JCS* 60 [2008]: 25–51), as is the use of a combination of older and later shapes in the same texts; see for instance PBS 1/2 11, J. G. Westenholz, "Sing a Song for Šulgi," in *"An Experienced Scribe Who Neglects Nothing": Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein*, ed. Y. Sefati et al. (Bethesda, 2005), 343–73.

[24] This article also focuses on the palaeography of texts of the so-called Southern Palace (pp. 172–73), but this archive was already treated in a previous article by the same author: van Soldt, "Naḫiš-Šalmu, an Assyrian Scribe Working in the 'Southern Palace' at Ugarit."

[25] W. H. van Soldt, *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit: Dating and Grammar*, AOAT 40 (Neukirchen, 1991), 373–74; D. Arnaud, *Corpus des Textes de Bibliothèque de Ras Shamra-Ougarit*, AuOrS 23 (Barcelona, 2007), 8.

[26] This is a copy of the Ballad of Early Rulers, Ugaritica V Nr. 164, Arnaud, *Corpus des Textes de Bibliothèque de Ras Shamra-Ougarit*, 142–48.

[27] Besides this text, mam_2 occurs at Ugarit only in Ugaritica V 4: 3 (cf. J. Huehnergard, *The Akkadian of Ugarit*, *Harvard Semitic*

Babylonian[28] and is attested in colophons from the library of Assurbanipal.[29] In the Ugaritic recension of the same text, RS 25.424, the writing *ma-am-ma* (l. 9) is documented. Therefore, RS 25.130 is to be considered an MB tablet.

The palaeographic analysis of the Amurru letters found at Amarna is the focus of "Amurru Scribes in the Amarna Archive" (pp. 185–200) by Juan-Pablo Vita. The author is able to identify six different scribes, two from the time of the king Abdiаširta (?–c. 1345 B.C.) and four from the Aziru period (c. 1345–1315 B.C.). These pieces of evidence are integrated with the petrographic analysis of clay tablets undertaken by Goren, Finkelstein and Na'aman,[30] showing that under Aziru, side by side with the expansion of his reign, a development of his chancery took place, resulting in the increase of the number of scribes (pp. 190–94). Moreover, the author shows that the two letters EA 169 and EA 170, characterized by the same ductus, despite Izre'el's conclusion that they display different linguistic traits,[31] may be in fact the work of the same scribe of Hurrian origin (pp. 195–98).

Following her previously-discussed theory that some Akkadian texts from the Western regions may in fact be Akkadographic representation of local languages, Eva von Dassow, in "Gloss Marking and the Language of the Alalaḫ Texts" (pp. 201–16), analyzes the attestations of *Glossenkeil* in fifteenth-century Alalaḫ. Words marked by *Glossenkeil* can be Hurrian,

Akkadian or Semitic, and very seldom do they gloss other words. According to the author, the *Glossenkeil* is used to emphasize certain words, which may be foreign to the language of writing or not. Comparison with the Qatna letters, which show an Akkadographically-written Hurrian language, leads the author to hypothesize that Alalaḫ Akkadian-written texts did not represent a language, but convey information to be interpreted in a language.

In "Chronological Developments in Hittite Scribal Habits and Tablet Shapes" (pp. 217–27) Willemijn Waal offers an overview of a typology of Hittite tablets, used for texts intended to be conserved (Type A).[32] Size, shape and format (i.e., number of columns and indentation) are considered with regard to chronological distribution and text genres. Finally, the layout of Hittite tablets is discussed, revealing a chronological development from "the utmost use of the tablet's surface" (p. 226) in the Old and Middle Hittite period to the more generously spaced and conveniently arranged layout of the later periods.

A group of tablets discovered at Hattuša was labelled Assyro-Mitannian, as they show a ductus and sign-forms similar to both Mitannian and Middle Assyrian texts from the fourteenth century B.C. Mark Weeden, in "Assyro-Mitanian or Middle Assyrian?" (pp. 229–51), provides a comparative palaeographic analysis of these three groups of script[33] on the basis of selected diagnostic signs, with the addition of remarks on some orthographic features. The author concludes that "all these script-groups are related as one larger family" (p. 244), evidencing, specifically, the close similarity between Assyro-Mitannian and Middle Assyrian script from the fourteenth century as against the Mitannian script. As a consequence, he proposes to label the Assyro-Mitannian tablets as Middle Assyrian.

Studies 34 (Atlanta, 1989), 407) a legal document from the Rašapabu archive in an unclear context so that P. R. Berger ("Zu den Wirtschafts und Rechtsurkunden Ugaritica V," *UF* 1 [1969]: 121) reads *mim-ma*.

[28] G. Jucquois, *Phonétique comparée des dialectes moyen-babyloniennes du nord et de l'ouest*, *Bibliothèque du Muséon* 53 (Louvain, 1966), 71.

[29] MZL, 450; AkkS Nr. 298.

[30] See the bibliography section at the end of Vita's article for references; petrographic analysis provides a different scenario compared to the historical reconstruction proposed by Singer.

[31] Vita points out that there is no basis to differentiate linguistically between these two texts.

[32] Ephemeral texts (Type B) are not discussed by the author.

[33] Note that the list of Assyro-Mitannian tablets provided on p. 230 is highly incomplete. For instance, CTH 794, KUB 37.95 and KUB 37.107 are missing.

Principles of Akkadian Textual Criticism. By Martin Worthington. Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012. Pp. xxiii + 352. €99.95 (cloth).
Reviewed by Janine Wende, *Universität Leipzig*

The book under review offers the first comprehensive study on textual criticism in Assyriology. While this practice is well-established in other disciplines dealing with textual material, it has so far only sporadically been employed to aid the study of Akkadian texts. As the author observes in his introduction, "under-

Read the latest issue.Devoted to an examination of the civilizations of the Near East, the Journal of Ne... Â Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age. Papers read at a symposium in Leiden, 17â€"18 December 2009 by Elena Devecchi. Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age. Papers read at a symposium in Leiden, 17â€"18 December 2009 by Elena Devecchi (pp. 136-140). Review by: Maurizio Viano. https://doi.org/10.1086/674817. In: E. Devecchi (ed.), Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age. (PIHANS, 119). Leiden, 33â€"45. Cohen, Y. 2013: Problems in the history and chronology of Emar. Kaskal 10, 281â€"294. Cohen, Y. 2015: A letter from the governor of Emar to the governor of Suá¸«u concerning a river ordeal. Journal Asiatique 303/2, 175â€'180. Cohen, Y., Dâ€™Alfonso, L. 2008: The duration of Emar archives and the relative chronology of the city. In: L. Dâ€™Alfonso, Y. Cohen, D. SÃ¼renhagen (eds.), The City of Emar Among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape and Society. Â Territories, Frontiers and Horizons in the Ancient Near East. Papers Presented to the XLIV Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Venezia, 7â€"11 July 1997. We wish to ex-. Feasting in Late Bronze Age Syro-Palestine 87. plore how it is that participants, especially the royal and priestly personnel who. conducted the religious rituals, used feasts to emphasize the established social. Â This practice bound commoners to elites in a power. relationship while granting the upper class a special status as distributors of ï¬‚esh. and other foods. Â The massive bone midden in the palace courtyard of Hazor contains. Paleography, study of ancient and medieval handwriting. The term is derived from the Greek palaios (â€œoldâ€) and graphein (â€œto writeâ€). Precise boundaries for paleography are hard to define. For example, epigraphy, the study of inscriptions cut on immovable objects for permanent public inspection, is. Â The primary task of the paleographer is to read the writings of the past correctly and to assign a date and place of origin. Close acquaintance with the language of the text is a prerequisite. Help in dating is offered by changes in styles of handwriting and variations from area to area. Abbreviations in texts likewise help in dating and localization. Â In the Middle Ages oak apples were steeped in water with â€œvitriolâ€ (ferrous sulphate) to produce ink. Paleography.