



HAL
open science

60) On Three Lexical Fragments from Uruk, 1: ATU 7, W 20516

Camille Lecompte

► **To cite this version:**

Camille Lecompte. 60) On Three Lexical Fragments from Uruk, 1: ATU 7, W 20516. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*, 2021, pp.151-152. hal-03384296

HAL Id: hal-03384296

<https://hal.science/hal-03384296>

Submitted on 21 Oct 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

N.A.B.U.

Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires

2021

N° 3 (septembre)

NOTES BRÈVES

60) On Three Lexical Fragments from Uruk, 1: ATU 7, W 20516 — The three fragments discussed here,¹⁾ which were published by Bob Englund and Hans Jörg Nissen in ATU 3 and 7, are manuscripts of lexical lists from the Uruk III period and can be briefly revisited. The following short notes are a modest tribute to the memory of Bob Englund and to his painstaking research on this topic.

ATU 7, W 20516, which was not originally identified as a lexical manuscript,²⁾ probably displays on its obverse the list “Archaic Officials”. Its reverse gives the number of lines recorded on the tablet’s obverse and a colophon, SANGA_a AMA_a GAR []. Accordingly, it dates back to the Uruk III period.

Transliteration

Several lines lost	Several lines lost
O0101'. [1N ₁] 'EN _a *1 [ŠU NUN _a ']	O0201'. []
O0102'. [1N ₁] 'EN _a * AMAR ¹	O0202'. '1N ₁ ' []
	O0203'. '1N ₁ *1 []
	O0204'. '1N ₁ ' []
	O0205'. '1N ₁ *1 []

R0101. '1N₃₄ 3N₁ 'SANGA_a GAR 'AMA_a' []

Notes

O0101'-O0102'. The restoration of the sign EN_a, though tentative, relies on the photograph available on the CDLI website (P003847). Thus, O0102' concords with Archaic Officials 17, this fragment probably being a hitherto unidentified manuscript of the aforementioned list. EN_a AMAR occurs also in ATU 3, W 22119,5, which had to date been considered as “Vocabulary 8/1”, but, as shown below (see Note 2. *ATU 3 W 22119,5 and the reconstruction of Archaic Officials 16*), is in fact another manuscript of the Officials List.

O0201'-O0204'. All the numerals are 1N₁ and not 1N₁₄.

R0101. The colophon seems to have been correctly restored by Englund in an unpublished paper (2007).³⁾ SANGA_a AMA_a GAR also occurs as a colophon in several lexical texts of the Schøyen collection (cf. Steinkeller 2019: 120-121). Whether or not this is the same individual cannot be determined with certainty. This concordance raises the problem of the provenance of the archaic lexical tablets housed in the Schøyen collection, although it cannot be ascertained whether or not they originate from Uruk.⁴⁾ Steinkeller (2019: 121 fn. 21) interprets it as Ama-GAR sanga, “Ama-GAR, the accountant”. This is consistent with the occurrence of the term SANGA_a as a colophon of several lexical tablets from the Late Uruk period (notably SANGA_a 'PIRIG_{a1}' [], in a manuscript of the Metal List, ATU 3: p. 141 and SANGA_a SUKKAL A, see below, Note 3) as well as with the usual presence of sangas (or umbisaḡ) in the

colophons of the lexical texts from the Fāra period (cf. Krebernik 1998: 325-333). Less probably, it might refer to the professional title sanga-ĜAR, which also occurs in the texts from Fāra (cf. Pomponio 1987: 309, Visicato 1997: 128), the sign AMA_a possibly being a part of it or referring to a personal name.

Notes

1. I would like to thank Hugo Naccaro who drew my attention to the fragments discussed here and gave me some valuable information as to their context which he has been studying for his PhD research. I also thank Cale Johnson for sharing his unpublished paper with me and Anne-Christine Parr for correcting my English.
2. Although the archaeological context is elusive, it is interesting to note, as Hugo Naccaro reminded me, that the same sector yielded several lexical tablets, unfortunately not in a primary context (Nc XVI, 5, where 36 lexical tablets were found, see in general the map of the sector in ATU 3: p. 11).
3. This is only mentioned in the recorded presentation which differs from the written papers bearing the same title. Bob did not, however, mention the excavation number of the relevant tablet published in ATU 7.
4. See Englund 2007.

Bibliography

- ENGLUND, R.K. 2007. “The Smell of the Cage”, *Origins of Early Writing Systems*, Peking University, <http://www.caeno.org/origins/> and http://www.caeno.org/origins/papers/Englund_Archnames.pdf
- KREBERNIK, M. 1998. “Die Texte aus Fāra und Tell Abū Šalābīḥ.” In P. Attinger and M. Wāffler (eds) *Mesopotamien. Späturuk-Zeit und Frühdynastische-Zeit*, ed. OBO 160/1, 235–427. Fribourg-Göttingen.
- POMPONIO, F. 1987. *La prosopografia dei testi presargonici di Fara*. SS Nuova Serie 3.
- STEINKELLER, P. 2019. “Babylonian Priesthood during the Third Millennium BCE: Between Sacred and Profane.” *JANER* 19: 112-151.
- VISICATO, G. 1997. *Indices of Early Dynastic Administrative Tablets of Šuruppak*. IUO Series Maior VI/A.

Camille LECOMPTE <camille.lecomppte@cnr.fr>
CNRS, UMR 7041, ArScAn, Nanterre (FRANCE)

61) On Three Lexical Fragments from Uruk, 2: ATU 3 W 22119,5 and the Reconstruction of Archaic Officials 16 — ATU 3 W 22119,5 has to date been considered as the only witness to the existence of the list known as Vocabulary 8/1. However, on a closer examination of the photograph available on CDLI (000628), this text appears to contain the Officials List (Fig. 1):

O0101'. [1N₁ SANGA_a?] 'GAL_a?*1 O0201'. '1N₁ NUN_a EN_a ŠU?*1
O0102'. '1N₁ UB*1 O0202'. 1N₁ 'EN_a AMAR'



Fig 1. W 22119,5. New copy

O0101' = Officials 10? – O0102' = Officials 11 – O0201' = Officials 16 – O0202' = Officials 17.

The reconstruction of O0201', supposed to correspond to Officials 16,¹⁾ raises some difficulties: according to ATU 3: p. 87, this line might be EN_a I' NUN_a but none of the manuscripts support this. On the other hand, Johnson, in an unpublished paper (2018), also considers Officials 16 to be EN_a ŠU NUN_a following a line of reasoning based on the administrative evidence, mostly ATU 6, W 14777,c and MS 3172, which display the same entries in an order identical to that of the Officials List.

A closer look at all of the relevant archaic manuscripts confirms the reading presented here:²⁾