



HAL
open science

61) On Three Lexical Fragments from Uruk, 2: ATU 3 W 22119,5 and the Reconstruction of Archaic Officials

16

Camille Lecompte

► **To cite this version:**

Camille Lecompte. 61) On Three Lexical Fragments from Uruk, 2: ATU 3 W 22119,5 and the Reconstruction of Archaic Officials 16. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*, 2021, pp.152-154. hal-03384298

HAL Id: hal-03384298

<https://hal.science/hal-03384298v1>

Submitted on 22 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.

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 I also thank Cale Johnson for sharing his unpublished paper with me and Anne-Christine Parr for correcting my English.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@cncrs.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⁾

W 11985.g. O0101.	ʽ1N ₁ ŠU ^{?*} 1 NUN _a ʽEN _a *1
W 19771.g. O0201.	[1N ₁] ʽEN _a NUN _a 1
W 20516. O0101ʹ.	[1N ₁] ʽEN _a ?1 [ŠU NUN _a ?]
W 22119.5. O0201ʹ.	ʽ1N ₁ NUN _a EN _a ŠU ^{?*} 1
W 24008,16. O0203.	ʽ1N ₁ EN _a ŠU* NUN _a 1

Although Englund and Nissen had suggested reading the latter as EN_a I[?] NUN_a, and Cavigneaux as EN EŠ₅ NUN (BagM 22, p. 44), the broken sign seems to fit neither of these reconstructions. One vertical and curvy wedge appears, according to the photograph of the tablet, to be missing in the copy in BagM 22. The sign can be correctly identified with ŠU and the line, accordingly, read as EN_a ŠU NUN_a (Fig. 2). In W 11985.g, a similar sign, starting with four horizontal wedges, might be present, again ŠU, despite the copy in ATU 3 (Fig. 3).



Fig. 2. W 24008,16. O0203. Drawing in BagM 22. Photography from CDLI (P000661). New representation of the sign ŠU



Fig. 3. W 11985.g. O0101. Drawing in ATU 3. Photography from CDLI (P000010). New drawing

Note that EN_a ŠU NUN_a occurs notably in ATU 6 W 14777,c,³⁾ in which it follows ʽHI E_{2a} NUN_a and precedes EN_a AMAR. Since, as proven by Johnson (2015: 190-102), this text is connected with the Officials List and follows its canonical order, it can be assumed that the position of EN_a ŠU NUN_a tallies with Officials 16. Johnson stated that each line of this text represented an office of the Officials List and, therefore, that the lines 3' to 8' were to be equated with Officials 13-19. This observation, which is fully correct, reinforces the present paleographic identification of the broken sign of Archaic Officials 16 with ŠU. In ATU 6, W 14777,c O0103-O0107, the order of the officials mentioned is as follows:

- O0103a. EN_a NUN_a = Officials 14
- O0104a. ʽHI E_{2a} NUN_a = Officials 15 (ʽHI E_{2a} EN_a NUN_a)
- O0105a. EN_a ŠU NUN_a = Officials 16
- O0106a. EN_a AMAR = Officials 17
- O0107a. AN ŠU₂+EN_a = Officials 18

The same holds true for MS 3172, in which are found successively, among others: NUN_a EN_a = Officials 14, ʽHI E_{2a} NUN_a = Officials 15 (ʽHI E_{2a} EN_a NUN_a), EN_a SAG = Officials 22, EN_a ŠU NUN_a = Officials 16, EN_a AMAR = Officials 17, AN ŠU₂+EN_a = Officials 18 and so on.⁴⁾

Taken together, the paleographic examination of the archaic manuscripts of the Officials List and Johnson's discussion of the relevant administrative documents therefore substantiate a reconstruction of Archaic Officials 16 as EN_a ŠU NUN_a.

Notes

1. It might also be Officials 15 (EN_a NUN_a E_{2a} ʽHI), but this is less likely.
2. The later parallels, which differ from the archaic version, can shed some light on the transmission of Officials 16 until the 2nd millennium:
 - ED manuscripts (Pettinato MEE 3: p. 180 – DCCLT):
 - SF 59. obv. i. 15 [1(aš) A]N EN ʽHI EZEN
 - MEE 3. 50. Obv. i. 15. EN.NAB.U_x.ʽHI
 - OB manuscript (OrNS 76.p. 172, see DCCLT and CDLI):
 - CBS 2243. Obv. i. 3'. [] na-ab-du₇-a
 In CBS 2243 du₇ stands for du₁₀ = ʽHI. It was partially published by Cavigneaux in OrNS 76. See P231387 and DCCLT, oracc.museum.upenn.edu/dcclt/P231387/html.
3. For this text see Johnson 2015: 190-192 and Bartash ZA 105, p. 136.

4. Johnson 2018; Wagensonner *Die frühen lexikalischen Texte und ihr Aufbau*. Unpublished Diss, Vienna, 2016, p. 196. For EN_a ŠU NUN_a, see also ATU 6, W 14804,a+ O0604, ATU 6, pl. 071, W 15775,u O0203a, ATU 6, pl. 074, W 15860,a8 O0102, BagM 22, 139, W 24160 O0102a, BagM 22, 141, W 24181,d O0101, IM 045974 O0103, MS 3155 O0103 and O0302, MS 3172 O0106 and W 20423 O0105.

Bibliography

- JOHNSON, J. C. 2015. “Late Uruk Bicameral Orthographies and Their Early Dynastic Rezeptionsgeschichte.” In: R. Dittmann and G. J. Selz (eds.): *It’s a Long Way to a Historiography of the Early Dynastic Period(s)*. AVO 15. Münster. 169-210.
- JOHNSON, J. C. 2018. “Food, Status and Institutional Mechanics in the Uruk IV-III Texts”, Bologna, unpublished paper.

Camille LECOMPTE <camille.lecompte@cnrs.fr>

62) On Three Lexical Fragments from Uruk, 3: ATU 7, W 20521,2. — On W 20521,2, recognized as a school text by Englund and Nissen in ATU 7,¹⁾ only the reverse, with the number of lines of an unknown list and a colophon, is preserved:

R0101. ʾ1N₃₄ 1N₁₄ 1N₁ʾ SANGA_a SU[KKAL_a Aʾ]

This colophon can be restored in accordance with ATU 3 W 15863,d.²⁾ R0201, a manuscript of the Officials List.

Notes

1. It was, however, identified as a “*Schülertafel mit bisexagesimaler Übung*”, which is probably not the case, since the tablet should have contained a lexical list.
2. As Hugo Naccaro, p.c., informed me, the two fragments were found far from each other, at circa 80 meters.

Camille LECOMPTE <camille.lecompte@cnrs.fr>

63) À propos du terme *kir-na-nu* et des tissus pour les cérémonies funèbres dans les textes d’Ébla — Dans les textes administratifs éblaïtes on connaît un terme *kir-na-nu* grâce surtout aux passages concernant les apports (mu-DU) de certaines villes telles que *Du-gú-ra-su^{ki}*, *DU-lu^{ki}* et *Ra-’à-ag^{ki}* (Pasquali 1997 : 244 ; 2010 : 180-181), dont la localisation fait toujours l’objet de débats (voir Archi 2016, avec bibliographie). Dans un cas, en revanche, *kir-na-nu* est cité parmi les objets de valeur présents dans l’apport (mu-DU) du ministre *Ib-rí-um* (TM.75.G.1527 f. IV :5, translittéré sur la base de la photo publiée par Matthiae 1989 : tav. 62). Ce terme, qui présente de nombreuses variantes graphiques, certaines d’entre elles difficiles à expliquer, se réfère à un type de tissu en lin, comme nous l’assure le fait que le mot est parfois précédé ou suivi par le sumérien *gada-túg*. Même si on n’arrive pas à identifier de façon précise ce tissu précieux, on peut proposer une comparaison avec l’assyrien ^{tu}gú-è *ša kir-na-a-a* (Pettinato 1980 : 141), attesté en tant que hapax dans une liste lexicale et dont l’étymologie demeure à ce jour malheureusement inconnue. Malgré cela, il s’agit de l’unique explication sérieuse du terme *kir-na-nu* à ce jour avancée.

Très récemment, toutefois, Biga et Steinkeller (2021 : 32-33) ont cru pouvoir proposer que *kir-na-nu* signifie « linceul ». Selon ces auteurs, le matériel et ses dimensions « would make it perfect for that purpose ». Le *kir-na-nu*, en effet, est souvent qualifié comme *maḥ*, « grand », et *gíd*, « long », mais aussi – faut-il le remarquer – comme *lúgud-da*, « court », et *tur*, « petit ». En tout cas, cette interprétation repose surtout sur le rapprochement de ce terme éblaïte avec l’akkadien *girrānu*, « lamentation funèbre » (CAD, G, 89), qui dériverait, d’après les auteurs, d’une hypothétique forme *girnānu* à travers l’assimilation présumée de la séquence consonantique *rn*. Mais, au-delà des évidents problèmes d’ordre sémantique – le passage de « lamentation funèbre » à « linceul » est loin d’être évident – et philologique, cette proposition est à refuser à cause du fait qu’à Ébla le *kir-na-nu* n’est jamais mentionné dans les désormais nombreux contextes connus qui enregistrent les sorties de tissus et d’objets précieux pour les cérémonies funèbres (ÉXPAP) ainsi que pour l’habillement des membres décédés de la cour éblaïte ou de ceux d’autres règnes. Rien ne nous autorise, donc, à y voir un tissu lié aux cérémonies funèbres. En revanche, c’est la mère du roi qui de son vivant reçoit l’apport du *kir-na-nu* (voir, entre outre, TM.75.G.2341 f. VI : 4-7 : 1 *gada-túg*