



HAL
open science

A Pig in a Poke

Camille Lecompte, Hugo Naccaro

► **To cite this version:**

Camille Lecompte, Hugo Naccaro. A Pig in a Poke. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*, 2024. hal-04655047

HAL Id: hal-04655047

<https://hal.science/hal-04655047v1>

Submitted on 21 Jul 2024

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

2024

N° 2 (juin)

NOTES BRÈVES

35) A Pig in a Poke — The interpretation of the list known as Archaic Swine has been debated since its publication in ATU 3. The composition is preserved on one complete manuscript, W 12139 (P000014), and another fragmentary tablet, W 20497 (P000456), which contains only a few items and does not fully duplicate the former. The following presents a detailed analysis of W 12139. As notably argued by Englund (*Fs. Boehmer*), the text has generally been considered to represent a compilation of various types of swine, featuring diverse aspects such as their color and age. Steinkeller (*AfO* 42/43, 211-214), however, challenged this interpretation, citing factors such as the “absence of separate swine lists in later periods,” the list’s length, and paleographic issues regarding the identification of the sign šubur. While Cavigneaux (2006: 20-21) agreed with Englund’s view that the sign ŠUBUR likely denotes a swine, he also acknowledged the inconsistencies of the list and its limited currency, suggesting that it might have served purposes beyond mere lexicography, possibly including puns or proverbial expressions. Nevertheless, he attempts to contextualize the names within a herding background.¹⁾

One of the main challenges revolves around the interpretation of the sign ŠUBUR, which appears in Archaic Lu₂ 7 in GAL_a ŠUBUR. In the ED III tradition, it is equated with ŠAH₂. However, it seldom refers directly to swine in the administrative documentation.²⁾ Steinkeller thus proposed that ŠUBUR could be interpreted as šubur, a servant or slave, or correlated with the well-known Sumerian term ur.³⁾ Recent studies on archaic documentation, particularly Englund CDLJ 2009:4, which includes a list of slaves’ names, provide an opportunity to present new insights and draw attention to several intriguing parallels with late Uruk administrative documentation.

Archaic Swine	Administrative Texts	Commentary – concordance with Englund CDLJ 2009:4
1. ŠUBUR	Passim. MS 2840. O0107a./R0202a. MS 2393. O0201. MS 2497. O0102. MS 2388. O0102b3. MS 2431. O0107b1. MS 2443. O0103b. MS 2498. O0101b8. MS 2520. O0101a. MS 2863/30. O0104’. CUSAS 1, 18. O0401. CUSAS 21, 162. O0101.	Recipient of land with a number of sheep as a tax. R0202a. Delivery of goats? Recipient of land with a number of sheep as a tax. Ration of cereals. List of personnel. List of personnel. List of personnel. List of personnel. List of personnel (ŠUBUR seems to have supervised two dead (?) slaves). List of personnel. List of names.

Archaic Swine	Administrative Texts	Commentary – concordance with Englund <i>CDLJ</i> 2009:4
	CUSAS 31, 44.	Small round tablet. SANGA _a RAD _a ŠUBUR x KIŠ KUR _a SAL Compare with MS 2391. O0101.ŠUBUR NIMGIR. Englund <i>CDLJ</i> 2009:4, 23
2=42. ŠUBUR+1N ₅₇	MS 2862/12. O0105a. MS 4503. O0203 (?).	Ration of cereals. Equines and onagers.
4=38. U ₄ ŠUBUR	Uruk IV. W 21060.01. O0302a. MS 2389. O102b. O103b. MS 4552. O0105.	Beer and pots. Unknown commodity. Personnel? List of an unknown commodity (ŠE ₃ ?) with professions (SUKKAL, SANGA _a , NAR) and possible personal names (PAP _a EN _a)
5. KAB ŠUBUR	Uruk IV. W 9579.cx. O0102. CUSAS 31, 49. O0203. MS 4552. O0301.	Uncertain. Account of onagers. Associated with personal or professional names. List of an unknown commodity (ŠE ₃ ?) with professions (SUKKAL, SANGA _a , NAR) and possible personal names (PAP _a EN _a)
7. RAD _a gunū ŠUBUR	CUSAS 31, 44. R0201.	Account of onagers. This personal name seems to be a SANGA _a .
10=39. BU _a ŠUBUR	W 19415.1. O0301 W 20511.02. O0203b. W 24181.a. O0202b. MSVO 1, 78. O0201. CUSAS 21, 217. O0101.	Uncertain commodity. Deliveries for Inanna's festival. BU _a ŠUBUR is followed by SUKKAL. Uncertain commodity. Cereals. Personal name. Small tablet with a personal name.
11=21. MUŠEN ŠUBUR	CUSAS 31, 29. O0201?	Fragment featuring other terms with ŠUBUR Compare with ŠUBUR RAD _a MUŠEN in MRAH O.4995. O0105b3 (E Englund <i>CDLJ</i> 2009:4, 22). Personal name.
12. PAP _a ŠUBUR	CUSAS 1, 84. O0102. (?) CUSAS 31, 173. O0205. (?)	Fragment. Fragment. Compare with PAP _a ZI _a ŠUBUR in W 20274.126. O0104c3 (but the sign PAP _a seems to be an administrative mark), See Englund 2009:4, 22. W 20274.002. O0204b2, W 20274.009. O0102b1, W 20274.24. O0204. This is a personal name.
15. KASKAL ŠUBUR	MSVO 1, 224. O0204a. MS 2431. O0110b2. MS 2436. O0103b2. MS 2437. R0109a. MS 2498. R0201b1.	Uncertain commodity. Probably a personal name. List of slaves. List of slaves. List of slaves (KASKAL ŠUBUR is the supervisor of two slaves) List of slaves. Englund <i>CDLJ</i> 2009:4, 22
16. LAM _b ŠUBUR	CUSAS 31, 16. O0302. W 23973.9a. R0102. (?)	List of personnel. Pots for Inanna's festival. Compare with W 9579.ae (Uruk IV). O0101. Rations? MS 2357. O0105. ZATU795 ŠUBUR LAM _b . Uncertain commodity, the term refers to a personal name.
18. ADAB ŠUBUR = W20497. O0301.	MS 2840. O0409a. MSVO 4, 54. O0104. MSVO 4, 58. O0102b1. O0105. R0101.	Recipient of land with a number of sheep as a tax. Cereals with personal names. List of slaves (ADAB ŠUBUR is both the name of a slave and of the supervisor of six of them).
20. UB ŠUBUR	MS 2436. O0101b2.	List of slaves. Englund 2009: 22-23
23. GI ŠUBUR		Compare with MS 2677. O0305. GI ŠUBUR UŠ _a . See MS 2391
24. UR _a ŠUBUR		Compare with CUSAS 31, 90. O0202. DUB _a GA _{2a2} UR _a ŠUBUR and MSVO 4, 41. O0205. MEN _a UR _a ŠUBUR?, the last sign being probably not ŠUBUR.

Archaic Swine	Administrative Texts	Commentary – concordance with Englund <i>CDLJ</i> 2009:4
25. ŠA _{3a1} ŠUBUR = W 20497. O0301.	W 17729.ee. R0103c1. MS 2357. O0105.	Equines? Uncertain commodity. Personal name?
26. GAN ₂ ŠUBUR	MS 4, 45. O0104a. CUSAS 21, O0201.	Cereals. Personal name? Equines. Personal name.
32. AB ₂ ŠUBUR	MSVO 4, 1. O0202.	Cereals. Personal name?
41. KAL _{b1} ŠUBUR		Compare with KAL _{b2} ŠUBUR. MS 2437. O0305a. Supervisor of slaves. MS 2840. O0209a. Holder of a plot of land.
45. EN _a ŠUBUR	MS 2840. R0402b1. (?)	Responsible for the delivery of sheep and kids. Compare with W 9579.by1. O0101. W 14354.a. O0205. EN _a ZI _a ŠUBUR. W 20274.111. O0103. CUSAS 31, 138. O0101.MS 2863/04. O0102.
47. MU ŠUBUR	MS 2507. O0206a. MS 2432. O0203. MS 2437. R0101a.	Recipient of land with a number of sheep as a tax. List of slaves (MU ŠUBUR is a supervisor). List of slaves (MU ŠUBUR is a supervisor).
48. TE ŠUBUR	MS 2356. O0104. O0202. MS 4162. O0404. R0104. MS 2437. O0107. MS 2499. O0205. MS 2862/16. O0203.	Sheep and goats. Sheep and goats. Complete form IB _a TE ŠUBUR URI _{3a} . List of personnel (?). List of personnel (?). Beer.
54. ŠUBUR+1N ₅₇	CUSAS 21, 183. O0101.	Small round tablet. Compare with ATU 6, 14329, _{a+} . O0202. GEŠTU _b ŠUBUR? 3N ₅₇

26 entries, including four which occur twice, can therefore be identified as personal names in administrative sources with varying levels of certainty, particularly in lists of unknown provenance dealing with slaves or personnel. The relatively high number of names containing ŠUBUR may lend support to the connection with Sumerian terms šubur or even ur, as suggested by Steinkeller, although these archaic names show only weak ties with the later Sumérian onomasticon.⁴⁾ They do not appear to be exclusively borne by slaves or individuals of low status. We can point to several instances of personnel supervisors as well as of higher administrators, notably SANGA_a. Two entries in the list might also conceal a combination of the personal name ŠUBUR and a professional term: 28. GURUŠDA ŠUBUR and 31=51.BAĦAR_{2a} ŠUBUR. It is unlikely that a potter would be associated with a pig. The term BU_a+DU_{6a} in Swine 35, which is not found in the extant administrative texts, is likely used in other names (cf. Englund *CDLJ* 2009:4, 22), and may also represent a personal name combined with ŠUBUR. Other correspondences with administrative documents are highly improbable.⁵⁾ Entries featuring the sign ŠUBUR either alone or associated with a numeral N₅₇ are to some extent ambiguous, since they may either represent abbreviated personal names or merely refer to the age of the animal. Despite these correlations with personal names, several other entries are ambiguous. They may refer to pigs, to their anatomical features, or even to other animal species: the signs NE_a, GI or U₄ denote the color of textiles and animals; ŠA_{3a1} the inner body; SUĦUR ŠUBUR, the “pig-carp” and MUŠEN ŠUBUR, the “pig-bird.”⁶⁾

A review of the archaeological information available for tablet W 12139 also provides insight into its chronological context. According to the Uruk-Warka excavation inventory, W 12139 was discovered during the 4th campaign (winter 1931/32 - UVB 4), at “Oe XVI,4; +19.80 m, über der Tempelmauer von IVa, südwestlich vom Labyrinth”.⁷⁾ The “Tempelmauer von IVa” corresponds to the remains of *Gebäude D* and Eanna IVa phase. The so-called *Labyrinth* is located northeast of square Oe XVI,4 and belongs to Eanna III – 2nd Phase. In square Oe XVI,4, the remains of *Gebäude D* are almost entirely covered by the Terrace of Eanna III – 1st Phase.⁸⁾ This Terrace is documented in plans and in two sections (Profil 35 and Profil 36).⁹⁾ In Oe XVI,4, according to the sections, the Terrace stands at an elevation between +19.65 m and +20.15 m (Profil 35) or between +19.80 m and +20.20 m (Profil 36) (AUWE 14: 272, Plan 67). Since tablet W 12139 was founded at +19.80 m, it might have been discovered in fill layers beneath the terrace or in lower brick layers of this terrace. Thus, we can propose a *terminus ante quem* equated to Terrace of Eanna III – 1st Phase (UA 4: T 13/14-1).¹⁰⁾ The often problematic nature of findspots in the inventory and the presence of a *wadi* in the south-western part of square Oe XVI,4 (UVB 4: 18, Taf. 3) add to the

uncertainty of this t.a.q.¹¹) However, the elevation annotation “+19.80 m” can be distinguished on the plan of the preliminary report (UVB 4: Taf. 3), written above the remains of *Gebäude D*, above the southwest wall of room R6 and northwest of passageway D10 (cf. AUWE 14: Plan 65), just southwest of the wall associated with the *Labyrinth*.¹²) This location corresponds well with the inventory description and to a location where the terrace remains intact, unaffected by the *wadi* (AUWE 14: Plan 67). Thus, despite the proximity of a *wadi*, we can consider W 12139 with a possible t.a.q. Terrace of Eanna III – 1st Phase (UA 4: T 13/14-1). According to H. J. Nissen’s model, it should be characterized by a t.a.q. “IIIc”, which is applied almost exclusively to tablets from the “Uruk IV” paleographic phase (Nissen 1987a; 1987b: 53-62; 2021: 304).¹³)

The Archaic Swine list exhibit some specific features consistent with an early stage of composition, likely between the “Uruk IV and III” paleographic phases:

- While the paleography of the text aligns with the “Uruk III” style overall, its layout, oval shape, and the presence of the colophon on the edge are distinctive characteristics
- The absence of later witnesses parallels the situation of several other lexical tablets labeled simply as “Vocabulary” and in the corpus “Geography”, a forerunner to the Early Dynastic Word List F. This indicates that despite the existence of manuscript W 20497, this list did not succeed in becoming one of the established texts of the Late Uruk traditions
- The topic of personal names featuring a single common sign and its potential combination with terms referring to pigs is also quite unique within the archaic lexical corpus

Notes

1. We thank Christian W. Hess for correcting our English. More recently, Dahl (2006), Veldhuis *GMTR* 6, 46, and Wagensonner (*Die frühen lexikalischen Texte und ihr Aufbau*. Unpublished Diss, Vienna, 2016, p. 208-210), in his review of the list and its bibliography, do not seem to challenge the conventional interpretation; the latter accepts Cavigneaux’s observations. See also Lion-Michel (*Babel und Bibel* 4, 422).

2. Following Englund (*Fs. Boehmer*, 126), Dahl (2006, 32) refers to W 23948 as “the only known administrative text concerning pigs”.

3. Englund *CDLJ* 2009:4, 20 notes that the correspondence is uncertain.

4. ŠUBUR U₄ is the only entry which may represent a possible divine name. Another example, but not mentioned in Archaic Swine, is ŠUBUR (AN) MUŠ_{3a}, cf. ATU 6, W 13675. O0101; MS 2439. O0404 and MS 4488. R0109.

5. These generally consist of longer combinations of signs than those found in Archaic Swine. Swine 29. A ŠUBUR. Maybe W 14338.d. O0101. Swine 33 NE_a ŠUBUR: compare with CUSAS 31, 80. O0202. Swine 36. LAGAB_a ŠUBUR: compare with CUSAS 31, 138. O0101. Swine 40. URI_{3a} ŠUBUR: compare with MS 4162. O0404. Swine 43. KU_{6a} ŠUBUR: compare with MSVO 4, 22. R0102. ŠUBUR KU_{6a} RAD_a. Swine 49. AN ŠUBUR. Compare with MS 3886. O0105. AN ŠUBUR HI_{gunû}_a. MS 2863/29. O0302. AN⁷ ŠUBUR RU. MS 4488. R0109. KUR_a ŠUBUR AN MUŠ_{3a}. See also Archaic Cities 54. DU AN ŠUBUR (= W 20274.126. O0102b). ATU 5, W 9656,ew (Uruk IV). Bottom. 0101. U_{2b} ŠUBUR AN. Swine 53. GIR_{3a} ŠUBUR. Compare with MS 2862/01. R0101. GIR_{3gunû}_c ŠUBUR SIG RAD_a.

6. The modern taxonomy contains similar examples of names of species referring to the pig, e.g. the pigfish (*Orthopristis chrysoptera*), while the call of the water rail (*Rallus aquaticus*) resembles the grunt or squeal of a pig.

7. As argued in Lecompte and Nacarro, “The Archaic Colophons and their Social Setting,” forthcoming, this context corresponds to Findspot 3.

8. According to revisited terminology used by R. Eichmann in the Uruk-Warka publications (AUWE 3 and 14), the *Gebäude D* = *Gesamtstratigraphie* 15: *Untersuchungsareal* 4: *Bauschicht* 14; Eanna IVa (cf. see AUWE 14: 262-268, Plans 65; UVB 4: 17-18, Taf. 3-5a). The *Labyrinth* = GS 13-12: UA 4: BS 12-11; Eanna III - 2^{de} Phase (cf. see, AUWE 14: 296-299, Plans 69-70; UVB 4: 19-21, Taf. 3-5b). The terrace = GS 14/15: UA 4: T 13/14-1 (cf. AUWE 14: 269-272, Plans 67; AUWE 3: Plan 38). The architectural analysis of Eanna III, which included the definition of the two phases and the *Labyrinth* analysis, is developed in greater depth in my PhD thesis (Naccaro 2023, 317-478), currently in preparation for publication.

9. The terrace is documented in Profil 35: SE 18 and Profil 36: SE 66 (cf. AUWE 3: 100-101, Beilage 12).

10. On the application of *terminus ante quem* to the Uruk excavations, see Hrouda *BagM* 5; Nissen 1987a; van Ess 1992: 125; Sürenhagen 1999: 83-97.

11. On the difficulties involved in defining findspots in the inventory, see Nissen 1987a: 22; van Ess 1992: 124-125; Englund and Nissen ATU 3, p. 10 fn. 18; Nissen *CDLJ* 2014:a, 13-16). To illustrate the topography of this area before excavations, see Sürenhagen 1999: Taf. 13.

12. The wall is associated with the *Labyrinth* = UA 4: BS 12-11: 14 (cf. AUWE 14: Plan 69-70).

13. Sürenhagen (1999: 87-88, 107-112 and 117-119) highlighted exceptions to the Nissen model, with rare occurrences of tablets of “Uruk III” paleographic phase featuring a t.a.q. “IIIc.”

Bibliography

- CAVIGNEAUX, A. 2006: “Les suidés : pictogrammes et listes lexicales”, in B. Lion & C. Michel (eds.), *De la domestication au tabou. Le cas des suidés au Proche-Orient ancien*, Paris, p. 15-24
- DAHL, J. 2006: “Early Swine Herding”, in B. Lion & C. Michel (eds.), *De la domestication au tabou. Le cas des suidés au Proche-Orient ancien*, Paris, p. 31-38.
- EICHMANN, R., 1989, *Uruk. Die Stratigraphie*, AUWE 3, Mainz am Rhein.
- EICHMANN, R., 2007, *Uruk. Architektur I. Von den Anfängen bis zur frühdynastischen Zeit*. AUWE 14, Mainz am Rhein.
- NÖLDEKE, A. (ed.), 1932, *UVB 4*, Berlin.
- VAN ESS, M., 1992, “Teil II. Die Kleinfunde aus Asphalt, Farbre, Fritte / Fayence und Ägyptisch Blau, Glas, Holz, Knochen und Elfenbein, Leder, Muschel und Schnecke, Schilf, Textilien Materialien”, in M. van Ess and F. Pedde, (eds.), *Uruk. Kleinfunde II*, AUWE 7, Mainz am Rhein, p. 119-314.
- NACCARO, H., 2023, *La Mésopotamie du sud à la transition des IV^e et III^e millénaires avant notre ère : évolution des cultures proto-urbaines*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne.
- NISSEN, H. J., 1987a, “Zur Datierung der Archaischen Texte aus Uruk”, in M. W. Green and H. J. Nissen (eds.): *Zeichenliste der archaischen Texte aus Uruk*, ADFU 11, ATU 2. Berlin, p. 21-51.
- NISSEN, H. J., 1987b, “Innere Datierungskriterien”, in M. W. Green and H. J. Nissen (eds.): *Zeichenliste der archaischen Texte aus Uruk*, ADFU 11, ATU 2, Berlin, p. 53-116.
- NISSEN, H. J., 2021, “Uruk zur Ĝemdet Našr und Frühdynastischen/Akkadischen Zeit (Uruk zur Zeit der Archaischen Schichten III und I: 3300–2100 v. Chr.)”, in M. van Ess (ed.): *Uruk- Altorientalische Metropole und Kulturzentrum: 8. Internationales Colloquium der deutschen Orient Gesellschaft 25 und 26 April 2013*, CDOG 8, Berlin. Wiesbaden, p. 297-317.
- SÜRENHAGEN, D., 1999, *Untersuchungen zur relativen Chronologie Babyloniens und angrenzender Gebiete von der ausgehenden 'Ubaidzeit bis zum Beginn der Frühdynastisch II-Zeit. 1, Studien zur Chronostratigraphie der südbabylonischen Stadtruinen von Uruk und Ur*, HSAO 8, Heidelberg.

Camille LECOMPTE <camille.lecomppte@cns.fr> & Hugo NACCARO <hugo.naccaro@gmail.com>
CNRS, UMR 7041 – Nanterre & Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne (FRANCE)

36) Aunt or cousin: A cross-generation consanguineous marriage in Early Dynastic Umma — In a famous gold tablet from ED IIIb Umma collected by Louvre Museum (AO 19225), a woman Bara-irnum was the wife of Gishakidu ruler of Umma. She was also a daughter (dumu) of Ur-Lumma ruler of Umma, granddaughter (dumu-KA) of Enakalle ruler of Umma, and daughter-in-law (e₂-gi₄-a) of Il ruler of Umma (THUREAU-DANGIN 1937: 177-182; SOLLBERGER and KUPPER 1971: 83-84; ANDRÉ 1982: 86; STEIBLE 1982: 268-269; COOPER 1986: 93-94; BRAUN-HOLZINGER 1991: 378; FRAYNE 1998: 371; ANDRÉ-SALVINI 2003: 78; PETTINATO 2003: 126; NEUMANN 2011: 4).

In his interpretation on the term dumu-KA, Å. W. Sjöberg (1967: 210), followed by D. O. Edzard (1959: 22), wrote that Il and Bara-irnum were cousins, and grandchildren of Enakalle, whose sons were Urluma and Eandamua. However, the identification was later disputed.

In his *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, J.-J. Glassner (2004: 104) wrote that “one Giššakidu who married his cousin Bara-irnum”. In his list on the Genealogy of the Kings of Umma, both En-a-kal and E-anda-mu were co-generational (brotherhood), and both Bara-irnum and Gišša-kidu were also co-generational (cousinhood) (GLASSNER 2004: 105). J. M. Asher-Greve (2013: 368) also recognized the cousinship between Bara'irnum and Gishakidu, “Marriage between cousins is attested in the inscription of Bara'irnum, wife of Gishakidu, king of Umma”. In his article, S. F. Monaco (2015: 163) listed that Enakalle and Eandamua were co-generational (probably spousal relationship), and Bara-irnum and Gišša-kidu were also co-generational.

We agreed to the identification by Edzard (1959: 22) and Sjöberg (1967: 210). Based on another text (FRAYNE 1998: 369), Ur-Lumma was a son of Enakalle. Il was a son of Eandamu, also a grandson of Enakalle. It is clearly supposed that:

- i) Eandamu was a son or a nephew of Enakalle, also a cousin of Ur-Lumma;
- ii) Bara-irnum was a cousin of Il, also an aunt of Gishakidu.