Corrections and notes to RIME 1

(by Gábor Zólyomi)
(updated continuously)

This text is being prepared by the author as a spin-off of the online edition of the early dynastic royal inscriptions on the website of the Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Royal Inscriptions (http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/etcsri/), where there is no room for a justification of the grammatical analysis and translation provided.

→ = is/are to be corrected to

Ur-Nanše 4 (E1.9.1.4)

p. 86:
between upper and lower rows of figures 5: é-^{d}nin-ĝír-su → é-nin-ĝír-su

Ur-Nanše 6b (E1.9.1.6b)

p. 90:
"As called to my attention by G. Selz (following Bauer, in Bauer, Englund and Krebernik [eds.], Mesopotamien p. 564), the references in rev. iii 8–9 an v 4–5 to tumuli are not heaps of the enemy dead (as some scholars have previously translated) but rather to respectful burial mounds of Ur-Nanše's fallen soldiers." (This idea is in fact quite old, H. Frankfort already suggested it [Frankfort 1970, 71]).

Bauer writes here: "Welcher Feldherr würde sich schon der eigenen Verluste rühmen? Es sind die getöteten Gegner, die im Massengrab unter Totenopfer bestattet werden. Wie verfuhr man mit den eigenen Toten? Trennte man die Leichen sorgfältig nach Feinden oder Freunden, oder bestattete man sie gar zusammen unter demselben Hügel? Darauf gibt es keine sichere Antwort."

Bauer does not in fact state what Frayne takes as granted and then translates the idiom accordingly in the whole volume. In fact Frayne's assumption is quite unlikely (see now also Richardson 2007 and Winter 2010, 17[40]).

Last paragraph of the commentary: "in obv. col. iv line 9" → "in rev. col. iv line 9"

p. 92
obv. vii 2-3: the reading ^{d}lamma-u$_6$(DUL.KID)-è and the translation Lamma-šita-e do not match.
rev. ii. 8 and iv 3: nu-bànda^{da} →nu-bànda
rev. iv 2: bìl-la-la: BIL$_3$ = GIŠ.BIL$_2$(NE×PAP). In fact, the tablet has here the signs GIŠ, PAP, and NE.
Cf. George (2003, I: 73) "As part of the sign-group GIŠ:BIL:PAP the sign PAP is not present as a secondary element, to turn BIL into BÍL as it were, but exists in its owen rigth as a logogram, pa$_4$". On the basis of George's (2003) chapter

about the name of Gilgameš, one may want to read this name as pa_4-$bilga_x(GIŠ)^{bil}$-la-la.

rev. iv 5: pa-bìl(BIL.GIŠ)-ga-tuku → pa-bìl(BIL.GIŠ)-gal-tuku

Ur-Nanše 31 (E1.9.1.31)

p. 116: Frayne describes the text as "A stele fragment found at Ur deals with Ur-Nanše's digging of an irrigation channel"; and later he quotes Cooper (1986: 32) who asks: "Why is the verb "to build" (dù) used with a canal rather than Urnanshe's usual "to dig" (dun)". In fact the text is about an eg_2 "dyke" but not about an id_2 "canal"; and the former is as a rule built and not dug.

E-anatum 1 (E1.9.3.1)

p. 127

"In col. iv line 8, [na]-e is restored … see Steible, ASBW 2 p. 32 n. 17." → p. 33 n. 18

p. 128

obv. i 21-22: [...]-⌜ré⌝ [š]uku-bi, ⌜e⌝-lá is translated as "He would pay it as (interest-bearing) [loa]n". Frayne here adopts Cooper's translation but uses Steible's transliteration. Cooper's translation is, however, based on a different reading of l. 21: he reads ur_5 instead of šuku (cf. Cooper 1986: 38, n. 1).

obv. ii 26: The verbal form e-ma-da-dug_4 is unlikely to refer to a human participant in the comitative, one would rather expect a form like mu-da-dug_4. LL. ii 24–29 could accordingly be translated as "the leader of Umma acted belligerently against it and defied Lagaš".

p. 129

obv. iii 23–27: "At/regarding Piriĝ-… ĝirnun-šage, the god Ninĝirsu roared". In the introduction to the text on p. 126, the author still speaks about "the complaint of the lion to Ninĝirsu". Obviously, the introduction was not updated to match the final version of the translation.

obv. iii 23–24: ĝir-nun $šag_4$-ga-ke_4 appears to be a right-right headed noun-noun compound (cf. Jagersma 2010: 217–218). This type is attested in the Lagash corpus several times: ab-$šag_4$ "inner part of the sea" (Iri-kagina ii 12), e_2-$šag_4$ "personal quarter" (En-ana-tum I 17 iii 5, En-ana-tum I 17 ii 5, En-metena 15 iv 2, En-metena 27 ii 5). Consequently the possessor of this expression must be the lion in obv. iii 23. One may translate these lines as "the … lion of Ĝirnun's innermost part", which phrase perhaps refers to Ninĝirsu.

obv. iii 29: ⌜ú⌝-$durun_x$(DÚR.DÚR)-[n]a-mu → ⌜ú⌝-$durun_x$(DÚR.DÚR)-[n]a-$ĝu_{10}$. Frayne adopts Steible's transliteration, which does not use the ĝ-signs, without harmonizing it with the system used in the volume.

obv. iii 29: [n]ì-ní-gá → [n]ì-ní-ĝá

obv. iv 19: mu-ni-díb → mu-ni-dib. The last sign is clearly a DIB.

obv. iv 20–22: Frayne translates here and in obv. v 26–28 E-ana-tum's name given by Inana as: "Into[?] the E-anna of Inanna of the Great Oval I brought him". The word tum_2 "to be worthy of so/sth, to befit so/sth" is abundantly attested, and the participant "befitted" is case-marked with =/ra/ or

=/(')a/ (locative2 human and non-human) in the 3rd mill. BC, depending on the participant's gender. If the "I" in the name refers to Inana, one would rather expect "Into my E-ana ...". The finite prefix /a/- at the beginning of the verbal form is also against Frayne's interpretation, as it assumes a stative meaning, so a translation like "He is worthy of the E-ana of Inana of the Ebgal" seems preferable.

obv. iv 25 and 28: It is difficult to see what justifies the translations "special knee" and "wholesome breast"; one may simply translate the word zid here as "right". Statues of a ruler sitting on the knee of a goddess who is to breastfeed him are well known in ancient Egypt. The "right side" may have significance though, given its association with good fortune.

obv. v 6–12: Frayne adopts here Cooper's translation without any change. One may assume instead that Ninĝirsu measures baby E-ana-tum twice, double-checking his measurements. The difference may indicate E-ana-tum's very rapid growth, another sign of his exceptionality: "(Measuring,) he laid his handspan on him: he was 5 *kuš* tall. (Then) he laid his forearm on him, and he was (already) 5 *kuš* and 1 *zipah* tall."

obv. v 18–19: the translation given "...art quotes" suggests poor proofreading.

obv. v 29: The verb to be restored is most likely to be pad₃ (pace Steible (1982), II, 37). The expression mu — pad₃ "to proclaim one's name publicly" is attested with the construction in which the named person is in the locative2 (marked with the human locative2 case-marker =/ra/ and with the composite dimensional prefix –/nni/- in the verbal form, cf. En-ana-tum I 11). In obv. vi 2–3 the texts refers to E-ana-tum with his freshly acquired epithet mu pad₃-da, ᵈnin-ĝir₂-su-ka-ke₄ that appears to refer to the events described in obv. v 23–29. Also, it makes sense that the name given by Inana, acting here as a nugig, is announced publicly by the "proud father": "He proclaimed the name given by Inana to him 'He is worthy of the E-ana of Inana of the Ebgal' as the name of E-ana-tum". Note that in En-metena 23 13–18 a similar sequence of events is attested "When Nanše gave the kingship of Lagaš to (En-metena ...) and Ninĝirsu proclaimed his name". In E-ana-tum 1 the order of events appears to be the same: in obv. v 13–17 E-ana-tum is given the kingship of Lagaš, and then in obv. v 23–29 his (throne) name is proclaimed. It may be that the exceptionality of the events described here lies in the fact that the name given to E-ana-tum at birth is the same as the name given after he has been given the kingship and occupied the throne. All this again may refer to a miraculous pace at which E-ana-tum develops from an infant into an adult.

p. 130

obv. v 14: "nam-ga-húl-da (copy has nam-gal)". Frayne does not explain why he transliterates nam-ga-hul₂-da if the text has nam-gal-hul₂-da. If he perhaps assumes that it is a finite verbal form containing a –/nga/- prefix, then his assumption is unfounded on many accounts. Just to mention an obvious one, the construction is also attested with the compound verb ki — aĝ₂ "to love" (see, e.g., Gudea Cyl. A x 1) written as nam gal ki aĝ₂-da and not as *ki nam-ga(l)-aĝ₂-da.

obv. v 22 and vi 5: Frayne translates the expression kur a-ne-še₃ differently: in the former line as "the foreign land belongs to him"; in the latter as "Now then, Oh enemy!". The former comes from Steible, the latter from Cooper.

obv. v 29: mu-ni-[gar(?)] → mu-ni-[ĝar(?)]

obv. vi 5: g[á-gá-dè] → ĝ[á-ĝá-dè]

obv. vi 10: me-an → me-am₆

obv. vi 13: a-šàGÁNA → ᵃ⁻šàGÁNA. In other places Frayne tranliterates this word as
ᵃ⁻šàGÁNA, see, for example, En-metena 1 iii 9 (p. 197).

obv. vi 13 and 30: ág → áĝ

obv. vi 23: eger → eĝer

obv. vi 31: ᵈnin-gír-su → ᵈnin-ĝír-su

p. 131

obv. vii 4: zex(ÁB.ŠA)-ge → zeₓ(ÁB.ŠÀ.GI). See Krecher 1995: 189⁹⁹, and now Meyer-
Laurin 2011: 50–52. The same mistake occurs in the introduction to the
text on p. 127. Here the author refers to BiMes 3 no. 26 obv. iii; the correct
reference is obv. ii 4 (the CDLI catalogue number of the text is P221796).

obv. vii 5: The translation "will not support it" would suggest a reading gub for
DU. The verb gub can mean with the comitative "to stand by, to support
(cf. Gudea Cyl. A 1:25 and 3:24: inim-ba ha-mu-da-gub "May she stand by
me in this matter!").

obv. vii 6–11: Frayne, following here both Steible and Cooper, translates these
lines as if both verbal forms (iri-e₃ and iri-keš₂) were intransitive and in
present-future. The form of the verbal prefix /ri/, however, indicates that
there must be a morpheme immediately before the verbal base (cf.
Jagersma 2010: 423–424). This morpheme is most probably a final personal
prefix referring to the 1st ps. sg. Agent, Ninĝirsu, who speaks to E-ana-
tum. Consequently the verbal forms are transitive and in the past tense: "I
have made Utu appear at your right arm. I have bound a/the … on your
forehead". The prefix /r/ + /i/ (2SG + L2) agrees with the possessor of a₂
"arm" and saĝ-ki "forehead", an example of external possession (cf.
Zólyomi 2005 and Jagersma 2010: 396–398). The first sentence is probably a
pun on or reference to the expression a₂ zid-da "right arm" (cf., for
example, Gudea Cyl. A xi: 2) which means something like "aid (in war)",
and means that Ninĝirsu made Utu E-ana-tum's aid in the ensuing war. The
second sentence may refer to a symbolic gesture, also expressing that
Ninĝirsu supports E-ana-tum.

I consider it likely that that these lines are in fact the last sentences of Ninĝirsu's
speech in the dream, and E-ana-tum's name in l. 12 is may have been
followed by a phrase similar to the one that closes Gudea's dream in
Cylinder A 12: 12–13: i₃-zig₃ u₃-sa-ga-am₃, i₃-ha-luh ma-mu-dam "(Gudea)
rose — it was sleep; he shuddered — it was a dream (cf. Alster 2003/2004: 7
for a similar suggestion).

obv. vii 10: In the introduction to the text Frayne still wants to translate the
obscure logogram NE.GI.DU.US₂ as "blazing (?) …", an idea missing from
the final version of the translation.

obv. vii 20–viii 3: Following Cooper, Frayne translates these sentences as if the
verbal forms were in present-future. In fact all verbal forms are transitive
and are clearly in the past tense. In l. viii 1, for example, Frayne and
Cooper's translation would require a verbal form like e-na-zi-zi.
Consequently, these sentences cannot be part of Ninĝirsu's speech in E-
ana-tum's dream but part of the description of the war between Lagaš and

Umma, see Steible 1982: I, 126 and II, 43, note 45 and Alster 2003/2004: 7 for a similar understanding.

obv. vii 21: LÚ×ÚŠ-bi → adda-bi

obv. vii 22: bi-lá → bé-lá

obv. vii 23: ĝiš[KÙŠU](um[ma]).[KI] → ^{ĝiš}[KÚŠU.KI]. This reading must come from a version of the ms. in which Frayne still wanted to transliterate the logogram ^{ĝiš}KÚŠU.KI as umma.KI, as in the final version he argues against it, see pp. 357–359, and the notes here to p. 359 below.

obv. viii 3: The transliteration i$_3$-gaz ignores the rules of vowel harmony that would predict e-gaz here (cf. En-metena 1 3:18). This discrepancy is one of the arguments that support Jagersma who assumes that here we have a transitive verbal form beginning with a locative1 prefix, transliterated as ne$_2$-gaz, see Jagersma 2010: 470–473.

obv. ix 6: Schrakamp (2010: 220) suggests plausibly that word igi refers here to the arrowhead that remained in E-ana-tum's body.

obv. x 1–4: "E-anatum provoked a windstorm, like the baneful rain of the storm he provoked a flood there in Ĝiša (Umma)." This translation appears to be an amalgam of Cooper's (1986: 34) and Frayne's resulting in a sentence that does not correspond to the Sumerian text.

obv. x 5: ĝišKÚŠU.KI → ^{ĝiš}KÚŠU.KI

obv. x 13: G[ÍN].Š[È bi-sè → G[ÍN].Š[È bé-sè]

obv. xi 2: ĝišGÚŠU.KI → ^{ĝiš}KÚŠU.KI

obv. xi 5 and 12: ĝišKÚŠU.KI → ^{ĝiš}KÚŠU.KI

p. 132

obv. xi 22: [^{d}nin]-g[ír-sú-ra] → [^{d}nin]-ĝ[ír-sú-ra]

obv. xii 2: a-[šàGÁNA-ki]-ág-[ni] → ^{a}-[^{šà}GÁNA-ki]-áĝ-[ni]

obv. xii 11: a-šà da-n[a] "The fields of his (Ninĝirsu's) side". The word da "side" apparently has a /g/-Auslat, which makes Frayne's interpretation questionable as one would rather expect *da-ga-na (cf. Balke 2006: 89–91).

obv. xiv 1: The sign transliterated as bára by Frayne is most probably DAG. The sign BARAG looks very different in this period; see, for example, En-metena 1 2: 14–16.

obv. xvi 12: lú-ĝišKÚŠ[U.K]I-ra → lú-^{ĝiš}KÚŠ[U.K]I-ra

p. 133

obv. xvi 44 (xix 11, xxi 15; rev. i 34): šembi → šembi$_3$(BI×SIG7). Here the text is broken, but in fact where we have this line (obv. xviii 3, xxi 15; rev. i 34) the text always writes šembi$_3$, so it should be written as šembi$_3$ everywhere.

obv. xvi 20, xvii 29, xviii 32, xx 9, rev. i 10: mu-na-ku$_5$-de$_6$ → mu-na-ku$_5$-re$_6$. As Frayne writes the forms of the verb followed by the subordination suffix /'a/ as ...-ku$_5$-ra$_2$, it would be more consistent to use the writing suggested here. See Jagersma (2010: 43–45) about last consonant of the verb "to cut" and about the writings of the phoneme /ř/ in the 3rd millennium BC.

obv. xvii 6–7: When the order of the divine name and the title lugal/ama-ĝu$_{10}$ is preserved (obv. xviii 8–9, xix 20–21, xxii 7–10), the order always is title – DN, except for rev. ii 1–2, where it is probably [^{d}utu], ⌜lugal⌝-ĝu$_{10}$-[ra]. This restoration, coming from Steible, is therefore rather uncertain. The

translation, which is adopted from Cooper's translation, gives the "more likely" order.

obv. xvii 8–9: The meaning of the word šar$_2$ is explained as "bitten (= to pray)" by Poeble (1925: 2) on the basis of 1st millennium lexical lists (Idu II 76 and A V/2: 55, cf. CAD Š/III, p. 400, s.v. šutēmuqu; MSL 14, p. 416), followed also by Steible (1982: II, 52). Cooper (1986: 35 and passim) translates it with "to reiterate". Another possibility is to understand the two clauses containing the verbal forms dug$_4$-ga-na and šar$_2$-ra-na as a kind of verbal hendiadys. The use of the verb šar$_2$ "(to be) numerous" is namely well attested in this function in Old Babylonian literary texts. Consider, for example, this line: lugal-e im-ma-ab-gaz-e udu im-ma-ab-šar$_2$-re (Ur-Namma A 81, ETCSL 2.4.1.1), translated by Flückiger-Hawker as "The king slaughters numerous bulls and sheep" (1999: 116). In Flückiger-Hawker's translation the verb šar$_2$ is reflected by the adjective "numerous". In somehow similar way, the two verb forms could be translated as "tell him more than once" → "tell him again" → "repeat him" in xvii 8–9, taking off the burden of explaining the meaning of šar$_2$ on the basis of much later lexical texts; and retaining its well-known basic meaning.

The common interpretation and translation of these difficult lines still goes back to Poebel (1925: 2), who assumed that a-ba is the human interrogative pronoun which functions as an anticipatory (left-dislocated) genitive, the 3rd. ps. sg. human possessive enclitic =/ani/ after the verbal stem agrees in person, number, and gender with the left-dislocated interrogative pronoun, and the phrase ends in a locative. Both Steible and Cooper, and consequently Frayne, follow this analysis. Steiner (1974: 55–56), however, suggests, I think plausibly, that the verbal forms dug$_4$-ga-na and šar$_2$-ra-na are rather to be analyzed as imperatives with a 3rd ps. sg. human addressee. He refers to the introductory formula of Sumerian letters from the middle 3rd millennium BC: PN$_1$=e na-e-a PN$_2$=ra dug$_4$-ga-na "What PN$_1$=e says, tell PN$_2$". Steiner analyses then a-ba as an interrogative pronoun that functions syntactically as the subject of the non-verbal clause in l. 11: "Wer (auch immer) (er ist, nämlich) ein 'Mann' von Umma", der von dem Vertrag zurücktreten will, …". ETCSRI follows Steiner's analysis and would like to give back ll. xvii 6–11 in English as "Whoever — repeat this to my master, Enlil — may be the leader of Umma intending to revoke this agreement, …". Steiner's analysis has the advantage that it provides a clear function for the divine names in dative at the beginning of these episodes, and makes more transparent the underlying communicative situation, namely that the doves are sent to Enlil as messengers entrusted with a message.

obv. xvii 10–15: These lines have three different translations in this edition: version a): obv. xvii 10–15, xix 24–29, xxii 13 — xxiii 3, rev. v 26–31; version b) obv. xviii 12–17; version c) rev. ii 5–9. Version a) repeats Cooper's (1986: 37) translation, version b) repeats it with an omission; version c) slightly rephrases it. The important discussion of Steinkeller (1989: 58–60) is not reflected by Frayne's translation. (Note that in the bibliography for the text no work published later than 1986 is mentioned.)

obv. xvii 10: The translation "any leader in Ĝiša (Umma)" goes apparently back to a note by Edzard (1975: 67, fn. 16): "Lú umma^{ki}-a ist nicht = lú-umma^{ki}-ke$_4$, also keine Genitivverbidung; daher 'jemand im Umma'." This analysis has

been accepted both by Steible and Cooper. In fact the writing umma^{ki}-a stands certainly for umma=ak=ø : umma=GEN=ABS in En-metena 1 3: 36 and 6: 9, so umma^{ki}-a may well stand for the city name in the genitive case.

obv. xvii 11: The translation "reneges against the agreement" neglects the form of gur-ra-da-am₆, which (pace Wilcke 2003: 75, fn. 231) I would like to analyze as gur-ed=ø-am-ø : STEM-PF-ABS-COP-3-SG-S, with an assimilation of the /e/ of ed to the copula. This form expresses an intention in the future; see, for example, la-he-dam (NG 120a 11) "(the sheep) are to be taken (to Nippur by the mayor of Nagsu and the king's soldier).

obv. xvii 15: The transliteration šu i₃-bal-e ignores the rules of vowel harmony that would predict šu e-bal-e here. Discrepancies like this one support Jagersma's assumption that the locative1 prefix may begin the prefix-chain of a transitive verbal form, see Jagersma 2010: 470–473. Consequently the verbal form should be transliterated as šu ne₂-bala-e.

obv. xvii 23: ^dnin-gír-sú-ka → ^dnin-ĝír-sú-ka

obv. xvii 39: [^{ĝišKÚŠU}.KI-a] → [^{ĝiš}KÚŠU.KI-a]

obv. xvii 44: ba-ni-gar → ba-ni-ĝar

obv. xvii 44: sag-ba → saĝ-ba

p. 134

obv. xviii 19: ^dnin-hur-saĝ-ra → ^dnin-hur-saĝ-ka

obv. xvii 32: ur → GUR₈ (at least this is how Frayne writes it in obv. xvi 24)

obv. xvii 33, xviii 37, xx 15, rev. i 15: ÚŠ-šè → idim-šè (at least this is how Frayne writes it in obv. xvi 25). In obv. xvi 24 he translates the line as "A dyke was dug (lit.: made) to spring", while in the other places as "I shall not ... the irrigation channel!"

obv. xvii 44: ^dnin-hur-saĝ-ka-ke₄ → ^dnin-hur-saĝ-ka. The divine name is in the genitive with no further case-marker: Ninhursaŋak=ak : DN=GEN; the divine name itself contains a genitive and the genitive construction "the great battle-net of Nin-hursaŋa" functions as the head of a relative clause. Cf. obv. xix 12: sa-šuš-gal, ^den-ki, lugal abzu-ka "the great battle-net of Enki, king of the abzu", where the analys of the last word is abzu=ak=ak : STEM=GEN=GEN.

obv. xviii 9: ama-[mu] → ama-[ĝu₁₀]

p. 135

obv. xix 10–13: This restoration, accepted by both Steible and Cooper, cannot be correct as E-ana-tum probably sends fishes but note doves to Enki, who lives in the abzu, the cosmic underground water.

obv. xix 31: [^den-ki] → [^den-ki-ka]. Enki's name ends with a /k/, so if the name is followed by a genitive case-marker, it should be reconstructed as suggested here; cf., for example, En-metena 1 iv 8b or En-metena 15 ii 6.

p. 136

obv. xx 7: lú-ĝiš[KÚŠU.KI]-ke₄ → lú-^{ĝiš}[KÚŠU.KI]-ke₄

obv. xxi 15: ba-ni-gar → ba-ni-ĝar

obv. xxi 16: sag-ba → saĝ-ba

obv. xxi 17: 2-nam-uri₅.KI-še₃ → 2-nam uri₅.KI-še₃

obv. xxii 7: lugal-mu → [lugal-ĝu₁₀]

obv. xxii 14: gur-ra-da-am₆ → gur-da-am₆

obv. xxiii 5: [ᵈEN.ZU] → [ᵈEN.ZU-na]. The divine name is in the genitive, it should be reconstructed as suggested here.

p. 137

rev. i 7: e-na-ta-ku₅-ra₂ → e-na-ta-ku₅

p. 138

rev. v 30–31: u₄-da inim-ba šu i₃-bal-e, i₃-bal-e → u₄-da inim-ba, i₃-bal-e

p. 139

rev. vi 1: The passage rev. v 42 – vi 9 consists of a series of genitive constructions, but only the very last one has a genitive case-marker, as was already pointed out by Wilcke (1990: 461). Consequently the restoration given by Frayne (following here again Steible) cannot be correct. The restored form must be ᵈ⌈nin⌉-[ĝir₂-su] and not "ᵈn[in-ĝír-sú-ka]".

rev. viii 1': The destruction of Arua is preceded by the raid of Mišime in both E-ana-tum 5 (iv 16–17) and 6 (v 1–2). Consequently there seems to be no basis to reconstruct here "GÍN.ŠÈ bi-sè".

E-ana-tum 3 (E1.9.3.3)

p. 143: "The inscription was restored by Cooper (RA 79 [1985] pp. 111–14), following (Steible) En-metena 1. However, since the restoration is not absolutely certain we have (conservatively) given an unrestored text here." One has the suspicion that Frayne simply overlooked that Cooper's restoration in RA in fact relies on the texts edited as "Ean. 63" and "Ent. 30" by Steible (1982: I, 176–178 and 246–247). This must be the explanation for the fact that "Ent. 30" is completely missing from Frayne's book, its text is not edited anywhere in the volume, and no references can be found to it or any of its two mss. in the indices. (CDLI, which refers to the royal inscriptions with their RIME numbers, is compelled to list "Ent. 30" as an additional text [RIME 1.09.05.add31, P431148, P222535, P222536]). Frayne's edition relies only on "Ean 63."

ii' 6: Frayne following Cooper (1986: 40, note 3) emends DU₆ to KI at the beginning of the line. There seems to be no compelling reason for this emendation. A translation like "the mound on which Mesilim had erected a stela" does not seem impossible. In Cooper's reconstruction of the text (1985: 113), this phrase is followed by verbal forms containing a comitative infix (e-da-ru, e-da-ru-a-ba). Cooper's translation does not account for the use of the comitative prefix (unless he assumes that it agrees with the phrase "at Ningirsu's command" reconstructed for him in line ii' 9). Assuming that the verbal form bi₂-du₃-a at the end of line ii' 7 in fact ends with a comitative enclitic, which is not written after a vowel in the orthography of this period (cf. Jagersma 2010: 197), then ll. ii 6–17 of the text reconstructed by Cooper (1985: 113) may well be translated like this: "At the command of Ninĝirsu, E-ana-tum erected a stela next to the mound on which Mesilim had erected a stela. He named the stela that he erected next to it 'Ninĝirsu, the lord, is eternally exalted in the abzu'". This translation would provide for the comitative prefix.

If my argument and translation is correct, then this text provides unique information on the location of Mesilim's original stele missing from other texts, namely, that it was located on a height probably more visible from afar.

Note that the emended KI at the beginning of ii' 6 would suggest that the verbal form bi$_2$-du$_3$-a at the end of line ii' 7 ends with a locative1. Retaining DU$_6$ has two consequences: i) it would explain the uncommon use of the comitative prefixe in the subsequent verbal forms; ii) it would confirm that Cooper's reconstruction combining "Ean. 63" and "Ent. 30" is basically correct.

iii' 1: ⌜x⌝ a mu-[(x)-ba]l-e-a → A mu-[ba]l-e-a. Cooper notes that "collation shows no sign preceding A" (1983: 40), and the photo on CDLI (P222463) confirms him. The photo also shows that there cannot be any sign between MU and BALA.

iii' 2: nin-ĝír-su → ^{d}nin-ĝír-su

iii' 9–12: These lines in fact are "reconstructed" on the basis of the mysteriously missing "Ent. 30", in particular relying on 1 H-T 122 ii' 1'–4' (P222536). In l. 12 the verbal form na-dib-be$_2$ is itself a reconstruction proposed by Cooper, the sign after ŠE$_3$, however, looks as the beginning of a MU on the copy.

ETCSRI follows Cooper's reconstruction without his restoration of the missing lines. The following note refers to his reconstruction and translation in RA 79: 111–114 and Cooper 1986: 40–41.

i 15: mu-DU. The form of the ventive prefix indicates that the verb is kur$_x$(DU) "to enter" here and in the parallel passage in En-metena 1 i 21 (i$_3$-DU). The prefix /mu/- namely indicates that there must be a morpheme before the verbal base. Since the verbal form is intransitive this morpheme is probably the syncopated locative1 prefix /ni/ → /n/, which in turn indicates that the verb must be kur$_x$(DU) "to enter" as this is the verb that commonly requires a locative1 prefix in its prefix-chain. This example is probably one of the earliest attestations of the later more common phenomenon that the verb "enter" has a locative1 prefix in the prefix-chain but marks the place of entrance with the terminative (cf. Zólyomi 2000: 343–344). Consequently, Cooper's translation "The leader of Umma … marched on the plain of Lagash" could be changed to "The leader of Umma … entered the territory of Lagash".

E-ana-tum 5 (E1.9.3.5)

p. 146

i 4: lagaš(NU$_{11}$.BUR.LA).KI → lagaš(NU$_{11}$.BUR.LA).KI-ke$_4$

p. 147

iv 8: úri.KI → uri$_5$.KI

iv 14–15: énsi-bi, mu-ug$_7$ translated as "(He destroyed Uruaz and) killed its ruler". Here again Frayne adopts Steible's transliteration and Cooper's translation without harmonizing them. Steible transliterates the sign BAD as ug$_7$, i.e. with the plural stem of the verb 'to die, kill', because he translates the line as "deren (= dieser Städte) Stadfürsten, hat er getötet". He meant the rulers of all the cities listed in iv 6 – 13 (Uruk, Urim, Ki-Utu, Iri-az).

p. 149
viii 3: lagaš.KI → lagaš.KI-ke$_4$

E-ana-tum 6 (E1.9.3.6)

p. 151
iii 18: énsi-bi saĝ mu-gub-⌜ba⌝ → énsi-bi saĝ-ba mu-gub-⌜ba⌝

p. 151
iv 7: a-šà-ki-áĝ-ni. The text has $^{a-šag_4}$ašag$_5$ ki aĝ$_2$-ni
iv 8: úri.KI → uri$_5$.KI
iv 14: ki-^{d}utu → ki-utu-ka

E-ana-tum 8 (E1.9.3.8)

p. 155
The notes at the bottom of the page:
v 3.6–8 bi-sè → iv 3.6–8 bi-sè
v 6.2–8 Omit-a → iv 6.2–8 Omit-a
v 7.6–8 bi-sè → iv 7.6–8 bi-sè
v 8.3, 4, 8 → iv 8.3, 4, 8

iii 7, iv 7, v 4: bí-sè — Frayne neglects here the orthographic rules of ED Lagaš
texts. The sign NE should be transliterated as bi$_2$ when used for writing the
prefix /bi/, while the sign BI should be transliterated as be$_2$ when used for
writing the prefix /bi/, cf. now Meyer-Laurin 2011: 39–40. The verb *se$_3$* may
occur with both graphemes in the Lagaš texts, this may reflect that its
pronunciation varied: its vowel was heard either as an open vowel or as a
closed vowel. The variant graphemic forms may be transliterated as *bi$_2$-si$_3$*
vs. *be$_2$-se$_3$* reflecting the choice of grapheme for writing the prefix-chain.

E-anatum 10 (E1.9.3.10)

p. 158
col. iii 2: mu-na-[du3] → mu-na-du3 (cf. the photo on p. 205 of Crawford 1977,
where the sign DU3 can be seen clearly)

En-ana-tum I 3 (E1.9.4.3)

p. 174
Translation of iii: 2–6: "The poplar dogs(?)(or lions[?]) that he installed for him
there as gatekeepers, he set for the god Ninĝirsu, his master who loves
him." The translation does not give back the meaning of the idiom mu —
ĝar, and disregards the locative case at the end of the phrase in iii 1–2. Cf.
K. Radner (2005: 73): "Ganz im Einklang mit der parallelen Verwendung
der mündlichen und schrift- und bildgebundenen Gedächtniskultur zur
Perpetuierung des Namens wird die Phrases sum. mu ĝar = akk. *šumam
šakānum* ebenso auch auf den Namen in seiner schriftgestützten Form, den
"geschriebenen Namen, "angewandt. Der ältesten Belege dafür finden sich
in den Inschriften frühdynastischer Herrscher. So heißt es in einer
Bauinschrift des Enanatum I. von Lagaš vom Heiligtum für Ninĝirsu: 'Er
(d.h., Enanatum) hat (seinen) Namen für seinen ihn liebenden Herrn

Ninĝirsu auf die hölzernen Löwen gesetzt, die er für ihn (d.h., Ninĝirsu) als Türhüter sitzen ließ.'" The lines may thus be translated as "For Ninĝirsu, his master who loves him, he recorded (his) name on the lions of halub wood he had seated for him as doorkeepers".

E-anatum 16 (E1.9.3.16)

p. 165

ii' 1': ᵃ⁻ˢᵃGÁNA-ki-áĝ-ĝá-ni → ᵃ⁻ˢᵃGÁNA-ki-áĝ-ĝá-ni. Note that in other places Frayne transliterates the word as a-šàGÁNA, see, for example, E-ana-tum 1 obv. vi 13 (p. 130)

En-ana-tum I 9 (E1.9.4.9)

p. 181

v 6: en-na-na-túm-me → en-an-na-túm-me
v 12: en-na-na-[túm] → en-an-na-[túm]

En-ana-tum I 18 (E1.9.4.18)

p. 190

i 1: en-na-na-túm → en-an-na-túm

En-ana-tum I 19 (E1.9.4.19)

p. 191

3: en-na-na-túm → en-an-na-túm

En-metena (E1.9.5)

p. 193

"En-anatum I was succeeded by his third son, Enmetena (see Bauer in Bauer, Englund, and Krebernik [eds.], Mesopotamien p. 469)." In fact Bauer here says (emphasis is mine): "Doch nicht Meanesi oder Lummatur, sondern *ein dritter* Sohn Enanatums I., Enmetena, wurde sein Nachfolger." So → by a third son of his.

En-metena 1 (E1.9.5.1)

p. 194, Catalogue

It is stated that ex. 2 (=NBC 2501) "omits lines corresponding to ex. 1" (AO 3004). In fact it is the other way round: it is AO 3004 that omits lines, i.e. NBC 2501 has additional lines compared to AO 3004.

p. 194, commentary, column a

"... 'to tear out' see Sjöberg, PSD 2 p. 161" → p. 162

p. 195

i 19: i$_3$-bux/bur$_9$(PAD) → i$_3$-bu$_x$/bur$_9$(PAD) or rather i$_3$-bu$_{15}$/bur$_9$(PAD). On p. 194 Frayne says: "Another possibility is to read the verb as padr = *kasāpu(m)* "to break into bits." This reading is impossible because of the prefix-chain of the verbal form. A reading like *pad* would require *e-pad* because of the vowel harmony.

p. 196

additional lines between ii 3 and 4: it should be mentioned that these lines come from NBC 2501 (= ex. 2). Frayne leaves out from the transliteration but translates the last, 6th, additional line: ì-DU.

p. 197

additional lines between iv 8 and 9: Frayne leaves out from the transliteration but translates two lines that are only on NBC 2501 (= ex. 2): ^{d}en-líl-lá, ^{d}en-ki-ka.

iii 29: zabalam.KI-kam → zabalam₅.KI-kam (zabalam = ZA.MUŠ₂.UNUG, the text has here MUŠ₃.AB)

p. 198

iv 18: hé-šè-gi₄-gi₄ → hé-šè-gi₄-gi₄-a (ex. 1 also has the sign A at the end of the verbal form). The note on this line at the bottom of the page: vi 18.2 → iv 18.2

p. 199

vi 26: nam-lú-ùlu-uru-na corresponds in the translation to "the people of his own city". As this phrase is the subject of a transitive verb it should either be amended to nam-lú-ùlu-uru-na-<ke₄>, or it must be analyzed as to be in the locative case and the translation should be changed accordingly. One way of translating vi 26–29 is "Having revolted against him in his city, may the people kill him in the middle of his city!"

En-metena 5a (E1.9.5.5a)

p. 205

Exx. 3 (UCLM 9-1766) and 4 (UCLM 9-1767) both have in col. iv 2 du₃-a (see the photos belonging to the catalogue entry of P222589 and P222590 on CDLI)

En-metena 11 (E1.9.5.11)

p. 212

Steible, ASBW 1 pp. 264-65 → 254-55

En-metena 26 (E1.9.5.26)

p. 231

i 2 ur-saĝ-^{d}[e]n-líl → ur-saĝ-^{d}[e]n-líl-˹ra˺

On Sollberger's copy the broken sign under SAG does not belong to EN, it can only be the traces of a RA.

En-metena 30 (E1.9.5.30)

p. 235

l. 10: en-na-na-[túm] → en-an-na-[túm]

En-ana-tum II 1 (E.1.9.6.1)

p. 238

l. 14: é-bàppirka-ni → é-bàppir-ka-ni

l. 17: lú-bàppir- → lú é-bàppir-

Lugal-Anda 2 (E1.9.8.1)

p. 242

l. 1: lugal-an-da-nu-hun-gá → lugal-an-da-nu-huĝ-ĝá

Lugal-Anda 2 (E1.9.8.2)

p. 242

i' 6', ii' 3'and 6', iii' 3: (-)gír- → (-)ĝír- . Interestingly in the translations the author writes Ninĝirsu.

ii' 6': The author translates the name of the stele as "Ninĝirsu Is the Lord Eternally Exalted in Nippur", following Cooper (1986: 69). One may wonder if it were to make more sense to translate it as: "Ninĝirsu, the Lord, is Eternally Exalted in Nippur".

iii' 3': lugal-an-da-nu-hun-gá → lugal-an-da-nu-huĝ-ĝá

URU-KA-gina 1 (E1.9.9.1)

p. 262

viii 7–9: These lines are translated as "he restored the customs of the former times" following the interpretation of G. Selz (1995: 29–30, fn. 84). Selz's interpretation is based on his understanding of col. xii 34–35 which has the same verbal form (*e-še₃-ĝar*): "Seinen (des Kanals Ningirsu-Nibrutanirgal) Namen von früher setzte er (wieder) ein". There is, however, nothing in the text that would compel one to assume that the phrase *mu ud-bi-ta-bi* "its former name" refers to the name given in l. xii 36 (*id₂-ᵈnin-ĝir₂-su-nibru^{ki}-ta-nir-ĝal₂*) as assumed by Selz and Frayne. It may well refer to the name mentioned in l. xii 30 (*id₂-tur-ĝir₂-su^{ki}-i₃-tuku-a*) as assumed, e.g., by Cooper (1986: 73). If so, then, in both viii 9 and xii 36 the verbal form may be translated as "replaced" or "changed". Frayne's translation of ll. viii 7–9 is also odd as the text makes it clear that the deplorable conditions described in the first part of the text have existed "since the dawn of time, since primeval days" (cf. ll. iii 2–3). There are no former days from before the dawn of time, so their "customs" cannot be restored either. It is more plausible to assume that Irikagina intends to replace them.

p. 263

x 3: ninda-ni 420-am₆ → ninda-ni 240-am₆, and the translation must be corrected accordingly.

x 33: AO 3149 (ex. 2) has here nam-um-ma-me.

URU-KA-gina 2 (E1.9.9.2)

p. 267

ii 11: The divine name transliterated as ᵈza-za-ru₉ is in the form Zazari in the translation, based probably on another translitation: ᵈza-za-ri₂.

iii 10': Ex. 2 has here clearly e₂-sirara₆ and not e₂-sirara₃^{ki}. On Ex. 1 only an UD and a MA₂ can be seen. Ex. 4 is unavailable.

URU-KA-gina 5 (E1.9.9.5)
p. 277
in the bibliography, in the title of Komoróczy 1965: Nyelvíí → Nyelvű

Unnamed rulers of Lagaš 1 [E1.9.10.1]
p. 289
iii': 3': ^{ĝiš}KÚŠU.KI → ^{ĝiš}KÚŠU.KI-a

p. 290
iv': 4': gú ki-gar ba-ni → gú ki ĝar-ba-ni (l. iv': 8' also contains mistakes)

A-ane-pada 3 (E.1.13.6.3)
p. 397
l. 3: uri$_5$^{ki} → uri$_5$ (ŠEŠ.AB$^!$)$^{<ki>}$
l. 5: ur[i$_5$](ŠEŠ.A[B]).[KI] → uri$_5$(ŠEŠ.AB)^{ki}
Apparently, Frayne mixed up l. 3 with l. 5, as on the website of the BM one can see
    on the photos of ex. 1 (BM 11698) that l. 5 has lugal urim$_5$(ŠEŠ.AB)^{ki}, the
    signs AB and KI are on the right edge and the back. But in l. 3, KI is missing
    and only the first two paralell horizontal wedges of AB were written, the
    sign was not finished by the scribe.

Ĝiša and Umma (E1.12)
p. 359
In the table entitled "Early Dynastic Rulers of Umma attested in the Lagaš
    Inscriptons": Pabilga-tuk → Pabilgal-tuk

    In the table entitled "Early Dynastic Rulers of Umma Attested in Umma
Inscriptions" there appear to be plenty of mistakes and omissions. Here is a
revised version of the rulers before Bubu, father of Lugal-zage-si:

Ruler of Umma	Umma source inscription	RIM reference no.
En-akale	Ur-Luma Il Ĝiša-kidu	E1.12.4.1, E1.12.4.2 E1.12.5.1 E1.12.6.1
(E-anda-mua)*	Il	E1.12.5.1
Ur-Luma	Ur-Luma Ĝiša-kidu	E1.12.4.1, E1.12.4.2 E1.12.6.1
Il	Il Ĝiša-kidu	E1.12.5.1 E1.12.6.1
Ĝiša-kidu	Ĝiša-kidu	E1.12.6.1

*Cooper (1983: 60) suggests that he was a brother of Ur-Luma who did not become
    ruler.

    Frayne concludes the discussion about the identity of Ĝiša and Umma that
these were two different cities. He, however, does not discuss the fact that three
of the Ummaite rulers are attested both with the title ensi2 GIŠ.KUŠU2.KI and
lugal ŠAR2×DIŠ. See the table below:

	ensi2 GIŠ.KUŠU₂.KI	lugal ŠAR₂×DIŠ
En-akale	En-metena 1 i 40–41	Ur-Luma 1 5, Ur-Luma 2 5, Ĝiša-kidu 1 4
Ur-Luma	E-ana-tum I vii 8–9	Ur-Luma 1 3, Ur-Luma 2 3, Ĝiša-kidu 1 3
ll	En-metena 1 iii 35–37, iv 20–21	Il 1 2, Ĝiša-kidu 1 5

The table shows that the former title occurs in texts from Lagaš, while the latter title from texts from Umma. These data suggest that the two writings of "Umma" reflect the use of different names for the same political entity by Ummaites and by not Ummaites. Or shall we assume that these rulers had two titles and were both *ensi* and *lugal*?

Ur-Lum-ma 2 (E.1.12.4.2)
p. 368
l. 6: é mu-na-dù → é-ni e-na-dù

Il 1 (E.12.5.1)
p. 369
l. 3: dumu é-an-da-mú → é-an-da-mú-a

Ĝiša-kidu (E1.12.6)
p. 371
"Il was succeeded by his son Ĝiša-kidu on the throne of Lagaš" → "… of Umma"

Ĝiša-kidu 1 (E1.12.6.1)
p. 371
l. 8: nam-ti-la-ni-da is left untranslated.

Ĝiša-kidu 2 [E1.12.6.2]

pp. 373–374
passim: "This is the frontier according to the monument of the god Šara": This translation would require in Sumerian *zag na-ru₂-a ᵈšara₂-ka-kam*. Because in the text there is only one genitive, the phrase *na ru₂-a* should probably be taken as a non-finite form modifying the word *zag* "border". The god in the genitive is then either the agent, as in in the phrase *sipad šag₄-ge pad₃-da ᵈNanše* "the shepherd chosen in the heart by Nanše", or the beneficiary as in the phrase *kur gu₂ ĝar-ĝar ᵈnin-ĝir₂-su-ka* "(E-ana-tum) who makes the foreign lands submit to Ninĝirsu". The phrase *zag na ru-a Šara=ak* is the predicate complement of a copular clause, while the subject of the clause is the length specified. So one may translate, for example, ll. 49–52 as follows: "The border (marked with) the stele erected for Šara is 1180 *nindan* long from Naĝ-Nanše until the Id-gibil canal".

15

p. 373

l. 40: bàd(Text: EZEN×U)-⌜da⌝: This reconstruction has no basis, as neither of the mss. has this form. This line is preserved only on YBC 2139, and this ms. has here (= ii 3', and also in ii 6' = l. 44) only bad₃(EZEN×U). The sign DA is "reconstructed" by Frayne in l. 40 on the basis of col. ii 3' (= l. 44) of the Erlenmeyer text (Ex. 1) which has, however, "10 bad₃-⌜da⌝".

l. 42: 390 NINDAN.[DU]: In the corresponding translation Frayne writes "21,630 nind[an]". Both Steible (1982, II, 335 [Anm. 14]) and Cooper (1986, 96 [note 3]) commented on these numerals. YBC 2139 appears to have 6 × ŠAR₂ and 3 × U, the resulting length, 21.630 nindan = 129.78 km, however, cannot be correct in this context. The numeral is likely to be emended to 6 × GEŠ₂ and 3 × U. Frayne apparently adopts here Steible's transliteration and Cooper's translation without harmonizing them.

Lugal-zage-si (E1.12.7.1)

p. 375

Another ms. of the inscription, a rectangular stone tablet with oval hole in center, is catalogued on CDLI with the P-number: P235681.

A-KALAM-du (E1.13.4.1)

p. 389

l. 4: a-šu-sikil-am₃ → a-šu-sikil-am₆. Note, however, that it is quite unlikely that a personal name in which the first element functions as the subject may contain a copula. It is therefore more likely that the AN sign at the end of the name writes the name of the god An, as suggested by Marchesi (2004: 181–182).

En-šakuš-Ana 1 (E1.14.17.1)

p. 430

l. 15: uru na-ga-hul-e → uru na-ga-hul-a

l. 2': mu-né-gi₄ → mu-ne-gi₄

Lugal-zage-si (E1.14.20.1)

p. 435

l. i 30: lú-ᵈpísan-saĝ-unu.KI-ga is translated as "'servant' of the god Mes-saĝ-Unug". On p. 435, Frayne himself says: "the name has sometimes been read (incorrectly) as pisan-saĝa-unu.KI". The same error occurs on p. 438, in col. i' 3' of Lugal-zage-si 2.

l. i 32: ᵈnin-gìrim(A.BU.HA.DU) → ᵈnin-girimₓ(A.BU.HA.DU). The compound sign girim₃ is A.HA.KUD.DU. The same error occurs on p. 438, in col. ii' 5' of Lugal-zage-si 2.

References

Alster, Bendt (2003/2004), 'Images and Text on the Stele of Vultures', *Archive für Orientforschung* 50, 1–10.

Balke, Thomas (2006), *Das sumerische Dimensionalkasussystem* (AOAT 331). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Cooper, Jerrold (1979), 'Medium and Message: Inscribed Clay Cones and Vessels from Presargonic Sumer', *Revue d'Assyriologie* 79, 97–114.

Cooper, Jerrold, S. (1983), *Reconstructing History from Ancient Inscriptions: The Lagash-Umma Border Conflict* (SANE 2, I). Malibu: Undena Publications.

Cooper, Jerrold, S. (1986), *Sumerian and Akkadian Royal Inscriptions,* I (The American Oriental Society. Transation Series, 1). New Haven, Connecticut: The American Oriental Society.

Crawford, Vaughn E. (1977), 'Inscriptions from Lagash, Season Four, 1975-76', *JCS* 29, 189–222.

Edzard, Dietz Otto (1975), 'Zum sumerischen Eid', in Stephen J. Lieberman, ed., *Sumerological Studies in Honor of Thorkild Jacobsen on his Seventieth Birthday, June 7, 1974* (Assyriological Studies, 20). Chicago — London: The University of Chicago Press, 63–98.

Flückiger-Hawker, Esther (1999), Urnamma of Ur in the Sumerian Literary Tradition (OBO 166). Fribourg, Suisse: Editions Universitaires / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Frankfort, Henri (1970), *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient* (The Pelican History of Art). Harmondsworth. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd.

George, Andrew (2003), *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, I-II. *Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jagersma, A. H. (2010). *A descriptive grammar of Sumerian* (PhD Dissertation, Universiteit Leiden, 2010).

Krecher, Joachim (1995), 'Die *marû*-Formen des sumerischen Verbums', in M. Dietrich — O. Loretz, eds., *Vom Alten Orient zum Alten Testament. Festschrift für Wolfram Freiherrn von Soden zum 85. Geburtstag am 19. Juni 1993* (AOAT 240). Kevelaer — Neukirchen-Vluyn: Verlag Butzon & Bercker — Neukirchener Verlag, 141–200.

Marchesi, Gianni (2004), 'Who Was Buried in the Royal Tombs of Ur? The Epigraphic and the Textual Data', *Orientalia* NS 74, 153–197.

Meyer-Laurin, Vera (2011), 'Die "Zeichenpaare" im sargonischen Akkadisch aus sumerologischer Sicht', WdO 41, 27–68.

Poebel, A. (1925), 'Sumerische Untersuchungen', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 36, 1–10.

Radner, Karen (2005), *Die Macht des Namens. Altorientalische Strategien zur Selbsterhaltung* (SANTAG 8). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Richardson, Seth (2007), 'Death and Dismemberment in Mesopotamia: Discorporation between the Body and Body Politic', in Nicola Laneri, ed., *Performing Death. Social Analyses of Funerary Traditions in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean* (OIS 3). Chicago: University of Chicago, 189–207.

Schrakamp, Ingo (2010), *Krieger und Waffen im frühen Mesopotamien. Organisation und Bewaffnung des Militärs in frühdynastischer und sargonischer Zeit.* PhD diss. Philipps-Universität, Marburg.

Selz, Gebhard (1995), *Untersuchungen zur Götterwelt des altsumerischen Stadtstaates von Lagaš* (OPSNKF 13)/ Philadelphia.

Steible, Horst (1982), *Die altsumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften*, I-II (Freiburger altorientalische Studien, 5). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Steiner, Gerd (1984), 'Was bedeutet a-ba dug₄-ga-na / a-ba šar₂-ra-na in der Inschridt der Geierstele?', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 74, 53–58.

Steinkeller, Piotr (1989), Sale Documents of the Ur-III-Periods (Freiburger altorientalische Studien, 17). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Wilcke, Claus (1990), 'Orthographie, Grammatik und literarische Form. Beobachtungen zu der Vaseninschrift Lugalzaggesis (SAKI 152–156)', in T. Abusch et al., eds., *Lingering over Words. Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honour of William L. Moran* (Harvard Semitic Studies, 37). Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 488–498.

Wilcke, Claus (2003), *Early Ancient Near Eastern Law. A History of its Beginnings: The Early Dynastic and Sargonic Periods* (BAW, Phil.hist. Kl. Sitzungsberichte, 2003, II). München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Winter, Irene J. (2010), 'After the Battle is Over: The Stele of the Vultures and the Beginning of Historical Narrative in the Art of the Ancient Near East', in I. J. Winter, *On Art in the Ancien Near East*, II. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 3–52.

Zólyomi, Gábor (2000), 'Structural Interferences from Akkadian in Old Babylonian Sumerian', *ASJ* 22, 335–360.

Zólyomi, Gábor (2005), 'Left-dislocated possessors in Sumerian', in K. É. Kiss, ed., *Universal Grammar in the Reconstruction of Ancient Languages* (Studies in Generative Grammar, 83). Berlin — New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 161–188.