dedicated to Nebuchadnezzar II, and two fragments of eighth-century commemorative inscriptions on cylinders. While one of these is a previously known inscription of Sargon II, the other helps to fill a gap in the historical record as it is the first attested inscription of the early eighth-century king Eriba-Marduk. As George points out, this text has importance beyond what might be suggested by its thirty-four lines of lacuna-ridden text, since it is rich in religious and cultural content. The remaining Mesopotamian section of the volume is right at the end, Section XIII, and along with the Gudea bilingual and the Nebuchadnezzar stele, is one of the highlights of the book. This is a clay cylinder inscribed with the text of the Laws of Ur-Namma and the editor, Miguel Civil, takes the opportunity to provide a full critical edition of the Laws using all the known text witnesses and supplying a new translation with full philological commentary. Section IX is devoted to five Elamite inscriptions, ably expounded by François Vallat, including one in the linear Elamite script that still hides its mysteries, while in Section X Mark Weeden guides the reader through a short Urartean inscription in which Minua, some of Ishpuini, "founds" a granary by the might of Ḫaldi.

Thus, the volume makes an extremely important contribution to Ancient Near Eastern historical studies over a series of wide fields, with the highest level of expertise lavished upon it by the team assembled by A.R. George. It may serve as a caution to those who would ignore unprovenanced material.

Alasdair Livingstone

JEREMIAH PETERSON:
Sumerian Literary Fragments in the University Museum, Philadelphia.
(Biblioteca del Próximo Oriente Antiguo, 9.) 372 pp., 68 plates. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2011. ISBN 978 84 00 09314 3.
doi:10.1017/S0041977X12000109

The principal task confronting those working on the literatures of Ancient Mesopotamia remains the publication of primary sources. A case in point are the thousands of tablets and fragments found at Nippur, in central southern Iraq, by the archaeological expedition of the University of Pennsylvania (1888–1900). The archaeological context of their discovery was not recorded in any detail and they were at first considered to be the remains of a temple library. It is almost certain that they derive instead from pedagogical activity conducted in private houses in the eighteenth century BC.

The tablets found at Nippur were split among collections in three different countries: the University Museum in Philadelphia, the Museum of the Ancient Orient in Istanbul, and the epigraphist's personal collection, donated in 1925 to the University of Jena in Germany. Despite this unfortunate dispersal of the material, publication began before the First World War, although with little understanding of some genres of text.

Especially difficult were the literary compositions in Sumerian, a language then only poorly understood. Progress with these texts took place over the course of many decades. From the 1940s onwards, the Philadelphia scholar Samuel Noah Kramer and his students successfully used the tablets from Nippur to reconstruct the principal works of Sumerian literature, thus recovering the oldest corpus of

literature in human history. Kramer died in 1990, but the task goes on, for many hundreds of fragments from Nippur are not yet identified and published, and many dozens of literary compositions are incompletely reconstructed.

The book at hand continues the work of Kramer. In it Jeremiah Peterson presents 284 fragments identified during his study at the University Museum, many of them then joined to other pieces in Philadelphia. This was painstaking work, for most pieces are very fragmentary and hard to read. But they are a familiar bunch. The Sumerian literary compositions known at Old Babylonian Nippur number about four hundred. More than a quarter of them are represented here. Peterson gives hand-drawn copies of almost all fragments, and photographs of a great many. Especially instructive are the plates of photographs of reconstructed tablets, which illustrate the joining of newly identified pieces to known tablets and fragments (pls. 1–68).

Beyond the presentation of the cuneiform the fragments are treated variously. Pieces of well-known compositions that hold no new information attract no comment beyond a short description, including dimensions, and identification of text and passage by line number. Where his fragments do present new evidence Peterson adds commentary, extending from a few pertinent remarks to a full edition. One text, no. 283, is a manuscript of a composition (*ululumama*-song of the god Ningublag) that has not previously benefited from public exposure. Peterson makes good that lack with a very thorough treatment on pp. 317–31.

Among the mass of Old Babylonian pieces, text No. 170 stands out as Middle Babylonian. It is a manuscript of the Sumerian hymn now catalogued as Lipit-Ištar A, with interlinear Akkadian translation. The cuneiform has already been published, by M. de J. Ellis in 1979, but Peterson's photograph affords a second view, and some improved readings can be offered against his *editio princeps* on pp. 192–3:

l. 2′: the reading *la maḫ-ir* is an improbable syllabification. More likely: [am su-ba] sag nu-gá-[gá-me-en] // [*ri-mu šá ana zu-um-r*]*i-šu* ⌈*la i*⌉*-we-er-rù* [*ana-ku*] "[I am a wild bull whose presence] men dare not approach!" The equivalence sag-gá-gá = (*w*)*âru* is conventional in the lexical texts.

l. 3′: no need to emend *ši-it-a-ar* to *ši-it-ḫa-ar*; cf. *ši-it-a-ra* in Ammiditana's hymn to Ištar (F. Thureau-Dangin, *Revue d'Assyriologie* 22 [1925] 172, l. 12).

l. 4′: read máš (not gi) kéš-da [me-en]. The Akkadian is probably to be restored as [*šá zi-qin*]-⌈*šu*?⌉ *el-le-tu*$_4$ *a-šá-re-ed* [*rik-si ana-ku*] "[I, whose beard] is pure (black), am leader of [the gang]"; the equivalence máš = *ašarēdu* is well established in the lexical texts.

l. 5′: Akk. better: [*šá i-nam d*]*am-qá-ku ap-pa* <*damqāku*> *libba*(šà) *ú-ṭib ú-ne*[*m-mir pa-na*] "I [who] had fine [eyes and a handsome] nose, gladdened the heart and brightened [the visage]". The Sumerian phrase šà-ga zal-le is translated twice, and placed in the past (MB pret. *unemmir*: pres. *unammar*); *nummuru* derives from the standard lexical entry zal = *nawārum*.

l. 6′: the Akkadian translation of [uktin ḫuš-ḫuš-a] is probably [*šá ṣu-bur pa-ni-šú ru*]-*uš-šu-ú* "[I, whose facial features are] ruddy …". The continuation, ḫi-li du$_8$-du$_8$-[me-en], is assuredly rendered *ku-uz-ba ṭuḫ-ḫ*[*u-da-ku*] "… [am richly] endowed with attractiveness".

l. 7′: part of the translation of ḫé-du$_7$ is visible, both on the photograph and in Ellis's copy: *wa-às-*[*ma*]. In this and the following line the Akkadian seems to display a syntactic pattern different from that employed in ll. 4′–6′; here perhaps [*šapt*]*ān ša ana awâtim was*[*mā šaptāya*] "[my lips are] lips that are well suited to speaking".

l. 8′: before *ubānātum* read: …]-*a-tum*.

l. 9′: begins [*eṭ-lu dam-q*]*u*.

Peterson notes the importance of this fragment for documenting the rare survival of a standard school copy book into the Middle Babylonian period. Lipit-Ištar A

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X12000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

joins the small number of Sumerian literary compositions that had a bilingual afterlife in the later scholarly traditions. One may additionally observe that the Akkadian translation shows evidence of Old Babylonian dialect (ll. 2′ *iwerrū*, 7′ *was*[*mā*]) as well as Middle Babylonian (ll. 4′ stat. subord. *elletu*, 5′ pret. *une*[*mmir*]). Evidently it was not achieved all at once. Probably individual words of the Sumerian text were glossed in Akkadian in the Old Babylonian period, and these glosses only later joined up to yield a full translation.

The book concludes with an index of museum numbers, a list of joins and a bibliography. The author is much to be thanked for continuing the process of publishing the Sumerian literary tablets from Nippur in this handsome and well-organized volume.

A. R. George

SELIM FERRUH ADALI:
The Scourge of God: The Umman-manda and Its Significance in the First Millennium BC.
(State Archives of Assyria Studies.) xvi, 220 pp. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2011. $62. ISBN 978 952 10 1335 5.
doi:10.1017/S0041977X12000110

A revised 2009 University of Sydney dissertation, Selim Ferruh Adalı's book analyses the portrayal of Cimmerians and Medes in Assyrian and Babylonian texts of the first millennium BC as allusions to a literary classic (p. 1), arguing that mentions of Umman-manda are "direct or indirect, deliberate or subliminal, literary allusions" to the so-called *Cuthean Legend of Naram-Sin* (p. 100), attested from the early second to the mid-first millennium BC. The composition's appreciation in courtly circles is demonstrated by manuscripts in the royal libraries of Hattusha and Nineveh. Given that Adalı argues for its direct influence on the inscriptions of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal of Assyria, Nabonidus of Babylon and Cyrus of Persia, the cultural contexts in which the composition is attested in the seventh and sixth centuries BC need more analysis than a few superficial remarks (pp. 103, 105).

Elsewhere, Adalı's book is less terse. The first chapters ("Sources and written form", pp. 3–14; "Etymology", pp. 15–34) present an overview of the orthography of Umman-manda and proposals for its etymology, including Adalı's suggestion "troops of the (distant) terrain" ("Excursus", pp. 173–89), yet Umman-manda's original meaning remains elusive. These chapters are not obviously relevant for the aim of explaining the *Cuthean Legend*'s influence on the portrayal of Cimmerians and Medes in Mesopotamian historiography. A discussion of how first-millennium users viewed the etymology of the word would have been more useful: in the inscriptions of Esarhaddon, Umman-manda was clearly understood to mean "numerous army", as Adalı himself points out (p. 85). Chapter 3 analyses Umman-manda in "The omen tradition" (pp. 35–42), which Adalı links to the *Cuthean Legend*, although he concedes that the omens' succinctness makes this difficult to prove. These chapters will need to incorporate a new inscription of Sin-iddinam of Larsa (eighteenth century BC) which mentions the Umman-manda (K. Volk in A.R. George (ed.), *Cuneiform Royal Inscriptions and Related Texts in the Schøyen Collection*, Bethesda, 2011, 59–88 no. 37, esp. 87–8.