
Reviews of Books

KINGSHIP IN THE EARLY MESOPOTAMIAN ONOMASTICON, 2800–2200 BCE. By JAKOB ANDERSSON. (Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 28). pp. 440. Uppsala, Uppsala University Press, 2013.
doi:[10.1017/S1356186314000388](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186314000388)

The personal names preserved from cuneiform texts constitute a wealth of unique importance for the study of ancient Mesopotamia. They offer a perspective on society and beliefs different from that available from other sources. It is furthermore a wealth that continues to grow year by year! In this thorough study of a specific subset of names from the third millennium BC Jakob Andersson gives us an up to date and thorough analysis of the corpus of names which include the element “king” – lugal in Sumerian, *šarrum* in Akkadian – in their composition. As Andersson demonstrates, this proves a rich field.

To start off Andersson reviews the history of previous studies into the Mesopotamian onomasticon, and particularly studies of material from the third millennium by Limet, Krebernik and others. Edzard and Westenholz in their studies of “kyriophore” names established most of the basic categories into which they can be divided, according to which attributes of the leader are highlighted – strength, wisdom, justice, protection, care and involvement in cultic duties. As noted, the work focuses on names compounded in lugal and *šarrum*. As the author notes, the study was not able to expand to include names compounded in analogous terms for ruler (for example, en and lú in Sumerian, *malkum* and *ba'lum* in Akkadian), although this has not excluded making comparisons; one may hope that analysis of such other names may in any case form the subject of future research. The basic material for this research is the 20,000 or so texts from the earlier and mid-third millennium available to scholarship. The majority are administrative texts, but they also include documents such as sales and legal texts as well as several hundred commemorative inscriptions. Also important are the legends on seals. The period covered essentially starts with the time when cuneiform texts are sufficiently comprehensible to make such a study possible at all and takes us up to the eve of the Third Dynasty of Ur, an intelligent cut-off point as the rise of that dynasty saw the creation of an empire of radically different scope and character to the regimes which preceded it. Altogether these sources yield some 5,400 pre-III names.

Andersson's next step is to outline the development of kingship in southern Mesopotamia. In the third millennium there were dynasties at Adab, Akšak, Kish, Lagaš, Mari, Nippur, Umma, Ur and Uruk. Whereas in texts of the Uruk period (late fourth millennium) the highest position went under the title en, in the third millennium the corresponding terms were lugal and ensi. This is followed by a discussion of Sumerian and Akkadian name types and name-giving traditions. An important question is who is in fact referred to when lugal and *šarrum* feature in personal names, for it turns out that it is not just the human ruler who is referenced: lugal in names may also refer to the gods, notably An, Enlil, Suen/Nanna and Utu; *šarrum* on the other hand seems for the most part to refer to the human

ruler, though there are some names of the type DN-*šar* or *šar*-DN. This done, the ground is laid for a semantic analysis of the names. Andersson identifies about 750 names compounded in *lugal* and about 90 compounded in *šarrum*. A comprehensive selection of these is given. We cannot reproduce all here but some examples will illustrate the richness and diversity of these names. On the Sumerian side there are names such as *lugal-aga-zi* “the king (wears) the legitimate crown”, *lugal-gidri-du₁₀* “the king (with) a good sceptre”, *lugal-túg-mah* “the king (is the wearer of) a splendid robe”, *lugal-inim-zi-da* “the word of the king is true”, *lugal-sipa* “the king is a shepherd”, *lugal-ur-sag* “the king is a hero |”, *lugal-pirig* “the king is a lion” and so on. An interesting group is formed by names given to servants of the king involving animal imagery as in *ur-lugal* “dog of the king” and *amar-lugal* “calf of the king”. On the Akkadian side there are names such as *šarrum-bani* “the king is a creator”, *šarrum-dan* “the king is powerful”, *šarrum-paluh* “the king is awe-inspiring”, *šarrum-isar* “the king is just”. The semantic analysis is followed by a glossary of the key elements – divinities, localities, nouns, adjectives and verbs, as well as grammatical components – together with a listing of the names in which each element appears. These sections serve in their turn as the building blocks for a number of approaches of integrated analysis. A caveat is sounded in that for a third of the Sumerian names, and a fifth of the Akkadian, the meaning is not understood. Nevertheless the ground is laid for comparisons to be made between the Sumerian and Akkadian kyriophore traditions, between the names of the Early Dynastic and Sargonic periods and those of the Ur III empire, as well as for a diachronic analysis. The work then moves on to a listing of all the applicable names, concluding with a number of indexes.

In summary this is a comprehensive and stimulating work whose treatment of this aspect of the early onomasticon provides much material and analysis of interest while at the same time leaving open doors for future avenues of research. johnmacginnis@aol.com

JOHN MACGINNIS
University of Cambridge

THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF SUMERIAN LITERATURE. By PAUL DELNERO. (*Journal of Cuneiform Studies Supplemental. Series 3.*) pp. 210. Boston, American Schools of Oriental Research, 2013.
doi:10.1017/S1356186314000492

As the world’s oldest creative writing, Sumerian literature has a special place. Nor is it a small place. Somewhere between three hundred to four hundred compositions, have come down to us, typically varying in length from 50 to 800 lines. They are known to us from cuneiform texts recovered over the previous two centuries. The majority of manuscripts date to the Old Babylonian period (nineteenth/eighteenth centuries BC) but the compositions which they record were overwhelmingly composed earlier – direct evidence takes us back to the Ur III empire and the Early Dynastic period and there is no telling just how much older some of the compositions may truly be. Their origins are lost in hoary antiquity. But the textual documentation is vast. Most works are preserved in multiple manuscripts, in some cases the duplicates running into the hundreds, and the textual situation which these manuscripts present is highly complex. The corpus is characterised by a very large number of divergent writings, orthographic variants which demonstrate not simply errors on the part of the scribe – though these do, of course, feature – but rather attest to the fact that Sumerian literature, in the form in which we have it, allowed and indeed perhaps encouraged a degree of parallel traditions in the manifest text(s). Coming to grips with how to deal with this is at the core of the present volume. It aims to formulate the basic principals for the textual criticism of the Sumerian manuscript tradition.