

is parallel to the following ll. 19–20, where Lamaštu is pictured in relation to various architectural elements. Therefore I would suggest the noun *ṭurru* B (*turru*), which is a well-known architectural feature (CAD Ṭ 165b ff.), but remains difficult to translate. Pp. 290–91: “*Emar*” 1: I prefer to see here an anticipatory genitive construction ‘DUMU’.MUNUS *a-nim* DUMU.MUNUS *a-nim* *ša* <sup>i-li</sup> DINGIR-*li* *na-a-li* *a-bu-ša* “Daughter of Anu, Daughter of Anu, of the gods Nāli is her father!” Pp. 292–93 “*Emar*” 37: *šu<sup>2</sup>-uk-na* is most probably an imperative pl. (*šuknā*) denoting a possible ritual action instead of sg., where *šuknī(m)* is expected addressing Lamaštu. Pp. 324–25 “*Emar*” 8: Concerning further evidence for the prefix *ti-* used for the 2.f.sg. in western peripheral Akkadian without feminine marker *-ī*, note *ti-ka-as-su-us-ma* in an incantation addressing fever from Ugarit (AuOr Suppl. 23, 14:4).

In conclusion, it must be stated that a milestone has been reached by Farber, providing a complete overview of all Lamaštu texts, containing expert transliterations, transcriptions, elaborate commentaries, and excellent copies which will serve research for many decades to come.

ELYZE ZOMER  
UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG

#### REFERENCES

- Arnaud, D. 2007. *Corpus des textes de bibliothèque de Ras Shamra-Ougarit (1936–2000) en sumérien, babylonien et assyrien*. Barcelona: Editorial Ausa.
- Del Olmo Lete, G. 2014. *Incantations and Anti-witchcraft Texts from Ugarit*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Lambert, W.G. 1965. A Middle Assyrian Tablet of Incantations. In *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on His Seventy-fifth Birthday, April 21, 1965*, ed. H. G. Güterbock et al. Pp. 283–88. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Nougayrol, J. 1969. La Lamaštu à Ugarit. *Ugaritica* VI: 393–408.

---

*He Has Opened Nisaba's House of Learning: Studies in Honor of Åke Waldemar Sjöberg on the Occasion of His 89th Birthday on August 1st 2013*. Edited by LEONARD SASSMANNSHAUSEN and GEORG NEUMANN. Cuneiform Monographs, vol. 46. Leiden: BRILL, 2014. Pp. x + 319, illus. \$162.

The present volume honors Åke Sjöberg for having “opened Nisaba’s house of learning” through his research and through nurturing others in the “house” (p. vii). Articles celebrate Sjöberg’s interests and achievements in Sumerology by presenting new texts or updated editions, by offering lexical studies, or by treating topics such as the structure of the Sumerian debate poems or the Early Dynastic lexical tradition. M. Cohen publishes a new Sumerian lamentation to Inana or Dumuzi (correct the tablet number published as CUNES 53-08-060 to CUNES 52-08-060). B. Alster offers an edition of two bilingual Neo-Assyrian proverbs, re-edited in light of new evidence. J. Bauer re-interprets two problematic texts from Fara/Abu Salabikh as personal name lists. J. Klein and Y. Sefati provide a lexical study of the terms *mul* and *mul-an* in Šulgi B 305–19 and Šulgi E 242–57, arguing against the conventional interpretation that these are “poetic expressions for cuneiform writing” (p. 85). B. Foster investigates diorite and limestone “as case studies in how the Sumerian poet of *Lugale* explained and understood their use” (p. 52; for a similar investigation of the hematite stone see Simkó 2014). This review comments only on contributions for which there is new evidence or for which further investigation is required.

In “Two Lullabies,” M. Jaques publishes one text from the Old Babylonian period (note CT 58, 22 is BM 38099 not BM 96936) and another from Kassite Nippur, both of which bear resemblance to the lullaby Šulgi N (p. 61). Jaques addresses the genres of texts concerning babies, incantations and lullabies, in order to differentiate between them, and to determine the occasions for which they were composed (pp. 68–70). She suggests that lullabies, which “use a literary language,” were part of the Old Babylonian Sumerian scribal curriculum (p. 70) and speculates that their inclusion in it “could have been [due to] their literary qualities and historical importance” (p. 70). Jaques posits that Šulgi N

was written to commemorate the birth of his son, and that her texts may have been forerunners to Šulgi N or composed “for other parallel occasions” (p. 71).

These assertions require further inquiry. The problems associated with applying historical events to literary texts are well established (Veldhuis 2003: 66–75). I would argue that Šulgi N was composed or adapted for use within the scribal school because Šulgi was a well-known character. However, assigning lullabies to the Old Babylonian Sumerian scribal curriculum is problematic. The only lullaby attested securely within a school setting is Šulgi N, found on at least one tablet at House F (Delnero 2011: 17, no. 33). Yet Šulgi N is known from only six manuscripts, all from Nippur, none of which (to my knowledge) is an extract tablet, as one would expect to find if Šulgi N were a common curricular text (Michalowski 1983a: 238; Delnero 2010: 59).

Jaques tentatively suggests restoring the end of her Kassite lullaby as  $e[r_2\text{-}\check{s}a_3\text{-}\check{h}u\check{g}_2\text{-}\check{g}a_2]$  (p. 65). If she is correct, it is all the more likely that this lullaby was not a curricular text (for the differences between liturgical and curricular texts, see Tinney 2011: 585). Ultimately, while lullabies may have been used in some schools in certain periods or on specific occasions, the overall situation was assuredly more complex.

In their article, “The Rejected Sheep,” E. Leichty and A. Guinan publish two Old Babylonian texts that explain why certain animals were not selected for divination (p. 103), usually due to defects in their horns, ears, or feet (p. 106). Also on p. 106 the authors mention MS 3331, a similar tablet in the Schøyen collection now published by George (2013: 281–84). George argues that Leichty and Guinan’s interpretation of the texts as lists of animals rejected for divination “on account of minor deformities” is strengthened “by the systematic nature of the descriptions, especially by the concern for right and left, for this was an opposition fundamental in assessing sacrificial animals” (George 2013: 281). However, he disagrees that the personal name following each animal referred to its owner (p. 103). The first line of MS 3331 assigns the animal as food for the king. Therefore George concludes that the persons listed were likewise those who received the animal as food (*ibid.*).

A. Zgoll’s contribution, “Dreams as Gods and Gods in Dreams,” investigates “Mesopotamian dream theory and its anthropological and theological bases” (p. 299). She argues that Mesopotamian dreams were conceptualized as “external dreams,” in which “a person could be visited by gods and demons during a dream, and also be transported to other spaces” (p. 313). The premise for this, she suggests, is the “conception of *zaqīqu* ‘dream spirit’” (p. 313), which allows one to literally travel in his dreams and encounter other persons and deities (p. 308).

Zgoll makes a problematic assumption, however, when she conflates Akkadian *zaqīqu*, which she translates as “‘spirit’ of breath or air” with Sumerian *si-si-ig*, “wind” (p. 308). Instead Gadotti (2014: 88) demonstrates that unlike for *zaqīqu*, there is no evidence that *si-si-ig* ever means spirit or phantom, but simply refers to a gust of wind. Thus, while Zgoll is correct to recognize that traveling in dreams is a well-attested anthropological phenomenon (pp. 308–9), it is not attested in Sumerian sources.

In “The Sumerian Debate Poems: A General Presentation, Part III,” H. Vanstiphout summarizes the structure of these texts. Although it is only a minor point, Vanstiphout states that the verdict of Bird and Fish “is at least partly decided on the grounds of an unforgivable breach of the rules in that fish thinks it is allowed to use violence where argument will not suffice” (pp. 231–32 n. 6). However, Mittermayer’s discussion of a new Schøyen manuscript shows that the physical attack is not relevant to the outcome of the debate, since this manuscript leaves out Fish’s assault (2013, 2015). She argues that this is also the case in the versions which do include the attack. Instead, Bird is victorious as a result of his singing. More importantly, she argues “the winner is—as in all the other Adamins—the superior debater and he wins for rhetorical reasons” (2013, forthcoming). This supports Vanstiphout’s conclusion that the verdict of a debate is “based more on the manner and/or style of the argumentation of the loser than on any substantive reason” (p. 239).

These brief remarks cannot adequately reflect the depth of the contributions in the volume. In sum, the articles provide new material and pave the way for further research, much as Sjöberg has always done.

ALEXANDRA KLEINERMAN  
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Delnero, P. 2010. Sumerian Extract Tablets and Scribal Education. *JCS* 62: 53–69.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. Literature and Identity in Mesopotamia during the Old Babylonian Period. Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/1910372/Sumerian\\_Literature\\_and\\_Local\\_Identity](https://www.academia.edu/1910372/Sumerian_Literature_and_Local_Identity).
- Gadotti, Alhena. 2014. *“Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Netherworld” and the Sumerian Gilgamesh Cycle*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- George, A. 2013. *Babylonian Divinatory Texts Chiefly in the Schøyen Collection*. Bethesda: CDL Press.
- Lambert, W. G. 1996. *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Michalowski, P. 1983a. History as Charter: Some Observations on the Sumerian King List. *JAOS* 103: 237–48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983b. Review of Luigi Cagni: *Briefe aus dem Iraq Museum*. *Altbabylonische Briefe*, 8. *JCS* 35: 221–28.
- Mittermayer, C. 2013. Order and Disorder in the Sumerian Disputation between Bird and Fish. Paper presented at the RAI, Gent, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. mušen ku<sub>6</sub>: Viel Vogel und wenig Fisch in MS 2110/1. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 41: 201–22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Forthcoming. *Was sprach der eine zum anderen? Argumentationsformen in den sumerischen Rangstreitgesprächen*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Simkó, K. 2014. Überlegungen zu den symbolischen Rollen der Steine in Mesopotamien. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 41: 112–24.
- Tinney, S. 2011. Tablets of Schools and Scholars: A Portrait of the Old Babylonian Corpus. In *Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, ed. E. Robson and K. Radner. Pp. 577–96. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Veldhuis, N. 2003. *Religion, Literature and Scholarship: The Sumerian Composition “Nanše and the Birds.”* Leiden: Brill.

---

*Einführung in die urartäische Sprache*. BY MIRJO SALVINI and ILSE WEGNER. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 2014. Pp. ix + 124, illus. €28 (paper).

The study of Urartian has its roots in the early nineteenth century, yet after all this time it remains on the fringes of ancient Near Eastern studies. This is due to numerous factors: the relatively short duration of the Urartians as a significant power, the short diachronic coverage of the small amount of extant textual material, and the “exoticness” of the language are among the most important. Mirjo Salvini has devoted a considerable portion of his career to the Urartians, from philological work to the exploration of sites and discovery of new inscriptions. In many ways the past six years have represented a culminating experience for his research. In 2008, the first three volumes of his *Corpus dei testi urartei* (CTU) were published. In these volumes he has collected all known Urartian rock inscriptions and provided new transcriptions and translations for them. A fourth volume has been published in 2012, covering inscriptions on bronze and other material as well as general paleographic concerns. The work under review is a valuable companion piece, presenting the grammar of Urartian in a clear, concise manner. This short work will be a valuable addition for anyone interested in this fascinating language.

The grammar is co-written by Ilse Wegner, who, while focusing on Hurrian, has also worked on Urartian. More importantly, Wegner brings her experience from her Hurrian grammar (2000, revised 2007), and this Urartian grammar follows closely the format that she has developed in these earlier works. The book begins with a short introduction providing background information on Urartian chronology and the basics of how Urartian scribes used the cuneiform script to write the language (pp. 1–11). The second part of the book is devoted to grammar (pp. 13–62). This is followed by the third section, which includes a large sample of Urartian passages with translations and some philological commentary (pp. 63–106). This section is useful but also problematic as will be explained below. The book concludes with a short glossary of Urartian words (pp. 107–15), a list of abbreviations (pp. 116–18), and five photos showing various Urartian inscriptions (pp. 121–24). The photos are all of good