vom M587 und M597 (vgl. Plate 401. 402). Darin
den sich natürlich (unter c) folgende Passage: 
ПЕНАШ НИИ ПЕШЕЧАН ЗЕ ЩЕ НАПОУЙТЕ УМОЙ 
ТЕ ТЕПЯМЯС. ПЕНАШ НИИ ПИПЕРЕ ЩЕ ЩЕ ЩЕ НА-
ПОУЙТЕ УМОЙ ЩЕ ТЕОМ АЛЕФ. ПЕНАШ НИII ПЕШЕЧАН 
ЗЕ Атине) НА ПИ ЩЕ ПЕШЕЧАНН ЩЕ ПЕШЕЧАН 
АЛЮ ЩЕЛІТО ЕВО. Und diese „erinnert“ nun auf 
das Lebhafteste an folgenden Text im Dialekt М: 
[ПЕНАШ ПЕШЕЧАН] НЕЙ ЩЕ ЩЕ ЩЕ НА 
ПОУЙТЕ УМОЙ ЩЕ ТЕОМ АЛЕФ. ЩЕ ПЕШЕЧАН 
[ПЕНАШ ПЕШЕЧАН] НЕЙ ЩЕ ЩЕ ЩЕ НА 
ПОУЙТЕ УМОЙ ЩЕ ТЕОМ АЛЕФ. ЩЕ ПЕШЕЧАН 
[ПЕНАШ ПЕШЕЧАН] НЕЙ ЩЕ ЩЕ ЩЕ НА 
ПОУЙТЕ УМОЙ ЩЕ ТЕОМ АЛЕФ. ЩЕ ПЕШЕЧАН 
[ПЕНАШ ПЕШЕЧАН] НЕЙ ЩЕ ЩЕ ЩЕ НА 
ПОУЙТЕ УМОЙ ЩЕ ТЕОМ АЛЕФ. ЩЕ ПЕШЕЧАН 
ЕХО ЩЕЛІТО ЕВО. Und diese „erinnert“ nun auf 
das Lebhafteste an folgenden Text im Dialekt М: 
ПЕНАШ ПЕШЕЧАН НЕЙ ЩЕ ЩЕ ЩЕ НА 
ПОУЙТЕ УМОЙ ЩЕ ТЕОМ АЛЕФ. ЩЕ ПЕШЕЧАН 
ПЕШЕЧАН НЕЙ ЩЕ ЩЕ ЩЕ НА 
ПОУЙТЕ УМОЙ ЩЕ ТЕОМ АЛЕФ. ЩЕ ПЕШЕЧАН 
ПЕШЕЧАН НЕЙ ЩЕ ЩЕ ЩЕ НА 
ПОУЙТЕ УМОЙ ЩЕ ТЕОМ АЛЕФ. ЩЕ ПЕШЕЧАН 
ПЕШЕЧАН НЕЙ ЩЕ ЩЕ ЩЕ НА 
ПОУЙТЕ УМОЙ ЩЕ ТЕОМ АЛЕФ. ЩЕ ПЕШЕЧАН 
ЕХО ЩЕЛІТО ЕВО.


Keilschriftforschung


R. Biggs noted in JCS 20 (1966) 84 that, among the many literary and lexical tablets unearthed in the extraordinary excavations of the northern Babylonian tell Abu Salabikh undertaken by the Oriental Institute during just eight weeks of work in the years 1963 and 1965, there were a number of texts containing an until then unknown list of toponyms – easily recognizable by the repeating determinant KI in most entries. A full publication of this list and its witnesses, together with short commentary, appeared in Biggs, Inscriptions from Tell Abu Salabikh (= OIP 99 [Chicago 1974] 71–78). At the time, Biggs could not know that the missing first lines of the text did not contain entries of the 'major Sumerian cities' attested in the Fara text SF 23 and
the Abu Salabikh texts AbS-T 294 and 392q = OIP 99, nos. 21–22. As editor of the Early Dynastic tablets recovered during Italian excavations of the Syrian settlement Ebla, G. Pettinato in his article “L’Atlante Geografico del Vicino Oriente Antico attestato ad Ebla e ad Abū ‘Alabikh (I),” Or. NS 47 (1978) 50–73 (the announced continuation of this article has my knowledge not appeared), presented a revised partitum of the list incorporating a large and nearly complete witness from Ebla. In an appendix, Pettinato cited the discovery by P. Steinkeller that the fragment OIP 99, no. 331, belonged to the list; the entry obv. iii 2 of this tablet contained the toponym EN LIL of the city Nippur (= line 177 of the reconstructed list), with ISP [line 70] two of the middle Babylonian centers. It was thus clear that the new geographical list was not concerned with southern, Sumerian centers; Pettinato stated in Or. NS 47, pp. 50–51, and, for example, in Ebla: un impero inciso nell’argilla (Milan 1979) 259–260, that the list contained toponyms spanning the fertile crescent from Elam to the Levant and that it had been composed not in Mesopotamia, but rather in Ebla.

This interpretation was challenged by R. Biggs in 1980 (in: Biblical Archeologist 43, 84, and see his remarks in: L. Cagni, ed., La lingua di Ebla [Naples 1981] 131; further G. Pettinato, MEE 3 [Naples 1981] 217–241, esp. 227); above all the correct sign sequence of the phonetically written Ebla text, he stated, made it highly unlikely that the Ebla material should have preceded the non-linear, in part morphologically written Abu Salabikh list witnesses, that is, that a developed written form should have served as precursor of a less developed form. Biggs believed that in all likelihood the geographical list derived from the north Babylonian political and cultural center of the mid-third millennium, Kish, whence it was borrowed, first by scribes from Abu Salabikh situated some 60 km to the southeast, later by scribes from Ebla far to the west. P. Steinkeller in a note published in 1986 (Vicino Oriente 6, 31–40) offered substantial support to the Kishite view of Biggs by equating a large number of toponyms found in the LGN (List of Geographical Names) with those known from third millennium texts to have represented settlements in northern Babylonia and in the trans-Tigridian territories of the Diyala, of the Zagros foothills and of Susiana. Some few were also equated with known cities in Sumer.

I first became aware of Douglas Frayne’s work on this list while reading his review in BiOr. 48 (1991) 378–409 of R. Kutscher’s The Brockton Tablets at the University of Haifa: Royal Inscriptions; the article “The Early Dynastic List of Geographical Names: Its Inner Structure,” announced there – in a discussion of the Akkadian ‘Great Revolt’ text BT 1 – to appear forthcoming in the journal JAROS, was instead published as volume 74 in the American Oriental Society monograph series. Some may fault the book entitled The Early Dynastic List of Geographical Names for in some ways giving the impression of being a large, bound article, to a certain extent lacking a developed expository composition which would have facilitated our understanding of what the author is saying; however, the high academic standards of the author evident in the work, his keen insight and apparent thoroughness make the publication a splendid addition to our knowledge of third millennium toponography and of early Babylonian lexical tradition. Frayne’s meticulous treatment of the composition as a whole and his particularly successful discussions of a number of proposed identifications of toponyms with modern tells (see, for example, his treatment of the two cities Sarruk and Edina on the Iturungal canal, pp. 32–37), deserve, in the reviewer’s opinion, unequivocal praise. This volume and his recently published Sargonic and Gutian Periods (= The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia: Early Periods vol. 2, Toronto 1993; cf. also his dissertation The Historical Correlations of the Sumerian Royal Hymns [2400–1900 B.C.] [Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1982]) identify the author as the leading current North American expert on late Early Dynastic and Old Akkadian historical texts.

Frayne predicates his analysis of the LGN on the assumption first that it in fact reflects the political situation around Kish in the mid-third millennium, enumerating cities either under the direct control of that center or with which it had trade relations, second that the text represents the synthesis of a number of local geographical lists, each of which described the settlements found along a discrete watercourse in northern Babylonia (his group A, pp. 3–51), as a rule in a sequence of toponyms running downstream, or along a trade route to the east or north of Mesopotamia (group B, pp. 53–85). Exploiting on the one hand the survey work of earlier excavators in Iraq and Iran, in particular of R. Adams and H. Nissen (Land Behind Baghdad [Chicago 1965], The Urku Countryside [Chicago 1972]; see the references, p. 100, n. 16), and on the other the often rather barren textual material – royal inscriptions from the Old Akkadian through the Old Babylonian periods being the most informative, but also including references from other lexical sources and from administrative documentation –, the author offers measured analyses of the data to place sets of city names along known canal systems in the south and trade routes in the east and north. The maps resulting from Frayne’s hypothet-ic reconstructions should accompany any future archaeologist involved in survey work in the region, and any philologist attempting to identify geographical names in third millennium textual material.

Frayne is in fact careful to emphasize throughout the book that his is a working hypothesis, which in
Map of the locations of toponyms in the so-called Atlante geografico drawn according to the reconstructions of D. Frayne, *The Early Dynastic List of Geographical Names*. Following this reconstruction, the shaded areas represent geographically meaningful units, in northern Babylonia stretches of major canals and settlements on their banks, to the east and north settlements along trade routes. These units are numbered according to op. cit., p. 88. Arrows indicate direction of the sequence of toponyms in the LGN postulated by the author.
R. K. Englund, *OLZ* 90, 165-166
(original map, using Garamond-based font)
its consequence allows the author to reconstruct whole geographical stretches of early Babylonia. The most important data for the Assyriologist are undoubtedly the many proposed locations of settlements along canals. Although the canals — often found in cuneiform texts with no apparent indication of their specific locations — are themselves not mentioned in the geographical list, their use as an organizing principle for many of the list’s sections appears to be well founded. The trade routes presumed by the author to have been defined by sequences of toponyms, however, seem to hang on finer threads. This is a consequence both of the paucity of geographical names positively identified in the Mesopotamian periphery, and of the difficulty in imagining the overall organizing principle of the list, which according to the author’s proposals jumps from one region to the next and back again, following no apparent spatial template.

The book under review does not make this fact sufficiently clear, lacking an introductory section, which I believe should have included the full partitur of the LGN and a general survey of the material available for geographical identifications (see below). An overview of the region dealt with, moreover, would have helped to make clear the inherent instability of the proposed identifications. Thus the illustrated map shown here, drawn after the author’s originals, serves to make explicit the sections of Babylonia Freyne has tentatively identified in his work, and to show that according to this reconstruction the composition as a whole would be considered, at the least, disparate (the sections listed in the author’s table on p. 88 are numbered to facilitate use of the map). According to the author, the scribe responsible for the canonization of the LGN began with a trade route to the far north of Kish (‘Road to Zamua’, no. 1), continued with the Diyala-Terqa route (no. 2), to enter northern Babylonia with two canal systems, one the northern section of the Irrina canal, the other the shorter Isin canal to the south (nos. 3–4). The next section seems to contain the names of Elamite cities (no. 5), followed by a route running up the Tigris river from below the delta of the Diyala to a point north of Assur (no. 6), then skipping back and forth through Babylonia (nos. 7–11), to return to the eastern periphery (nos. 12–15). After a last Babylonian canal (no. 16), the LGN returns, according to the author’s reconstruction, to the far north (no. 17). Considering the often pedantic systematization known from the lexical tradition in the south, this presumed northern disjunction could have been more forcefully underscored by the author, since it seems that the immanent difficulties in analyzing Babylonian geographical lists, for example the list of cities already attested in Uruk III witnesses from Uruk (s. R. Englund/H. Nissen, ATU 3 [Berlin 1993] pp. 34–35 and 145–150), can only serve to a certain point to cover unusual characteristics of hypothetical identifications. The myriad of possible associations — phonological, graphic, spatial, etc. — which can be reflected in a cuneiform scholastic text must be considered, but the working hypothesis of the present volume is that LGN contained consciously organized toponyms, so that scattering at the composition level, where one might expect redactional work, remains problematic.

A few small technical and contextual points may be made to the manuscript. The author’s charts, to begin on the technical level, were apparently printed on a low resolution printer, yet seem to have been pasted as camera-ready sheets in manuscript and so stand out next to the running text as smeared print. The editors of the book should have insisted on a consistent printing, and the printers should also have guaranteed for the even placement of left-right text and pages, which seem to have been improperly cut, with the apparent result that pass marks, and thus headers and text were not held on line; text typography seems, with few exceptions of no apparent consequence, clean.

The author uses throughout the book an unusual writing for place names, for example Salâbîkh instead of the conventional Salâbîk or simply Salâbîk. I believe transcriptions of proper nouns need not contain lessons in Arabic grammar for specialists; when they do, they are confusing to non-specialists, and in the present case led to incorrect citations of articles, for example, in note 210 on page 116. The point of transcriptions of foreign names is to make text less, not more difficult. A final criticism of the technical apparatus of the book involves the use of text-end notes instead of footnotes. Given the current possibilities of desktop publishing, it seems an entirely unnecessary burden on the reader to require paging back and forth to follow the author’s arguments. It is a common complaint that the reader even finds himself ‘storing’ a number of references to avoid the nuisance of leaving the text, finding the note and returning to text. This cannot be the point of using end-notes.

On the level of contents and presentation, the book seems to exhibit some weaknesses only from a subjective viewpoint. For example, the various charts in the book contain tables of place names listed chronologically from Early Dynastic on to Ur III and Old Babylonian and later. The author might have emphasized the receding reliability of these columns with greater distance from the LGN. Whereas Old Akkadian royal inscriptions may be highly relevant, scattered attestations of toponyms in Ur III administrative documents are already of very questionable value, in particular considering the inflation of matching city names in different localities. The uncertainty of proposed correspondences between toponyms in the LGN and those found in later texts is then further enhanced when
coupled with doubtful phonetic correspondences between certain elements in the names.

Since the LGN was never fully presented, nor the use of text sigla from G. Pettinato's presentation in MEE 3, 217–241, explained, it can occasionally be unnecessarily difficult to assess the reliability of the author's argumentation. For example, the reconstructions and corrections of F. Pomponio, JNES 42 (1983) 285–288, are cited without further explanation in a note on page 29 to LGN 161. Having gone to the source, one sees that Pomponio's reconstruction was in fact based on an entirely ad hoc reading tar-rē-gat (ME) of the Abu Salabikh witness OIP 99, no. 91 vi 4, the inherent weakness of which – the reading /gad/ of the sign ME is to my knowledge not attested in any period, let alone the period of the texts in question – is further enhanced by the assumption of the loss of the initial consonant of its presumed Ebla correspondence MEE 3, no. 56, vii 2 (a-rē-ga-at\textsuperscript{b}). Such textual acrobatics should be made clear in any secondary treatment of Early Dynastic texts, especially in the present case because the author uses the toponym as an anchor point for a second stretch of place names on the Isarum canal, beginning with LGN 173, tar-ri-be, read by Frayne tar-ri-bat and equated with tar-rē-gat, (the ka, 'mouth' of the Erina canal noted p. 38, by the way, should direct water from, not to Nippur), assuming a 'g/b variation'.

The large number of consonantal variations cited in the book to cover presumed toponym correspondences should have been reviewed and judged, at least in a philological excursion, as to their phonological meaning. To say, for example, that liquids are not well defined in Sumerian orthography is not a license to exchange freely all 'l's with 'r's or vice versa, nor are the alternations \([g] \sim [b]\) discussed by M. Civil, JNES 32, 59–61, \([m] \sim [b/p]\) most recently discussed by P. Steinke, AuOr. 2, 141–142, and so on, of particular relevance in contexts which do not share the phonetic and orthographic environments expected for these phonemes. Such presumed phonetic variations in the Sumerian system of writing are on occasion strained to support toponym identifications, for example, the identification pp. 77–78 of LGN 11 ū-ba-ru₂ with the much discussed A.BAR.SILAKTI of the Ebla Treaty and with Middle Assyrian Ugār-sallu.

There can be no doubt that many of the author's specific, and some of his general identifications, will be challenged and revised in time as research on third millennium sources continues. These revisions will not, however, diminish his important, timely, and for the present reviewer very welcome contribution to this continuing discourse.

