It may seem less than remarkable to many observers of the advancing civil rights movement in the United States that, in November of 2008, citizens of this country elected a black man to the office of President. Barack Obama is not personally descended from African slaves; still his ascension to the highest elective US office, despite the lingering liability of his skin color, represents a true benchmark in a sordid history of abuse that is intimately related to the European pillage of the New World. The history of European enslavement of Africans for the purpose of forced labor in transatlantic colonies describes a cultural atrocity whose flames burned brightly in the American South, but, we might note, longest in Brazil, where, beginning in the 16th century, hard labor in sugar cane production and mining operations was transferred by the Portuguese from the deteriorating indigenous slave populations into the hands of imported Africans. Here as in other New World colonies, slavery well outlived its abolition in Europe—in 1761 in Portugal, or with the Slave Trade Act effectively frozen in the British Empire in 1807 until its eventual prohibition in 1834.

The US followed Britain in the abolition of the slave trade in the early 19th century, but retained legal ownership of slaves, in the Confederate states until Lincoln’s famous Emancipation Proclamations of 22 September 1862 and 1 January 1863, finally banning all forms of slavery with adoption of the 13th Amendment in
December of 1865. Approximately four million black slaves were freed by July of 1865, but, as post-war federalism would play out, freed into the very uncertain future of Reconstruction that eventually failed them, and rewarded the intransigence of secessionist Southern states. By 1877, with the final withdrawal of federal troops in a kowtow by the US president, Hayes, to advocates of “states rights,” all Republican state governments were replaced by Democrats who instituted a system of segregation and poll taxing that effectively disenfranchised recently freed black men. This was, however, as the history of southern paramilitary organizations comprised of former Confederate soldiers demonstrated, not the most pressing existential distress of blacks in the post-war United States; still, poll taxes and other means of intimidating blacks, including the Jim Crow laws passed by the Democratic state legislatures, were an infection of the US body politic that held through the freedom marches of the 1960’s and beyond—the 24th Amendment, ratified in January of 1964, finally abolished poll taxes, and the Civil Rights Act passed in July over the Senate filibuster led by Southern Democrats, one month before Obama’s third birthday. The best chronicler of the Southern experience with Reconstruction and the succeeding Confederate resurgence is William Faulkner, from whose Go Down, Moses this paper’s title is borrowed:

The Smell of the Cage

The 1860 census counted 3,953,760 slaves in the Union. At this time, the slave populations of Mississippi and South Carolina easily surpassed those of free men (434,696 vs. 354,699 and 402,541 vs. 301,271, respectively), though with Virginia in the lead throughout the 19th century in total numbers (1860: 490,887 slaves). Though an abbreviated report due to political turmoil, the 1860 cartographic representations of the Census bureau did serve Union commanders with vital information concerning the populations—white and black—they would expect to encounter, the location of transportation routes, and even the crops they could count on to feed invading troops. See the historical resources of the US Census Bureau at <http://www.census.gov/prod/www/abs/decennial/>.

One might wonder where Sam Fathers got his name. He was described as part Chickasaw (his biological father), part African and part European (his quadroon mother), but his name derived from “Sam (Had-Two-)Fathers,” since his mother had been married off to a black slave before his birth. Such personal name etymologies (“anthroponomastics”) can form a vital part of social and linguistic research where source material is scarce. Genealogical research has always enjoyed a high degree of interest among informal learners in the United States, in particular of late among descendents of more recent European immigrants whose family records, though now much better searchable online, often end with the Ellis Island Online Database of New York passenger lists. With increasing digitization and networking of birth, marriage and death records from foreign organizations, including most importantly churches, we may expect in the near future to enjoy the capability of tracing, from our home computers, the lives of ancestors reaching back several centuries, and thus add to our family histories dimensions we had imagined long lost. Onomastic resources that might assist in charting the history of the African slaves imported into the Americas, however, are very meager indeed, and not likely to ever be recovered. For another indignity imposed on slaves arriving in the harbors of the New World was the stripping of their names, and the assigning of new ones by their masters.


6 http://www.ellisislandrecords.org/. Online genealogical resources are growing, with the Mormon site Family Search (<http://www.familysearch.org/>), Ancestry.com (<http://www.ancestry.com/>), and GenealogyBank (<http://www.genealogybank.com/>), among the better known current services.
Recent research conducted on ship rosters has shown us that transatlantic slaves’ names were not included, but rather just numbers, age, and gender of individuals, much as we might expect in the stock car transportation of cattle to market.⁸

And in no less dehumanizing a fashion, slaves sold into the chattel possession of plantation owners of the South were renamed willy-nilly, with no reference to practice in their African homeland (as fragile as this practice may have already been in African communities, where names often changed following important events in the individuals’ lives). Many black Americans thus today carry the European names of or assigned by their former owners, of their trades or of any of a number of other associations from their descendants’ past in the Americas, including new names chosen by emancipated slaves, but very rarely the names of their African past.⁹ Aside from the educational and social value a full reckoning of displaced Africans in the Americas would represent to the descendents of slaves, it is not difficult to imagine the geo-linguistic value such rosters would from ancient history or the Bible, evidently trying to keep individuals identifiable. See Berlin 2003: 73; he cites, pp. 57–58, Chesapeake plantation owner Robert Carter, writing to his overseer in 1727: “I nam’d them here & by their names we can always know what sizes they are of & I am sure we repeated them so often to them that every one knew their names & would readily answer to them.”

Curtin 1969 is the first attempt at a more systematic compilation of data documenting this trade from both East and West Africa via European ships to the Americas (“triangular trade”). Curtin concludes that the bulk of the trade went to the tropical Americas (from Brazil up through the Caribbean) and that relatively few slaves (ca. 5% of the total from Africa) entered North America. The ambitious Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database sponsored by Emory University and directed by David Ellis and Martin Halbert (<http://slavevoyages.org>), combines ship rosters with historical annotation with the market accounts, often anecdotal, available to earlier historians, and will fill in many of the gaps noted by commentators on Curtin, including testing Curtin’s hypothesis that slaves in the US enjoyed a much higher rate of survival than did their counterparts to the south, given census numbers of the mid-20th century. African names of these slaves remain hard to come by. Only in the case of repatriation or legal challenge following the British Slave Trade Act of 1807 were slave cargoes recorded according to African names. These name rosters are the subject of further research by the Emory-led team (see <http://slavevoyages.org/tast/resources/slaves.faces>).

⁸ Curtin 1969 is the first attempt at a more systematic compilation of data documenting this trade from both East and West Africa via European ships to the Americas (“triangular trade”). Curtin concludes that the bulk of the trade went to the tropical Americas (from Brazil up through the Caribbean) and that relatively few slaves (ca. 5% of the total from Africa) entered North America. The ambitious Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database sponsored by Emory University and directed by David Ellis and Martin Halbert (<http://slavevoyages.org/>) combines ship rosters with historical annotation with the market accounts, often anecdotal, available to earlier historians, and will fill in many of the gaps noted by commentators on Curtin, including testing Curtin’s hypothesis that slaves in the US enjoyed a much higher rate of survival than did their counterparts to the south, given census numbers of the mid-20th century. African names of these slaves remain hard to come by. Only in the case of repatriation or legal challenge following the British Slave Trade Act of 1807 were slave cargoes recorded according to African names. These name rosters are the subject of further research by the Emory-led team (see <http://slavevoyages.org/tast/resources/slaves.faces>).

⁹ A helpful general overview of naming practices, as is to be anticipated highly dependent on the particular language and culture of the naming owners, is offered by Miller and Smith 1997 s.v. “Names.” Thus, slaves imported to the US from Spanish or Portuguese speaking colonies in the Caribbean often retained (first, but seldom sur-)names drawn from those languages, where slaves from Jamaica or Barbados carried common English names. In many cases, owners drew names
bring to research on the African diaspora.

The destinies of slaves and the recording of slave names can be followed back much further in recorded history than most suspect. In particular the role of slavery in early state development assumed a central role in historical discussions of 3rd millennium Mesopotamia that took place among close colleagues of the scholar celebrated with this volume. I am honored, as a sign of

Dandamaev 1984: 30-35 and 67-80, offers a review of Dandamaev 1984: 30-35 and 67-80, offers a review of his history of philological and social-historical research of Babylonian slavery. The difficult terminology of slave trade and exploitation played a central role in debates conducted mostly in the 1930s and 1960s, debates as to the social status of dependent laborers known in 3rd millennium cuneiform texts as guruš (males) and gene2 (females), and organized in Ur III labor gangs. See, for instance, Diakonoff and I. J. Gelb opposed the more stringently ideological views of Struve in his application of Marxist formation theory to the particularly Mesopotamian variant of state and empire evolution ("Asiatic mode of production"), including his presumption that Ur III laborers were chattel slaves. In a series of articles, they proposed a more pluralistic model of late 3rd millennium social structure in Babylonia, with only slightly varying opinions about the status of the large numbers of laborers organized in Ur III labor gangs. See, for instance, Diakonoff 1969 and 1976; and Gelb 1965 (particularly pp. 238-241), 1967, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1979, 1982a. Further, Pecírková 1979; V. Afanasieva et al. 1968; Melekišvili 1974; Komoróczy 1978; Brentjes 1987, 175-180; and Westbrook 1995. Englund 1990: 63-68, basing his argument above all on accounting practice, comes down on the side of Diakonoff that there was little difference in practice between the state-organized system of labor (characterized by the terms guruš and gene2) and household chattel slavery, in which male slaves were designated with the sign ARAD2 (in lead lines of contracts of sale often sag nita2) female slaves with the same gene2 (in contracts of sale often sag mu-nu). The chief difference would be that chattel slaves in 3rd millennium Mesopotamia were freely marketable, while laborers in state servitude were not. See more recently B. Studevent-Hickman 2006; Koslova 2008.

It is understandable that earlier research on slavery in ancient Mesopotamia has concentrated on those periods best reflected in the inscriptional record. While most popular histories cite references to slaves and slave prices culled from the famous Babylonian law codes, certainly it is the documentation from legal contracts on the one hand, and from administrative accounts on the other, that offers the best evidence of the day-to-day existence of slave populations and their overlords. Historians are not entirely clear as to what constitutes chattel slave property, nor in many cases what the social, political or military environments were within, and beyond Babylonian borders that led to the enslavement of often large numbers of individuals. I would like to present here what little I have been able to gather from recent work on what I believe are personal names of slaves in proto-cuneiform documents dating to the Late Uruk period, ca. 3350-3000 BC, many of which derive from irregular excavations and are thus unprovenced. Indeed, without the rich resources of the Nor-
weigan Schøyen Collection made readily available for study by its owner, our current harvest of, at minimum, 440 personal names, would be reduced to a statistically insignificant 38.11

11 Assyriologists have taken a lot of flak recently, above all from members of the archaeological community, for their determination to publish and discuss all ancient cuneiform texts, with no regard to their immediate provenience. Thus the American Schools of Oriental Society, and the German Archaeological Institute, are currently restricting the publication of inscriptions that derive from recent antiquities market activity. Despite these roadblocks in scholarly communication and very possibly worse, most will agree that it is incumbent upon researchers to seek and exploit all avenues of evidence relevant to their work, but to condition the information derived from sources of varying reliability. Regardless of the irregular origin of many, indeed most cuneiform tablets in public and private collections, specialists are, based on a number of factors, well able to date, and even place in rough geographical locale, these unprovenienced documents, and are therefore able to judge their value in their own research. In the matter of the decipherment, or we should say the description and interpretation of proto-cuneiform, archival locus of text artifacts has in fact played no more than a passing role, insofar as the great bulk of texts derive from regular excavations of Uruk, and as these texts came exclusively from secondary, even tertiary ancient context. They had been discarded in antiquity and, together with the other detritus of administrative households, used to level depressions in underfloors, to fill mud-brick-faced walls, and so on. The private Schøyen cuneiform collection consists of a very substantial number of artifacts, with an over-representation of Old Babylonian and of Late Uruk period texts. The owner was fairly decided in his purchases in acquiring high-impact texts, with an over-representation of Old Akkadian sites, and rev. i 2; 44 rev. ii 4; Akkadian period (see, for instance, TMH 5, 28 i 7-8 and rev. i 2; 44 rev. ii 4; OSP 1, 23 vii 5; 1, 139 ii; but also the conventional form of other Old Akkadian sites, with exceptions in Nippur [cp. OSP 1, 41 obv. ii 1, and s. OSP 1, 25-27; OSP 2, 84 [onion archive] i 2], in Isin (BIN 8, 39 obv. ii 9 [and 66 obv. 8?]) and Adab (OIP 14, 56 obv. ii 7”) through ED IIIb. The ED IIIb form of a normal set of excavated texts. The first two editions of these texts appeared in 2007 (Friberg 2007; Alster 2007). Together with a small number of Ur III administrative texts published by in Owen and Mayr 2007 (nos. 1514-1526), two Gilgamesh witnesses published in George 2003 (vol. 2, p. 7, MS 2652/5 and pp. 8-9, MS 3025) and various other texts published before they were purchased by Schøyen, these editions amount to just under 200 published exemplars, a small fraction of the full collection. The remainder, including my own volume of the Late Uruk collection, are being prepared for publication under the general editorial supervision of Andrew George of the University of London. There can be little doubt but that the historical and linguistic content of this collection rivals that of most national collections on earth. But even if it consisted entirely of mundane copies of long-known literary compositions, it seems to me the ethical imperative of specialists to fully document the texts’ content, and to communicate their findings to the scholarly community as well as to the general public. Those who are not prepared to utilize all sources in their research, including texts available to us through private collections, and certainly those who would presume to limit the access or use in scholarly communications of unprovenienced sources, as has begun to happen with submissions even to such politically neutral editorial boards as those that oversee the publication of papers on the history of mathematics, may want to reconsider the professional choices they have made in their lives.

12 Cf. the forms a-c in the paleographical table compiled by Gelb 1982a: 98. Only the text *WF* 93 obv. i 1 attests the sign in clear semantic relationship with the male counterparts guruš in the ED IIIa period. This ED IIIa period sign form was retained in Nippur into the Old Akkadian period (see, for instance, *TMH* 5, 28 i 7-8 and rev. i 2; 44 rev. ii 4; *OSP* 1, 23 vii 5; 1, 139 ii; but also the conventional form of other Old Akkadian sites, with exceptions in Nippur [cp. *OSP* 1, 41 obv. ii 1, and s. *OSP* 1, 25-27; *OSP* 2, 84 [onion archive] i 2], in Isin (*BIN* 8, 39 obv. ii 9 [and 66 obv. 8?]) and Adab (*OIP* 14, 56 obv. ii 7”) through ED IIIb. The ED IIIb form...
Foreign lands, to the east or north of the Mesopotamian alluvium. The corresponding male designation ARAD₂ derived from the grapheme representing males (NITA) in combination with the same KUR sign.¹³

Successive publications of excavated text artifacts attesting to earlier and earlier phases of cuneiform led, in the mid-1920's, to the most ancient examples of the writing system. Conventionally known as "proto-cuneiform," the sign forms found on texts from Jemdet Nasr and Uruk invited comparison, both graphic and semantic, with characters found on later texts. Included with these earliest cuneiform signs was a sign combination interpreted by Langdon, and following him all other Assyriologists who dealt with these texts, to represent the precursor of ge₅₅ and thus "female slaves."

As with so much of note in researching early Mesopotamian administration, the first systematic discussion of 4th millennium slave designations was published by the Russian scholar A. Vaiman. In a 1974 article, Vaiman reviewed the then available textual evidence and concluded, correctly, that SAL and KUR₅ (KUR₆, q are graphic variants of this sign) in the archaic texts in fact represented female and male humans, and that these were recorded much as were the stock of herding accounts, including in the case of the Uruk IV period texts, the qualification of children with a special numerical sign that was otherwise employed to designate fractions of some whole unit.¹⁴ The next discussion of proto-cuneiform designations of archaic laborers was offered by Englund and Damerow in an edition of proto-Elamite texts from Tepe Yahya,¹⁵ followed by a re-interpretation of texts from the Langdon Jemdet Nasr publications by Englund/Grégoire, and by Nissen, Damerow and Englund in a catalogue prepared for an exhibit in Berlin's Charlottenburg Palace in 1990.¹⁶ Englund provides an overview of previous research on this matter in a 1998 publication.¹⁷ As this research has shown, the accounting for apparent slaves in the Late Uruk period reflected the same degrading abuse of fellow humans as was the defining flaw of the American South, but it collaterally resulted in lists of personal names, names that, in the tradition of Mesopotamia, should bear much linguistic, or at least orthographic information. With the infusion of large numbers of recently available proto-cuneiform texts, we have been able to add very substantially to the list of clear personal names ascribed to humans in the Late Uruk period, and can begin to investigate these.
names for elements that may support, or by their absence tend to hamper an identification of the language of our earliest cuneiform scribes.

The discussion about the “Sumerian question,” that addresses the linguistic affiliation of these archaic scribes, continues, at least in my mind, and has taken a rough edge of late, the more so with publication of the 2003 Leiden Rencontre volume that made no credible advances in the now fairly stale list of “proofs” that Sumerian phoneticisms, or even number words, were a clear advance in the now fairly stale list of “proofs” that Sumerian was the source of our earliest cuneiform scribes.

18 The RAI section organized by G. Whittaker in Leiden and published in van Soldt 2005 (Ethnicity in Ancient Mesopotamia; s. the Tuesday, July 2nd program, p. 452), was ostensibly devoted to the debate concerning phonetic glosses and other language clues in Late Uruk texts (thus not to be confused with the “Sumerian problem” debate that, at the turn of the 20th century addressed the question of whether Sumerian represented a real language at all). Two papers, one by the organizer (van Soldt 2005: 409–429) and one by G. Steiner (van Soldt 2005: 340–355; Steiner’s statement p. 345 that “all words transmitted in a “Sumerian” context are, independent of their structure, to be understood as “Sumerian” until they have been unambiguously assigned another language” [translation mine], does place skeptics at a distinct disadvantage) were informed, and informative. (An important third paper offered by J. C. Johnson (”Complex graphemes in the proto-cuneiform corpus and the problem of phonological reconstruction”) unfortunately did not make it to press in this volume, and will be published elsewhere.) However, the papers, and I will assume the presentations by G. Rubio (van Soldt 2005: 316–332) and C. Wilcke (van Soldt 2005: 430–445) were neither. To be clear, and since both authors expended some effort in responding to points I and others have made in the past concerning the all too marked willingness of Assyriologists to declare the question of the linguistic affiliation of Late Uruk scribes resolved in favor of Sumerian, I have always professed simple agnosticism in the matter and have attempted to keep a running tally of lines of evidence that may be cited on one side or the other. To satisfy Rubio’s untoward sensibilities, I am happy to retract my modest analysis that have accompanied this research are fairly
straightforward. In the first instance, a rebus use of discrete signs (for instance, the words for “arrow” and “life” are homophones in Sumerian, where as in the example below, if correct, the arrow pictogram is more likely to represent “life” than “arrow” or some other homophonic word). There are precious few proposed pairs in this vein of attack, although we would hope that with improved access to all Late Uruk texts interested scholars would perform more systematic searches. Second, www.cdli.ucla.edu/P387752> obv. 1b1a; collaboration needed of a notation that appears to read 2(N14) GI6 AMAa, “20 black AMA’s”[?]). Instead of citing elsewhere in the paper various correct interpretations, or justifiable speculations by Friberg, Wilcke should rather defer to him entirely. It is difficult to locate anything in the rest that deserves our attention, perhaps excepting the fanciful notion that we might attach number words to Uruk V period clay tokens (van Soldt 2005: 439; the author, pp. 441-443, trumps all earlier speculation by transporting Akkadian glosses back to the Uruk IV period Lu' Az list, and in a short excursus pp. 434-436 resolves, to his own satisfaction, a half century of theoretical discussions among historians of science on what constitutes abstract number in Mesopotamia). We must leave to Wilcke and M. Krebernik the determination of the ultimate source of Late Uruk GAL = /gal/ referred to in our list below (under NUN.ME = abgal), for which see van Soldt 2005: 444, with n. 56 citing Krebernik in Gerber, Ehlich and Muller 2002: 64 n. 4 (and cp. Krebernik in Streck and Weninger 2002: 1-2, n. 1; Krebernik 2007: 43 n. 19). In an uncommon sign of polygenesis, this identification even landed in Glassner 2000 (s. Englund 2005: 114).

19 I have been thinking about the apparent use of the SLEDGE sign GURUS to represent workmen (opposed to SAL) in the text MSVO 1.1, with which one of the participants of the University of Peking conference, Jerry Cooper, has confronted me in past, and, as we shall see, of the sign AL to represent apparent adult humans, consonant with later Sumerian AL = mah, (it should be noted that the sign MAH in the archaic texts was identified in Green and Nissen 1987 only according to graphic similarity with the sign mah of later periods, following Falkenstein 1936: sign no. 649, and that the sign mah is attested first in the ED IIIa period with both readings mah and ah, MAH has not been identified in texts from the periods ED I-II, and AL in those texts does not occur in the same context as in the archaic texts). We might imagine a language in both cases with homonym pairs SLEDGE = FIELD-HAND and HOE = ADULT-SLAVE (unless this means simply “horr”). The remarks of Steinkeller 1990: 22, based on the differentiation of KAL/GURUS in the ED IIIa corpus (GURUS a strict rectangle, KAL a rectangle with an angled line at the right, thus more graphically similar to the rounding of archaic GURUS and the graphic precursor of later kal/
we might expect to discover the use of phonetic rather than semantic values of signs (see the instance of "su-pa" below). Third, and most often seen, specialists will attempt to isolate use of phonetic glosses attached to logograms in some way (best known are instances of such phonetic glosses inscribed within sign frames, but also simply near to the sign of reference). This strategy considers the possible combinations in complex graphemes to include semantic element + semantic element (uninteresting for language identification), semantic element + phonetic element (interesting but difficult to identify), or phonetic element + phonetic element (very interesting, and very difficult to identify). I list below a selection of the multivalency proposals made heretofore on Sumerian phonetic signs, together with possible instances of iteration common to Sumerian orthography, and the proposal of M. Powell that the uniquely sexagesimal structure of Sumerian number words offers proof that Sumerians invented proto-cuneiform, where sexagesimal notations are amply attested in the earliest texts. In this regard, we should note the examples of multivalent sign use cited from the other pristine writing systems, Egyptian (with its key example of proposed b3-st for the place name (per)-bastet, "(house) of the goddess Bastet") Chinese and Mayan. I have set off in bold those candidates for Sumerian in the archaic texts that appear interesting, although of these only the very poorly attested šabu carries real conviction.

---

1) Multivalence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>archaic sign(s)</th>
<th>proposed Sumerian interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN-E₂-TI</td>
<td>en-lil₂-ti, &quot;Enlil (gives) life&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA-NAM₂-RAD/ZA(A)</td>
<td>nam₂-su-pa, /nam-sipa(d)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARA₂/PIRIG+MA</td>
<td>alima with MA = /ma/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRIG+NUNUZ</td>
<td>az(a) with NUNUZ = /za/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA₂×AN</td>
<td>ama with AN = /am/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA₂×EN</td>
<td>men with EN = /en/ or /men/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN-ME-MU</td>
<td>endub, with /en/ of EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN-ME-GI</td>
<td>engiz suggests /en/ of EN and /gi/ of GI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₂-BAHAR₃₅-NUNUZ</td>
<td>zilulu with NUNUZ = /za/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIR₂-SU</td>
<td>gir₂-su (Krebernik 2007: 43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZI // SI₄</td>
<td>with both = /si/ (Englund 1994: p. 38, W 9123,a1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Possible Sumerian verbal iteration?

| GI               | gi (gi₄) “return” (Vaiman 1974b: 16) |
| NUN-ME           | abgal among “gal-words” in the Lu₂ A list, with GAL = /gál/ (see above, n. 18) |
| ŠA₂-BU           | ša₂-bu // ED LAK₅₀/sha-bu-nun, OAtk ia-ab-bu-nu-um (Krebernik 2007: 43) |

3) Sumerian sexagesimal system?

As is evident from this list, classical graphotactics have

---

20 See my OBO 160/1, 77 n. 158, with reference in particular to the reviews of Green and Nissen 1987 (the revised Uruk sign list) by M. Krebernik and P. Steinkeller. The most powerful example of this list would have been the first, en-lil₂-ti; it was, however, already shown in Englund 1988: 131-132 n. 9, to be fallacious.

played only a minor role in such research, based on strong, though by no means overwhelming evidence that sign sequences in this largely logographic, or even saccades-based\textsuperscript{24} ancient orthography were fluid, and not dependable indicators of word or phoneme flow within textual sub-units ("words," cases or lines).

To this discussion I would like to add some material concerning Late Uruk personal names that have often been cited in literature generated by the Berlin-based project "Archaic Texts from Uruk," but never gathered systematically, and that I have in the past year only ordered in a preliminary way. The major difficulty in isolating clear instances of personal names, where we must expect that the accounts and perhaps sections of the lexical lists were replete with such designations, is that the text formats do not explicitly identify what is what once you leave the realm of numerical notations, object designations and signs or sign combinations of thematic meaning derived from the lexical lists. Of course, we have been unable to identify, nor should we expect to find, any semantic glosses of personal names—aside from the simple number sign representing "one unit," these were a millennium off. Frankly, one of the more dissatisfying discussions that I had with Peter Damerow and Hans Nissen in preparation of the Berlin Erlenmeyer exhibition catalogue\textsuperscript{25} was in fact having to admit that we could not state whether the sign combination "KU ŠIM," central though it was to understanding the archival meaning of the core texts in this collection, referred to a human, to a profession, or to a household. We agreed to an individual "human" (brewery foreman), but only as an expedient convention.\textsuperscript{26}

The same frustrations can be applied down the line to any number of signs or sign combinations that can, due to considerations of tablet format, or as part of a procedure that eliminates from consideration other spatially associated signs whose semantics are identifiable, be isolated. Since we cannot know how many variables are at play in these residual sign combinations, it would be less than prudent to simply assign to them all the role of personal names. There may be though other strategies to increase the likelihood that we are looking at names of specific persons. For instance, you can imagine an automatic text parser that searches all instances of sign combinations from the lexical lists "Professions" (Lu\textsubscript{2} A) and "Officials" from all sign strings found in discrete tablet cases (corresponding to "lines"), removes from the resulting list first these lexical notations, then eventual identifiable signs or sign combinations (numerical notations, object designations and so on) from the remainder, and writes a list of all still remaining signs and sign combinations. Aside from possible functional terms, including for instance verbal forms, we would anticipate that these entries represent the personal names of cited household officials. We might also look for parallels in the text formats that isolate distinct personal names for us—for instance, some designation of personnel inventories as was well known in later periods, or, say, a format like later table accounts with some global qualification followed by strings of individual cases, each with signs or sign combinations with no further qualifications.

Isolating these names would help to satisfy our curiosity about the conceptual organization of its members that archaic household accountants imposed on their books, but more importantly, since cultural continuity is regularly cited as one of the lynch pins of Sumerian civilization, and since personal names as a conservative cultural trait should be discoverable in texts that code, or are coded by Sumerians, this prosopographic material from the Late Uruk texts could play a prominent role in discussions of archaic linguistics. For despite all the caveats offered by specialists in early cuneiform orthography, it has, since my time as a student in Dietz Edzard's seminars in Munich, reading 3\textsuperscript{rd} millennium texts and examining, as was his wont, earliest sign etymologies, seemed to me curious that if these should be texts written by Sumerians, we did not immediately recognize a substantial number of forms that could at least plausibly be interpreted to represent elements of the Sumerian language—quite aside from the seeming-

\textsuperscript{1} 1, 212 obv. ii 8.a, MS 2998 obv. ii 6, and <http://www.cdli.ucla.edu/P004452> rev. ii 4.b2).

\textsuperscript{24} J. C. Johnson and A. Johnson (private communication) are investigating the sign clustering of selected Ed IIIa period UD.GAL.NUN texts with an eye to understanding how scribes were overcoming the challenges they faced in representing texts through syntactical rather than formally text structural means as was the case in the preceding ED I-II and Late Uruk periods. Their working hypothesis is that a cognitive reading strategy of harvesting sign clusters for interpretation rather than a strict linearization, is not only at work in early cuneiform orthography, but is a more natural and efficient means of reading. The "saccade" refers to a rapid movement of both eyes in the same direction, the natural way that humans gather visual information; "saccade generation" to such movements in lexical processing. See for instance Rayner 1998; Reichle et al. 1998; Engbert, Longtin and Kliegl 2002.
ly missing references to the Sumerian pantheon. And
in the first instance, I would have expected language-, or if you wish, culture-specific patterns to show up in
personal names. Still, neither the list \textit{Lu}_2 \textit{A}, nor the so-
called list of officials, gave any clear indication of sign
patterns that would comport with later, often predic-
tative formulations in personal names such as “servant of
Enlil,” “he is my lord,” or “lady of Inanna.”

It turns out that the Late Uruk accounts of herds of
animals led us to the sorts of texts that clearly included
personal names.\footnote{Nissen, Damerow, and Englund 2004.}
Records of such herds, first edited by M. Green,\footnote{Nissen, Damerow, and Englund 2004: 66-70.}
contained data much like that known to
specialists working on texts from later periods, including
numbers and designations of animals, of their ages
and gender, as well of course as identification of their
owners, herdsmen, and whereabouts, and the real or antici-
pated dairy and textile products associated with these
animals. As is the case with other types of accounts,
these texts detail conceptually important terminological
categorizations, for instance qualifying x ewes (sign \textit{U}_8)
and y rams (\textit{UDUNITA}) as x+y small cattle (\textit{UDU}).
Just as with small and large cattle, and as we are seeing
with a substantial recent influx of archaic accounts deal-
ing with donkeys,\footnote{Green 1980; cf. Nissen, Damerow, and Englund 2004:
131-138, with further reference to contemporary herd-
ing texts from neighboring Iran.}
pig herds were also differentiated
according to animal age and use, in the case of cattle also
gender. The text W 23948\footnote{OBO 160/1, pp. 143-175.}
records the distribution of
animals from a large herd of 95 pigs into two groups of
adults assigned temple units in Uruk, and a third com-
prised of juvenile animals. The juveniles were qualified
with a designation borrowed from time accounting met-
trology to represent animals that had reached the age of
one year; one porker, together with ten mature animals,
were then according to this text possibly slaughtered for
the household kitchen.\footnote{This is a provisional interpretation of numerical signs}

During our work on the Uruk III period texts from
Jemdet Nasr, Grégoire, Damerow and I noticed that
a similar terminology and syntactically motivated text
format were visible in accounts of what were, in totals
of the texts, qualified as \textit{SAL KUR}_a \textit{ERIM}_a and \textit{SAL}
\textit{KUR}_a \textit{SAGxMA}, that is, what we speculated to be “yoked” and “noosed” female and male slaves, follow-

\begin{figure}[ht]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figure3.png}
\caption{W 9827 contains an apparent account of a number of
groups of male and female laborers, listed individually on
the obverse (23+ in the first column, 22+ in the second) and
totaled on the reverse (preserved is a notation representing in
the sexagesimal system 211+ female and male laborers, in
proto-cuneiform \textit{SAL KUR}_a).}
\end{figure}
ing Vaiman’s interpretation of SAL and KURₐ. With the series of three Jemdet Nasr texts MSVO 1, 212-214, we were able to demonstrate several things. First, that the numbers of individuals qualified as SAL or KURₐ in archaic texts were not large—at most 211+ recorded on the reverse of the account W 9827, doubtless representing the summation of smaller groups recorded on the obverse (see figure 3).33 Second, we saw that the accounting procedure of text consolidation, so well attested for later periods of Mesopotamian history, was employed already by household bookkeepers at the dawn of writing. MSVO 1, 213 and 214, were in fact entered, sign for sign, into the larger account MSVO 1, 212. But then third and most significantly, we could see that the accounting format of these texts was very complex, but foresaw the division of individual records into sub-cases with formal differentiations. The first sub-case of one entry contained a numerical notation, an object designation (as we believe, “slave of quality x”) and one or more signs apparently referring to persons or offices. There followed one or more sub-cases, with one exception34 never with a numerical notation, containing signs that we interpreted to represent the personal names of the designated slaves. Where the initial numerical notation was 1, there was one or two such associated sub-cases; where 2, there were at least two.

Thus the initial entries of MSVO 1, 212, are:

1a  \[1N₁ \cdot \text{ SAL KURₐ SAG} \cdot \text{MA ŠA} \cdot E₂\]
   \[\text{MUŠEN×2N₅₇} \cdot \text{ERIM₄} \cdot X\]
1b1 \[\text{ZATU₇₅₁} \cdot \text{ERIM₄}\]
1b2 \[[\ldots] \cdot X\]

from the derived system S’ where it is employed to qualify herded animals, and possibly humans. See Green and Nissen 1987: p. 131.

32 Above, n. 14. The justification of MA = “noose” in SAG+MA was based on the associated yoke pictogram ERIM₄, on the combination of this sign with animal head signs (and thus in those instances not to be understood as a phonetic gloss), and on a consideration of the pictographic referent of MA. This sign, later peš₃, is interpreted to reflect the “string of fruit” that Gelb 1982b convincingly explained, and thus “tied-back cord” generally—in our case, tied round the neck of the slaves, thus qualifying them in some way other than the pictographic ERIM₄, “yoke.”

33 ATU 5, pl. 118, W 9827; cf. Falkenstein 1936: no. 577 (and see p. 22); Vaiman 1974a: 141, no. 24; Nissen, Damerow, and Englund 2004: 112, no. 13.2; OBO 160/1, p. 178 fig. 66.

Unfortunately, the complexity of the individual entries in this account makes it very difficult to understand the syntactical relationships among those entities represented by individual sub-cases, and the text would furthermore appear to contradict, with its combination in initial sub-cases of SAL, KURₐ and 1N₁, our belief that SAL denotes a single female, and KURₐ a single male. I have no credible explanation for this seeming contradiction. Similar accounts from Uruk with less complex accounting format, however, do help to fill out this picture with terminology more reflective of that known from herding accounts. Where herding texts recorded domesticated animals according to species, gender and age of breeding significance—we expect also qualifying the males as to whether and when they had been castrated—the archaic accounts of groups of humans added new levels of qualification, with clearer differentiation of the terms SAL and KURₐ, and with designations of slaves that contained greater terminological color.

The two Uruk texts in figure 4 are good examples of this accounting procedure. Each has in the left column a total, eight individuals in both texts, corresponding to numerical entries to the right. Clearly enough, the first text35 lists 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 1 for a total of 8, while the second text lists 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 10, using formal differentiation of individuals associated with sub-cases. This, too, is not without precedent. See Green and Nissen 1987: 131. The possibility for disambiguation in the Uruk texts is well suited to the sloppiness of our understanding of the term KURₐ, as we explore below. Upon closer examination, we see that the Uruk texts differ from the Jemdet Nasr texts in a number of salient ways. The first is the limited number of instances: only seven recorded in the obverse (MSVO 1, 213-214, OR 1, 212-214, and OR 2, 211-212, to which we turn below). The second is the proliferation of variants: 1N₁10, KURₐ11, and SAL12, as we turn to the discussion of designations below.

34 And this exception, MSVO 1, 212 obv. i 4b1-2 = MSVO 1, 213 obv. i 4b1-2, recorded ten sheep and one male donkey, KIŠ KURₐ, probably purchased together with the recorded slave AMA₉, MUŠEN MAŠ.

35 Note that “LUGAL” in W 20274,2 obv. 3b1 probably refers to a one-year-old slave child, and thus is not likely to represent anything like “king” of later tradition. The
the second has \((4+1) = 5 + (1+2) = 8\). The latter text demonstrates that SAL and KUR qualify different objects, probably female and male slaves, that are themselves in the accounting terminology further divided into apparent age qualifications. Thus, in the former text we have, seen formally, the qualifications AL, ENa TUR, \(1N_{67}\times U_4\) TUR, BULUG, U\(_2\) A and SU; in the second text, SAL, KUR\(_a\) and \(\mathcal{S}A_{3a}\) TUR. Several of these designations are terms well known to Sumerologists. TUR (a presumed pictogram of human breasts) representing young children (Sumerian dumu), \(1N_{67}\times U_4\) representing “one year,”\(^{36}\) and AL (picture of a type of hoe) representing “adult” (with later Sumerian reading \(\text{ma}_2\)), this sign usually qualifies sexually mature domestic animals, but is also possibly an element of two personal names in the ED IIIa period, and is even a qualifier of the capacity unit gur \([WF\,76\,rev.\,x\,3]\). Finally, SU will be associated by some with later \(\text{SU}(-\text{gi}_4)\), “old one,” found in many herding accounts and laborer inventories.

The most compelling accounting practice that emerges from the analysis of these two proto-cuneiform accounts from Uruk, was the clear practice of associating numerical notations and general slave designations with sub-cases of signs and sign combinations that corresponded exactly to the numerical notations. Thus, in the first text of figure 4, 1 AL (i 1a) is followed by one sub-case with non-numerical signs; 2 \(1N_{67}\times U_4\) TUR (i 3a) by two sub-cases, each with non-numerical signs. The case with 4 SAL in the second text (i 1b1a) is followed by four sub-cases, each, again, with non-numerical signs. It appears reasonable to conclude that these sub-cases contain personal names associated with individuals recorded in numerical sub-totals to their left (leaving aside a discussion of the true orientation of the proto-cuneiform texts), and that signs or sign combinations associated with these sub-totals qualified the named in-

sign combination LU\(_2\) GAL is attested 10 times in Uruk texts \([from\,a\,total\,of\,36,448\,lines]\), never in a context of any social consequence, and 55 times in ED I-II texts \([from\,a\,total\,of\,4004\,lines]\) in personal names of a form that is largely consonant with later usage. These figures would reflect a level of usage of “LUGAL” in the ED I-I period about 50 times that of Uruk IV-III, of course to be understood with a grain of salt.

\(^{36}\) Englund 1988: 121-185, especially 156-160.

\(^{37}\) Vaiman 1974a: 140 (=Vaiman 1989: 123), to no. 20, drew attention to the likelihood that \(\text{ATU}1,\,92\,\Rightarrow\text{ATU}\).
to the poor state of preservation of most Uruk texts, only about a dozen comparable accounts have been isolated among the more than 5000 tablets and tablet fragments unearthed there in regular excavations, and some few others from other sites. These numbers have been significantly increased with nearly 40 new reference texts that form part of the Norwegian Schøyen collection.

One of these texts, first observed in Brussels by Philippe Talon, who kindly posted to me his carefully done copy and transliteration before it entered the Oslo collection and was assigned the manuscript no. MS 3035 (figures 5-6), is of particular note.40 The large account exhibits the same correspondence between cases with numerical notations and associated sub-cases with non-numerical notations that we have seen in smaller texts above. For instance, the section in the lower left of the tablet's obverse surface (figure 5) contains a notation representing "12" in the sexagesimal system, qualified by 3N 57×U4 TUR, probably "three-year-old children." Exactly 12 sub-cases follow, each with one or more signs representing as many personal names of the individuals summarized in the left-most case.

The account at a higher structural level employs procedures that are well known from the grain accounting office of Jemdet Nasr.41 The double dividing line down the middle of the text indicates that it is the compilation of two still quite significant accounts, each beginning with the most valuable objects (here AL, presumably adult slaves) and continuing through numbers of less valuable items. The first sub-account appears to be globally qualified by the sign 2N 57 MUNa, the second 1N 57 MUNa. This MUNa is likely to represent some sort of accounting (rationing?) period, possibly connected to the sign combination PAPa SUa discussed below.

The parallel text has not reemerged since it went through Belgium, but was copied by Talon and posted to CDLI under <http://cdli.ucla.edu/P005573>. A third, though poorly preserved parallel text is MS 2863/18 (<http://cdli.ucla.edu/P006184>). We may note that many of these texts give clear indication of gender distinctions.
Using this, and the 50 other accounts registering numbers of humans in this way, we may compile a list of general qualifications for what we interpret to be archaic slaves:

**general terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KURₐ</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAG</td>
<td>head, human⁴²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAG×MA</td>
<td>noosed head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIMₐ</td>
<td>yoked one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPₐ</td>
<td>?⁴³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**adults**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>of working age (&quot;hoer&quot; ?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**youths**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENₐ TUR</td>
<td>four years old and older up to AL?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURₐ TUR</td>
<td>boy, younger than ENₐ TUR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURₐ ŠA₃a₁</td>
<td>boy, very young?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL TUR</td>
<td>girl, younger than ENₐ TUR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL ŠA₃a₁</td>
<td>girl, very young?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠA₃a₁ TUR</td>
<td>= KURₐ/SAL ŠA₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N₅₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋之內容</td>
<td>three-year-old (or: child in third year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N₅₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋₋之內容</td>
<td>two-year-old (or: child in second year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1N₅₋₋₋₋₋₋₋之內容</td>
<td>one-year-old (or: child in first year)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These then are the higher-level qualifications of persons in proto-cuneiform accounts, quite possibly chattel slaves, or humans in some form of servitude to Late Uruk households. While I must admit to some doubt about the interpretation of the complex signs including “U₄” (‘day,’ but a general anchor for time metrology notations in this period), it may be relevant to mention the analyses by I. Gelb, H. Waetzoldt and others that children of state-dependent laborers will have been assigned full work loads by the age of six or shortly thereafter. If our designation ENₐ TUR encompasses a period of several years, AL might indeed qualify workers of an age that would appear young to us, but certainly not to many sweatshop owners around the world, and certainly not to the industrialized West prior to such legislation as the British Factory Act of 1833 aimed at curbing abusive child labor in British textile manufacturing. According to this at the time heralded advance in labor rights, children aged nine to thirteen could not be forced to work more than nine hours a day. Nevertheless, why did archaic accountants so exactingly record the ages of children from their first through their third years? This system of dating bears an uncanny resemblance to herding accounts of large cattle and of pigs of later periods, or even of the initial lines of the so-called archaic Pig List.⁴⁴ The age designations of domestic animals employed in those accounts are explicit tools known to any dairy or pig farmer; they track age to know when to wean the young, to judge weight gain, and to prepare sexually mature animals for breeding, or to train oxen for the plough. It is difficult to recognize a comparable need in accounting for young children, aside possibly from the intent of accountants to retain strict control of juveniles as they grew to working age. As slave laborers, after all, they would have represented a substantial chattel asset to ancient households.

Doubtless, tagging all proto-cuneiform accounts that contain the format for personal names described above will result in a list that is, for a number of reasons, by no means complete. In the first place, H. J. Nissen and his research collaborators have stated again and again that we must understand the nature of the texts taken from Uruk excavations. To make historical points, often the best preserved of those accounts are cited and put in illustrative graphics or book jackets, but these are the tablets that survived more than 5000 years of deposition in Uruk, after having been rudely gathered and tipped, as detritus of a burgeoning administration, into construction projects of the ancients. Most artifacts could not survive such ill treatment intact.⁴⁵ Thus the very frag-

---


⁴² See the SAG inventory MS 2437, comprising columns of lines, each with one sub-case containing a numerical notation and sign combinations representing presumable personal names, followed by a second sub-case with only counted SAL. The text, including particularly the summation rev. col. iii, is unclear to me.

⁴³ The total of the account MS 3035 (figs. 5-6 and cf. <http://cdli.ucla.edu/P005573> and MS 2863/18, bottom of second column) contains this sign combination where we might expect a general designation of the humans recorded in the text; MS 2498 would tend to sup-
Figure 6: MS 3035, a complex account in the Schøyen collection, contains notations representing numbers of apparent slaves qualified according to age, though not (visibly) gender.
Transliteration of M 3035:

obverse i
1.a. 3N14 2N1 AL 2N57
1.b. 3N14 1N1 AL
1.c. 3N14 2N57 TUR
1.d. 3N14 1N1 AL
1.e. 3N14 2N57 TUR
1.f. 3N14 1N1 AL
1.g. 3N14 2N57 TUR
1.h. 3N14 1N1 AL
1.i. 3N14 2N57 TUR
1.j. 3N14 1N1 AL
1.k. 3N14 2N57 TUR
1.l. 3N14 1N1 AL
1.m. 3N14 2N57 TUR
1.n. 3N14 1N1 AL
1.o. 3N14 2N57 TUR
1.p. 3N14 1N1 AL
1.q. 3N14 2N57 TUR
1.r. 3N14 1N1 AL
1.s. 3N14 2N57 TUR
1.t. 3N14 1N1 AL
1.u. 3N14 2N57 TUR
1.v. 3N14 1N1 AL
1.w. 3N14 2N57 TUR
1.x. 3N14 1N1 AL
1.y. 3N14 2N57 TUR
1.z. 3N14 1N1 AL
2.a. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.b. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.c. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.d. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.e. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.f. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.g. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.h. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.i. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.j. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.k. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.l. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.m. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.n. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.o. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.p. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.q. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.r. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.s. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.t. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.u. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.v. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.w. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.x. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.y. 2N1 ENa TUR
2.z. 2N1 ENa TUR
3.a. 3N57 SAL
3.b. 3N57 SAL
3.c. 3N57 SAL
3.d. 3N57 SAL
3.e. 3N57 SAL
3.f. 3N57 SAL
3.g. 3N57 SAL
3.h. 3N57 SAL
3.i. 3N57 SAL
3.j. 3N57 SAL
3.k. 3N57 SAL
3.l. 3N57 SAL
3.m. 3N57 SAL
3.n. 3N57 SAL
3.o. 3N57 SAL
3.p. 3N57 SAL
3.q. 3N57 SAL
3.r. 3N57 SAL
3.s. 3N57 SAL
3.t. 3N57 SAL
3.u. 3N57 SAL
3.v. 3N57 SAL
3.w. 3N57 SAL
3.x. 3N57 SAL
3.y. 3N57 SAL
3.z. 3N57 SAL
4.a. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.b. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.c. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.d. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.e. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.f. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.g. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.h. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.i. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.j. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.k. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.l. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.m. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.n. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.o. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.p. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.q. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.r. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.s. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.t. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.u. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.v. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.w. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.x. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.y. 2N1 ENa TUR
4.z. 2N1 ENa TUR
5.a. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.b. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.c. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.d. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.e. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.f. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.g. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.h. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.i. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.j. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.k. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.l. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.m. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.n. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.o. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.p. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.q. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.r. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.s. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.t. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.u. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.v. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.w. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.x. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.y. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57
5.z. 1N14 2N1 AL 2N57

Port the notion that PAP a SU a qualifies slaves in some general way, with the first cases containing numerical notations qualified with PAP a SU a in parallel to AL on our larger accounts. Cp. in particular MS 2439.

44 Englund and Nissen 1993: 22-23, 100-103; Englund 1995; OBO 160/1, 169-175.

45 The attractive state of preservation of many archaic collections gathered from the antiquities markets notwithstanding, since these tablets are what remained after a rigorous sifting process that selected "preserved" and left behind "fragmentary" at the site of plunder, and this sifting continues through the markets down to end-buyer. Though now exposed to the elements, we may hope that future regular excavations will gather in the many thousands of fragments of texts that must well litter the edges of illegal excavations of post-Kuwait war Iraq.


47 Research conducted in particular by J. Dahl on the approximately contemporaneous, proto-Elamite accounts from ancient Iran has led to substantive gains in accessing that related writing system. See Dahl 2005a and 2005b.

48 Still, public access to proto-cuneiform texts has moved to an entirely new level since the establishment of an
Nevertheless, the limited method of sign and sign string isolation used here has resulted in a list of ca. 450 entries—in an appendix below—, each with fair probability representing the given name of an individual. We may look at these personal names in a number of ways. The resolute decipherer will first just count and rank signs, always aware that the sample may be skewed, given that so much now derives from one private collection of inscriptions of unknown provenience. Persons whose names included the sign ENₐ, possibly the ruler of archaic communities or even of regions, should not surprise us, and this may be the correspondence to lugal in later Early Dynastic personal names. This sign is attested more than twice as often as the runner-up signs BUₐ (unclear meaning) and 3N₅₇ (in some and possibly most instances an abstracted form of the sign KURₐ, “male slave” or perhaps after all also “mountain,” “foreign land.” For comparison, I have listed below the high-frequency signs in the archaic texts generally (excluding lexical list attestations).

**High frequency signs used in personal names and the number of attestations in all discovered names (left), and the most frequent signs in the proto-cuneiform texts generally (right; excluding lexical list attestations):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>ED IIIb Names</th>
<th>ED IIIb Times</th>
<th>Late Uruk, ca. 3200 BC Names</th>
<th>Late Uruk, ca. 3200 BC Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENₐ</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>ZATU659</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUₐ</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>PAPₐ</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N₅₇</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>ŠUBUR</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPₐ</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>BUₐ GI</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠU</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>SANGAₐ</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₂ₐ</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>ENₐ PAPₐ</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>ENₐ U₂₉ DU</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠUBUR</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>ENₐ EZEN₉ EN₉</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUŠEN</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>NI₉ GIRQ₅₉</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>ND₉ GIRQ₅₉</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>ŠU ŠU</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3N₅₇ SAL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E₂₉ DAH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EN₉ GIŠ×ŠU₂₉</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KASKAL ŠUBUR</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UB ZI₉</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although I cannot recognize a meaningful pattern in these numbers, at least we now have a basis for comparing the frequency of signs used in personal names versus those used in the texts as a whole; such frequency tables can serve, for instance, to test in Babylonian texts the hypothesis of Meriggi, Vallat and Dahl that proto-Elamite scribes developed a syllabary used exclusively to record proper nouns.⁴⁹ It might here be more instructive to consider the signs and sign combinations that are most often found in our list as those representing true names of individuals, and to compare these entries with the most frequently attested names in the texts from the ED IIIb (ca. 2400 BC) and the Ur III (ca. 2000 BC) periods.⁵₀

---

⁴⁹ Meriggi 1975; F. Vallat 1986: 338-339; Dahl 2005a:

---

international project, the Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative (<http://cdli.ucla.edu/>), dedicated to the digital capture and dissemination of all cuneiform sources, but in its initial phases focusing on corpora of the 4th and 3rd millennia. No phase of cuneiform is so well documented online currently as is the Late Uruk period, including image and text representations of nearly all available text artifacts, both edited and unedited. Thus, digital facsimiles of nearly all proto-cuneiform texts are available for free use by all networked researchers, and are being profitably exploited by specialists in their work and publications; one successful recent example is the edition of the Cornell proto-cuneiform collection by Monaco 2007. Further, the field may expect in the next years to avail itself of a federated and persistent website that will facilitate wholesale downloads of data packages and accompanying open source software to better interpret locally the descriptions of early cuneiform texts posted by Assyriologists, by linguists and scholars from other related fields, and by informal learners alike. We may therefore be confident that in the near future the resources for study of onomastics in the archaic texts will steadily improve.
Comparing the list of proto-cuneiform personal names with those of the most common personal names or name elements in the Early Dynastic and Ur III periods, we see quite substantial differences. First is, our archaic personal names contain no obvious theophoric elements. Indeed, in this list, there is not one instance of a name that might plausibly be interpreted to include a Sumerian divine element, whereas such names outnum-ber all other examples in both ED IIIb and Ur III texts. Then also, the common elements ur, amar, a (seed) are nearly unknown in the archaic texts, and those instances of EN arranged in bold that we might consider archaic correspondences to later lugal contain other elements that make no sense if interpreted to be Sumerian. Finally, the Sumerian names of women from later periods find no counterparts in the archaic texts.

I have stated elsewhere that this search for personal names among slaves might be skewed in another telling way. We might suspect that as in later periods, and as the designations SAG+MA and ERIMa, as well as seeming prisoner scenes on many Late Uruk seals might tend to support, the chattel slaves were above all taken from foreign populations, their names thus in some non-Babylonian language. But frankly, it would surprise me if the Uruk overlords did not rename their foreign slaves with terms comprehensible to the local population, much as did the buyers of African slaves shipped to the Americas, since it is difficult to imagine that those engaged in the exchange and exploitation of humans, of whole families judged as little better than local livestock, would have made an effort to retain their native names. I can offer only indirect evidence that this may have been true. Contracts of the sale of chattel slaves in the Ur III period followed a standard format that included the name of sold persons in the form “one (slave type), PN his/her name, his/her price n shekels of silver ...”. A quick search of available documents, restricting myself for the present to only those contracts and related court records that included the phrase “PN mu-ni-im,” “PN is his/ her name,” demonstrates that some of these names are clearly of foreign origin, or are Akkadian, but that the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ED IIIb, ca. 2400 BC</th>
<th>names with this element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>names, men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dDN-… (in any position)</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugal-…</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-…</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en-… (excluding d-en-ki/d-en-lil2)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2-…</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-…</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amar-…</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lu2-…</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me-…</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nam-…</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sag-…</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>names, women</th>
<th>names with this element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nín-…</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geme2-…</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ama-…</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ur III, ca. 2000 BC</th>
<th>names with this element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>names, men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dDN-… (in any position)</td>
<td>1664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-…</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lu2-…</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugal-…</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…-mu (some = muñaldim)</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2-…</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du11/inim-…</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dingir-…</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha/he-/hu-…</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(en-…</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(amar-…</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>names, women</th>
<th>names with this element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nín-…</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geme2-…</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ama-…</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§5.5, and nd.

50 The numbers of ED IIIb and Ur III names are to be understood as very preliminary, and more relative than absolute; they are based on a count of attestations in the transliterations available to CDLI (and downloadable at <http://cdli.ucla.edu/downloads.html>). Our files contain ca. 8500 names in the Ur III period.

51 OBO 160/1, 176 n. 407.

52 A search for instances of PN1 ARAD, PN2 (“PN1, male slave of PN2”), PN1 sag nita, PN2 (“male ‘head’ of”), PN sag munus (“female ‘head’ of”) and PN1 dumu nita2/munus PN2 (“male/female child of”) in our files results in a list of more than 300 occurrences, indicating the range of numbers we might expect in a full set of chattel slave names. My quick perusal of the names of
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majority carried a plausible Sumerian pedigree. sag munus <HTMLInputElement type="text" value="db-ba₄-lu₂-sa₄-sa₄ mu-ni-im" />

In Nippur:

sag nita  nam-dumu mu-ni-im
ur-lugal mu-ni-im
lugal-ur₃-ra-ni mu-ni-im
ad-da₁(... mu-ni-im
lu₂₃-en-lil₂-l₃₂ mu-ni-im
šar-ru-a mu-ni-im
nu-ḫi-dingir mu-ni-im
lu₂₃-suen mu-ni-im
guruš i-din₃-da-gan mu-ni-im
dumu a-bi-ša-ru-um
sag munus maš-da₂-gu-la mu-ni-im
dumu a-bi-ša-ru-um
sag munus maš-da₂-gu-la mu-ni-im
dumu a-bi-ša-ru-um

In Ur:

sag nita₂ šu-gu-bu-um mu-ni-im
en-um₃-tikur mu-ni-im
₃nin-gr₂-su-ka₁-i₃₄-s₄₄ mu-ni-im
dingir-ma-li-k mu-ni-im
sag munus ta-re-ša-am₄ mu-ni-im
i₃-li₂-bad₃-re mu-ni-im

In Wilayah³:

sag nita₂ |PU₃-S₄|-ha-ia₃ mu-ni-im
sag munus na-an-na-a mu-ni-im
a-qa-ti-ma mu-ni-im
eš₁₈-dar-um-mi mu-ni-im

In Umma:

sag nita a-ba-in-da-an-e₃ mu-ni-im
dumu nita₄ a-ba-in-da-an-e₃ mu-ni-im

Isolating personal names in the proto-cuneiform texts represents an important beginning in our efforts to lemmatize all proto-cuneiform transliterations with an eye toward identifying the signs that we do understand, or that we believe we understand, and toward more broadly defining what the sign combinations represent that do not correspond to common entries in our lexical lists. I put these data up to underscore the lingering problems in determining the linguistic affiliation of the earliest Babylonian scribes. It may be doubted that the rough translation “male slave” and “female slave” are correct renderings of the proto-cuneiform signs SAL and KUR₃, but I think not reasonably that most, perhaps all, of the sign combinations discussed above in selection, and listed in the appendix below, do in fact represent personal names. They are directly, or by association categorized by Late Uruk scribes using terminology that ultimately points to SAL and KUR₃; they are found in a distinct text format that removes them from the realm of simple object designations; and they do not correspond to entries in the thematic lexical lists.

The list of presumed slave names is by no means definitive, but I think a good indication of problems inherent in the archaic Sumerian postulate. Even under the assumption that the personal names in our texts were those of prisoners of war, or of slaves imported into Babylonian bondage from regions surrounding Mesopotamia and thus were not of the “Uruk core,” sharing the language and culture of their overseers, it remains difficult to understand the absence of theophoric elements, Sumerian or otherwise. This reminds us of the fact that we have found no lexical god lists of the pantheistic form well attested in the ED IIIa period—it is in fact difficult to point to any clear evidence of anthropomorphic deities in the Late Uruk period at all, once the presumed depiction of Inanna on the Uruk Vase is put in doubt—and that such theophoric elements have not been identified in any other sign combinations that would be credible candidates for personal names. That would leave us with the common elements for males, lu₂₃, lugal, nin, ur, and ARAD₂, and for females nin, geme₂ and ama—all exceedingly rare, or missing here. If
we exchange SAL for gеме₂, and KUR₃ or 3N₅₇ or, for skeptics, even SUBUR for, say, ur, then the corresponding names in our list are not more reflective of expected early Sumerian forms. How much more agreeable this discussion would be if Langdon, now eighty years ago, had been right and not just en-lil₂-ti, but other names in this vein had been uncovered in the proto-cuneiform archives!

Appendix. List of personal names in “slave” accounts (signs of individual names have been force-sorted without regard to potential language-revealing sequences; an annotated archaic name glossary will appear in due time in the pages of the CDLI)

A AL MUN₂₁ TE
A EN₁
A KI NE₁ [...] A NAR
A NE₁ 1N₅₇
A NUNUZ₄₁
A SAG
A ṢANGA₂ [...] A ŠA ṢAK₄₄
A ṢAK₄₄ TAK₄₄ A TAK₄₄ A U₂b
A 3N₅₇
AB₁ EN₂ U₂b
AB₁ EZEN₂ X [...] AB₁ KA₉₁
AB₁ KU₆₆
AB₂ 5N₅₇
AB₂ GU₄ EN₂
AB₂ ṢANGA₂
AD₀ ṢANGA₁
AD₂ ṢANGA₁
AD₂ X
AD₂ E₂b SAL
AD₂ GI ḪI
AK₁ EN₂ GAL₂
AMA₂ AN EN₂
AMA₂ AN MA
AMA₂ ERIM₂ MUŠEN MAŠ
AMA₂ GI KI MUŠEN MAŠ ZATU₇₃₅
AMA₂ ZATU₆₂₈, N₄
AMAR EN₂ SU
AN AN GĀR
MUŠEN×2N₅₇ N₂₃
AN DU ZATU₇₃₅
AN DUB₂, NIN
AN DUR₁ EN₂ HI 1N₅₈
AN E₂¹ ME₂sembling ...
AN EN₁
AN EN₂ DU
AN EN₂ MUŞ₂₆
AN EN₂ SAG
AN EN₂ UMUN₂
AN EN₂ [...] AN EŞDA
AN GIŠ ZATU₇₃₅
AN GUM₁
AN I₂ M₂ KISI₂-h₁
AN KA₂ ME₂, NA₂
AN KI
AN L₁ ZATU₇₃₅
AN MU₂₂ SIG
AN NIMGIR
AN PIRIG₂ 3N₅₇
AN TAK₄₄ U₂b
AN TE KI GAL₂
AN UB ḪI
AN URU₁₁
AN ZI₁
AN ṢE₂ DU DUR₂ 7N₅₇
AP₂n
BA NESAG₂b
BAHAR₂₂ BU₂
BAHAR₂₂ EN₂
BAHAR₂₂ EN₂ AN
BAHAR₂₂ 3N₅₇
BALA₂ TUR₂₈
BAN₂ PAP₂
BAR’ GUG₂
BAR X [...] BAR₂₂, TAK₂₄
BAR₂, DU
BAR₂, SI
BU₁ A
BU₁ A DUR₂
BU₁ DU
BU₁ EN, KAL₂₂ MAŠ
BU₁ EN, MAŠ
BU₁ EN₂, 1N₅₇
BU₁ GI
BU₁ HAL ŠITA₂₃
BU₁ I₂b
BU₁ LAL₂₂
BU₁ MAŠ
BU₁ MUD NA₂
BU₁ MUŞ₂ ṢEN TUR
BU₂ PAP₂
BU₂ PAP₂ BU₁
BU₂ PAP₂ [...] BU₂ ŠAL
BU₂ ṢA₂₄₁
BU₁, SE₂
BU₁, ŠE₂, SUBUR
BU₁, ŠE₂, 3N₅₇
BU₁, ŞE₂
BU₁, ŠU
BU₁, ŠU₂
BU₁, SÜR₂b
BU₁, TUR
BU₁, U₂a
BU₁, UR₂
BU₁, DU₂₆ BU₂₂, DU₂₆
BE₂, DU₂₆, DI NAB
BE₂, DU₂₆ DUR₂ 3N₅₇
BE₂, DU₂₆ GUL
DA₂ E₂₃, 3N₅₇
DA₂ KA₂
DA₂ KA₂, SE₂/ŞE₂
DA₂, KU₂₂ [...] DAH
DAH [...] DANNA KUR₂
DA₂, PAP₂, SAL
DA₂, E₂₃
DA₂, KUR₂, E₂₃ ŠA
DARA₂, KAR₂
DARA₂, SI NIB
DI NAB
DI NAB NIN
DIM₂
DIM₂, DA₂
DIM₂, X
DIN E₂₃
DU BA KI
DU E₂₃, PIRIG₂, 3N₅₇
DU E₂₃, KI 3N₅₇
DU E₂₃, KU₂₂
DU E₂₃, PAP₂, TUR₂₆
DU TA₂
DU TUR₂₂ U₂b
DU, URI₂, [...] DU N₂, X
DU×DIŠ ERIM₂, LAGAB₂
DU₂, ZATU₂₆₂₆
DUG₂, SL X
DUR₂ DUR₂
DUR₂ ERIM₂, MEN₂
ZATU₂₇₁₄
DUR₂ SE₂
DUR₂ ZATU₂₇₁₄, 3N₅₇ [...] E₂₅, BU₂
E₂₅, DAH
E₂₅, EN₂, AN
E₂₅, GİR₂
E₂₅, LAM₂, MUD
E₂₅, NE₂, PAP₂
E₂₅, PIRIG₂, UDU₂
E₂₅, SAG 3N₅₇
E₂₅, SAL
E₂₅, SI ME₂
E₂₅, SUBUR
E₂₅, ZI₁
E₂₅ [...] E₂₅, BAR 3N₅₇
E₂₅, BU₂
E₂₅, KALAM₂
E₂₅, SI NAGA₂
E₂₅, 3N₅₇
E₂₅, 3N₅₈
EN₂, EN₂, E₂₅
EN₂, EZEN₂
EN₂, EZINU₂
EN₂, GIŠ₂, ŠU₂
EN₂, GUL₂, SAL
EN₂, HI
EN₂, HI KA₂
EN₂, HI RAD₂
EN₂, HI ŞA₂₁
EN₂, HI U₂₂
EN₂, UNUG₂
EN₂, IB₂
EN₂, IN₂
EN₂, KI₁
EN₂, KID₂, NUN₂
ŠU X TAK₄b U₂b UB ZI₁ ZATU659
ŠU [...] TE UNUG₄ UD₄a ZATU795
ŠU₁ URI₄a TI ZI₁a [...] UNUG₄ ZATU77₃a ZATU811 3N₅7
ŠU₂ N₂a Ti₆n₉ GIR₃c UNUG₄ [...] ZATU819 3N₅7
ŠUBUR TU₅b UR₄ TUR³b UD₅a 3N₅7
ŠUBUR X TB UnUG₅ TUR₃b 3N₅7 X 3N₅7 X [...]
ŠUBUR ŠUM TUR₅b UR₄a UR₃b URI₃a 3N₅7 [...]
ŠUBUR UB UR₅b 5N₅7 UR₆b 3N₅7 [...] 3N₅7 [...]
SURE J12a U₂b [...] ZATU659
SURE J1b U₅ 6N₅7 URI₃a ZATU77₃a
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