

Original Research Article

A decipherment of the Eteocretan inscription from Psychro (Crete)

ABSTRACT

This study presents a decipherment of Eteocretan inscription from Psychro (Crete), which was discovered in 1958 and dated to about 300 BC. The inscription was attributed to the non-deciphered Eteocretan language, while the attempted decipherments of the text included so far languages like the Hittite, Semitic, even Slavic, without remarkable results. The herein attempt of decipherment is based on the following concepts and evidence. The inscriptions that are conventionally called Eteocretan convey more than one language. These languages could not have remained exactly the same through the centuries. Eventually, they would have to be written in Greek alphabet, because of the predominant cultural context. Nevertheless, this is a script not suitable for precisely rendering the non-Greek Eteocretan languages. Therefore, the scribes would have to improvise how to approximate the Eteocretan sounds using a script made for a different language, which makes even harder to determine the language nowadays. It would be also meaningless to return once again to the languages of the previous attempts. Following the latest linguistic evidence about the Sumerian origins of the Aegean scripts and, especially, the existence of a Cretan Protolinar script, the present decipherment is conducted towards this linguistic direction.

Keywords: Psychro; Eteocretan languages; Cretan Protolinar script; decipherment.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1958, the existence of an inscription from Psychro (Crete) that belonged to the private collection of Dr. S. Giamalakis (Fig. 1) was reported by Marinatos [1]. It was engraved on a piece of stone, clearly showing by its shape that it was made to fit into an architectural triangle, namely a triangle formed over a door (in this case of a very small structure). Based essentially on Kritzas [2], Brown [3] attempted to prove that the inscription is a modern fake, mainly because it contains what appears to be syllabic signs (the three of them at the bottom), while the piece of stone has been dated to 300 BC and the Minoan syllabaries are supposed to have been extinct 900 years before. Yet, Kenanidis & Papakitsos [4] presented the necessary arguments that the inscription is genuine.



Fig. 1. The Psychro inscription [3]

The inscription was attributed to the Eteocretan language, initially by Marinatos [1] and later on by Brown [5] and Duhoux [6]. Some attempts have been made to decipher the text. The proposed languages included Hittite [7] and Semitic [8, 9], even Slavic [10]! The shortcomings of each one of the previous attempts are presented and commented by Brown [11], although the latter implies that there was only one other language spoken in Crete, apart from Greek, contrary to the linguistic evidence, since it is clear that more than one non-Greek languages were spoken in Crete [12, 13, 14].

2. METHODOLOGY

The herein attempt of decipherment is based on the following concepts and evidence. The inscriptions that are conventionally called Eteocretan convey more than one language. These languages could not have remained exactly the same through the centuries. Eventually, they would have to be written in Greek alphabet, because of the predominant cultural context (i.e., Greek). Nevertheless, this is a script not suitable for precisely rendering the non-Greek Eteocretan languages. Therefore, the scribes would have to improvise how to approximate the Eteocretan sounds using a script made for a different language, which makes even harder to determine the language nowadays [4]. It would be also meaningless to return once again to the languages of the previous attempts (see section: 1. Introduction). Following the latest linguistic evidence about the affinity of the Aegean scripts to Sumerian [15, 16, 17, 18] and especially the existence of a related Cretan Protoliner script [12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24], the present decipherment has been conducted towards this linguistic direction.

In the hands of the Sumerian Cretans, the Cretan Protoliner script could not be easily distorted, no matter how many years would have passed, because each letter should always be recognized directly as a sketch of a common cultural object. The scripts that were altered originated from Cretan Protoliner but used by people who did not have the (Archaic) Sumerian as their first language. The Sumerian (/Minoan) and other non-Greek languages were spoken in Crete at least until 300 BC and even much later [21], because of the relative geographic isolation of their speakers. This is not strange since, even in Mesopotamia, the Sumerian language remained in hieratic use until the 1st century AD [25]. Until today, although the pre-Greek languages are forgotten, they left strong phonological elements in the Cretan dialect, and even outside Crete. We do not mean the aspiration of palatals, which is a Doric and a general Indo-European phenomenon. We mean many other sounds of Asian origin that are strange to non-natives, as well as the general morpho-phonology of the Cretan dialects, which removes consonantal complexes as much as possible.

The linguistic evidences are not the only ones. There is a plethora of cultural evidences regarding the influence of the Aegean/Minoan Civilization to other civilizations, as late as the Classical era. The comparison of the Bronze Age Aegean wall paintings to the Etruscan ones reveals a remarkable resemblance [26]. Furthermore, the Minoan religion motives have survived as portrayals on the coins of Tenedos Island (Fig. 2) of the 5th and 4th centuries BC, whose thematic origins remain rather a mystery, not only for mainstream Archaeology but for Ancient Greek sources, as well [27, 28, 29]. Specifically, on the right of figure 2, the backside of the coin depicts a double axe, which was the well-known religious symbol of the Minoans. It symbolized the power and the duality of God An, the supreme deity both of Minoans [12] and Sumerians [30]. The symbol was present both in the Aegean scripts [12, 20, 21, 23] and the Sumerian Proto-cuneiform pictography [17, 22]. Consequently, the double-head on the front-side of the coin (on the left of figure 2) symbolized the same duality (masculine-feminine) of the deity. Most scholars speculate that the double-head depicts Zeus and Hera (or another popular religious/mythological couple) [29], yet in this dual form that has never been seen anywhere else, in the entire Antiquity.



Fig. 2. The Silver Drachma of Tenedos (5th century BC)

Back to the Psychro inscription (Fig. 1), it was filling a (architectural) “relieving triangle” of a chapel, being the only fully readable Eteocretan language inscription. The readers may notice that all consonants of the inscription are voiceless (‘Z’ too was not really for a voiced sound: it was the only available means to approximate the Minoan (Sumerian) /š/ at that time); the reason for that is that the Minoan, like all other Sumerian dialects, did not use any voiced consonants. Also, all words end with vowels, as was necessary in Sumerian, and those are long vowels, because this was usually the case in all Sumerian dialects: the vowels at the end of words were mostly long; otherwise short final vowels were interpreted as used, only to enable the previous consonant to be pronounced. In the case of ΕΠΙΟΙ, the final ‘I’ was in fact a semivowel (see also the interpretation in p. 200 of Kenanidis [21]).

Throughout this work, we use Latin letters for the transcription of the Minoan (/Sumerian) language and according to the phonological rules that are cited in Kenanidis & Papakitsos [31], unless stated otherwise. The sound /b/ is conveyed by ‘Π’ and /d/ by ‘Τ’, because of rule 5.0.6 (in p. 34: [31]), /j/ by ‘Ι’ because there was no other way to do it and the final /r/ has left a /j/-trace (see rule 5.0.33 in p. 37: [31]). The Sumerian /š/ is conveyed by the Greek ‘Ζ’, just like the Mycenaean Greek ‘Ζ’ that is conveyed as the Sumerian /š/ in Linear-B (see Sign *20 and *17 in p. 337: [12]). ‘Θ’ was used for the Sumerian /θ/ (pronounced like the Modern Greek /θ/) and then together with ‘Ν’ to show the pre-nasalization (see rule 5.0.15 in p. 35: [31]); there was not a more accurate way to convey the Sumerian sounds by Greek letters. The aspirated /t/ could not be conveyed by anything else than ‘Θ’. Similarly, the Sumerian aspirated /p/ could not be conveyed by anything else than ‘Φ’. Please note that in the translation of the Old Testament (Septuagint), the Hebrew /k/, /p/, /t/ are conveyed by the Greek ‘Χ’, ‘Φ’, ‘Θ’, respectively. Generally, in Akkadian and other Semitic words that passed

into Greek, there is the same transcription: e.g., the Akkadian *tarmuš* (= lupine) in Greek became *θήρμος* (/θέρμος/). Another phonologically interesting thing in this inscription is that there is not any voiced consonant, because of rule 5.0.6 (in p. 34: [31]); 'Z' is voiced in Modern Greek, but even if in Ancient Greek was voiced, as well, there was no closest Greek phoneme for conveying the Sumerian (voiceless) /š/. The length of long vowels is denoted by duplication, i.e., 'H' = /ee/.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Let us now look at the inscription. The text of the Greek alphabet says (Fig. 1): ΕΠΙΟΙ ΖΗΘΑΝΘΗ ΕΝΕΤΗ ΠΑΡ ΣΙΦΑΙ. Underneath there are three syllabograms of the Proto-linear saying "ci-ti-li". These words, in the pure Sumerian dialect of Crete can be interpreted very clearly as follows [21]:

- i. ΕΠΙΟΙ = ebi oj = /ébi or/ = this temple (chapel),
- ii. ΖΗΘΑΝΘΗ = šeeθa~tee = /šée(š)θat-ee/ = Šéeθat (a proper noun [name], as subject of an active verb),
- iii. ΕΝΕΤΗ = énedee = /é-ne-dee/ = he built;
- iv. ΠΑΡ ΣΙΦΑΙ = báarisiipii = /báari-siip-ii/ = not going to collapse.
- v. ci-ti-li = citilii = /ci-til-ii/ = to live!

Before we proceed to the interpretation of the words, let's observe the characteristic Sumerian morpho-phonology that did not allow any consonant not followed by a vowel. The complex 'NΘ' is not two consonants, but the Sumerians /t/ aspirated and with pre-nasalization, since it follows a short vowel ('A'). The sound /p/ is not pre-nasalized because a long vowel ('H') precedes. In "ΠΑΡ ΣΙΦΑΙ" a consonant ('P') is displayed as if it is not followed by a vowel, but actually after /r/ there is a short and unaccented /i/ which was hardly noticeable, and there was no way to be conveyed by the Greek alphabet. The long /ii/ was conveyed by the Greek diphthong 'AI', that those years in Koine Greek was pronounced as /aa/ (long, closed and almost frontal /a/). It is not unlikely that in the local (Cretan) Greek dialect 'AI' was pronounced approximately as in Mycenaean Greek: rear and closed; in any case long. Now let's look at the words, one by one:

[i.a]: /ébi/ in the Sumerian cuneiform is "ub", i.e., /œby/ from the older /ebi/ (see rule 5.0.4 in p. 34: [31]). This "ub" meant "shrine/chapel" and is found composite with "lil²" (wind, air, countryside) in "wr. ub-lil₂-la₂ = outdoor shrine". In one case, the letter UB alternates with "ib" and "ib-bi" (i.e., /ebi/): "wr. ub; ib; ib-bi = corner, recess; Akk. *tubqu*", which confirms that the cuneiform-sign UB was pronounced /œby/ from the older /ebi/.

[i.b]: /or/ not followed by a vowel becomes /oj/ (see rule 5.0.33 in p. 37: [31]). This in Sumerian cuneiform is "ur₅", a very common demonstrative pronoun.

[ii]: /šée(š)θat-ee/ is a Sumerian name of the most usual type, consisting of a degree of relationship + honorific adjective. The most famous Sumerian names are of this type: "Gilgames", in the classical Sumerian being "bil₂-ga-mes" = ancestor heroic; and "Dumu-zi" = "son right". Here we have "brother right". In cuneiform: /šeš/ = brother, and "zi(d)" = right, just. The /e/ of Cuneiform normally conveys a long /e/, although Cuneiform is not very accurate about vowel length, but in this case it is verified by the use of 'H' instead of an 'E'. Also /š/ at the word-end is not very accurate in Cuneiform, but here it is. The brother was called exactly like this: /šēš/. It is like these words that mean affinity and are formed by doubling the single-consonantal root: /mama/ (= mom), /baba/ (= dad), lala (= grandmother), teta (= aunt), /papu/ (= grandfather), words known to Modern Greek dialects, but also known in many other and distant languages. In this inscription, /šēš/ is simply /šē/, because consonants could not be pronounced if not followed by a vowel. Being the first component of the compound, it bears also the stress. The second component is the Cuneiform's "zi(d)", a

word with great semantic value, where the true with the good coincide, meaning: “right”, “guileless”, “fair”, “reliable”, “faithful to duty” or “sanctuary”. The Sumerian “zi(d)” was pronounced /θet/ (see rule 5.0.39 in p. 38: [31]) from an earlier /θat/ (see rule 5.0.3 in p. 34: [31]), which is what we have in this inscription. This name has the suffix /-ee/, denoting the subject of an active verb in all the Sumerian dialects. It is the best known suffix of well-known function, in Cuneiform. Thus the name Šéeθat meant “brother just/right”.

[iii]: /é-ne-dee/ is the verb /dee/, in cuneiform encountered as “du₃”, i.e., /dœ/, which means “to build/construct”. In PSD [32], the verb is listed 7061 times, in Mesopotamian tablets and ownership inscriptions. Here the verb has the /e-/ and /ne/ prefixes; this /e-/ is found as ‘i’ in Cuneiform (usually the short /e/) and it is the most common prefix in Sumerian verbs. In this inscription, Šéeθat is talking about something that he has built and the reader can see: he built the chapel, where this inscription was placed. As for the second prefix, /ne/, in Cuneiform it is found as a plain ‘n’, which along with the previous ‘i’ becomes “in”. Exactly this verbal type is found very often in Cuneiform as “in-du₃” (pronounced /énedœœ/) = he built. This /ne/ (or ‘n’) was placed before the verbal stem to indicate the person-subject of the verb in a perfect tense. Essentially, it was a remnant of the pronoun “ane” (= he/she).

[iv.a]: /báari/ is a prefix found in Cuneiform as “bar-” at the beginning of verbs with the meaning “it does not happen/done; it is not going to”. In Sumerian, there is also a common prefix “ba-” (e.g., “ba-du₃” = being built). In order to pronounce /r/, a vowel should follow, because the final consonants in closed Sumerian words were not pronounced. So an /i/ was added to become /báari-/.

[iv.b]: in /siip-ii/, the verbal stem is /siip/. This is a very common verb in Sumerian, in the form of “sig” = throw, bring down; pronounced /siiq/ in Mesopotamian (see rule 5.0.39 in p. 38: [31]). There are many standard and idiomatic relevant expressions in Sumerian Cuneiform worth seeing:

- the “wr. igi sig₁₀ = to see” is literally just like the Modern Greek “to drop an eye” (= to have a look);
- the “wr. inim sig₁₀ = to express an idea or desire” was literally “to throw a comment” (in the discussion);
- the “wr. sa₂ sig₁₀ = to plot” is literally “to throw an idea / a proposal”;
- in PSD [32], “sig₁₀” is well translated by the English “to cast” (bring down), where some not so common metaphoric meanings originate from, like the word “ki sig₁₀ = to flatten” (“ki” = earth);
- the “wr. sig₉; sig₁₀; si-ig = to place; Akk. šakānu = let down, place, put something down”;
- in the “wr. šag₄-sug₄-ga; šag₄-sug₄; šag₄-sig = waste, empty (land), emptiness, hunger, famine”, “sug₄” (or “sig”) has the passive meaning of collapsing or implosion;
- the word “sig₁₀”, which appears to have mostly active sense, could have also a passive one (“to drop”), depending on the context;
- in p. 293 of the glossary of Behrens & Steible [33], “sè(g)” (= sig₁₀) is translated as active (knock down, subdue), “temen-sig = set foundation”, but then (in p. 295: [33]) “si(g)” is translated as passive (collapsing, sinking);
- in the collection of proverbs by Gordon [34], we have a very interesting proverb: “bread (or food) fell down, the hand (that left the bread) did not know; water was poured, the hand (that poured water) did not know; however, in the arid parts of the underworld these are food and drink; the souls are grateful to the one who offered, it will bring him/her happiness”. This is mentioned because the phrase “bread fell down (on earth)” in the Sumerian text is “ninda i-sig”, where clearly “sig” has the meaning of “falling down”. It is mostly listed with the meaning of “being low” (see ETCSL [35]), but in reality it often meant “falls to the ground”.

This verb, which we have in our inscription in the form of /siip/ has much to do with the ground, indicating the meaning of “down”. What is certain is that /siip/ on this inscription corresponds to the Sumerian “sig” (mostly passive) and “sig₁₀” (mostly active), meaning “falls, collapses”; along with the affixes /báari-siip-ii/ = “not going to fall down, not going to collapse”. Now what remains to be seen is that /-ii/ at the end of /báari-siip-ii/. Certainly, some vowel had to be there, to be able to pronounce the previous /p/, but this is not the only reason. Falkenstein (in p. 1, §35.5: [36]) says that it is the “Konjugationspräfix i-” (i.e., the previously said /e-/), which is placed at the end in the form of an /a/, denoting the mood of desire (except the indicative’s). We do not agree, because that is an affix placed only at the beginning of a verbal stem and there was not any reason to be placed at the end. It is also unlikely that an /i/ would become /a/. Thus, this suffix must have been an /-aa/ (long /a/) in the Archaic Sumerian. Here, it was narrowed to /-ii/, due to vowel harmony, because the previous syllable had an /i/, which is a closed vowel, hence the suffix of /aa/ should be closed corresponding to /ii/. Thus, /báari-siip-ii/ = “not going to fall down”.

[v]: Beneath the alphabetic text, we have a small word in Protolinear: ci-ti-li = citili = /ci-ti-li/ = “to live”! This word is well known in Cuneiform as “wr. ga-til₃ = vow, an offering”. PSD [32] gives 20 instances, 13 of them as “ga-til₃” (or “ga-ti”), six as “ga-til₃-la” and one as “ga-til₃-le”. Although PSD [32] contains only 20 instances, this word was very common in Sumerian, since it is the verb “to live” that came to be used as a noun: an offer made by someone to his/her God saying “to live”, an offer for the benefit of his/her life. This word was used in proverbs too, as in: “niĝ₂ ga-til₃ nu ga-til₃ niĝ₂ ba-til nu ba-til”, which means, as far as we can understand: “the subject of the offer is not an offer, the finished work is not finished”. Namely, the one that you will offer (asking “to live”) is not offered, the work that should be done is not finished. In other words, if you will not offer to your God the necessary “ga-til₃” (the offer for the benefit of your life), you cannot complete the task you want. In the glossary of Sollberger [37], the word “ga-til₃-la” is also encountered as a proper name. Although used as a noun, basically “ga-til₃-la” was a verb meaning “to live”. The stem of the verb is /til/. The ending /-ii/ is the same as in /báari-siip-ii/. The prefix /ci-/ (“ga-” in Cuneiform) is extremely common, expressing desire or wish. In Sumerian Cuneiform, a verb with the meaning of “I want” was hardly ever used. The meaning of “I want to do something” was expressed by the prefix “ga-”, thus being a very common prefix. This word has two meanings:

- An offer (this chapel is offered to God) and
- “to live” (I make this offer for the benefit of my life).

Someone might ask: why “ti” letter is shaped differently from the tablets of Linear A/B? Because it was important that the letters of Cretan Protolinear were recognized as objects. Here, “ti” should be recognized as an arrow, called /ti/ in Sumerian, without the need for the abbreviated form used in Linear A/B due to the cramped space of the tablets and the required writing speed; but here it was possible, and desirable, to make the syllabogram more graphic. It could not be confused with /šo/ (see Sign *20 in p. 337: [12]), because “šo” (= javelin) has small horizontal line(s) below the spearhead (representing the peak bonding), whereas here the horizontal line (long enough to reach the edges of the triangle) belongs to the same (triangular) arrowhead.

4. CONCLUSION

The one who wrote this inscription used the Greek alphabet, because everybody knew it in Crete and because the Greek alphabet was the standard form of writing for inscriptions on stone (300 BC): “This chapel that Šéeθat built is not going to collapse”. The Cretan Protolinear syllabary was used almost exclusively on unbaked clay-tablets. However, the so important ritual word “citili” (= “I make this offer for the benefit of my life”) had to be written in the traditional Cretan Protolinear, in the same way that the ritual prayers, nowadays, are recited in Koine Greek, the ancient dialect of the New Testament.

REFERENCES

1. Marinatos S. Γραμμάτων διδασκάλια. Minoica: Festschrift zum 80, p. 227. Berlin: Geburstag von Johannes Sundwall; 1958. German.
2. Kritzas CB. The "Bilingual" inscription from Psychro (Crete). A coup de grâce. In: Gigli R, editor, Μεγάλοι Νήσοι Studi dedicati a Giovanni Rizza per il suo ottantesimo compleanno (published in May 2006, I, pp. 255-261), Catania, Italy; 2004.
3. Brown R. The "Epioi" fake (a.k.a. the Psychro inscription). 2011. Accessed 6 October 2014. Available: <http://www.carolandray.plus.com/Eteocretan/Epioi.html>.
4. Kenanidis IK, Papakitsos EC. The Eteocretan Inscription from Psychro (Crete) is Genuine. Anistoriton Journal. 2015; ViewPoints 14(2):1-7.
5. Brown R. The Eteocretan Inscription from Psychro. Kadmos. 1978; Band XVII/Heft 1:43 sqq.
6. Duhoux Y. L'Étéocrétois: les textes - la langue. Amsterdam: JC Gieben; 1982. French.
7. Davis S. The Decipherment of the Minoan Linear A and Pictographic Scripts. Johannesburg; 1967.
8. Gordon CH. Evidence for the Minoan Language. New Jersey; 1966.
9. Stieglitz RR. The Eteocretan Inscription from Psychro. Kadmos. 1976; 15.
10. Serafimov P. Translation of Eteocretan Epioi Inscription. 2007. Accessed 6 October 2014. Available: www.korenine.si/zborniki/zborniki07/serafimov_epioi07.pdf.
11. Brown R. Some "Translations" of the Epioi fake. 2011. Accessed 6 October 2014. Available: <http://www.carolandray.plus.com/Eteocretan/PseudoTranslation.html>.
12. Kenanidis IK, Papakitsos EC. A Comparative Linguistic Study about the Sumerian Influence on the Creation of the Aegean Scripts. Scholars Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. 2015; 3(1E):332-346.
13. Woudhuizen FC. The Language(s) of Linear A: An Updated Review Article. DO-SO-MO: Fascicula Mycenologica Polona. 2005; 6:95-121.
14. Duhoux Y. Pre-Hellenic Language(s) of Crete. The Journal of Indo-European Studies. 1998; 26(1 & 2).
15. Fischer SR. History of Writing, pp. 34-40. London: Reaktion Books; 2004.
16. Szalek BZ. Eteocretan, Linear A, Etruscan, Lemnian, Carianan, Eteocypriot and related problems in the light of heuristics and cryptology. Szczecin, Poland; 2008.
17. Davis B. Cypro-Minoan in Philistia?, KUBABA. 2011; 2:40-74.
18. Szalek BZ. Tartessian, Etruscan, Linear A, Sumerian and related problems in the light of heuristics and cryptology. Szczecin, Poland; 2015.
19. Willetts RF. The Civilization of Ancient Crete, p. 100. Oakland, California: University of California Press; 1977.
20. Kenanidis I. Eteokreetes Megaleetores. Athens: National Library of Greece; 1992. Greek.
21. Kenanidis I. Historical and Linguistic Studies: "cwepeker.doc". Kavala: Lazidou; 2011. Greek.
22. Papakitsos EC, Kenanidis IK. Additional Palaeographic Evidence for the Relationship of the Aegean Scripts to the Sumerian Pictography. Scholars Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. 2015; 3(3C):734-737.
23. Kenanidis IK. A 17th c. BC Minoan Votive Double Axe (Labrys): The Arkalochori Axe and its siblings. Anistoriton Journal. 2016; In Situ 15 (2016-2017).
24. Papakitsos EC, Kenanidis IK. Cretan Hieroglyphics: The Ornamental and Ritual Version of the Cretan Protoliner Script. Anistoriton Journal. 2016; Essays 15: No 2.
25. Campbell L, Mauricio JM. A glossary of historical linguistics, p. 196. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press; 2007.

- 324 26. Gerakis A, Katsalirou A. A Comparison of Etruscan and Aegean Wall Painting.
325 Anistoriton Journal. 2007; ViewPoints, 10: no 3.
- 326 27. Kyriakidis B, Konstas H, editors. Nobel, vol. 10: Tenedos, p. 3971. Athens: Giovanis
327 1974. Greek.
- 328 28. Touratsoglou I. The Aegean of coins. Athens: Ministry of Culture; 2001. Greek.
- 329 29. Klonizaki A, Lazongas E. Coins of Ancient Greece: Tenedos Drachma. Athens: 4π
330 (National Geographic); 2012. Greek.
- 331 30. Roux G. Ancient Iraq, 3rd Edition. London: Penguin; 1993.
- 332 31. Kenanidis I, Papakitsos EC. Yet another suggestion about the origins of the
333 Sumerian language. International Journal of Linguistics. 2013; 5(5):30-44.
- 334 32. The Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary (PSD), University of Pennsylvania. Available:
335 <http://psd.museum.upenn.edu/epsd/index.html>.
- 336 33. Behrens H, Steible H. Glossar Zu Den Altsumerischen Bau-Und Weithinschriften
337 (Freiburger altorientalische Studien, Band 6). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag
338 GmbH; 1983. German.
- 339 34. Gordon EI. Sumerian Proverbs. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, University
340 Museum; 1959. Reprinted with a Chapter by Thorkild Jakobsen, New York:
341 Greenwood Press; 1968.
- 342 35. The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature (ETCSL), University of Oxford.
343 Available: <http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/>.
- 344 36. Felkenstein A. Das Sumerische (Handbuch Der Orientalistik). Leiden: E.J. Brill;
345 1964. German.
- 346 37. Sollberger E. The business and administrative correspondence under the kings of Ur
347 (Texts from cuneiform sources, vol. 1). New York, Locust Valley: J.J. Augustin;
348 1966.
- 349