

Antichistica 9
Studi orientali 4

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano



Edizioni
Ca' Foscari

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Antichistica
Studi orientali

Collana diretta da
Lucio Milano

9 | 4



Edizioni
Ca' Foscari

Antichistica

Studi orientali

Direttore scientifico

Lucio Milano (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia, Italia)

Comitato scientifico

Claudia Antonetti (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia, Italia)

Filippo Maria Carinci (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia, Italia)

Ettore Cingano (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia, Italia)

Joy Connolly (New York University, USA)

Andrea Giardina (Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, Italia)

Marc van de Mieroop (Columbia University in the City of New York, USA)

Elena Rova (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia, Italia)

Fausto Zevi (Sapienza Università di Roma, Italia)

Direzione e redazione

Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici

Università Ca' Foscari Venezia

Palazzo Malcanton Marcorà

Dorsoduro 3484/D,

30123 Venezia

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

Venezia
Edizioni Ca' Foscari - Digital Publishing
2016

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery
Maurizio Viano

© 2016 Maurizio Viano
© 2016 Edizioni Ca' Foscari - Digital Publishing for this edition

Qualunque parte di questa pubblicazione può essere riprodotta, memorizzata in un sistema di recupero dati o trasmessa in qualsiasi forma o con qualsiasi mezzo, elettronico o meccanico, senza autorizzazione, a condizione che se ne citi la fonte.

Any part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without permission provided that the source is fully credited.

Edizioni Ca' Foscari - Digital Publishing
Università Ca' Foscari Venezia
Dorsoduro 3246
30123 Venezia
<http://edizionicafoscari.unive.it/>
ecf@unive.it

1a edizione luglio 2016
ISBN 978-88-6969-076-1 [ebook]

ISBN 978-88-7543-417-5 [print]
Edizione a stampa a cura di Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina srl

Certificazione scientifica delle Opere pubblicate da Edizioni Ca' Foscari - Digital Publishing: tutti i saggi pubblicati hanno ottenuto il parere favorevole da parte di valutatori esperti della materia, attraverso un processo di revisione anonima sotto la responsabilità del Comitato scientifico della collana. La valutazione è stata condotta in aderenza ai criteri scientifici ed editoriali di Edizioni Ca' Foscari.

Scientific certification of the works published by Edizioni Ca' Foscari - Digital Publishing: all essays published in this volume have received a favourable opinion by subject-matter experts, through an anonymous peer review process under the responsibility of the Scientific Committee of the series. The evaluations were conducted in adherence to the scientific and editorial criteria established by Edizioni Ca' Foscari.

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

Abstract

This book investigates the transmission of Sumerian literature to Syria and Anatolia (i.e. the Western periphery) during the Late Bronze Age. Sumerian is the most ancient language so far documented and remained for about three millennia the language of culture in Mesopotamia for its association with scribal education. With the end of the Old Babylonian period, Sumerian literary and lexical texts were disseminated to regions outside Mesopotamia. The volume, however, is not limited to the documentation stemming from peripheral sites but also includes a comprehensive study of contemporary Mesopotamian sources, i.e. Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian. Sumerian literature is best known through the Old Babylonian texts, to which countless studies were dedicated, while the subsequent period is poorly known and has been neglected by scholars for the scarcity of sources. Nevertheless, the Late Bronze Age is extremely important for the Sumerian literature because the process of selection and modification of texts that ended up in the first millennium canonization started in this period. Therefore, this book aims at filling a gap in our comprehension of the history of Sumerian literature. The primary objective of this book is the identification of the tradition of texts discovered in the Western periphery in comparison with second and first millennium Mesopotamian sources. The subject has been approached from different perspectives, taking into account philological, cultural, and historical aspects.

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

Acknowledgments

This book is a substantially revised and expanded edition of my Ph.D. dissertation defended at the Università degli Studi di Trieste, April 2010. This work was made possible through the sponsorship of the following grants: DAAD Post-Doctoral Fellowship at the Institute für Assyriologie und Hethitologie of the Ludwig Maximilians Universität, Munich (03/2012 – 08/2012); Government of Canada Post-Doctoral Research Fellowship at York University, Toronto (09/2012 – 09/2013); Sonia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology Post-Doctoral Fellowship at Tel Aviv University (10/2013 – 09/2014). My deepest gratitude goes to the editor of *Antichistica* Professor Lucio Milano who strongly supported and sponsored the publication of my book in this series. As co-supervisor of my Ph.D. his advice and support were of prime importance for my research. Likewise I am deeply thankful to Professor Stefano de Martino for his assistance and guidance as supervisor of my doctoral dissertation. Moreover he always encouraged me to continue along the road of academic research especially when my confidence in the future was at the lowest level.

I am grateful to Professor Walther Sallaberger for hosting me at the LMU in 2008 during my doctorate and in 2012 as DAAD fellow as well as for his helpful suggestions on critical passages of several Sumerian texts. Professor Maynard P. Maidman is to be thanked for supporting my application for the Government of Canada PDRF and for his kind hospitality at York University.

Special and warm thanks are offered to Yori Cohen. I am indebted to him for many reasons. He proposed me to apply for the post-doctoral fellowship at the Sonia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology and he gave me the opportunity to teach Akkadian at The Department of Archaeology and Ancient Near Eastern Cultures at Tel Aviv University. Moreover he read the entire manuscript and dedicated hours to discussing with me some crucial points of this work. His remarks have been essential to this book. Last but not least I thank him for the wonderful time spent in Tel Aviv and for making me feel at home. I would like to thank Graciela Gestoso Singer for her warm hospitality on my arrival in Tel Aviv.

I wish to express my gratitude to Stefano Seminara for introducing me to the world of Assyriology. He was my first teacher of Sumerian and without his inspiration my academic career would not have started. Professor Daniel Schwemer is to be thanked for his helpful comments and suggestions on my Ph.D. thesis. I am also grateful to Uri Gabbay for reading the manuscript and for his relevant remarks. It is my pleasure to thank Vanna Biga for her kind support and encouragement. I wish also to remember the support received by the late Mrs. Terzi. I must mention the critical comments of the anonymous peer-reviewers that led to several corrections and improvements.

Sincere thanks are due to my dear friend and colleague Francesca Nebiolo (EPHE) for her constant moral and practical support even in the most difficult moments over the past four years. I cannot help mentioning the many times I asked her to provide me with bibliographical material that was unavailable to me. Finally, studying Assyriology could have never been possible without the help and support of my family.

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

Table of contents

Abbreviations	17
Bibliographical Abbreviations	17
Philological Abbreviations	21
Introduction	23
1 Middle Babylonian Sumerian Literary, Liturgical and Magical Texts	33
1.1 Text Analysis	37
1.1.1 Divine Narratives	37
1.1.1.1 Enlil and Ninlil	37
1.1.1.2 Enlil and Sud	41
1.1.1.3 Inana and An	42
1.1.1.4 Inana's Descent to the Netherworld	42
1.1.1.5 Lugal-e	43
1.1.1.6 Angim	43
1.1.2 Royal Narratives	44
1.1.2.1 Sargon and Ur-Zababa	44
1.1.3 Royal Praise Poems	45
1.1.3.1 Šulgi B	45
1.1.3.2 Šulgi O	46
1.1.3.3 Hymn to Šulgi – PBS 1/1 11	47
1.1.3.4 Lipit-Ištar A	49
1.1.3.5 Lipit-Ištar and the Plow – Lipit-Ištar F	50
1.1.3.6 Praise Poem of Ḫammu-rābi	52
1.1.4 Divine Praise Poems	53
1.1.4.1 Enlil A	53
1.1.4.2 Inana C	54
1.1.5 Types of Songs	56
1.1.5.1 The Song of the Plowing Oxen	56
1.1.5.2 A Litigant's Prayer	56
1.1.6 Wisdom Texts	57
1.1.6.1 The Instructions of Šuruppak	57
1.1.6.2 The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta	58
1.1.6.3 Counsels of Wisdom	60
1.1.6.4 The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab	61
1.1.6.5 The Fowler and his Wife	62
1.1.7 Proverbs	63
1.1.7.1 CBS 8039	63

1.1.7.2	N 3395	63
1.1.7.3	N 3783 + N 5031	63
1.1.7.4	N 5447	64
1.1.7.5	UM 29-16-561	64
1.1.7.6	Ni 679	64
1.1.7.7	VAT 17353	64
1.1.7.8	MS 2065	65
1.1.7.9	MS 3310	65
1.1.7.10	MS 3323	65
1.1.8	Unidentified Literary Texts	66
1.1.8.1	3N-T 195	66
1.1.8.2	CBS 4615	66
1.1.8.3	CBS 13990	66
1.1.8.4	CBS 19831	66
1.1.8.5	N 3783 + N 5031	66
1.1.8.6	N 4529	66
1.1.8.7	UM 29-13-543	67
1.1.8.8	UM 29-15-944	67
1.1.8.9	UM 29-16-383	67
1.1.8.10	BM 81700	67
1.1.8.11	VAT 17223	67
1.1.8.12	VAT 17224	67
1.1.8.13	VAT 17357	67
1.1.8.14	VAT 17563	67
1.1.8.15	IM 13365	68
1.1.8.16	MS 3362	68
1.1.8.17	MS 3405	68
1.1.8.18	Unpublished Extract Tablets	68
1.1.9	Emesal Liturgies	69
1.1.9.1	Eršaḥuḡa to Enki – BM 78164	69
1.1.9.2	Balaḡ to Enlil	70
1.1.10	Incantations	71
1.1.10.1	Udug-ḥul Tablets VII-VIII	71
1.1.10.2	Incantation to Utu	73
1.1.10.3	Kiutu-incantation – HS 1512	75
1.1.10.4	BM 54692	76
1.1.11	Omina	76
1.1.11.1	UM 29-13-542	76
1.1.12	Royal Inscriptions	77
1.1.12.1	Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription	77
1.2	The Middle Babylonian Sumerian Literary Tradition	78
2	Middle Assyrian Sumerian Literary, Liturgical and Magical Texts	87
2.1	Text Analysis	90
2.1.1	Divine Narratives	90

2.1.1.1	Lugal-e	90
2.1.1.2	Angim	95
2.1.1.3	The Creation of Mankind – KAR 4	97
2.1.2	Divine Praise Poems	99
2.1.2.1	Ninisina C – KAR 15 - KAR 16	99
2.1.2.2	Hymn to Ninurta – KAR 97	100
2.1.2.3	A Hymn to Ninurta with Ethical Instructions – KAR 119	102
2.1.3	Proverbs	103
2.1.3.1	KAR 103	103
2.1.3.2	VAT 10810	103
2.1.4	Emesal Liturgies	104
2.1.4.1	Balaĝ-prayer to Enlil – KAR 375	104
2.1.4.2	Ritual Eršemma(?) to Enlil ^d utu-gen ₇ e ₃ -ta – KAR 9+	107
2.1.5	Tukulti-Ninurta Texts	109
2.1.5.1	Prayer to Assur for Tukulti-Ninurta I	109
2.1.5.2	A Praise Poem of Tukulti-Ninurta I	112
2.1.6	Incantations	114
2.1.6.1	Udug-ĥul Tablet XIII-XV – KAR 24 (+) BM 130660	114
2.1.6.2	Kiutu Incantation for Bīt rimki ‘Third House’ – LKA 75	116
2.1.6.3	Incantation of the Mīs pî-ritual Tablet III – VAT 10038	119
2.1.6.4	Rm 376	119
2.1.6.5	KAR 91	120
2.1.6.6	YOS 11 74	121
2.1.6.7	KAR 333	121
2.1.7	Unidentified Texts	121
2.1.7.1	KAR 113	121
2.1.7.2	BM 121117	121
2.2	The Middle Assyrian Sumerian Literary Tradition	122
3	Corpora of Sumerian Literary Texts from the Western Periphery	131
3.1	The Corpus of Sumerian Literary Texts from Ḫattuša	131
3.2	The Corpus of Sumerian Literary Texts from Emar	135
3.3	The Corpus of Sumerian Literary Texts from Ugarit	137
4	Unorthographic Writings	141
4.1	List of Unorthographic Writings	147
4.1.1	Ḫattuša	147
4.1.1.1	Babylonian Script Tablets	147
4.1.1.2	Assyro-Mitannian Tablets	151
4.1.1.3	Hittite Script Tablets	152
4.1.2	Emar	155
4.1.2.1	Syrian and Syro-Hittite Script Tablets	155
4.1.3	Ugarit	159
4.1.3.1	Babylonian Script Tablets	159
4.1.3.2	Ugarit Script Tablets	160
4.2	Graphic Alterations	165

4.2.1	Homophony	165
4.2.2	Syllabification of Logograms	168
4.2.3	CvC-signs for Cv-C(v) – Cv-vC	172
4.2.4	Additional Vowels	173
4.2.5	Scriptio Plena	177
4.2.6	Additional Consonants	179
4.2.7	Analytic Writings	180
4.2.8	Bindings	180
4.2.9	Sandhi	183
4.2.10	Short Writings	183
4.3	Phonetic Alterations	186
4.3.1	Consonants	186
4.3.1.1	Stops	186
4.3.1.2	Nasals	197
4.3.1.3	Trills and Laterals	204
4.3.1.4	Sibilants	204
4.3.2	Vowels	209
4.3.2.1	Alterations of a	209
4.3.2.2	Alterations of u	212
4.3.2.3	Alterations of e	213
4.3.2.4	Alterations of i	217
4.4	Other Alterations	221
4.5	Concluding Remarks	224
5	Sumerian Literary and Magical Texts from Ḫattuša	229
5.1	Babylonian Script Tablets	229
5.1.1	Monolingual Incantations – CTH 800	229
5.1.2	KBo 36 19 (CTH 812)	235
5.1.3	KBo 36 21 (CTH 801)	235
5.1.4	KBo 13 37 (CTH 813)	235
5.1.5	KBo 14 51 (CTH 813)	236
5.2	Assyro-Mitannian Script Tablets	237
5.2.1	Collection of Udug-ḫul Incantations – CTH 805.1	238
5.2.2	CTH 805.2-3	244
5.2.3	KUB 4 16	246
5.2.4	CTH 794	247
5.2.5	KUB 34 3	249
5.2.6	KUB 37 127	250
5.2.7	KUB 37 95	250
5.3	Hittite Script Tablets	250
5.3.1	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad – CTH 314	251
5.3.2	The Message of Lu-diğira to his Mother – CTH 315	256
5.3.3	Edubba E – KUB 57 126	265
5.3.4	The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesağ	267
5.3.5	Nergal D – KUB 4 7	271

5.3.6	KUB 4 41	273
5.3.7	KUB 4 26 (+) HT 13 (+) KUB 37 112	273
5.3.8	Incantation to Utu – KUB 4 11	274
5.3.9	KUB 4 24	275
5.3.10	KUB 37 111	275
5.3.11	KBo 1 18	279
5.3.12	KUB 4 23	279
5.3.13	KUB 34 4	280
5.3.14	KBo 36 20	280
5.3.15	ABoT 1 43	280
5.3.16	KBo 36 17	280
5.3.17	KBo 19 98	280
5.3.18	KBo 36 24	281
5.3.19	KUB 4 10	281
5.4	Unplaceable Fragments	281
5.4.1	KUB 37 41	281
5.4.2	KUB 37 92	283
5.4.3	KBo 36 14	283
5.4.4	KBo 36 18	283
6	Sumerian Literary and Magical Texts from Emar	285
6.1	Syrian School Texts	285
6.1.1	A Prayer for a King – E 775 - RS 79.25	285
6.2	Syro-Hittite School Texts	298
6.2.1	The Ballad of Early Rulers	298
6.2.2	Enlil and Namzitarra	310
6.2.3	The Fowler – E 768 - E 769 - E 770	313
6.2.4	The Letter of Sîn-iddinam to Utu – TBR 101	314
6.2.5	Unidentified Literary Text – E 776	316
6.2.6	Udug-ḥul Tablet III – E 729	316
6.2.7	Udug-ḥul Tablet IV – E 790	318
6.2.8	Tsukimoto Incantation - E 730	319
6.2.9	Saġ-geg Incantation – E 732	321
6.2.10	Unidentified Udug-ḥul Incantation – E 731	321
6.2.11	E 733 – Msk 74107q	321
6.2.12	E 740	321
6.2.13	E 743	322
6.2.14	E 744	322
6.2.15	E 745	322
6.2.16	E 751 - E 752 - E 746	322
6.2.17	E 756	322
6.2.18	Bilingual Incantations – E 757 - E 763 - E 764	323
6.2.19	Phonetic Sumerian Incantations – E 734 - Msk 74148f	323
6.2.20	Fragments of Incantations	323
6.2.21	Unidentified Text – E 777	323

7	Sumerian Literary and Magical Texts from Ugarit	325
7.1	Babylonian Script Tablets	325
7.1.1	The Ballad of Early Rulers - Proverbs from Ugarit – RS 25.130	325
7.1.2	Hymn to Enki (?) – AuOrS 23 28	327
7.1.3	Collection of Incantations – AuOrS 23 25	327
7.1.4	Collection of Incantations – AuOrS 23 27	329
7.1.5	AuOrS 23 58	330
7.1.6	AuOrS 23 59	330
7.1.7	AuOrS 23 61	330
7.2	Hittite Script Tablets	330
7.2.1	The Message of Lu-diğira to his Mother	331
7.3	Ugarit Script Tablets	331
7.3.1	A Prayer for a King – RS 79.25	331
7.3.2	The Ballad of Early Rulers – RS 23.34+ - RS 25.424	331
7.3.3	Enlil and Namzitarra – AuOrS 23 47	331
7.3.4	The Message of Lu-diğira to his Mother	332
7.3.5	The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesağ	332
7.3.6	The Fox and the Hyena – RS 86.2210	332
7.3.7	Collection of Incantations – AuOrs 23 21	334
7.3.8	AuOrS 23 13	336
7.3.9	AuOrS 23 67	336
7.3.10	AuOrS 23 68	336
8	The Sumerian Literary Tradition at attuša	337
8.1	Literary Texts	337
8.2	Incantations	339
8.3	Tablet Format	343
8.4	Tradition and Reception	345
8.5	Archival Distribution	349
8.6	Concluding Remarks	359
9	The Sumerian Literary Tradition at Emar and Ugarit	361
9.1	Literary Texts	361
9.2	Incantations	365
9.3	Bilingual Texts	367
9.4	Tradition and Reception	368
9.5	Archival Distribution and Scribes	376
9.5.1	Emar	376
9.5.2	Ugarit	377
9.6	Concluding Remarks	379
10	Conclusions	381
	Toward a History of Sumerian Literature in the Late Bronze Age	
	Bibliography	387
	Index of Cuneiform Sources	405

ai miei genitori

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

Abbreviations

Bibliographical Abbreviations

4R ²	Rawlinson, H.; Pinches, T.G. (1891). <i>The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia. Vol. IV: A Selection from the Miscellaneous Inscriptions of Assyria</i> . London
5R	Rawlinson, H.; Pinches, T.G. (1909). <i>The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia. Vol. V: A Selection from the Miscellaneous Inscriptions of Assyria and Babylonia</i> . London
A	Tablet siglum in the collections of the Oriental Institute, University of Chicago
ABAW	Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
ABoT 1	Balkan, K. (1948). <i>Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde bulunan Bogazköy Tabletleri / Bogazköy Tablets in the Archaeological Museum of Ankara</i> . Istanbul
ABoT 2	Akdogan, R.; Soysal, O. (2011). <i>Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde bulunan Bogazköy Tabletleri II / Bogazköy Tablets in the Archaeological Museum of Ankara II</i> . Chicago. CHD Supplements, 1
ADOG	Abhandlungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft
AEPHESR	Annuaire de l'École pratique des hautes études, section des sciences religieuses
AfO	Archiv für Orientforschung
AHAW	Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften
AhW	von Soden, W. (1959-1981). <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> . Wiesbaden
AION	Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli
AJSL	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures
ALASP	Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas
AMD	Ancient Magic and Divination
AnAr	Museum siglum of the Archaeological Museum of Ankara
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AoF	Altorientalische Forschungen
ArchAn	Archivium Anatolicum
ArOr	Archiv Orientalni
AS	Assyriological Studies
ASJ	Acta Sumerologica Japonica
Ashm	Museum siglum of the the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford
Ass.	Field numbers of tablets excavated at Assur
AO	Museum siglum of the Louvre (Antiquités orientales)
AT	Wiseman, D.J. (1953). <i>The Alalakh Tablets</i> . London
AuOr	Aula Orientalis; S = Supplementa
AuOrS 23	Arnaud (2007)
AUWE	Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka. Endberichte
BaM	Baghdader Mitteilungen
BAM	Köcher, F. (1963 ff.). <i>Die babylonisch-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen</i> . Berlin
BBVO	Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderer Orient
BE	The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania
Belleten	Türk Tarih Kurumu, Belleten
BeR	<i>The Ballad of Early Rulers</i>
BiMes	Bibliotheca Mesopotamica
BiOr	Bibliotheca Orientalis
BL	Langdon, S. (1913). <i>Babylonian Liturgies. Sumerian Texts from the Early Period and from the Library of Ashurbanipal, for the Most Part Transliterated, with Introduction and Index</i> . London
BoHa	Bogazköy-Hattusha. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen
BM	Museum siglum of the British Museum, London

BMS	King, L.W. (1896). <i>Babylonian Magic and Sorcery</i> . London
Bo	Field numbers of texts excavated at Boğazköy
BPOA	Biblioteca del Proximo Oriente Antiguo
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
Bu	Museum siglum of the British Museum (Budge)
CAD	The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary
CBS	Museum siglum of the University Museum, Philadelphia (Catalogue of the Babylonian Section)
CDLI	Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative
CHD	The Chicago Hittite Dictionary
CLAM	Cohen (1988)
CM	Cuneiform Monographs
CNI	Publications of The Carsten Niebuhr Institute of Ancient Near Eastern Studies
Publikations	
CNMA	Museum siglum of the Copenhagen National Museet Antiksamlingen
CRRAI	Compte rendu de la Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale
CT	Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum
CTH	Laroche, L. (1966). <i>Catalogue des textes hittites</i> . Paris
CTMMA	Corpus of Cuneiform Texts in the Metropolitan Museum of Art
CTN	Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud
CUSAS	Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology
DBH	Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie
DCSL	The Diachronic Corpus of Sumerian Literature
D-I R	<i>Dumuzi Inana R</i>
E	Arnaud (1985-1987)
ÉPHÉ	École Pratique des Hautes Études
Edin.	Museum siglum of the National Museum of Scotland, Edinburgh
ePSD	Electronic Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary
ETCSL	Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature
Expedition	Bulletin of the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania
FAOS	Freiburger Altorientalische Studien
Fossey	Fossey, C. (1926). <i>Manuel d'assyriologie. Fouilles, écriture, langues, littérature, géographie, histoire, religion, institution, art. Tome II, Evolution des Cunéiformes</i> . Paris
GAAL	Göttinger Arbeitshefte zur Altorientalischen Literatur
GAG	von Soden W. (1995). <i>Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik. 3., ergänzte Auflage</i> . Roma. <i>Analecta Orientalia</i> 33
GBAO	Göttinger Beiträge zum Alten Orient
GMTR	Guides to the Mesopotamian Textual Record
H	Field numbers of tablets excavated at Tell Haddad/Meturan
HAV	Hilprecht Anniversary Volume
HdO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
HS	Tablet siglum of the Hilprecht Collection in Jena
HSAO	Heidelberger Studien zum Alten Orient
HES	Heidelberger Emesal-Studien
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HT	King, L.W. (1920). <i>Hittite Texts in the Cuneiform Character from Tablets in the British Museum</i> . London
HZL	Ruster, C.; Neu, E. (1989). <i>Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon. Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten</i> . Wiesbaden
IBoT	Istanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde Bulunan Bogazköy Tabletleri
IM	Museum siglum of the Iraq Museum, Baghdad
ISSET	Kramer, S.; Çig, M.; Kizilyay, H. (1969/1976). <i>Istanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde bulunan Sumer edebi tablet ve parçaları (Sumerian Literary Tablets and Fragments in the Archaeological Museum of Istanbul)</i> , Vol. I/II. Ankara
IstMitt	Istanbuler Mitteilungen
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JAS	Journal of Archaeological Science
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies

JON	Siglum of a private collection in New Jersey
K	Museum siglum of the Kuyunjik collection of the British Museum in London
KAJ	Ebeling, E. (1927). <i>Keilschrifttexte aus Assur juristischen Inhalts</i> . Leipzig. WVDOG, 50
KAR	Ebeling, E. (1919/1923). <i>Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts, I/II</i> . Leipzig. WVDOG, 28/34
KAV	Schroeder, O. (1920). <i>Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts</i> . Leipzig. WVDOG, 35
KBo	Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi
KM	Museum siglum of the Kelsey Museum of Archeology at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor
KUB	Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi
LAPO	Littérature ancienne du proche orient
LB	Tablet siglum of the de Liagre Böhl Collection, Leiden
LI-LN	The Letter of Luga-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ
LKA	Ebeling, E. (1953). <i>Literarische Keilschrifttexte aus Assur</i> . Berlin
LSS	Leipziger Semitistische Studien; NF = Neu Folge
LTBA	Matouš, L.; von Soden, W. (1933). <i>Die lexikalischen Tafelserien der Babylonier und Assyrer Bd. I-II</i> . Berlin
MAH	Museum siglum of the Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, Geneva
Manchester Memoirs	Memoirs and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society
MAOG	Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft
MARV	Mittelassyrische Rechtsurkunden und Verwaltungstexte
MC	Mesopotamian Civilizations
MDOG	Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft zu Berlin
MDP	Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse
ME	Tablet siglum of Moye-Euphrate (TBR)
MesZL	Borger, R. (2003). <i>Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon</i> . Münster. AOAT, 305
MIO	Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung
MLC	Morgan Library Collection, siglum of the Yale Babylonian Collection, New Haven
MLM	<i>The Message of Lu-diĝira to his Mother</i>
MM	Museum siglum of the Abbey of Montserrat Museum, Barcelona
MMUM	Museum siglum of the Manchester Museum, The University of Manchester
MS	Museum siglum of the Schøyen Collection, Oslo
Msk	Field numbers of tablets excavated at Meskene/Emar
MSL	Materialien zum sumerischen Lexikon/Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon; SS = Supplementary Series
MVAG	Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Agyptischen Gesellschaft
MVS	Materiali per il vocabolario neosumerico
N	Museum siglum of the University Museum, Philadelphia (Nippur)
ND	Field numbers of tablets excavated at Nimrud
N-T	Field numbers of tablets excavated at Nippur (in Chicago and Baghdad)
NABU	Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires
NAWG	Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen
Ni	Museum siglum of the Archaeological Museum, Istanbul (Nippur)
NBC	Siglum of the Nies Babylonian Collection, Yale Babylonian Collection, New Haven
OBGT	Old Babylonian Grammatical Texts (MSL 4)
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OECT	Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
OLP	Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica
OIC	Oriental Institute Communications
OIP	Oriental Institute Publications
Or	Orientalia
OrAnt	Oriens Antiquus
OrSu	Orientalia Suecana
PBS	Publications of the Babylonian Section, University of Pennsylvania
Peiser Urkunden	Peiser, Kohler (1905)
PfK	<i>A Prayer for a King</i>

PIHANS	Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandaise de Stamboul
PRAK	de Genouillac, H. (1924/1925). <i>Premières recherches archéologiques a Kich, I/II</i> . Paris
PRU	Palais royal d'Ugarit
PSBA	Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology
Rm	Museum siglum of the British Museum (Rassam)
RS	Museum siglum of the Louvre and Damascus Museum (Ras Shamra/Ugarit)
RA	Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale
RE	Beckman, G. (1996), <i>Texts from the Vicinity of Emar in the collection of Jonathan Rosen</i> . Padova. HANE/M 2
RGTC	Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes
RIA	Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie
RIMB	Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Babylonian Periods
RIME	Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Early Periods
RSO	Ras-Shamra Ougarit, Paris
SAACT	State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts
SAALT	State Archives of Assyria Literary Texts
SAAS	State Archives of Assyria Studies
SBH	Reisner, G. (1896). <i>Sumerisch-babylonische Hymnen nach Tontafeln griechischer Zeit</i> . Berlin
SEL	Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico
SI-Utu	<i>The Letter of Sin-iddinam to Utu</i>
Sm	Museum siglum of the British Museum (Smith)
SMEA	Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici
SP	Sumerian Proverb Collection
SpTU	Hunger, von Weiher (1976/1988)
StBoT	Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten; Beih. = Beiheft
StOr	Studia Orientalia
StPohl	Studia Pohl; SM = Series Maior
STT	Gurney, O.; Finkelstein, J. (1957/1964). <i>The Sultantepe Tablets, Vol. I/II</i> . London
STVC	Chiera, E. (1934). <i>Sumerian Texts of Varied Contents</i> . Chicago. OIP 16
TBR	Arnaud, D. (1991). <i>Textes syriens de l'Âge du Bronze récent</i> . Barcelona. AuOrS 1.
TCL	Textes cunéiformes, Musées du Louvre
TH	Texte der Hethiter
TLB	Tabulae cuneiformes a F.M. Th. de Liagre Böhl collectae
TIM	Texts in the Iraq Museum
TMH NF	Texte und Materialien der Frau-Professor-Hilprecht-Sammlung Vorderasiatischer Altertümer (Jena), Neue Folge
UBL	Ugaritisch-biblische Literatur
UET	Ur Excavations Texts
UF	Ugarit Forschungen
Ugaritica V	Nougayrol, J. ; Laroche, E.; Virolleaud, C. ; Schaeffer, C.F.A. (1968). <i>Ugaritica V. Nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit, commentaires des textes historiques</i> . Paris. Mission de Ras Shamra, 16
UH	Udug-ḫul = Geller (2007)
UHF	Forerunner to Udug-ḫul = Geller (1985)
UM	Tablet siglum of the University Museum, Philadelphia
VAT	Museum siglum of the Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin
VO	Vicino Oriente
VS	Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler
W	Field numbers of tablets excavated at Warka/Uruk
WAW	Wisdom of the Ancient World
WVDOG	Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft
WO	Die Welt des Orients
WOO	Wiener Offene Orientalistik
WZJ	Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena
WZKM	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
YBC	Tablet siglum of the Yale Babylonian Collection, New Haven

YOS	Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts
ZA	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie
ZDPV	Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins

Philological Abbreviations

A	Akkadian
Ass	Assyrian
Bab	Babylonian
Ass-Mit	Assyro-Mitannian
fig.	figure
H	Hittite
IO	Indirect Object
LB	Late Babylonian
LBA	Late Bronze Age
L. Col.	left column
LOB	Late Old Babylonian
MA	Middle Assyrian
MB	Middle Babylonian
MS	Hittite Middle Script
NE	Not edited
NA	Neo Assyrian
NB	Neo Babylonian
NS	Hittite New Script
OA	Old Akkadian
OB	Old Babylonian
obl.	oblique
Obv.	obverse
OH	Old Hittite
OO	Oblique Object
OS	Hittite Old Script
sg.	singular
PhS	Phonetic Sumerian
pl.	plural
Pl.	plate
R. Col.	right column
Rev.	reverse
S	Sumerian
SH	Syro-Hittite Script (Emar)
Sy	Syrian Script (Emar)
Ug	Ugarit Script

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

Introduction

The subject of the present study is the Sumerian tradition in the Syro-Anatolian region during the Late Bronze Age (LBA) - 16th - 12th century B.C. The Late Bronze Age in the ancient Near East is usually termed the International Period¹ by scholars because of the relationships that were cultivated among the so-called great powers (i.e. Babylonia, Assyria, Mitanni, the Hittite kingdom and Egypt) and between the great powers and their vassals (local domains) in those centuries. This period is characterized by intense political, economic and cultural exchanges. Movements of traders, merchants, diplomats, scribes and scholars across the ancient Near East can be traced in the textual and archeological documentation. In this context Akkadian, the language of Babylonians and Assyrians, became the international language of diplomacy, correspondence and trade. Letters sent by private citizens and royal courts alike were written in Akkadian not only in Mesopotamia but also in Syria, Anatolia, and even Egypt.

Paralleling the widespread distribution of diplomatic and economic texts, literary, religious and lexical texts can be found in just about every region of the ancient Near East, written in Akkadian, Sumerian or local languages. In the Western periphery, as the area outside Mesopotamia comprising Syria and Anatolia is usually called, Sumerian literary texts were recovered in three centers only: Ḫattuša, the capital of the Hittite Empire, Emar, a city on the Middle Euphrates first under Mitannian rule and later part of the Hittite Empire, and Ugarit, the major Syrian harbor on the Mediterranean Sea.² Lexical texts were found not only at these sites but in several other places too, e.g., Nuzi, Megiddo and Alalāḫ.³

Sumerian is the most ancient language so far documented, but it is an isolated language with no known relatives in the world. Its earliest written attestations, dated to the late fourth millennium B.C., were found in the city of Uruk, in southern Mesopotamia, where Sumerian was used for economic accounts and lexical texts. The first half of the third millennium B.C., the Early Dynastic period, saw the political fragmentation of southern Mesopotamia into small city-based states. Sumerian was the current language of administrative and economic texts, lexical lists and royal inscriptions. To this period (ca. 2600 B.C.) date the earliest examples of literary texts, discovered in the cities of Fāra (ancient Šuruppak) and Abū Šalābīḫ. Some of these literary works, such as the wisdom composition *The Instruction of Šuruppak*, survived in modified and adapted forms until the late second millennium. After the Sargonic period (ca. 2350-2200 B.C.), when the use of Sumerian was reduced in favor of Akkadian, Sumerian flourished anew during Gudea's dynasty and the Ur III period. Under the kings of the Third Dynasty of Ur (2112-2004), Mesopotamia was unified as a political and administrative entity. The vast collection of tablets (over 60000 published texts)⁴ yielded by the Ur III chancellery comprises mostly administrative texts and royal inscriptions but a small number of literary texts are also preserved. These are the remains of a larger corpus that with further modification and adaptation was (partially) adopted in scribal schools of the Isin-Larsa and Old Babylonian periods (2004-1600). After the fall of the Ur III dynasty and the collapse of its centralized administrative system, Sumerian went out of use as a spoken language by the 19th century,⁵ even though a certain level of proficiency was probably retained in scribal schools.⁶

1 Liverani 1994.

2 A single Sumerian incantation was found at Alalāḫ, AT 453.

3 Hallo 1992, 80, with bibliography; see also van der Toorn 2000; for literacy in Late Bronze Age Syria see van Soldt 2013.

4 Jagersma 2010, 5.

5 On the death of Sumerian see Edzard 2000, Michalowski 2000, Jagersma 2010, 9-10.

6 Sjöberg 1975b, 161-162.

The bulk of Sumerian literature is known from the Old Babylonian scribal schools and particularly from those of the city of Nippur, the major cultural and religious center of southern Mesopotamia due to its status as the seat of the god Enlil, the principal deity of the pantheon. These texts are the products of scribal education, resulting from the effort of non-native speakers to learn to read and write Sumerian. The Old Babylonian Nippur tablets date to the second half of the 18th century. The Old Babylonian literary corpus resulted from the expansion and adaptation of selected texts of the Ur III repertoire, while at the same time new compositions were created.⁷

In the second half of the second millennium B.C., Sumerian had been a dead language for over half a millennium, but it continued to function as a written language of scholarship and education in scribal circles, very much like Latin in the Middle Ages. In an environment in which only a small percentage of the population was educated to read and write, scribal schools remained for over three thousand years centers for the transmission of literacy and culture. Scribes were trained in the cuneiform script. Sumerian was the principal part of this training, because the study of cuneiform was always associated with Sumerian, even when it had gone out of use as a spoken language. The cuneiform system, invented to write Sumerian, was adopted by many different languages, but always preserved its logographic character. A knowledge of Sumerian was indispensable for every scribe, in Mesopotamia as well as in the whole cuneiform world, because Sumerograms were used as logograms to write texts in all languages and in all text genres, from economic accounts to the most advanced literary works. Sumerian was learnt not only in its homeland, the south of Mesopotamia, but all over the ancient Near East when the cuneiform script was adopted in regions such as Syria and Anatolia. In addition to the practical use of Sumerian, a cultural interest in Sumerian literature ensured its preservation in scribal circles. In the Old Babylonian schools, however, Akkadian was also taught; in particular, Akkadian wisdom texts were commonly used in schooling during the Late Old Babylonian period, as the surviving literary catalogues indicate.⁸ In the post-Old Babylonian period Akkadian became more relevant in scribal education.⁹ Sumerian texts were copied and transmitted in the scribal schools for centuries, probably until the first centuries of the Christian era.¹⁰

Our comprehension of the educational system during the Old Babylonian period has been considerably improved since the pioneering studies of Sjöberg (1975b) and Vanstiphout (1979). In recent years interest in the function of the scribal school, or *e₂-dub-ba*, and its curriculum has grown, as reflected in several studies devoted to the topic.¹¹ Education in the Old Babylonian period took place in private houses,¹² often but not exclusively within family circles.¹³ Sumerian was the main focus of this training and Sumerian literary texts were primarily pedagogic tools. Physical examination of epigraphic material has led to major insights into Old Babylonian schooling, particularly with respect to the relationship between the texts learned in school and the tablets on which they were written. Literary texts, as well as lexical lists, were inscribed on several tablet types that served various uses. Civil's classification of tablets includes the following types:¹⁴

7 For a history of Sumerian literature see Hallo 1976.

8 Sallaberger 2010, 307-309.

9 Cohen 1988, 12, Groneberg 2003.

10 For the last cuneiform texts see Geller 1997.

11 Vanstiphout 1995, Veldhuis 1996, Veldhuis 1997, Tinney 1998, Tinney 1999, Vanstiphout 1999, Veldhuis 2000a, Veldhuis 2000b, Robson 2001, Robson 2002, Delnero 2006, Veldhuis 2006, Delnero 2010, Tinney 2011, Delnero 2012.

12 Veldhuis 1997, 23-28. On the relation between private and public spheres in the OB educational system see Veldhuis 1996, 13-14.

13 Tinney 1998, 49.

14 Civil 1995. For lexical lists see Veldhuis 1997, 28-40; for literary texts see Tinney 1999, 160, Delnero 2006, 82-84.

Type I: Large multicolumn tablets containing one long composition or several shorter texts (*Sammel tafeln*).

Type II: Tablets inscribed with different material on each side: the obverse contains a two-column exercise with the teacher's model on the left and the student's copy on the right; the reverse contains an extract from a different text. Literary texts are rarely attested on Type II tablets.

Type III: The so-called *imgidda* is a single-column tablet containing an excerpt of a longer composition (ca. 40-60 lines) or a complete shorter text.

Type IV: Lentil-shaped tablets containing an excerpt of few lines.

Type P: Prisms inscribed with either a long composition or a collection of several texts.

This classification is primarily based on Nippur tablets but comparable types were found in all the Old Babylonian sites where school material was discovered, such as Ur, Uruk, Sippar and Kiš. The continuation of this system can be traced in later periods and in the Syro-Anatolian documentation as well, even though major differences can be detected. Multicolumn tablets are indeed attested in the Sumerian textual production of Ḫattuša and Emar but they serve a purpose different from the OB type. Multicolumn tablets (more than two columns) from the Western periphery are inscribed with a single composition written in different versions, i.e. Sumerian, phonetic Sumerian, Akkadian and occasionally Hittite (see below). The best examples of these multicolumn tablets are the manuscripts containing the *Ballad of Early Rulers* from Emar and *The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother* discovered at Ugarit, but stemming from Ḫattuša. Prisms are only known from the Hittite capital. A new type of tablet, Type V, developed in the LBA, but it is restricted to the Kassite documentation. This is a pillow-shaped tablet with text lines written in different orientations on the two sides: the obverse contains an extract (few lines) of a literary text with lines written along the long side, the reverse has an excerpt of a lexical list with lines written along the short side. Extract tablets are known from Emar and Ugarit where they were used for lexical lists, but no lentil-shaped or Type V tablets are attested. Also the social setting of the OB *Edubba* is reflected in the LBA scribal schools. The family-based schooling system clearly stands out at Ḫattuša,¹⁵ Emar¹⁶ and Ugarit.¹⁷

On the basis of tablet types, the sequence in which texts appear on specific tablet types and the occurrence of texts on the so-called literary catalogues (lists of literary compositions probably used for archival purposes but containing compositions learned in school),¹⁸ modern scholars were able to reconstruct the scribal curriculum during the Old Babylonian period. Three progressive pedagogic phases can be distinguished according to level of difficulty.¹⁹ The first or Elementary Phase, as reconstructed by Veldhuis,²⁰ includes lexical lists, model contracts and proverbs. After preparatory exercises in impressing combinations of wedges on clay, pupils proceeded from elementary lists up to very complex lexical texts. Mathematical texts²¹ were learned along with the most advanced lexical lists, followed by model contracts. At the end of the first phase samples of literary compositions were introduced in the form of proverbs. Vanstiphout²² identified the royal praise poem *Lipit-Ištar B* as an

¹⁵ Beckman 1983.

¹⁶ Cohen 2012a.

¹⁷ van Soldt 1995.

¹⁸ According to Delnero 2010, literary catalogues do not list compositions in the sequence in which they were learned in school but are simply inventories. Nevertheless, as he admits (Delnero 2010, 53), they list texts copied as scribal exercises.

¹⁹ On the literary genres taught in the curriculum and on schooling in general see Waetzoldt 1989, Vanstiphout 1995, Vanstiphout 1999.

²⁰ Veldhuis 1997, 41-64.

²¹ For mathematical tablets see Robson 2002.

²² Vanstiphout 1979.

elementary literary text that was presumably learned in school after the Elementary Phase, on the basis of its occurrences on Type IV tablets. Three other literary texts, namely *Iddin-Dagan B*, *Enlil-bani A* and *Nisaba A*, were later identified by Tinney²³ as copied at the same stage as *Lipit-Ištar B*. This group of four compositions, called the Tetrad by modern scholars, belongs to the Intermediary Phase together with other short compositions such as didactic pieces, Edubba texts,²⁴ literary letters etc. Tinney also identified a group of ten compositions that occur as the first entries in literary catalogues, dubbed the Decad, as part of the Advanced Phase. Even though the sequence in which texts from the Advanced Phase were learned cannot be assumed on the basis of the catalogues,²⁵ it is clear that the Decad includes some of the compositions most commonly studied in Old Babylonian Nippur. Further popular literary texts, which Robson²⁶ called the House F Fourteen, form a group of fourteen compositions found in more than ten exemplars in the scribal school House F in Old Babylonian Nippur. Unsurprisingly, the Advanced Phase is associated with a fluid group of texts, and the teacher had some latitude in choosing which texts to use.

Elementary Phase	Writing Exercises Elementary Lists Ur-ra Advanced Lists Mathematical Tablets Model Contracts Proverbs
Intermediary Phase	Tetrad Short Literary Compositions
Advanced Phase	Decad House F Fourteen Further Long Compositions

Reconstruction of the scribal curriculum is based on sources from Nippur, but the same texts were found in other southern Babylonian cities. Šulgi's claim to have founded scribal schools at both Ur and Nippur underlines the similarity between the corpora in the two cities.²⁷ The repertoire of Northern Babylonian²⁸ schools was comparable to what we find in the south although with important recensional and orthographic variants, as we will see. From a comparative perspective the study of the OB curriculum allows us to place material from later times, in our case the LBA, within the schooling process. This is also relevant to understanding the function of Sumerian texts in the Western periphery and the level of proficiency reached by scribes. As will be demonstrated in detail, the Sumerian literary texts transmitted to Western regions belong to the Intermediary Phase: this was the highest level of Sumerian education required by Syrian or Hittite scribe. The compositions of the Advanced level were replaced by Akkadian literary pieces as a consequence of the acquired prominence of Akkadian in schooling.

The LBA represents, in terms of Sumerian literature, the Middle Babylonian period and is generally considered to be the moment when the canonization of the Ur III/OB Sumerian literary corpus

23 Tinney 1999.

24 Edubba texts are literary compositions regarding the scribal school.

25 See remarks in Delnero 2010.

26 Robson 2001.

27 Hallo 1976, 198.

28 Note that 'Babylonia' here refers to central-southern Mesopotamia and 'Babylon' to the city; Northern Babylonia indicates the upper part of southern Mesopotamia, namely the Sippar area and the Diyala region.

which was transmitted to the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian libraries started.²⁹ Canonization³⁰ is the outcome of a long process of textual transmission resulting in a final version which is no longer modified.³¹ During the Middle Babylonian period, OB Sumerian texts went through a process of selection by scribes and only some compositions were transmitted, whereas others were no longer copied. Some texts were passed on as they had been received, but in most cases they were modified and adapted according to cultural tendencies, and usually an Akkadian translation was added to the monolingual Sumerian version. At the same time, new bilingual texts were created, notably liturgical texts in the Emesal dialect,³² but also compositions in the main dialect. For religious and magical texts, canonization ended in the compilation of series comprising a fixed number of tablets with a stable sequence.³³ Long compositions that survived into the post-Old Babylonian period are almost exclusively limited to the myths related to the god Ninurta, *Lugal-e* and *Angim*, which however are never found outside Mesopotamia. Nevertheless, shorter divine narratives are quite well attested until the first millennium. Divine hymns survived to a very limited extent. Royal hymnology, which represented the core of scribal education in the Old Babylonian period, lost its role in the cult setting with the collapse of the system of UR III-OB courts. Only a limited number of royal praise poems survived after the Old Babylonian period. Wisdom literature is a genre well represented in the post-Old Babylonian period: proverbs and short reflective compositions were very popular especially in the Western periphery.³⁴ Wisdom bears the legacy of a traditional knowledge that always represented a paradigmatic reference for ancient Near Eastern populations. Emesal liturgies continued to be tradited, blossoming in the first millennium because they were associated with religious institutions which survived and developed after the Old Babylonian period.³⁵ As will be demonstrated in detail, Sumerian literary texts from the LBA had not yet reached the standardized form they display in the first millennium. Thus canonization was not yet accomplished in the Kassite period,³⁶ but occurred later.³⁷ Likewise the texts from the Second Dynasty of Isin that are probably reflected in Middle Assyrian documentation do not represent the final 'canonical' version, but were further modified in the first millennium. However, some Sumerian literary texts from Ḫattuša and Ugarit such as the *Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ* show a high degree of stability between LBA and first-millennium sources. This indicates that some compositions had reached their 'canonical' form already in the LBA. Therefore the Middle Babylonian period was a fluid moment in which diverse stages – i.e. *seniores* and *recentiores* – of the canonization process coexisted. Even a single composition could be available in different versions as exemplified by the *Ballad of Early Rulers*.

The raid on Babylonia led by the Hittite king Muršili I (1595 B.C.) brought the Old Babylonian period to an end with the fall of the first dynasty of Babylon. From this moment on, Sumerian and Akkadian texts spread to regions outside Mesopotamia, reaching Syria and Anatolia in the west and Susa in the east. As outlined above, dissemination of Mesopotamian scholarly material is related to the transfer of knowledge of the cuneiform script, and Sumerian texts were used in the Western periphery scribal schools as learning tools. Sumerian texts transmitted to Syria and Anatolia may be grouped in three main categories: lexical lists, which represented the core of the scribal training, medical magical texts, used in rituals and to repel diseases, and literary texts. Notwithstanding its importance, the Middle Babylonian Sumerian literary tradition is poorly known because of the scarcity of sources. Archeological excavations on Kassite sites and levels were undertaken only to

29 Cooper 1971, 1-8, Hallo 1976, 198-201, MSL XIV, 168-169, see also Falkenstein 1953.

30 For canon and canonization see Hallo 1990, Hallo 1991.

31 For techniques of canonization see Hallo 1991, 12-15.

32 Falkenstein 1953, Hallo 1976, 187, Cohen 1981, 2 n. 7.

33 Falkenstein 1931, 7-15.

34 For the wisdom literature in LBA Syria see Cohen 2013.

35 Cohen 1981, 4-6.

36 The ongoing process of canonization during the Kassite period can be observed for the divinatory texts, see Heeßel 2011.

37 Standardization and compilation of series is clearly documented in the Second Dynasty of Isin for the SA.GEG omina, Finkel 1988, see also Heeßel 2011, 193-195.

a limited extent, and for many epigraphic finds discovered during old campaigns or illegal excavations, provenance and dates are uncertain. In addition, several relevant sources remain unpublished such as the school tablets from Nippur³⁸ and Babylon.³⁹ Material from the Western periphery indeed represents one of the main sources for the study of Sumerian literature in this period.

Previous research on the Middle Babylonian Sumerian texts is limited to studies which concern individual literary works⁴⁰ or are restricted to editions of compositions which include the few relevant Middle Babylonian manuscripts but pay little attention to their special importance in the context of the transmission and preservation of Sumerian literature.⁴¹ Akkadian literature received more attention from scholars, and some studies have been devoted to the diffusion of Akkadian literary compositions in Syria and Anatolia.⁴² For instance the epic of Gilgameš attested at Ḫattuša, Emar, Ugarit and Megiddo, as well as in the Middle Babylonian documentation of Nippur and Ur, has been the focus of many contributions.⁴³ Sumerian literary texts from the Western periphery have been neglected by scholars because they fall outside the specific competence of both Sumerologists, who usually deal with the much wider production of the third and early second millennium, and Hittitologists and western Semitists, who are focused on the local cultural milieu. Indeed, reading Sumerian texts from Syria and Anatolia is not an easy task, for the manuscripts present a variety of aberrant spellings, morphological anomalies, and phonetic alterations. Hence, there are no studies comprehensively dealing with the Sumerian tradition in the Late Bronze Age and the question of how and why these texts and the cultural knowledge they contain were transmitted. The study of the Sumerian texts from Syria and Anatolia is not only relevant for the Western periphery, it represents an indispensable source for the history of Sumerian literature in general. In fact, it allows us to fill the gap in our knowledge of Sumerian literature from Mesopotamia during the Late Bronze Age that, as noted above, is only partially preserved. A study on the Sumerian material from the Western periphery also needs to address the contemporaneous sources from Mesopotamia in order to identify their place in the tradition and their relation to the Syro-Anatolian texts. For this reason the present work also includes a comprehensive survey of the Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian tablets published so far.

The object of this study is limited to the literary material; as a consequence lexical lists are not addressed. Here, however, the term 'literature'⁴⁴ has been used in a broad sense to include texts that stem from praxis, such as incantations and Emesal liturgies.⁴⁵ These text types were not part of the scribal curriculum but were used in magical and liturgical contexts. Incantations, denoted by the Sumerian word *en₂*, Akkadian *šiptu*, belong to the realm of magic, and were designed as tools to remove diseases. Incantations demand divine intervention, usually by the couple Enki/Ea and Asalluḫi/Marduk, in order to release the patient from demons that were believed to cause illnesses. They encode magical, religious and medical knowledge, and in order to have effect incantations were recited by an *āšipu*, the incantation priest. This material has been taken into consideration since, as in the case of Ḫattuša, most of the Sumerian texts are incantations. Moreover, incantations appear at the dawn of Sumerian literature in the same contexts where literary texts and lexical lists were found.⁴⁶ The tablet collection from Meturan bridges the literary-practical boundary, offering a mixed group of texts.⁴⁷ The specialized training of *āšipūtu*-apprentices also included literary and

38 Veldhuis 2000a.

39 Pedersén 2005.

40 Falkenstein 1939, Cooper 1971, Cooper 1972, Dietrich 1992, Dietrich 1998.

41 See for instance the editions of *The Song of the Plowing Oxen* in Civil 1976, the hymn *Inana C* in Sjöberg 1975a, and the myth *Angim* in Cooper 1978.

42 Dietrich 1988, Dietrich 1991, Dietrich 1996, Kämmerer 1998, Seminara 2000.

43 George 2003, 24-27, 287-347; see the studies of Beckman 2003, Klinger 2005, Archi 2007.

44 On the term 'literature' in Sumerian see Veldhuis 2003.

45 For the definition of incantations and Emesal liturgies as non-curricular texts see Tinney 2011, 584-588.

46 Incantations also contain literary language and poetic structures, see Veldhuis 1991, 58-59, Veldhuis 1999.

47 Tinney 2011, 589-590.

curricular texts. In the third millennium, incantations represent the most popular genre of Sumerian literature and Ebla incantations are the oldest pieces of Akkadian literature.⁴⁸ Incantations were also learned in scribal schools⁴⁹ although to a limited extent.⁵⁰ Emesal liturgies were not transmitted to the Western periphery but are attested in the Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian documentation; thus they represent an additional source of information on the Sumerian tradition in Mesopotamia during the Late Bronze Age. Emesal texts are cultic liturgies used in religious ceremonies officiated by the *Gala*-priest.⁵¹ Old Babylonian tablets containing Emesal texts are predominately not from Nippur, but from Northern Babylonia, likely Sippar. This material was found during the 19th century excavations that are acknowledged to have targeted the mound of Sippar, and then purchased on the market by several museums including the British Museum and the Vorderasiatische Museum. It is unclear why only a limited number of Emesal texts were recovered at Nippur, and perhaps this quantitative difference derives from archaeological accident;⁵² in any case Northern Babylonian tablets remain our primary source for this text type. These sources reveal a specific segment of the Sumerian tradition.⁵³ A further reason for including Emesal lamentation liturgies in the present study is that, like incantations, they were learned in the schools,⁵⁴ although they were not part of the regular curriculum.

Sumerian texts from the Western periphery are not (yet) known from contemporaneous Mesopotamian sources, and often not even from earlier and later periods. This holds true for some Akkadian literary compositions as well. These features led some scholars to argue that Sumerian as well as Akkadian texts underwent modification and adaptation to the local cultural milieu when they reached the Western periphery. As will be demonstrated in the present study, there are no grounds for such a claim. Sumerian texts from Western regions represent part of the lost Mesopotamian repertoire of the Late Bronze Age. Modification and adaptation, which can be detected in the Sumerian texts from Syria and Anatolia through comparison with Old Babylonian recensions, occurred within the Mesopotamian tradition as a result of the process of selection and reworking operating in the Middle Babylonian scribal schools. Over time and space, texts were subjected to modification with regard to content, grammar, phonetics and writing. The corruption and alteration of Sumerian, which had already started in the Old Babylonian period under the influence of Akkadian, became stronger in the second half of the second millennium, especially in texts from Syria and Anatolia, where the knowledge of both Akkadian and Sumerian was weaker than in Mesopotamia. Sumerian texts from the Western periphery are based on Mesopotamian models, whether they were physically transported to Syria and Anatolia in the form of tablets or whether they were transmitted by traveling Mesopotamian scholars who knew texts by heart. Generally, this analysis will show that intentional modification of Sumerian texts did not occur in the Western periphery.

The principal goal of this work is to understand the process of dissemination of Sumerian literature in the Western periphery. This is tied to the identification of the tradition of the textual material. As mentioned earlier, our knowledge of the Old Babylonian Sumerian literary corpus is primarily based on the tablets from Nippur that account for 83% of the total number of manuscripts.⁵⁵ The central role of the city of the god Enlil is not an accident of archaeological discovery but was recognized in

48 Cunningham 1997, 5-9.

49 Veldhuis 1999, 36 n. 5 with further bibliography.

50 Michalowski 1985, 216-217.

51 Cohen 1981, 3-6.

52 Tinney 2011, 586, suggests that only contexts that provide curricular texts were the target of archaeological excavations at Nippur. According to J. Peterson (personal communication) there are ca. 100 tablets and fragments from Nippur scattered across Philadelphia, Istanbul and Jena.

53 Krecher 1966b, 14-15.

54 Löhnert 2009, 82-86.

55 Tinney 2011, 578-581.

antiquity.⁵⁶ In an Old Babylonian literary letter⁵⁷ it is explicitly stated that there is no place where one can learn the scribal art as in Nippur, and that the Isin school should be inspired by the one in Nippur. The Nippur scribal school represents our primary source for the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition that was generally adopted in Mesopotamia.⁵⁸ Other streams of tradition are known from the Sumerian literary documentation. One flourished at the court of the dynasty of Larsa and was characterized by a corpus of texts virtually absent from the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition⁵⁹ and featuring a language with a strong local coloring. A further stream of tradition has been identified in the texts found in the Northern Babylonian centers such as Sippar, Kiš, Tell Hadad-Meturan and Tell Harmal-Šaduppum. In particular, Sippar had a preeminent religious role in the whole northern Mesopotamia similar to that of Nippur in the South.⁶⁰ The Northern Babylonian repertoire did not substantially differ from the Nippur corpus, as is clear from the Meturan findings⁶¹ and from the compositions listed in a literary catalogue from Sippar.⁶² Nevertheless texts may show strong recensional variants.⁶³ Moreover texts such as *Incantation to Utu*,⁶⁴ *Kiutu*⁶⁵ incantations, and more generally texts centered on the Sun-god, seem to be peculiar to Northern Babylonia and are unattested in Nippur. Also Emesal lamentations primarily stem from Northern Babylonia. One of the main differences of the Northern Babylonian Sumerian texts concerns orthography.⁶⁶ Many texts produced in Northern Babylonian scribal schools were written according to a substantially different orthographic convention that scholars call phonetic or unorthographic writing (for this term see below); it consists in replacing logograms with syllabograms, e.g. du-mu for dumu, i-gi for igi. This orthographic convention, attested in Mesopotamia since the third millennium, was adopted to a greater extent in Northern Babylonia during the (Late) Old Babylonian period. Unorthographic texts comprise compositions already known in standard orthography as well as texts unattested in other corpora. However, it must be remembered that not all the texts from Northern Babylonia are written in phonetic orthography. The tradition of phonetically written Sumerian texts survived in Northern Mesopotamia up to the first millennium as attested in the tablets from Sultan Tepe.⁶⁷ A few unorthographic texts such as *Incantation to Utu* have also come down to us in MB copies.

Identification of the tradition(s) of the Sumerian literary and magical texts from the Western periphery is an extremely complicated and often unsolvable question. The subject of the tradition of the LBA Sumerian literary texts will be approached from different perspectives, taking into account philological, cultural and historical aspects. The identification of a single text cannot be based on a unique criterion; several aspects must be taken into account. One is orthography because several manuscripts present phonetic writings. However, one must be aware that the presence of unorthographic writings is not *per se* a clear indication of the Northern Babylonian tradition. For instance a group of monolingual incantations from Ḫattuša (CTH 800) probably rely on the Northern Babylonian

56 Sjöberg 1975b, 176.

57 Kleinerman 2011, 194-198, see also Löhnert 2009, 83.

58 The mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition is understood here as a repertoire of texts widespread in Mesopotamian scribal circles that is known to us mainly from Nippur. However, texts that are not Nippur compositions, even though mostly preserved in Nippur copies, such as *The Instructions of Šuruppak*, can be attributed to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. Conversely, not all the Nippur texts belong to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition if they only reflect a local tradition. Obviously, this definition does not pretend to be a fixed classification and is subject to modification.

59 As will be seen (§ 6.2.4), only royal praise poems belong to the Larsa corpus, whereas literary letters are Nippur compositions.

60 Myers 2007.

61 Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993a, 95.

62 See Tinney 1999, 168.

63 See Michalowski 2003, 111.

64 This is a composition attested in the MB documentation as well as at Ḫattuša, §§ 1.1.10.2, 5.3.8.

65 For this incantation see §§ 1.1.10.3, 5.2.4.

66 See § 4.

67 Reiner, Civil 1967, 209.

tradition because they are completely written in phonetic orthography, and their phonetic writings reveal close similarities with the Old Babylonian unorthographic texts from Northern Babylonia. On the other hand, phonetic versions added on multicolumn tablets to texts written in standard orthography are not indicative of the Northern Babylonian tradition. They may only reveal that the copyist was learned in the phonetic orthography convention that was likely drawn from Northern Babylonian scribal tradition. To give an example, it will be argued that *The Ballad of Early Rulers* that was copied on a multicolumn tablet with a phonetic version in addition to the text written in standard orthography probably belonged to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. A further criterion adopted is genre. As mentioned above, texts related to the Sun-god are likely to be a product of Northern Babylonian scribal circles regardless of their orthography. Two compositions, *Incantation to Utu* (KUB 4 11) and a *Kiutu* incantation (CTH 794), stem from Ḫattuša. Comparison with the earlier (Old Babylonian) and contemporaneous (Middle Babylonian) Mesopotamian Sumerian literary texts can provide considerable information on the tradition of the Syro-Anatolian texts. For other compositions the identification of the tradition remains an educated guess. The Sumerian documentation from Syria and Anatolia that spans a long period does not represent a monolithic tradition. Nevertheless it is plausible that the majority of the Sumerian literary and magical texts were transmitted by scribal schools located in regions close to Syria and Anatolia (Northern Babylonia, Babylon) regardless of their literary tradition. Differences between earlier and later corpora will allow us to understand the place of the LBA Sumerian texts in the context of the transmission and preservation of Sumerian literature. This study will show that the corpus of Sumerian literary texts from the Western periphery does not reflect a homogeneous phase. Indeed, transmission of this material occurred in several waves reflecting different stages of the process of selection and standardization of the Old Babylonian corpus.

A philological and grammatical analysis of the documentation will be the basis of this study as it provides one of the principal ways to identify the stream of tradition. Notably, text analysis will distinguish between alterations, modifications and scribal habits which can be traced back to any segment of the Mesopotamian Sumerian literary tradition – i.e. traditionally motivated changes and features – and those, if any, that were produced in Syria and Anatolia as a result of copying by local scribes. To anticipate some results of the present work, most of the anomalies can be traced back to the Old Babylonian Sumerian literary tradition. Only in a few cases can anomalies be attributed to local copyists.

The Sumerian texts discovered in the Western periphery are far removed from the cultural milieu in which they had been created. Therefore, another important objective of the present work is to identify the function and cultural value of these texts in their new scribal and social context. In southern Mesopotamia, in cities such as Nippur or Ur, Sumerian was a primary part of the people's cultural heritage, but in Syria and Anatolia it must have been perceived as something alien or at least unusual.

A terminological note is required. According to the definition provided by Cooper (2000), the terms 'phonetic'/'unorthographic' and 'writing'/'spelling' will be used interchangeably to indicate writings deviating from the standard orthography. Additionally, as far as possible, the term 'text' will be used for the reconstructed wording of a literary work or composition. The material attestation of a text inscribed on a cuneiform tablet will be referred to as a 'manuscript' or 'copy'. 'Version' in regard to bilingual and multilingual texts identifies the various realizations of a single text, namely standard Sumerian or unorthographic Sumerian and Akkadian and Hittite translations. 'Recension' defines a series of manuscripts of a composition, roughly dated to the same period, and showing only minor variants.

The material will be presented according to its provenance. To each manuscript or group of manuscripts associated with a single composition will be dedicated a section containing grammatical and philological analysis. This study begins by presenting the material from Mesopotamia: Middle Babylonian (Chapter 1) and Middle Assyrian (Chapter 2) Sumerian literary and magical texts. This choice is intended to provide the reader with a comprehensive overview of the tradition of Sumerian texts from Mesopotamia that will provide the standard for comparison. This material will be organized according to types of compositions; it follows, with only a few modifications, the usual classification of Sumerian literature into divine narratives, divine praise poems, royal praise poems, wisdom compositions, liturgical (Emesal) texts and incantations. Chapter 3 provides an introduction to the

Syro-Anatolian material with the list of manuscripts and a brief description of sites and find-spots. Chapter 4 will be dedicated to the analysis of the phonetic writings contained in the Sumerian texts from Syro-Anatolian archives. Orthographic and phonetic anomalies will be compared with those attested in the OB unorthographic texts. This will allow us to define the knowledge and tradition of the syllabary used by scribes who copied Sumerian literary and magical texts discovered in the Western periphery. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 will be devoted to the documentation from Ḫattuša, Emar and Ugarit respectively. Within each chapter, manuscripts will be presented according to their scripts. Indeed, tablets from the Syro-Anatolian archives containing Sumerian texts show a very different range of sign shapes and ductus, i.e. manner of incision,⁶⁸ related to the origin and background of scribes. Some tablets are the work of local scribes but others are clearly the product of non-Syrian or non-Anatolian scribes. Therefore, a detailed paleographic analysis will be provided for each tablet or group of tablets. Paleographic systematization allows us to determine the provenance and date of tablets, providing further evidence for understanding the stream of tradition to which the texts inscribed on them belong. Lastly, a complete outline of the tradition and the process of dissemination of Sumerian literature in the Western periphery, placed in its historical context, will be presented in Chapters 8 - Ḫattuša - and 9 - Emar and Ugarit. The choice to organize in a single chapter the outcomes of text analysis from Emar and Ugarit depends on the presence of the same compositions in the two sites.

68 For the distinction between ductus and sign shape see van den Hout 2012b, 152-153.

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

1 Middle Babylonian Sumerian Literary, Liturgical and Magical Texts

The corpus of the Middle Babylonian Sumerian literary texts dates to the period of Kassite rule over Babylonia (16th-mid-12th century).⁶⁹ The dearth of epigraphic findings due to a restricted archaeological investigation strongly limits our understanding of the Sumerian material from the Kassite period. Moreover, the attribution of cuneiform tablets to the Kassite dynasty is very problematic. Literary texts are not dated and frequently neither paleography nor archeology provides conclusive evidence for dating tablets. Distinguishing paleographically between the Late Old Babylonian and Kassite periods is notoriously complicated.⁷⁰ Much of the material has no clear archaeological context because it was acquired on the market, and even those tablets discovered during regular excavations often lack accurate archeological records.⁷¹ Finally, several tablets are still unpublished or published only in hand-copy. In particular a substantial number of Middle Babylonian tablets from Babylon are unpublished.⁷²

In addition to the Kassite tablets two sources are known from the period of the Sealand dynasty, but only one, an Emesal liturgy, has been published.

Text editions are scattered in various journals and books. The main reference here used to collect all the textual material and the relevant secondary literature is *The Diachronic Corpus of Sumerian Literature* (DCSL) project website which provides a list of the Middle Babylonian Sumerian and bilingual literary texts, with the exception of magical and Emesal texts. Additional bibliography has been provided by Sassmannshausen's article 'Babylonische Schriftkultur des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr. in den Nachbarländern und im östlichen Mittelmeerraum',⁷³ the CDLI website and Pedersén's studies on the ancient Near Eastern archives⁷⁴ and on the archives of Babylon excavated during Koldewey's campaigns between 1899 and 1917.⁷⁵

A large number of tablets are badly preserved and several are excerpts, either lentil tablets or Type V tablets, usually containing a literary text on the obverse and a lexical list on the reverse.⁷⁶ The majority of tablets stem from Nippur, but several manuscripts are from Sippar and Babylon. As far as the archeological evidence shows, the material dates back to the late Kassite period (1350-1150 B.C.).⁷⁷ As in the case of the Old Babylonian manuscripts, it is uncertain which Kassite tablets may stem from Sippar. The city was the target of early campaigns in the 19th century which did not prepare excavation records, thus the exact provenience of many cuneiform tablets is unknown. In addition to the tablets that ended up in the British Museum and the Louvre, a group of circa 2000 tablets, probably from Sippar, was acquired on the market by the University of Pennsylvania Museum and registered as early numbers in the CBS collection, the so called

69 To my knowledge the Sumerian texts from the Second Dynasty of Isin are limited to a few royal inscriptions, some of which are only preserved in first-millennium copies, see Jestin 1958, Lambert 1974b, Jacobsen 1991.

70 See the discussion in Rutz 2006, 67-72.

71 Many of the Nippur tablets were found during the first campaigns of the University of Pennsylvania between 1889 and 1900 which did not provide accurate reports, see Pedersén 1998, 113.

72 Pedersén 2005, 69-108.

73 Sassmannshausen 2008.

74 Pedersén 1998.

75 Pedersén 2005.

76 Veldhuis 2000a, see Introduction.

77 Pedersén 1998, 103.

Khabaza collection.⁷⁸ This collection mostly includes Old Babylonian tablets but it also contains some Middle Babylonian manuscripts.

Genres represented in the Middle Babylonian corpus are those common in the Old Babylonian period, but the corpus also includes some new Middle Babylonian compositions.⁷⁹

Texts are presented according to a typology that, with a few exceptions, follows Civil's unpublished catalogue as made available by ETCSL and Cunningham (2007). A full list of the Middle Babylonian Sumerian and bilingual literary and magical texts is presented in the following table. Only the published material is included in the present study.⁸⁰

Provenance	Museum Number	Composition	Hand-copy	Edition	Language
Nippur	N 3455	Enlil and Ninlil	Peterson (2011), 26-27	NE	S
Nippur	N 6126	Enlil and Ninlil	Peterson (2011), 27	NE	S
Nippur	N 1747	Enlil and Ninlil	Behrens (1978), Pl. 16	Behrens (1978)	S
Nippur	N 2431	Enlil and Sud	Civil (1983), 43-64	Civil (1983)	S
Nippur	N 2203	Enlil and Sud	Civil (1983), 43-64	Civil (1983)	S
Nippur	UM 29-13-495	Enlil and Sud	NP	Civil (1983)	S
Nippur	UM 29-13-545¹	Enlil and Sud	NP	Civil (1983)	S
Nippur	CBS 3832	Inana and An	de Jong Ellis (1979), 225	van Dijk (1998)	SA
Nippur	UM 29-16-35	Inana's Descent to the Netherworld	Veldhuis (2000a), 90 fig. 10	Veldhuis (2000a), 74-75	S (A)
Nippur	N 3783 + N 5031	a) Unidentified Text b) Proverb c) Lugal-e	Veldhuis (2000a), 90 fig. 11	Peterson (2007) Veldhuis (2000a), 75	S
Nippur	N 3719	Lugal-e	NP	Peterson (2013)	S
Nippur	N 6286 + CBS 11153	Angim	Cooper (1978), Pl. XIV	Cooper (1978) Viano (2012a)	SA
Babylon	VAT 17166	Sargon and Urzababa	VS 24 75	Westenholz (1997), 52-55	SA
Nippur	CBS 13509	Šulgi B	Peterson 2011	Peterson 2011	SA
Nippur	CBS 10900	Šulgi O	NP	Klein (1976)	SA
Nippur	Ni 13227	Šulgi O	ISET I p. 208	Klein (1976)	
Nippur	CBS 11341	Shulgi Hymn	PBS 1/1 11	Westenholz (2005), 344	SA

⁷⁸ For the origin of these tablets see Civil in RA 73, 93, Tinney 2011, 586.

⁷⁹ A group of *Eršaruğa* prayers attributed by Krecher 1966a to the Middle Babylonian period have been identified as Old Babylonian by Michalowski 1987: BM 78198 = CT 44 14, VAT 1320 = VS 2 47 (these are duplicates of the same text, see Lambert 1974a, 288-293), CBS 35 = PBS 10/2 3 (Bergmann 1965, 33-42). These texts are not treated in the present work.

⁸⁰ Museum numbers in bold refer to texts taken into consideration. Some of the unpublished texts or those published only in hand-copy will be the object of future studies by the writer.

The following tablets have not been considered:

VAT 17316 = VS 24 70, a fragment of Farmer's Instructions indicated by van Dijk as possibly Middle Babylonian ('Mittelbabylonische (?) Schrift'), has been edited by Civil 1994, 4, as an Old Babylonian manuscript. The comparison with another OB fragment from Babylon of Farmer's Instructions, VAT 17142 = VS 24 69, does not provide evidence for dating VS 24 70 to the Middle Babylonian period; the only possible hint of a late date is the shape of the sign E.

CBS 1422, a bilingual extract tablet from an unknown literary text, probably from Sippar, is attributed by Michalowski 1981 to the Old Babylonian period and has not been included by Veldhuis 2000a in the catalog of Kassite exercise texts.

CBS 10295 = van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, Pl. 38 (C₄), indicated in CDLI as MB is considered as OB by van Dijk with whom I agree on the basis of his copy.

CBS 11553 = ETCSL 2.4.2.e (Sjöberg 2005) is a hymn to Šulgi dated as Middle Babylonian(?) in CDLI, but in my opinion it is an Old Babylonian tablet: the shape of tablet (*Imgidda*) and the sign forms (see AN and TA, l. 6) might be evidence for an earlier date. Moreover Sjöberg does not mention a possible Middle Babylonian date.

Provenance	Museum Number	Composition	Hand-copy	Edition	Language
Nippur	CBS 3558 + Ni 9696 (+) Ni 4557	Lipit-Ištar A	CBS 3558 = de Jong Ellis (1979), 226 Ni 9696 = ISET I p. 109 Ni 4557 = ISET I p. 109	CBS 3558 = Peterson (2011), 192-194 Ni 9696 = Delnero (2006), 1909 ff. source N _{U1} Ni 4557 = Delnero (2006), 1909 ff. source N _{U7}	SA
?	MAH 10828	Lipit-Ištar A	Boissier (1926), Pl. 1	Römer (1965), 2-3	S
Nippur	UM 29-15-399 + Ni 9734	Lipit-Ištar F	Ni 9734 = ISET II Pl. 26 UM 29-15-399 = NP	Lines 115-121 = Civil (1976), 85	SA
Nippur	N 3495	Lipit-Ištar F	NP	NE	S (A)
Nippur	N 3498	Lipit-Ištar F	Peterson (2011), 208	Peterson (2011), 208	SA
Babylon	VAT 19236	A Praise-poem of Hammu-rābi	VS 24 41	NE	SA
Sealand	Private Collection	Praise-poem of Aadaragalama	NP	NE	SA
Nippur	CBS 10475	Enlil A	NP	Delnero (2006), 1216 ff.	S
Nippur	CBS 10903	Enlil A	NP	Peterson (2010b), 574-575	SA
Nippur	CBS 13860	Inana C	Sjöberg (1975a), 168	Sjöberg (1975a), 161-253	SA
?	KM 89404 Obv.²	Inana C	Michalowski (1998)	Michalowski (1998)	SA
Nippur	CBS 15203	Inana C	NP	NE	SA
Nippur	UM 29-13-560 (+) N 3529 (+) N 3196	The song of the Plowing Oxen	Photo: Civil (1976), Pl. VI	Civil (1976), 83-95	SA
Borsippa (?)	LB 806	A Litigant's Prayer	Peiser Urkunden 92	Veldhuis (2014), 262-263 Peiser, Kohler (1905), 4	SA
?	MS 2291	The Instructions of Šuruppak	Alster (2005), Pl. 68	Alster (2005), 31-220	S
Babylon (?)	MM 487b	The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta = Ur-Ninurta G	Civil (1997), 53	Alster (2005), 221-240	SA
Nippur	UM 29-13-419A Obv. I³	The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta = Ur-Ninurta G	Civil (1997), 53	Alster (2005), 221-240	S
Nippur	UM 29-13-419A Obv. II - Rev. I-II	Counsels of Wisdom	Civil (1997), 53	Alster (2005), 241-264	S
?	AO 7739 + AO 8149	The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab	TCL 16 80 + TCL 16 83 Cavigneaux (1987), 51-52	Alster (2005), 373-383	S
Nippur	UM 29-15-848	The Fowler and his Wife	Veldhuis (2000a), 89 fig. 5	Alster (2005), 371	S
Nippur	CBS 9899	Dialog5 - Two Women B	NP	NE	S
?	IM 44131	Lamentation to the Mother goddess	TIM 9 33	NE	S
Nippur	CBS 8039	Proverb	Veldhuis (2000a), 89 fig. 6	Veldhuis (2000a), 73	S
Nippur	N 3395	Proverb	Hand-copy: Lambert (1960), Pl. 71 Photo: Alster (1997), Pls. 98-99	Alster (1997), 288-290 Lambert (1960), 272-273	SA
Nippur	N 5447	Proverb	Sassmannshausen (1997), No. 22	Veldhuis (2000a), 72-73	S
Nippur	UM 29-16-561	Proverbs	Veldhuis (2000a), 94 fig. 22	Veldhuis (2000a), 80	S
Nippur	Ni 679	Proverb	ISET II Pl. 109	Alster (1997), 247	S

Provenance	Museum Number	Composition	Hand-copy	Edition	Language
Babylon	VAT 17353	Proverb	VS 24 113	Lambert (1960), 274	SA
?	MS 2065	Proverb	Alster (2007), 29	Alster (2007), 30	PhS SA
?	MS 3310	Proverbs	Alster (2007), 46-47	Alster (2007), 47-49	S
?	MS 3323	Proverb	Alster (2007), 52	Alster (2007), 52-54	SA
Nippur	3N-T 195	Unidentified Text	OIP 97, 90 No. 42	NE	S
Nippur	CBS 4615	Unidentified Text	PBS 12/1 44	Veldhuis (2000a), 75-76	S
Nippur	CBS 13990	Unidentified Text	NP	NE	SA
Nippur	CBS 19831	Unidentified Text	Veldhuis (2000a), 91 fig. 13	Veldhuis (2000a), 76	S
Nippur	N 4529	Unidentified Text	Veldhuis (2000a), 90 fig. 9	Veldhuis (2000a), 74	S
Nippur	UM 29-13-543	Unidentified Text	Veldhuis (2000a), 91 fig.12	Veldhuis (2000a), 76	S
Nippur	UM 29-15-944	Unidentified Text	Veldhuis (2000a), 92 fig. 18	NE	S
Nippur	UM 19-16-383	Unidentified Text	Veldhuis (2000a), 91 fig. 14	Veldhuis (2000a), 76	S
Sippar	BM 81700	Unidentified Text	CT 58 61	NE	S
Babylon	VAT 17223	Unidentified Text	VS 24 38	NE	S
Babylon	VAT 17224	Unidentified Text	VS 24 39	NE	SA
Babylon	VAT 17357	Unidentified Text	VS 24 72	NE	SA
Babylon	VAT 17563	Unidentified Text	VS 24 15	NE	S
?	IM 13365	Unidentified Text	TIM 9 29	NE	SA
?	MS 3362	Unidentified Text	Alster (2007), 67	Alster (2007), 67	S
?	MS 3405	Unidentified Text	Alster (2007), 70-71	Alster (2007), 70-71	S
Sippar (?)	BM 78164	Eršaḥuḡa	CT 58 70	Geller (1992)	SA
Sealand	Private Collection	Balaḡ to Enlil	Photo: ZA 104, 153-154	Gabbay (2014a)	S
Sippar (?)	BM 83021	Emesal Lyric (?)	NP	NE	S
Nippur	CBS 8547	Emesal Lyric	NP	NE	S
Babylon	VAT 17119	Emesal Lyric	VS 24 25	NE	SA
Nippur	Ni 2676 + Ni 2997 + Ni 4017 + Ni 4018	Incantation	Geller (1985), Pls. 5-6	Geller (1985) Ms C	SA
Nippur	12 N 228	Incantation	NP	NE	S
Sippar (?)	AO 7738 + CBS 1521	Incantation to Utu	AO 7738 = TCL 16 79 CBS 1521 (Hand-copy) = PBS 12/1 25 CBS 1521 (Photo) = Castellino (1969), 14-15	Alster (1991a) Castellino (1969)	S
Sippar (?)	CBS 587 + CBS 353 (+) D fragment	Incantation to Utu	Castellino (1969), Pls. XI-XIII	Alster (1991a) Castellino (1969)	S
Sippar (?)	CBS 1686 + CBS 1533	Incantation to Utu	NP	Alster (1991a)	S
?	HS 1512	Kiutu Incantation	Krebernik (2001)	Krebernik (2001)	SA
Sippar	BM 54692	Incantation	Lambert (2006)	Lambert (2006)	S
?	VAT 1514	Incantation	VS 17 43	NE	SA
Nippur	UM 29-13-542	Omen	Veldhuis (2000a), 89 fig. 8	Veldhuis (2000a), 74	S
Dūr-Kurigalzu	IM 50009 (+) IM 50140 (+) IM 50010 (+) IM 50011	Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription	Kramer (1948), 30-34 Pls. 1-5	Veldhuis (2008) Kramer (1948), 1-38	S

1 Published in Civil 1983 as UM 29-13-345.

2 This manuscript could be Late Old Babylonian.

3 The Middle Babylonian date is uncertain, see DC SL.

1.1 Text Analysis

1.1.1 Divine Narratives

1.1.1.1 Enlil and Ninlil

The mythological text *Enlil and Ninlil*⁸¹ relates the story of the encounter between Enlil and Ninlil. Enlil in disguise seduces Ninlil who gives birth to the gods Sîn, Nergal, Ninazu and Ennibilulu. All the preserved OB manuscripts (eighteen) are from Nippur.⁸² However, the text's circulation was not limited to Nippur, as it is attested in a catalogue from Sippar⁸³ and in the Nippur and Louvre catalogues.⁸⁴ This was not among the most popular compositions in House F, as only four manuscripts were found in this scribal school.⁸⁵ The text survived in the first millennium in two Neo Babylonian bilingual manuscripts,⁸⁶ one of which is from Nippur. Three monolingual MB manuscripts, all from Nippur, are known: N 3455, N 1747, N 6126.

N 3455 is a fragment from the left edge of its tablet preserving six lines on the obverse, whereas the reverse is broken away. No distinctive MB sign is preserved but according to Peterson⁸⁷ the manner of incision is reminiscent of other MB tablets from Nippur. According to Peterson, the fragment preserves lines 23-28 of the composition. However, N 3455 seems to offer a conflation of lines 15-20 and 23-28 which feature the same refrain: lines 15-20 contain the speech of Nunbaršegunu to her daughter Ninlil reported in the Emesal form, whereas lines 23-28 repeat the same sentences in the main dialect and in an anonymous third person voice. N 3455 shows a combination of Emesal and eme-gir₁₅ forms, but it is too fragmentary – no line is fully preserved – to be assigned with full confidence to either of the two sections. The transliteration proposed here might suggest that the tablet reports a variant of lines 15-20:⁸⁸

N 3455	1	[.....] 'a' n[am ² -
15 A	i 15	i ₇ -ku ₃ -ga nu-nus(=NUNUZ)-e i ₇ -ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ a nam-mi-tu ₅ -tu ₅
B	15	i ₇ -ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ munus-e i ₇ -ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ a nam-mi-tu ₅ -tu ₅
C	15	i ₇ -ku ₃ -ga nu-nus(=NUNUZ)-e i ₇ -ku ₃ -ga a nam-mi-tu ₅ -tu ₅ <i>i-na na-a-ri el-le-ti sin-niš-tu₄ MIN me-e la' ram'-k[at₃]</i> ⁸⁹
G	11	[.....] i ₇ -ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ [.....]
H	i 9	[.....]-en
	i 9	[.....] 'i ₇ '-ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ a nam-mi-tu ₅ '-tu ₅ <i>The river is holy, woman! The river is holy – don't bathe in it!</i>
23 A	i 23	[i ₇ -ku ₃ -g]a-am ₃ munus-e i ₇ -ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ im-ma-ni-tu ₅ -tu ₅
B	23	i ₇ -ku ₃ -ga-a[m ₃ munus-e] 'i ₇ '-ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ a im-ma-tu ₅ -tu ₅ <i>The river is holy; the woman bathed in the holy river.</i>

81 ETCSL 1.2.1; lineation according to Behrens 1978.

82 Cooper 1980, 176.

83 Si 331 Rev. 10, van Dijk 1989, 448, see Robson 2001, 56.

84 N2: 22 (ETCSL 0.2.1), L: 19 (ETCSL 0.2.2)

85 Robson 2001, 56.

86 See comments in Cooper 1980, 176.

87 Peterson 2011, 26-27.

88 A = CBS 9205; B = A 30202; C (NB) = BM 38600 (80-111-12, 484); G = UM 29-15-611; H = CBS 13853 + CBS 8315 + CBS 8176; I = Ni 2707; see Behrens 1978, 8-11.

89 In C the line is repeated twice, Behrens 1978, 77.

N 3455	2	[.....g]u ₂ 'i ₇ '-nun-bi-ir-k[a] n[am ² -.....]
16 A	i 16	^d nin-lil ₂ -le gu ₂ i ₇ -nun-bi-ir-ka nam-mi-in-du-de ₃
B	16	^d nin-lil ₂ -le gu ₂ i ₇ -nun-bi-ir-tum ₂ -ka / nam-mi-du-e-de ₃
G	12	[.....-n]un-bi-i[r-.....]
H	i 10	[.....] 'x'
I	10	[.....]-ir-tum ₂ -ka nam-mi-in-KAŠ-'x' <i>Ninlil, do not walk along the bank of the Nunbirdu Canal!</i>
24 A	i 24	[^d nin-lil ₂]le gu ₂ i ₇ -<<gu ₂ >>-nun-bi-ir-ka i-im-du-de ₃
B	24	^d n[in]-lil ₂ gu ₂ i ₇ -nun-bi-ir-tum ₂ -ka i-im-du-e-de ₃ <i>Ninlil walked along the bank of the Nunbirdu Canal.</i>
N 3455	3	[.....-g]a ² lugal i-bi ₂ -ku ₃ -ga i-bi ₂ [.....]
17 A	i 17	i-bi ₂ -ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ u ₃ -mu-un-e i-bi ₂ -ku[g-ga-am ₃] i-bi ₂ ba-ši-bar-re
B	17	'i-bi ₂ -ku ₃ '-ga-am ₃ u ₃ -mu-un-bi i-bi ₂ -ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ / i-bi ₂ ba-e-ši-bar-re
H	i 11	[.....] 'x'
I	11	[.....]-ku ₃ -ga-[.....] <i>(His) eye is bright, the lord's eye is bright, he will look at you!</i>
25 A	i 25	[igi-ku ₃ -g]a-am ₃ lugal-e igi-ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ igi im-ma-ši-in-bar
A	25	igi-ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ lugal-e igi-ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ / igi im-ma-ši-in-bar
H	i 1'	[.....]-'bar' <i>(His) eye was bright, the king's eye was bright, he looked at her.</i>
N 3455	4	[.....a]-a ^d en-lil ₂ -la ₂ [(...)]
18 A	i 18	kur-gal aia ^d mu-ul-lil ₂ i-bi ₂ -ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ i-bi ₂ ba-ši-bar-re
B	18	k[ur-gal] 'aia' en-lil ₂ i-bi ₂ -ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ / i-bi ₂ ba-e-ši-bar-re
H	i 12	[.....] 'x'
I	12	[..... b]a-ši-bar-re <i>The Great Mountain, Father Enlil - his eye is bright, he will look at you!</i>
26 A	i 26	[kur-gal aia] ^d en-lil ₂ igi-ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ igi im-ma-ši-in-bar
B	26	[kur-gal] 'aia' ^d en-lil ₂ -le igi-ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ igi im-ma-ši-in-bar
H	i 2'	[.....]-'ši-in-bar' <i>The Great Mountain, Father Enlil - (his) eye was bright, he looked at her.</i>
N 3455	5	[.....x] 'nam'-tar-tar-ra [(...)]
19 A	i 19	sipa-x-NE nam-tar-tar-re i-bi ₂ -ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ i-bi ₂ ba-ši-bar-re
B	19	sipa na ¹ -aĝ ₂ -tar-tar-re i-bi ₂ -ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ i-bi ₂ ba-e-ši-bar-re
H	i 13	[.....] 'x'
I	13	[.....] 'x' [.....] <i>The shepherd who determines destinies - (his) eye is bright, he will look at you!</i>
27 A	i 27	[.....N]E nam-tar-tar-re igi-ku ₃ -ga-am ₃ igi im-ma-ši-in-bar
B	27	[.....n]a-aĝ ₂ -tar-tar-re igi-KU ₂ -ga-am ₃ igi im-ma-ši-in-bar
H	i 3'	[..... i]m-ma-[ši-in]-bar <i>The shepherd who determines destinies - his eye was bright, he looked at her.</i>

	N 3455	6	[.....ĝe]š ₃ 'ma'-ra-'an'-du ₁₁ ne [.....]
20	A	i 20	a-da'-lam mu-bi am ₃ -i-i še am ₃ -mi-su-ub-be ₂
	B	20	a-da'-lam mu-bi am ₃ -i-i še am ₃ -mi-ib ₂ -su-ub-be ₂
	H	i 14	[.....] 'x' <i>At that moment he will want to have intercourse, he will want to kiss!</i>
28	A	i 28	[lugal] ne ga-e-du ₁₁ mu-na-ab-be ₂ nu-da-ra-ši-ib-še-ge
	B	28	[.....]-'x'-du ₁₁ mu-na-ab-be ₂ nu'-un-da-ši-ib-še-ge
	H	i 4'	[.....]-'da-ra-ši-ib-še-ge <i>The king said to her, 'I want to have sex with you!', but she would not agree to do it there with him.</i>

1. The last sign resembles NAM as in line 16 rather than IM as in line 23.

2. N 3455 shares with A the variant *i*₇-nun-bi-ir-(ka) for the Nunbirdu canal; in light of the MB manuscript, it can no longer be assumed that this writing was a mistake as argued by Behrens.⁹⁰ The remains of the last sign resemble nam- as in line 16; this could be further evidence that the MB fragment reports a variant of lines 15-20.

3. This line has the Emesal form *i*-bi₂ as in line 17 and lugal as in line 25 instead of /umun/. The copula -am₃ and the ergative case ending -e are omitted; it is worth noting that -am₃ is omitted in line 15 in the NB manuscript C.⁹¹

4-5. N 3455 indicates the ergative with -a; this phenomenon first appears in the Old Babylonian period.⁹²

6. According to Cooper⁹³ line 28 should be emended as ĝeš₃--du₁₁ and line 29 as ne--su-ub; the two verbal forms appear together in line 20 but in Emesal: ĝeš₃--du₁₁ VS mu--i-i, ne--su-ub VS še--su-ub.⁹⁴ The MB manuscript seems a main dialect variant of line 20 or a conflation of the first part of lines 28 and 29 in a single line; cf. *Enlil and Ninlil* 45=47=49, ĝeš₃-bi na-mu-un-du₁₁ ne-bi na-mu-un-su-ub.

Whatever segment N 3455 reports, it is clear that this fragment does not duplicate any of the OB manuscripts. Probably the text results from modification and adaptation by Middle Babylonian scribes.

Another possible MB manuscript of *Enlil and Ninlil* is **N 6126**.⁹⁵ This tiny fragment preserves a few signs corresponding to lines 59-64. The following observations are worth noting:

- In line 2 (= *Enlil and Ninlil* 60) /muzug/, 'priest', is written muzug₂ (U₂.KA) instead of muzug₆ (U₂.KAxLI) as in the OB manuscripts. muzug₂ is also attested in the NB manuscript C. N 6126 seems to omit -(g)e after muzug₂.
- Lines 3 and 4 (= *Enlil and Ninlil* 61-62) seem to omit -še₃ after niĝ₂-nam, but here as in the preceding line the omitted sign could have been written in the unpreserved part of the line.

⁹⁰ Behrens 1978, 49.

⁹¹ Lines 16 and 17 are not preserved in C.

⁹² Attinger 1993, 214; see § 6.1.1 and fn. 1547.

⁹³ Cooper 1980, 181: 28f.

⁹⁴ For these forms see Behrens 1978, 78-79, 92-94, Cooper 1980, 181.

⁹⁵ See observations in Peterson 2011, 28.

N 1747 is the only MB manuscript edited by Behrens.⁹⁶ Despite Cooper's remarks⁹⁷ it shows the typical MB shape of KUR (l. 4).⁹⁸ This fragment is part of a multicolumn tablet as is clear from the vertical double rulings on the left edge. Only the Sumerian text is preserved on the obverse which contains lines 128-140 of the composition, but possibly an Akkadian translation was arranged in a parallel column. The reverse is broken away. Lines 129-140 containing the refrain narrating the intercourse between Ninlil and Enlil are repeated in lines 77-88 and 103-114. As well as N 3455 this fragment shows several variants, but purely orthographic:

Line	N 1747	OB Manuscripts ¹
129	^d en-lil ₂	^d en-lil ₂ -le (A)
130	DU ₁₀ -ĝu ₁₀	umuš-ĝa ₂ (A L)
130	i ₃ -ib ₂ -tar ⁷² -[(ra)]	i-ni-in-tar-ra (A)
131	-su ₁₃ (BU)-ga-da-ĝu ₁₀	-su ₃ -ge-da-ĝu ₁₀ (A L)
132	^d en-lil ₂	^d mu-ul-[lil ₂] (L)
132	en	lugal (L)
133	^d en-lil ₂	^d mu-ul-lil ₂ (A L)
133	en-zu-gen ₇	u ₃ -mu-un-zu i ₃ -me-a-gen ₇ (A L)
134	za-e-me-e[n]	-me-en (A L)
135	en	u ₃ -mu-un (A L)
136	^d nin-a-zu	^d sin-(na) (A L R)
137	a-lugal-ĝu ₁₀	a-lugal-ĝu ₁₀ (A L) a-lugal-ĝa ₂ (R)
138	a-lugal-ĝu ₁₀ -gen ₇	a-lugal-ĝu ₁₀ -gen ₇ (A) a-lugal-ĝa ₂ -(a)-gen ₇ (L R)
139	[^d e]n-lil ₂	^d en-lil ₂ -le
139	lu ₂ -SI.[...]	nam-SI.LU.IGI-e (A L R)

1 A = CBS 9205, L = 3N-T 901, R = N 1774.

2 Behrens 1978, 41, reads GID₂[?], but the sign is probably a badly written TAR.

- N 1747 consistently uses the main dialect forms for the corresponding Emesal in the OB manuscripts: ^den-lil₂ VS ^dmu-ul-lil₂ (ll. 132, 133), en VS u₃-mu-un (l. 133).
- The genitive case ending is omitted in ^den-lil₂ (ll. 129, 139). The expected genitive/locative form of the 1sg. possessive suffix -ĝa₂ is written as -ĝu₁₀ (ll. 130, 137, 138); in lines 137-138 this form is also attested in A and L against R which has the correct form.
- The tablet shows a certain degree of carelessness in writing: TAR in line 130 is badly written; in line 131 the use of BU for SUD is probably due to the omission of the vertical strokes.
- In line 136 the god Sîn is replaced by Nin-azu.⁹⁹
- The presence of lu₂ is probably influenced by lu₂ abul-la, 'the city gatekeeper' (l. 87), and lu₂ i₇-kur-ra, 'the man of the River of the Netherworld' (l. 113), the two other disguises of Enlil.

96 Manuscript T in Behrens 1978.

97 Cooper 1980, 176.

98 Photo available on CDLI.

99 See Cooper 1980, 163.

Variants attested in N 1747 are only orthographic and often they are shared by one of the OB manuscripts.

The very few variants attested in the first-millennium manuscripts indicate the stability of the text already in early periods. A comparison between MB and NB sources is not possible on the basis of the preserved lines, but it is worth noting that they may share the same variants.¹⁰⁰ To conclude, this typical Nippur composition continued to be copied at Nippur during the Kassite period with some modifications especially concerning Emesal forms.

1.1.1.2 Enlil and Sud

The mythological text *Enlil and Sud*¹⁰¹ narrating the marriage between Enlil and Sud, who becomes Ninlil after the wedding, is attested in a relatively high number of OB tablets from Nippur (mostly), Susa and probably Sippar. This literary work survived in the first millennium in four Neo Assyrian manuscripts from Nineveh and Sultan-Tepe.¹⁰² The composition was particularly popular in House F as seven manuscripts come from this building.¹⁰³ According to Civil¹⁰⁴ *Enlil and Sud* is perhaps quoted in the OB Nippur catalogue (N2: 22).

Four unilingual Sumerian tablets, all of them from Nippur, are possibly Middle Babylonian in date: N 2431, N 2203, UM 29-13-495 and UM 29-13-545.

N 2431 (D) is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving lines 33-44 on the obverse whereas the reverse is broken away. Its MB date is uncertain.¹⁰⁵ On paleographical grounds¹⁰⁶ the mix of earlier and later sign forms¹⁰⁷ might be a Kassite trait.¹⁰⁸ This manuscript does not show any important variants compared to the OB recension.¹⁰⁹

N 2203 (F) is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving, on the obverse, lines 39-40 followed by 60-63 whereas the reverse is broken away. Except for a few minor orthographic variants,¹¹⁰ the MB manuscript adheres to the OB text. It is worth noting that in line 62, where the NA text slightly differs from the OB manuscripts, za-e-ke₄ VS za-gen₇, N 2203 agrees with the OB recension, za-a-gen₇. No difference can be detected with N 2431 since the two manuscripts do not preserve the same portion of lines 39-40. The major difference with the OB recension is therefore the omission of lines 41-59.

UM 29-13-495 (G) and **UM 29-13-545** (J)¹¹¹ are two pillow-shaped tablets each containing a one-line extract. UM 29-13-495 has line 40. It is interesting that this manuscript shares with N 2203 the variant za-a-ra for za-ra in the OB manuscripts. UM 29-13-545 reports line 70=99 with no variants compared to the OB recension. The NA manuscripts have instead some graphic variants.¹¹²

¹⁰⁰ N 3455, 3; N 6126, 2.

¹⁰¹ ETCSL 1.2.2; lineation and manuscripts according to Civil 1983.

¹⁰² For details on sources see Civil 1983, 47-48.

¹⁰³ Robson 2001, 56.

¹⁰⁴ Civil 1983, 61: 1.

¹⁰⁵ It is indicated as MB? in Civil 1983, 47.

¹⁰⁶ Photo available on CDLI.

¹⁰⁷ The sign AN has the later form in ll. 34, 35, 38 and 44 but the older one in l. 37.

¹⁰⁸ See Veldhuis 2008, 31 n. 11.

¹⁰⁹ The only variants not attested in other manuscripts are in line 39: the omission of -er in diġir-gal-gal-en-ne-er and the verbal form ħe₂-en-ne-[...] VS ħe₂-im-mi-ib₂-ĥal-ĥa, but the latter is possibly documented in E ħe₂-e[n...].

¹¹⁰ za-a-ra VS za-ra (l. 40), -an- VS -na- (l. 60), za-a-gen₇ VS za-gen₇ (l. 62).

¹¹¹ Published as UM 29-13-345, see Veldhuis 2000a, 84 n. 48.

¹¹² See Civil 1983, 54.

The MB manuscripts only preserve a few lines but it seems that they reflect the OB text and are closer to the OB sources rather than to the NA recension.

1.1.1.3 Inana and An

The composition *Inana and An*¹¹³ is known from only three Old Babylonian manuscripts, none of them from Nippur. CBS 1531¹¹⁴ is a two-column tablet from the Khabaza collection, thus possibly from Sippar. YBC 4665¹¹⁵ is a single-column tablet of unknown provenance, which, according to van Dijk,¹¹⁶ shows the ductus of the Rīm-Sîn period. W 16743ac¹¹⁷ is a small fragment of a two-column tablet¹¹⁸ from Uruk. The only Nippur source is **CBS 3832**, a MB bilingual tablet in parallel column format preserving lines 55-76.¹¹⁹ Unfortunately, the Sumerian column is poorly preserved¹²⁰ and most of it is unparalleled in the other manuscripts. From the few preserved parallel passages no significant difference from the OB manuscripts is evident.¹²¹ It is worth noting that line 75a quoted in this manuscript is not attested in CBS 1531, the only source that contains this section. The several variants between YBC 4665 and CBS 1531 show that the OB sources display a low degree of textual stability; this is common in non-curricular texts,¹²² a category to which *Inana and An* probably belonged. Moreover, the OB manuscripts have some phonetic writings¹²³ which are not unexpected for non-Nippur tablets. It is interesting that a composition unknown from the OB Nippur documentation is attested at Nippur in the Middle Babylonian period.

1.1.1.4 Inana's Descent to the Netherworld

UM 29-16-35 is a Nippur fragment from the upper left corner of a pillow-shaped extract tablet containing, on the obverse, an extract from *Inana's Descent to the Netherworld*.¹²⁴ Since only half of the tablet is preserved, a second column with the Akkadian translation was possibly present. The reverse has an extract from the *An=Anum* list.

This composition is known from fifty-eight OB manuscripts, mainly from Nippur and Ur,¹²⁵ and is quoted in several catalogues.¹²⁶ The MB extract tablet preserves lines 26-35 of the Old Babylonian text¹²⁷ and shows some variants. However, one must remember that not all the OB manuscripts have

113 ETCSL 1.3.5.

114 Copy in van Dijk 1998, 32-33.

115 Copy in van Dijk 1998, 36-37.

116 Van Dijk 1998, 12.

117 AUWE 23 101; hand-copy in van Dijk 1998, 38.

118 Zólyomi 2000.

119 Note the alternation between archaic and later forms in *a-wa-at* (l. 74) and *a-ma-tu₄* (l. 62).

120 Only the right edge of the column is preserved.

121 Lines 66-69 are duplicated in 112-115.

122 See Tinney 2011, 585-586, 591-592.

123 See van Dijk 1998, 30.

124 ETCSL 1.4.1.

125 Ferrara 2006, 127; new fragments are published in Peterson 2011, 45-48.

126 N2: 41 (ETCSL 0.2.1), L: 33 (ETCSL 0.2.2), Ur2: 27 (ETCSL 0.2.4).

127 Sladek 1974, 106-107.

been published¹²⁸ and the composition existed in different versions.¹²⁹ As noted by Veldhuis¹³⁰ the most interesting variant is u₄-da kur-ta (ll. 5-6) for u₄-da kur-še₃, which is probably influenced by the fact that Akkadian *ina* may correspond to -ta. The writing di-di-da (l. 7) is a phonetic variant for du₆-du₆-dam.¹³¹

No first-millennium sources of this composition are so far known, but this fragment provides a link with the Akkadian text of *Ištar's Descent to the Netherworld*.

1.1.1.5 Lugal-e

In the Middle Babylonian documentation *Lugal-e*¹³² is preserved on two extract tablets from Nippur. **N 3783 + N 5031**¹³³ only quotes the first line of the composition (l. 4).¹³⁴ **N 3719** is a fragment from a tablet¹³⁵ inscribed with a monolingual text continuing from the obverse to the reverse without a change in orientation. This extract is inscribed with lines 683-687 and reflects the OB recension.

1.1.1.6 Angim

The Nippur tablet **N 6286 (+) CBS 11153** is the only known MB manuscript of *Angim*.¹³⁶ This is a bilingual two-column tablet with the Sumerian text in the left column and the Akkadian in the right. The tablet originally contained the second part of the composition, but only lines 129-154 on the obverse and 162-185 on the reverse are preserved. *Angim* is a typical Nippur composition and all the OB manuscripts are from Nippur.¹³⁷ The study of lexical variants and line order¹³⁸ shows that the MB manuscript is closer to the OB recension than to the NA. However, in light of CBS 11153, not used by Cooper,¹³⁹ which has a different line order from the OB recension and, above all, reports line 139, which is only attested in one NA manuscript¹⁴⁰ but omitted in the OB tablets,¹⁴¹ the MB text must be considered an intermediate stage between OB and first-millennium recensions. CBS 11153 allows us to understand that lines 148-149 are not omitted in the MB recension but they have a different order from the OB manuscripts; only line 147 is omitted. Therefore, the line order of the MB recension differs from both the OB and the late manuscripts:

¹²⁸ A full edition of *Inana's Descent* has been announced by A. J. Ferrara; Sladek's edition is based upon 32 manuscripts.

¹²⁹ Ferrara 2006.

¹³⁰ Veldhuis 2000a, 75.

¹³¹ For similar variations see *Inana B*, 35, Zgoll 1997, 224, 452-453.

¹³² ETCSL 1.6.2.

¹³³ For this tablet see § 1.1.8.5.

¹³⁴ Another possible MB manuscript of *Lugal-e* is AO 8186 + ÉPHÉ 523 = TCL 16 85 + van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, Pl. 78 (text edited by Borger 1986) which is dated by de Genouillac to the first dynasty of Babylon but with a question mark; this would be the only OB bilingual manuscript, but according to Seminara 2001, 24 n. 7, it is too close to the late bilingual recension for the OB dating to be acceptable. As the fragment is actually missing from the collection (M. Guichard's personal communication), I do not consider this piece in the present work; on the basis of van Dijk's copy, the sign KUR does not show the typical MB shape, but many MB manuscripts have the same form; the sign NI seems to me OB rather than MB. I would tend to regard this fragment as a Late Old Babylonian tablet.

¹³⁵ The size of the manuscript is not clear, Peterson 2013.

¹³⁶ ETCSL 1.6.1.

¹³⁷ Cooper 1978, 39.

¹³⁸ Cooper 1978, 36-39, 42-43.

¹³⁹ See Viano 2012a.

¹⁴⁰ K 38 (e).

¹⁴¹ See Cooper 1978, 37, 125.

N 6286 (+) CBS 11153	
Obverse:	
	129-138
	140-146
	152
	150
	151(?)
	139
	148-149
	153-154
Reverse:	
	162-185

It should be noted, however, that the various stages of *Angim* (OB, MB, MA, NA, NB) do not present different traditions.¹⁴² Moreover, variants of the MB tablet are primarily documented in the section inscribed on the obverse that was particularly susceptible to errors and variants already in the OB manuscripts.¹⁴³

The Akkadian translation for the extant portion¹⁴⁴ adheres to the later recensions, but only a few lines can be compared.¹⁴⁵

To sum up, the MB recension results from modifications elaborated by Kassite scribes. However, OB, MB and first-millennium recensions belong to the same line of tradition.

1.1.2 Royal Narratives

1.1.2.1 Sargon and Ur-Zababa

VAT 17166 = VS 24 75 is a pillow-shaped tablet from Babylon containing a three-line bilingual extract in interlinear format of a Sargon narrative. Only the obverse is inscribed whereas the reverse is left blank. The text relates to Sargon's departure from the palace of Ur-Zababa. The composition *Sargon and Ur-Zababa*¹⁴⁶ is known from two OB unilingual Sumerian manuscripts, AO 7673 = TCL 16 73 - Segments A and C - from Uruk and 3N-T 296 (IM 58430) - Segment B - from Nippur.¹⁴⁷ The MB manuscript does not duplicate any portion of the OB text, but it seems to be the continuation of the story of Segment B.¹⁴⁸ The text shows some peculiarities:

- The spelling of Sargon as šar-rum-GI (l. 1) is nowhere else attested.¹⁴⁹
- Line 2 seems to be corrupted:

pa₅-sar-ra-ta mu-un-na-an-te-na-ra
a-na pa-lag mu-ša-ri-e iṭ-ṭe₄-ḫi
He approached the canal of the garden

¹⁴² Black 1980, 155-156.

¹⁴³ Cooper 1978, 39.

¹⁴⁴ Ll. 166-182.

¹⁴⁵ Only in line 173 does a variant occur.

¹⁴⁶ ETCSL 2.1.4; Cooper, Heimpel 1983.

¹⁴⁷ Heimpel 1983.

¹⁴⁸ Westenholz 1997, 52.

¹⁴⁹ Westenholz 1997, 52.

In pa₅-sar-ra-ta, also attested in line 3, -ta has a locative meaning corresponding to *ana* and *ina*.¹⁵⁰ The verbal form mu-un-na-an-te-na-ra as a preterite of an intransitive verb is expected to end with -te; the sequence -na-an- is also unclear.

- The plural stem of the verbal form in line 3, šar-rum-GI pa₅-sar-ra-ta i₃-dur₂-ru-na-ta = MIN *i-na* MIN [*it-ta-a*]š₂¹-ba-ma, ‘Sargon having reclined by the canal of the garden’, finds no corresponding plural form either in the subject or in the object.

No manuscripts of this text are known from later periods, but it is well known that Akkadian texts of the legends of the kings of Akkad were transmitted to the Western periphery and into the first millennium.¹⁵¹ This composition likely does not belong to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition.¹⁵² However, this fragment attests to the preservation of the Sumerian legends of the kings of Akkad in the post-Old Babylonian period. Remarkably, the composition – a non-curricular text as shown by the limited number of attestations – is inscribed on an extract tablet. It seems therefore that this text was adopted in schools in the Kassite period.

1.1.3 Royal Praise Poems

1.1.3.1 Šulgi B

The hymn *Šulgi B*¹⁵³ is known from a great number of OB manuscripts¹⁵⁴ of which around 90 percent are from Nippur. This composition belongs to the so called House F Fourteen¹⁵⁵ and is quoted in several literary catalogues.¹⁵⁶

CBS 13509, a MB manuscript from Nippur,¹⁵⁷ is a large fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving lines 311-326.¹⁵⁸ Only one side is preserved. The text is bilingual in interlinear format with the Akkadian version written in small script underneath Sumerian lines. For the extant portion, the text adheres to the OB manuscripts. Only a few minor variants are in fact attested:¹⁵⁹

Line	CBS 13509	OB Text
312	ḫe ₂ -en-ĝen	ḫe ₂ -ĝen
313	ḫe ₂ -en-ĝen-ne ₂ [?]	ḫe ₂ -(en)-ĝen
317	dib ₂ -ba-a[m ₃]	dib ₂ -ba
318	en ₃ -du-ĝa ₂ -ka	en ₃ -du-ĝa ₂ -a-kam
320	na-e [?] -x [?] -[...]	na-an-ga-am ₃ -me

¹⁵⁰ For the locative meaning of the ablative see Thomsen 1984, 107.

¹⁵¹ Westenholz 1997, 4-5.

¹⁵² Sumerian Sargonic tales are poorly documented, notably at Nippur. The only composition well attested in the OB documentation – most of the manuscripts stem from Nippur – is the *Curse of Akkad* that not by chance describes the sacrilegious destruction of the Ekur by Naram-Sîn; the defamatory portrayal of Naram-Sîn in *The Curse of Akkad* counters that of other historical-literary texts, see Cooper 1983, 5-10, 15-18.

¹⁵³ ETCSL 2.4.2.2.

¹⁵⁴ Castellino 1972, 27-29, new sources in Peterson 2011, 153-157.

¹⁵⁵ Robson 2001, 54-55.

¹⁵⁶ N2: 26 (ETCSL 0.2.1); L: 17 (ETCSL 0.2.2); U1: 13 (ETCSL 0.2.3).

¹⁵⁷ Another MB manuscript of *Šulgi B* is housed in the Schøyen Collection, Peterson 2011, 154 n. 6.

¹⁵⁸ Peterson 2011, 153-156.

¹⁵⁹ See also Peterson 2011, 155 n. 7.

1.1.3.2 Šulgi O

The royal hymn *Šulgi O*¹⁶⁰ contains a praise of Šulgi and Gilgamesh¹⁶¹ in the form of a dialogue between the two kings. From the Old Babylonian period the text is preserved on an unclear number of Nippur manuscripts (six to eight) because some fragments may be part of the same tablet.¹⁶² Additionally, *Šulgi O* is quoted in the Louvre catalogue (L: 62). The very last entry in this list (L: 68) reads ‘14 na-ru₂-a’ which has been acknowledged to refer to the previous 14 entries in the catalogue that, therefore, were originally composed as royal inscriptions and written on stele (*narua*).¹⁶³ This interpretation has been recently challenged:¹⁶⁴ line 68 of the Louvre catalogue would be a summarizing entry referring to 14 unspecified copies of monumental inscriptions not listed in the catalogue to be added to the other compositions quoted in the inventory, rather than a subtotal referring to the preceding royal hymns. Hence there is no conclusive evidence that *Šulgi O* was actually written on monuments. However, it is possible that some royal hymns were originally composed for monumental inscriptions and later incorporated in the curriculum.¹⁶⁵ The quotation in the Louvre catalogue and the tablet format of the OB manuscript SLTN 79, a well ruled *imgidda* tablet, are evidence that this text was associated with pedagogical activity. However, its use in school was restricted as shown by the limited number of duplicates.

Possible MB tablets are the Nippur fragments CBS 10900 and Ni 13227¹⁶⁶ which Klein tentatively assigned to the hymn as unplaced segments. The ductus resembles the Middle Babylonian script, but no diagnostic signs are preserved. The list of cuneiform sources in ETCSL quotes the UM-29-15-231 as a possible further manuscript of *Šulgi O*. This is a MB fragment, but the nature¹⁶⁷ and even the language¹⁶⁸ of the text are unclear to me.¹⁶⁹

CBS 10900 is a multicolumn tablet preserving on the obverse the right-hand side of the left column and the left-hand side of the right column. Both are inscribed with Sumerian text with Akkadian glosses in small script between lines. The reverse is broken away.

Ni 13227 = ISET I 208 is a fragment from the upper edge of its tablet preserving five broken lines of a bilingual version of the text with Akkadian translation in small script underneath Sumerian lines. Only one side is preserved.

According to CDLI and ETCSL these two fragments might join, but one may note that the Akkadian version in CBS 10900 does not seem to comprise a consistent translation in interlinear form as in Ni 13227.

Unfortunately, a large portion of the composition is missing. The two possible MB manuscripts are too poorly preserved and no parallel passages are known in the extant OB tablets. The possible MB date of these fragments witnesses the survival into the Kassite period of this royal hymn while no first-millennium sources are known to date.

¹⁶⁰ ETCSL 2.4.2.15.

¹⁶¹ Klein 1976, 271-273.

¹⁶² See the list of cuneiform sources in ETCSL and Peterson 2011, 174-175: Ni 2477 = SLTN 79, UM 29-15-9 + UM 29-15-158, CBS 10306, Ni 4112 = ISET I p. 130, Ni 4101 = ISET I p. 85, Ni 4535 = ISET II Pl. 1, UM 29-13-990, N 2541; CBS 10306, Ni 4112 and Ni 4101 are possibly part of the same tablet, Klein 1976, 272.

¹⁶³ Flückiger-Hawker 1996.

¹⁶⁴ Delnero 2010, 36 n. 10, Vacín 2014.

¹⁶⁵ Tinney 2011, 583.

¹⁶⁶ See Peterson 2011, 154.

¹⁶⁷ The tablet is listed as administrative in CDLI, but the layout with every line of the text ruled shows the scholarly nature of the tablet.

¹⁶⁸ L. 8, DIĜIR-šu?

¹⁶⁹ The text quotes ^dutu (l. 2) and ^dmaš, ‘Ninurta’, (l. 7, 9, 10).

1.1.3.3 Hymn to Šulgi – PBS 1/1 11

CBS 11341 = PBS 1/1 11 is a two-column tablet containing a bilingual text found in Nippur during the first excavation campaign. Only the reverse is well preserved whereas the obverse is almost completely lost. The tablet gives the Sumerian text in the left column and the Akkadian in the right but the lines do not evenly match and only the Sumerian lines have rulings.

This composition is probably a hymn to the king Šulgi although in view of the unusual character of this text different interpretations have been advanced.¹⁷⁰ No duplicates from earlier or later periods are known.

The date of the tablet is uncertain. J. G. Westenholz¹⁷¹ attributes this manuscript to the Old Babylonian period based on the presence of the OB form of the sign KUR and the preservation of Old Babylonian orthography throughout the text. Conversely, Veldhuis¹⁷² dates PBS 1/1 11 to the Middle Babylonian period;¹⁷³ the format in parallel columns is typical of the Kassite texts while the OB bilinguals were usually in interlinear format; the odd mix of earlier and later sign forms, which attempts to imitate an earlier script, is similar to that found in *Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription*.¹⁷⁴ Additionally, Veldhuis argued that some words are unusual or only attested in lexical lists providing evidence for an artificial and late creation of this composition.¹⁷⁵ In support of Veldhuis's view, the mix of earlier and later signs is typical not only of *Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription*, but of other Kassite texts such as HS 1512¹⁷⁶ and N 2431.¹⁷⁷ Moreover, the manner of incision reminds me of that of the MB manuscripts. Furthermore, the text does not agree with the Old Babylonian orthography: the etymological writing of Dental + Sibilant in *zi-im-ma-at-su₂-nu* instead of *zi-im-ma-as-su₂-nu* put forward by J. G. Westenholz¹⁷⁸ is a Middle Babylonian rather than Old Babylonian trait;¹⁷⁹ the value pi of the sign PI¹⁸⁰ is common in MB texts.¹⁸¹ Finally, the alleged absence of other MB bilinguals from Nippur claimed by J. G. Westenholz¹⁸² is rejected by the present study. All these pieces of evidence along with the unusual and unique nature of this composition¹⁸³ would lead me to attribute it to the Middle Babylonian period. However, it should be noted that mimation is retained throughout the text¹⁸⁴ and that the typical Old Babylonian signs *ša*, as preposition/pronoun, and *-šu* as suffix pronoun are used. These traits as well as the retention of *wa-* could be archaisms.

It is unknown whether this text already existed in the OB period or whether it was composed by the Middle Babylonian scribal schools. Features mentioned above may speak for an artificial creation

170 Westenholz 2005; according to Krecher PBS 1/1 11 may have had a ritual function, see RIA 5, 127.

171 Westenholz 2005, 345.

172 Veldhuis 2008, 31 n. 11; I thank Prof. Niek Veldhuis for providing me with his transliteration of the text.

173 Also van Dijk 1998, 12 n. 16 dates this text to the Middle Babylonian period.

174 See § 1.1.12.1.

175 The word *abununnu* (UD.MUD.NUN.NA), in Col. iv 72, is only attested in the lexical list *Diri*, Veldhuis 2008, 31; Westenholz 2005 reads UD.KIB.NUN.KI = *Sippar*. Veldhuis 2014, 265, mentions the value *ħara₄* in the unorthographic writing *ħara₄-tuš-a* for *ħal-la-tuš-a* (Col. iv 82) as unusual; the word *ħal-la-tuš-a*, 'apprentice singer' is itself a rare word only known from lexical lists, see Volk 1995, 210 n. 1007. *murub₂* (Col. iv 84), the Emesal form for *murub₄*, 'middle', is a learned equivalent for *ka*, Veldhuis 2014, 265-266.

176 See § 1.1.10.3.

177 See § 1.1.1.2.

178 Westenholz 2005, 353.

179 Aro 1955, 26.

180 Westenholz 2005, 353.

181 Aro 1955, 25.

182 Westenholz 2005, 345.

183 See Westenholz 2005, 346-351.

184 In Col. iii 44 mimation is missing in *eb-bu* (so Veldhuis; Westenholz: *ṭa-bu*), see Westenholz 2005, 360.

of the Kassite period on the basis of passages drawn from different OB literary and lexical texts.¹⁸⁵ Nevertheless it is not precluded that it results from the modification and adaptation of an OB text.

The Akkadian depends on the Sumerian¹⁸⁶ contrary to other new creations where Sumerian seems to be a secondary language.¹⁸⁷ As noted by J. G. Westenholz the Akkadian text seems more a paraphrase than a translation.¹⁸⁸ The Sumerian is in many cases poor¹⁸⁹ and very challenging. A few phonetic and uncommon writings are also attested.

Line	Phonetic Writing	Orthographic Writing
Col. iv 72	ad-ša	ad-ša ₄
Col. iv 74	gu ₂ -bi	gu-bi
Col. iv 82	pa-aḥ-tuš-a ¹	ḫal-la-tuš-a ²
Col. iv 88	ki-šu ₂	ki-šu
Col. iv 95	ĜEŠ	ḡeštug ₂ ³
Col. iv 95	ur ^{ki} -ga	urim (ŠEŠ.AB) ⁴

1 ḫara₄ (DAG.KISIM5 x BI) is written as PA.Aḫ

2 The word ḫal-la-tuš-a is attested in the Akkadian version.

3 ḡeštug₂ (ĜEŠ) is an abbreviated form (Veldhuis's reading).

4 According to Veldhuis, ur^{ki}-ga is a reading for the city of Ur which is written in the usual way ŠEŠ.AB^{ki} in the Akkadian version.

The nature of the composition is obscure and no performative subscripts such as *tigi* or *adab* are given, nor is the za₃-mi₂ doxology present.¹⁹⁰ On the contrary the text ends with an unusual reference to the *apkallu* sage. The composition is possibly connected with hymnic liturgies¹⁹¹ given the frequent references to music performances throughout the text¹⁹² and also because praise of the king is not the main concern. This may explain the absence of OB manuscripts if the composition already existed at that time. However, the text never refers to either *tigi* or *adab* and its connection with the ritual seems to be more descriptive rather than performative.

185 For parallels from Šulgi hymns and other compositions see commentary in Westenholz 2005. A similar manner of text-creation will be suggested for *A Prayer for a King*, attested at Emar and Ugarit, § 6.1.1.

186 See *a-na za-ma-ri-im i-za-am-mu-[ru]*, 'They will sing a song' (Col. iii 49), where the construction with the preposition *ana* seems to be a translation of the Sumerian adverbial postposition /eš(e)/, Westenholz 2005, 364; similarly in Col. iv 59 locative postposition -a is rendered with the preposition *ina* even though in Akkadian a direct object would be required, Westenholz 2005, 370.

187 See § 1.1.7.2.

188 Westenholz 2005, 344.

189 Note the position of the verb at the beginning of the sentence and the double accusative (the directive in the second object is unmarked) in Col. iv 78: *igi u₃-bi₂-za₃ ser₃ silim-e-eš du₇-a*, 'After I will have selected a song fit for praise' (Veldhuis). In Col. iv 91 *Šul-gi-ir-e-eš = a-na Šul-gi* (Veldhuis's reading; Westenholz reads differently) it seems that two cases, dative and terminative, are appended to the king's name.

190 For music terminology see Shehata 2009.

191 Tinney 2011, 585-586, defines hymnic liturgies as texts containing performative subscripts that were associated with the cultic sphere. These compositions were not part of the OB scribal curriculum and show a low rate of duplication. For royal praise poems hymnic liturgies substantially correspond to the traditional classification of Type A hymns (cultic hymns) that are addressed to a deity and show the performative subscripts, but contain a petition and blessing for a king. On the contrary Type B hymns do not contain performative subscripts but usually end with the za₃-mi₂ doxology and focus on the praise of the king, Römer 1965, Hallo 1976, 191-194; on the inadequacy of the traditional classification see Flückiger-Hawker 1999, 11-17.

192 Westenholz 2005, 344-351.

1.1.3.4 Lipit-Ištar A

The hymn *Lipit-Ištar A*,¹⁹³ a composition belonging to the so called Decad, is attested in many OB sources, mainly from Nippur, but is also known from Ur (five manuscripts), Babylon (one manuscript), Isin (one manuscript), Kiš (three manuscripts) and Larsa (one manuscript) as well as from twelve unprovenanced manuscripts.¹⁹⁴ Among the Nippur tablets, twelve are from House F.¹⁹⁵ Two MB tablets are preserved: CBS 3558 + Ni 9696 (+) Ni 4557¹⁹⁶ and MAH 10828.

CBS 3558 + Ni 9696 (+) Ni 4557 is a Nippur fragment from the upper edge of a single column tablet giving the text in bilingual interlinear format. CBS 3558 + Ni 9696¹⁹⁷ preserve lines 1-17 and Ni 4557,¹⁹⁸ from the reverse of the tablet, has lines 93-104. The script is quite archaic and does not show any typical Kassite feature. This source adheres to the OB manuscripts but a few variants may be noted:

Lipit-Ištar A Line	MB Tablet	MB Variant	OB Text
4	Ni 9696	lirum-a	lirum-ma
6	Ni 9696	nu-tuku-a	nu-tuku
11	CBS 3558	maš ₂ keš ₂ -d[a-me-en] ¹	ĝir ₂ KEŠ ₂ -KEŠ ₂ -sa-me-en
12	CBS 3558	ša ₃ -ga	ša ₃
95	Ni 4557	-ĝu ₁₀ -še ₃ ³	-ĝu ₁₀ -uš
102	Ni 4557	˘zu ⁷ -a	-
103	Ni 4557	˘x'(-)in(-)[...]	-

¹ Reading according to George 2012, 369.

² This variant is also shared by sources N₁₇ = HS 1492 + HS 1493 + HS 1557 + HS 2532 + HS 7432 + HS 2986 and Ur₂ = UET 6 395, in Delnero 2006, 1909 ff.

As noted by George¹⁹⁹ the Akkadian translation shows Old Babylonian forms as well as Middle Babylonian.²⁰⁰ He suggests that in the Old Babylonian period single words were glossed and later these glosses became part of a full translation. Peterson²⁰¹ noticed that the mistranslation of unken, 'assembly', by *ummanum*, 'army', in line 10 might reflect the conflation of two different traditions. The OB tablet UM 29-16-198 + UM 29-16-219 + N 1519 + N 1572²⁰² has indeed uĝnim, 'army'. However according to Delnero²⁰³ this is an unconscious memory error influenced by the phonetic similarity of the two forms. These two hypotheses might be reconciled by speculating that the mistake in UM 29-16-198+ was recopied in other unpreserved manuscripts leading to the creation of a textual variant reflected in the MB tablet. However, it seems to me more likely that the mistranslation is a scribal mistake due to phonetic similarities: the scribe misread unken as uĝnim and translated it with 'army'.

¹⁹³ ETCSL 2.5.5.1.

¹⁹⁴ For the full list of manuscripts see Delnero 2006, 1909-1916; line numbers are noted here as in his edition, Delnero 2006, 1917 ff.; newly identified Nippur fragments in Peterson 2011, 194-196.

¹⁹⁵ Robson 2001, 53.

¹⁹⁶ Joins according to Peterson 2011, 192.

¹⁹⁷ Ni 9696 source N_{U1} in Delnero 2006.

¹⁹⁸ Source N_{U7} in Delnero 2006.

¹⁹⁹ George 2012.

²⁰⁰ Note also the use of ša₂ in Ni 9696 (*Lipit-Ištar A*, 4), Delnero 2006, 1918.

²⁰¹ Peterson 2011, 193-194.

²⁰² Source N₁₆ in Delnero 2006.

²⁰³ Delnero 2006, 855.

MAH 10828²⁰⁴ is a pillow-shaped extract tablet of unknown provenance containing, on the obverse, § 7 of the Codex Hammu-rābi preceded by two lines of *Lipit-Ištar A*.²⁰⁵ The reverse has an unidentified lexical text, possibly a list of birds.²⁰⁶ MAH 10828, 1-2 reports lines 78-79 of *Lipit-Ištar A* with no variants attested.

These two tablets show that an important curricular text such as *Lipit-Ištar A*, which was adopted in many Old Babylonian scribal schools, continued to be copied as a learning tool during the Middle Babylonian period.

1.1.3.5 Lipit-Ištar and the Plow – Lipit-Ištar F

The composition *Lipit-Ištar and the Plow – Lipit-Ištar F*²⁰⁷ is a hymn composed to commemorate the *gusisu*-festival at Nippur during the reign of Lipit-Ištar of Isin.²⁰⁸ In the ritual the king assumes the characteristics of the divine farmer Ninurta. This text is known from a few OB Nippur manuscripts,²⁰⁹ but unfortunately remains unpublished.²¹⁰ Three MB tablets from Nippur are known so far.

UM 29-15-399 + Ni 9734²¹¹ (MB₁) is a bilingual tablet in parallel column format.²¹² The obverse duplicates STVC 75²¹³ Rev. I 10-22 and STVC 79²¹⁴ 1-7.²¹⁵ The reverse duplicates STVC 75 Rev. II 1-22.²¹⁶ This manuscript adheres to the OB sources, although some variants are attested.²¹⁷

N 3495 (MB₂) is a small fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving, on the obverse, *Lipit-Ištar F* 113-118 duplicated in UM 29-15-399+. Only the Sumerian text is preserved but it is not precluded that an Akkadian translation was arranged in a parallel column. The reverse is broken away. This fragment, therefore, offers the rare opportunity to compare two different MB manuscripts of the same composition.²¹⁸

113 A	Rev. II 1-2	[...] a[<i>pin</i> ?] [.....] / [.....-r]a ² mu-ra-an-dar-e
MB ₁	Rev. 1	[.....] x-na ² ḥu- ² mu- ² ra-ab-du ₇ -du ₇ -uš-ra ² mu- ² ra-[...] ²¹⁹
MB ₂	1	[.....ḥ]u- ² mu- ² ra- ² x-du ₇ - ² d[u ₇ ... mu-ra-an]-dar ²

204 Source X₁₀ in Delnero 2006.

205 Veldhuis 2000a, 72.

206 Veldhuis 2000a, 67 n. 1.

207 ETCSL 2.5.5.6.

208 Cohen 1993, 89-90.

209 The Old Babylonian manuscripts are listed in the DCSL website, see Civil 1976, 84 n. 3; newly identified Nippur fragments are published in Peterson 2011, 202-209.

210 A score transliteration by Miguel Civil is housed in the PSD files of the University Museum, Philadelphia, see Peterson 2011, 202 n. 68; an edition of the MB tablets will be prepared by the writer.

211 In Ni 9734 = ISET II Pl. 26, obverse and reverse must be interchanged; this fragment is the left edge of the tablet.

212 The sign KUR shows the typical Kassite form in Ni 9734 (ISET II Pl. 26) Rev¹. 4, 7 and UM 29-15-399 Obv. 3.

213 CBS 14062.

214 CBS 14054.

215 UM 29-15-399+, 7-9 have no duplicated lines preserved.

216 These lines correspond to *Lipit-Ištar F* 113-125, see Civil 1976, 85.

217 See for instance UM 29-15-399+, 4, kur-gal ^den-lil₂ en [^dn]in-urta-ra mi₂-zi na-mu-un-e₃ VS STVC 75 Rev. I, 17-18, ^den-lil₂ en [^dn]in-urta-ra mu-un-na-ni-ib-gi₄-gi₄.

218 A = STVC 75.

219 N 3507, 8, [.....ḥ]u-mu-ra-an-d[u₇...], Peterson 2011, 209.

114 A	Rev. II 3-4	[^d li-pi ₂ -it-ištar dumu ^d en-lil ₂ -la ₂ ke ₄ / muš ₃ nu-tum ₂ -mu he ₂ -me-en
MB ₁	Rev. 2	[^d li]- ^r pi ₂ -ištar dumu ^d en-lil ₂ -la ₂ -ke ₄ muš ₃ nu-tum ₂ -mu ḥ[e ₂ -me-en]
MB ₂	2	[^d li-pi ₂ -it]-ištar dumu ^d en-lil ₂ -[l]a ₂ -ke ₄ muš ₃ nu-tum ₂ -[mu he ₂ -me-en]
115 A	Rev. II 5-6	ʾlugal-ḡu ₁₀ gud [sa]ḡ [?] ḡeš ^š apin-na / mi ₂ ga-am ₃ -ma-ni-du ₁₁
MB ₁	Rev. 3	[lugal]-ḡ[u ₁₀] gud saḡ ḡeš ^š apin-na ʾmi ₂ ga-ʾam ₃ -ma-ni-ib-du ₁₁
MB ₂	3	[lugal-ḡu ₁₀ gud s]aḡ [?] ḡeš ^š apin-ʾra [?] mi ₂ ga-am ₃ -ma-ni-[(ib)-du ₁₁]
116 A	Rev. II 7-8	e-el-lu gud-ba [...]ḡen-a / ḡeš ^š utul ₄ -a gu ₂ -ḡar-i ₃
MB ₁	Rev. 4	[e-e]l-lu gud ḡen-ḡen-a ḡeš ^š utul ₄ -a gu ₂ -ḡar-i ₃
MB ₂	4	[e-el-lu gu]d ḡen-a ḡen-a ḡeš ^š utul ₄ -a gu ₂ -ḡar-i ₃
117 A	Rev. II 9-10	gud lugal-la-ke ₄ ḡen-a ḡen-a / ḡeš ^š utul ₄ -a gu ₂ -ḡar-i ₃
MB ₁	Rev. 5	[gud luga]l-la-ke ₄ ḡen-a ḡeš ^š utul ₄ -a gu ₂ -ḡar-i ₃
MB ₂	5	[gud lugal-la k]e ₄ ḡen-a ḡen-a [(...)]
118 A	Omitted	
MB ₁	Rev. 6	ʾxʾ (x) RIʾ [x] ḡiri ₃ DU.DU-i ₃ us ₂ si-sa ₂ ḥe ₂ -e-dib
MB ₂	6	[..... ḡi]ri ₃ ʾDU.DU-i ₃ us ₂ siʾ-sa ₂ ʾ [ḥe ₂ -e-dib]

As one may easily notice the two MB manuscripts are almost identical and also correspond to the OB tablet. The only relevant variant is the presence of line 118 in UM 29-15-399+ which is omitted in the OB manuscript. Although only a few traces are preserved, it seems that this line was inscribed in N 3495 as well. This addition is another example of the modifications of OB texts occurring in the Kassite period.

Another possible MB manuscript of *Lipit-Ištar F* is **N 3498**, a small fragment preserving a few lines on one side whereas the other side is broken away. The text is bilingual in interlinear format with the Akkadian version written in small script underneath Sumerian lines. This fragment does not duplicate any part of the OB recension, but according to Peterson²²⁰ it echoes lines 27 ff.

Although this composition was originally associated with the celebration of the *gusisu*-festival, its attestation on *imgidda* tablets²²¹ suggests that at a certain point it entered into the curriculum. Nevertheless *Lipit-Ištar F* did not become a very popular text as only ten OB manuscripts are preserved which is, however, a duplication-rate higher than for hymnic liturgies.²²² Moreover, it seems that the text has no practical association with the *gusisu*-festival because it probably lacks any performative subscripts typical of hymnic liturgies.²²³ The MB manuscripts should be regarded as ensuing from school activities. The provenance of the OB manuscripts and the context of the festival clearly indicate that this text is representative of the Nippur tradition.

220 Peterson 2011, 208.

221 N 3520, N 2571, see Peterson 2011, 202-204.

222 Cf. Tinney 2011, 585.

223 The OB tablet N 3520 ends with the phrase za₃-mi₂ du₁₀-ga that is evocative of the za₃-mi₂ doxology (for this term see Shehata 2009, 238-239), although this is not the last line because the tablet is an extract, Peterson 2011, 207.

1.1.3.6 Praise Poem of Ḫammu-rābi

VAT 19236 = VS 24 41²²⁴ is a pillow-shaped tablet from Babylon containing a two-line extract of a self-praise poem of Ḫammu-rābi²²⁵ (Type B.II)²²⁶ in interlinear bilingual format on the obverse. The reverse is uninscribed. This composition is known from two OB sources: LB 2111 = TLB 2 3 (A) a single-column tablet of unknown provenance; UET 1 146 Fragment b (B) a bilingual fragment of a diorite stele from Ur.²²⁷ A number of fragments of a Ḫammu-rābi inscription from Ur were excavated at the site – published under UET 1 146 – or purchased on the market – YOS 9 39-61 and A 3518.²²⁸ The relationship among these fragments is unclear but it seems unlikely that they belong to the same monument.²²⁹ This is one of the very few royal hymns actually found inscribed on monuments. The vast majority of royal hymns that were perhaps composed to be inscribed on monuments are only preserved on OB school tablets.²³⁰

VS 24 21 (C) reports lines 11-12 of the manuscript A:

C	1	ur-saĝ-ur-saĝ-e-ne bada ₃ ^d [^a giri ₁₇ -zal-e-ne ...]
	2	<i>qar-ra-ad qar-ra-a-di e-qi₂-i[d...]</i>
A	11	ur-saĝ-ur-saĝ-e-ne banda ₃ ^{da} giri ₁₇ -zal-e-ne / nam-šul nam-ur-saĝ šu-du ₇ -du ₇ -me-en
B	2-3	[ur-saĝ-ur-saĝ-e-n]e // banda ₃ ^{da} giri ₁₇ -zal-e-ne [nam-šul nam-ur-sa]ĝ // [šu-du ₇ -du ₇ -me]-en <i>qar-ra-ad qar-r[a-di] // e-qi₂-id mu-t[a-al-lu-tim] //</i> <i>mu-ša-ak-li-[il eṭ-lu-tim u₃] // mu-tu-t[im...]</i>
C	3	kalam ^d amar-utu-ke ₄ gu ₂ nu-un-[x ...]
	4	KALAM ša a-na ^d Marduk la ka-an-ša [...]
A	12	kalam ^d amar-utu-ke ₄ gu ₂ nu-ĝar-ra-ma
B	6-7	[kalam ^d amar-utu]-ke ₄ // [gu ₂ nu-ĝar-ra]-še ₃ <i>ma-tam ša [a-na ^dMarduk] // la ka-[an-šu...]</i>

The second part of line 11 (A) was perhaps inscribed on the broken portion of the extract tablet.²³¹ The text adheres to the OB sources both in Sumerian and Akkadian; the only variant in the Sumerian text is in line 3: nu-un- instead of nu- as in A. Although this is considered one of the rare examples of a royal hymn that was originally carved on a preserved monument, it is unclear whether the OB tablet TLB 2 3 is actually a copy of the inscription or an inspiration for it.²³² As with the Codex Ḫammu-rābi which is also attested on a MB excerpt,²³³ VAT 19236 shows the two poles of the setting of a royal inscription, the stele and the extract tablet. It is important that a possible piece of *narua* literature survived in the Kassite period for a pedagogical purpose. To date no first-millennium duplicates have been recovered.

224 For the date of this tablet see remarks in Veldhuis 2000a, 69-70.

225 ETCSL 2.8.2.c, see Cunningham 2007, 370.

226 For the classification of Sumerian hymns see fn. 191.

227 Sjöberg 1961a.

228 An edition of the relevant fragments is provided by Van de Mieroop 2011.

229 Van de Mieroop 2011, 310.

230 Flückiger-Hawker 1999, 78-85.

231 See Van de Mieroop 2011, 315 n. 25.

232 Van de Mieroop 2011, 329-331.

233 See Veldhuis 2000a, 71-72 and § 1.1.3.4.

1.1.4 Divine Praise Poems

1.1.4.1 Enlil A

The hymn *Enlil A*²³⁴ is one the most popular compositions in the Old Babylonian Nippur curriculum due to its inclusion in the Decad. It is attested in many sources mainly from Nippur but is known in manuscripts from Ur (four manuscripts), Babylon (one manuscript), Isin (one manuscript), Kiš (two manuscripts) and Sippar (one manuscript) as well as in eight unprovenanced tablets.²³⁵ Twenty-four tablets were unearthed in House F in Nippur.²³⁶

Two MB manuscripts from Nippur are preserved: CBS 10457 and CBS 10903. Unfortunately no lines are paralleled between these two tablets.

CBS 10457²³⁷ is a two-column tablet containing a monolingual version of the text. Lines 16-22, 31-48 (Col. I) and 62-95 (Col. II) are preserved on the obverse and lines 99-128 (Col. III) and 144-160 (Col. IV) on the reverse. This tablet presents several variants²³⁸ most of which are not attested in any other manuscript of *Enlil A*.²³⁹ Here follow some relevant variants:

- Substitution of -(C)e with -(C)a and vice versa:²⁴⁰

e > a:		
	72	kur-kur-ra VS kur-kur-re
	120	nu-du ₈ -a VS nu-du ₈ -e
	123	nu-il ₂ -la VS nu-il ₂ -e
a > e:		
	120	an-e VS an-na

- Incorrect substitution of -n- with -b- in the verb:²⁴¹

102	ši-im-mi-ib-[...] VS ši-im-mi-in-tar-re
106	ša ₃ mu-un-da-ab-[...] VS ša ₃ mu-un-da-an-kuš ₂ -u ₃

- Assimilation:²⁴²

102	ni ₂ -te-a-na VS ni ₂ -te-a-ni
106	mu-un-du-zu VS mu-(un)-da-an-zu

Confusion of -e and -a and of -b- and -n- are phenomena known since the Old Babylonian period, whereas the cases of assimilation are probably to be assigned to the scribe. Likely, the several omissions and additions are also scribal mistakes.²⁴³ Tablets sharing variants with CBS 10457 are mainly from Nippur.

²³⁴ ETCSL 4.5.1.

²³⁵ For the full list of sources see Delnero 2006, 2108-2114; lines are here cited according to his edition, Delnero 2006, 2115 ff.; newly identified Nippur fragments in Peterson 2010b, 574-579.

²³⁶ Robson 2001, 53.

²³⁷ Source N₁₃ in Delnero 2006.

²³⁸ For the full list of variants see Delnero 2006, 1221.

²³⁹ Delnero 2006, 1221-1222 (Type A variants).

²⁴⁰ Type A variations No. 185, 313, 316, 323 in Delnero 2006, 1309-1318.

²⁴¹ Type A variations No. 271, 278.

²⁴² Type A variations No. 269, 277.

²⁴³ See for instance ni₂ me-bi for ni₂ me-lim₄-bi (l. 78).

CBS 10903²⁴⁴ is a fragment from the upper right corner of a two-column tablet. The obverse preserves lines 1-11 of the composition with Akkadian glosses whereas the reverse is left blank, but probably column IV was inscribed.²⁴⁵ Only a few variants are attested:

- 1. -am₃ is omitted at the end of the line; this variant is shared with manuscripts N_{III} and X₁.
- 5. -a is omitted after para₁₀-mah; this variant is shared with manuscript N_{III} only.
- 9. The verbal form begins with the prefix ši- instead of im-; this variant is shared with the tablet from Babylon Ba₁.

It is clear that both manuscripts rely on the Old Babylonian Nippur textual tradition of this composition but some modifications elaborated in the Middle Babylonian period occur. The attestation of *Enlil A* in the Kassite documentation shows that this composition continued to be used in the Advanced Phase of the curriculum during the Middle Babylonian period. Nevertheless, no first-millennium sources have been recovered so far.

1.1.4.2 Inana C

The hymn *Inana C*²⁴⁶ is known from over thirty OB manuscripts,²⁴⁷ most of which are from Nippur (24). Seven bilingual tablets in phonetic Sumerian have been found in Tell Harmal, the ancient Šaduppum.²⁴⁸ Other manuscripts stem from Susa²⁴⁹ and probably Sippar;²⁵⁰ some are of unknown provenance. This text is quoted in the Louvre literary catalogue (L: 40)²⁵¹ and in the Andrews University catalogue (B4: 1).²⁵² Although the composition is not part of the Decad it is worth noting that in the unprovenanced Andrews University catalogue it is listed as the first entry, suggesting that *Inana C* was likely copied as an exercise in the school from which that catalogue stems, whatever the nature of literary catalogues was.²⁵³ Moreover *Inana C* was quite popular in House F in Nippur since nine manuscripts were unearthed there.²⁵⁴

Three MB tablets are thus far known: CBS 13860, KM 89404, CBS 15203.

CBS 13860 is a fragment from a two-column tablet from Nippur preserving a bilingual version of *Inana C* 7-22 in parallel column format.²⁵⁵ Only the right-hand side of the Sumerian column and the left-hand side of the Akkadian are preserved. Hence a complete comparison with the OB manuscripts is not possible. Some orthographic variants²⁵⁶ are attested but the OB manuscripts are also characterized by textual variation. Unfortunately, it is unknown whether some variants attested in CBS 13860 were contained in the OB manuscripts because of their fragmentary nature. The only

²⁴⁴ This source is not included in Delnero 2006.

²⁴⁵ See remarks in Peterson 2010b, 574.

²⁴⁶ ETCSL 4.7.3.

²⁴⁷ The tablets edited in Peterson 2010b, No. 24, 25, 26, 27, are to be added to the manuscripts listed in ETCSL.

²⁴⁸ See § 4.

²⁴⁹ Sb 12366.

²⁵⁰ BM 54316 = CT 58 53.

²⁵¹ ETCSL 0.2.2.

²⁵² ETCSL 0.2.11, see Sjöberg 1975a, 166.

²⁵³ Cf. Delnero 2010, 53.

²⁵⁴ Robson 2001, 56.

²⁵⁵ Sjöberg 1975a, 207-208.

²⁵⁶ Note for instance that e-ne in line 10, [...]ig E-NE, is probably copied from the following line [...ur₄]-re-e-ne; also lines 13, 16, 22 might contain mistakes.

relevant variant is the writing ši-la₂ for eš₂-la₂²⁵⁷ which is also shared by 3N-T 387 (IM 58456) (E). The lines of the Akkadian version in CBS 13860 are not preserved in any of the Tell Harmal manuscripts.

KM 89404 is a pillow-shaped tablet housed in the collection of the Kelsey Museum of Archeology at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. It is a bilingual extract tablet in interlinear format inscribed with two lines (*Inana C* 158-159) on the obverse whereas the reverse is uninscribed. Both date and provenance are uncertain, but according to Michalowski²⁵⁸ it could be an early Kassite tablet that is not from Nippur. Line 158 is only preserved in the Nippur manuscript Q (CBS 2357 = HAV 20), whereas line 159 is attested in Q as well as in R (IM 51176 = TIM 9 24), one of the bilingual tablets in phonetic writing from Tell-Harmal, and is quoted in the first five lines of Tablet II of the lexical series *Erimḫuš*.²⁵⁹ Variants are attested between KM 89404 and manuscript Q, some of which are phonetic writings:

Line	KM 89404	OB text
1=158	ba-an-gi	ba-an-gi ₄ ¹
1=158	niĝ ₂ kur ₂ di-di	niĝ ₂ -a ₂ -zi du ₁₁ -du ₁₁
2=159	niĝ ₂ kur ₂ di-di	niĝ ₂ kur ₂ du ₁₁ -du ₁₁
2=159	pi-il-la ₂	pe-el

¹ For this word see Michalowski 1998, 68-69.

- Note that niĝ₂-kur₂--du₁₁, 'to say something hostile',²⁶⁰ replaces niĝ₂-a₂-zi--du₁₁, 'to speak roughly, to make violence',²⁶¹ in line 158; in the OB text niĝ₂-kur₂--du₁₁ is attested in line 159 and in the shortened form kur₂ du₁₁-ga in line 157; the MB variant in l. 158 might be a mistake of the scribe who perhaps miscopied from the following line.
- The writing pi-il-la₂ is documented in the first-millennium sources of the series *Erimḫuš*.

As noted by Michalowski, the KM tablet provides a better Akkadian translation for line 159 than the Tell-Harmal manuscript and is closer to the first-millennium lexical list. The rendering of niĝ₂-kur₂ du₁₁-du₁₁ with *qabê šanīti*, instead of *ēpeš namūtīm* as attested in the Tell Harmal manuscript, is also documented in OB Lu and in the Middle Assyrian lexical text CT 51 168.²⁶²

This composition is known to us in two different textual traditions, one from Nippur in standard orthography, and another one from Northern Babylonia - Tell Harmal - in phonetic orthography.²⁶³ The relation of KM 89404 to these two traditions cannot be fully understood on the basis of only two lines. According to Michalowski, KM 89404 stems from Northern Babylonia. However, with the exception of the variants noted above, it resembles the Nippur textual tradition of manuscript Q rather than the Tell Harmal tradition. Indeed, the KM tablet does not contain any of the phonetic writings of manuscript R. The first-millennium tablets of the lexical list *Erimḫuš* rely on the same tradition as manuscript Q. On the basis of the evidence presently available it is not possible to clearly place KM 89404 within a stream of tradition. However, it is not precluded that this source represents a variant of the Nippur textual tradition.

²⁵⁷ For this term attested in CBS 13892 (A), see Sjöberg 1975a, 212; CBS 19795 (F) has šu-la₂.

²⁵⁸ Michalowski 1998, 66-67.

²⁵⁹ MSL 17.

²⁶⁰ Attinger 1993, 590-593.

²⁶¹ Attinger 1993, 628-629.

²⁶² Attinger 1993, 591.

²⁶³ On phonetic orthography in Northern Babylonia see § 4.

CBS 15203 is a bilingual manuscript in interlinear format²⁶⁴ with the Akkadian text written in small script. This is the largest MB fragment and contains lines 205 ff., but is unfortunately unpublished.²⁶⁵

1.1.5 Types of Songs

1.1.5.1 The Song of the Plowing Oxen

*The Song of the Plowing Oxen*²⁶⁶ is a short composition bearing a subscript that describes the text as an *ululumama*-song for Ninurta. Only four texts have the *ululumama* subscript appended and display thematic similarities in connection with cowherds and cattle.²⁶⁷ *The Song of the Plowing Oxen* was composed to be recited during the *gasisu*-festival at Nippur.²⁶⁸ As is typical of non-curricular texts this composition shows a low rate of duplication:²⁶⁹ only three OB multicolumn tablets from Nippur are preserved.²⁷⁰ Nevertheless it continued to be copied in the post-Old Babylonian period as a scribal exercise. Indeed, it is unlikely that the *gasisu*-festival continued to be observed after the Old Babylonian period.²⁷¹ The composition survived in the first millennium in a fragment from Nineveh, K 18450,²⁷² preserving the Akkadian translation,²⁷³ but probably the Sumerian version was arranged in a parallel column. *The Song of the Plowing Oxen* is also quoted in the Neo Assyrian catalogue of the series of Sidu that lists 35 wisdom compositions.²⁷⁴

Three bilingual fragments from Nippur, **UM 29-13-560**, **N 3529** and **N 3169**, date to the Middle Babylonian period. They probably belong to the same multicolumn tablet with Sumerian and Akkadian arranged in parallel sub-columns. Due to the fragmentary nature of the MB manuscripts Civil only edited column II of UM 29-13-560 preserving the Sumerian text of lines 15-29.²⁷⁵ The other two fragments are unplaced. For the extant portion of the text, the MB manuscript adheres to the Old Babylonian sources with only irrelevant variants attested.

1.1.5.2 A Litigant's Prayer

The small tablet **LB 806 = Peiser Urkunden 92** contains a bilingual prayer,²⁷⁶ with Sumerian on the obverse and Akkadian on the reverse.²⁷⁷ The tablet is part of a family archive of legal and business documents.²⁷⁸ This text is a personal prayer to the gods Šamaš and Nabû in order to gain their favor in a lawsuit. Likely the text was composed during the Kassite period; indeed no duplicates are

²⁶⁴ Veldhuis 2000a, 75 n. 23.

²⁶⁵ An edition of the manuscript will be prepared by the writer.

²⁶⁶ ETCSL 5.5.5.

²⁶⁷ Shehata 2009, 302-303.

²⁶⁸ *Lipit-Ištar F* is also associated with this festival, see § 1.1.3.5.

²⁶⁹ Cf. Tinney 2011, 585.

²⁷⁰ Civil 1976, 86.

²⁷¹ Cohen 1993, 91-92.

²⁷² Livingstone 1980.

²⁷³ Lines 117-129.

²⁷⁴ Finkel 1986; for the series of Sidu see § 9.4. Two texts from the Western periphery, *The Ballad of Early Rulers* and possibly *The Fowler*, are quoted in the same catalogue, §§ 6.2.1, 6.2.3.

²⁷⁵ Col. I contains the Akkadian translation of either the previous section of the text or of another composition, see remarks in Civil 1976, 86.

²⁷⁶ See Cooper 1971, 3.

²⁷⁷ For this type of text see RIA 5, 125.

²⁷⁸ Foster 2005, 767.

- The use of the verbal prefix *ši-* in lines 124-125 is shared by MS 3366, another manuscript of unknown provenance.
- The possible use of the non-human possessive suffix *-bi* instead of the human *-ani* after *ama₅* in line 125 perhaps indicates the late date of the manuscript.²⁸⁴

The Instructions of Šuruppak are included in the House F Fourteen and can be assigned to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. Nevertheless, despite its popularity in Nippur, this composition, as is clear from the Early Dynastic sources, did not originate in Nippur. In the Old Babylonian period different versions existed from Susa and Kiš²⁸⁵ and the Ur sources also display a certain degree of variation.²⁸⁶ The poor state of preservation of the Schøyen Collection tablet and the limited number of lines quoted do not allow us to sufficiently understand the relation between MS 2291 and the Old Babylonian recension(s). However, the variation shown by this manuscript – unclear placement of lines on the obverse; the absence of Rev. 3 from the OB tablets; orthographic variants – suggests that it reflects a tradition different from the OB Nippur recension.

A monolingual Akkadian version of *The Instructions of Šuruppak* is preserved on a MB tablet from Sippar²⁸⁷ and on a MA manuscript from Assur.²⁸⁸ This composition is also attested in an Akkado-Hurrian bilingual version inscribed on a fragment stemming from an unknown Syrian center.²⁸⁹ Only a few lines are duplicated in these tablets, but according to Alster²⁹⁰ the Akkadian translation was made up independently. Although there was much interest in this composition during the Late Bronze Age, no first-millennium copies are so far known.

1.1.6.2 The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta

*The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta (Ur-Ninurta G)*²⁹¹ and *Counsels of Wisdom* are related compositions; they reflect on similar themes and appear on the same OB *Sammeltafel*n.²⁹²

The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta is a composition of seventy-one lines comprising three different sections of 37, 27 and 7 lines respectively. The first section describing the installation of Ur-Ninurta as ruler of Nippur bears the subscript²⁹³ ‘precepts of a god’. The second section containing instructions on the work at the time of harvest, but with more of a religious tone than a practical one, is marked by the subscript ‘precept of a farmer’. The last section advises men to observe worship of the gods. This composition is transmitted either on *Sammeltafel*n together with *Counsels of Wisdom* or as a single composition written on single-column tablets.²⁹⁴ In one of the *Sammeltafel*n, VS 10 204,²⁹⁵ *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* and *Counsels of Wisdom* are preceded by *The Disputation of the Bird and the Fish* and an unknown composition.²⁹⁶ An OB catalogue from Sippar quotes the

284 Alster 2005, 142: 125.

285 See Alster 2005, 219.

286 Alster 2005, 220.

287 BM 50522 + BM 52767 + BM 52946 + BM 77468 + ?; edition in Alster 2005 with Lambert’s copies on Pl. 13-15.

288 VAT 10151 = KAR 27, Weidner 1952-53, No. 109; published in Lambert 1960, 92-95, 311, Alster 2005.

289 Alster 2005, 204-208; for this source see § 9.1.

290 Alster 2005, 207.

291 ETCSL 2.5.6.7.

292 See discussion in Alster 2005, 221-224.

293 Alster 2005, 222; for a possible subscript to the third section see Civil 1997, 49.

294 IM 55403 = TIM 9 1, Ni 4035 = SLTN 137.

295 VAT 6977 + VAT 6978.

296 Civil 1972, 88; the unknown composition is not preserved but its existence has been calculated by Civil from the size of VS 10 204.

first part of the incipit of *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* but it is unclear whether the entry actually refers to this composition.²⁹⁷

The text of *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* is preserved on three OB tablets of which just one, SLTN 137 (B), stems from Nippur. TIM 9 1 (A) is a single column tablet from Tell Harmal inscribed with the text in phonetic writing and VS 10 204 (C) is a three-column tablet of unknown provenience, but possibly from Sippar. Two additional manuscripts, UM 29-13-419A (D) and MM 487b (E), are probably Middle Babylonian.

UM 29-13-419A is a fragment from Nippur from the left edge of a three-column tablet inscribed with 40-50 lines per column. It contains monolingual Sumerian versions of *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* and *Counsels of Wisdom*. Lines 23-37 of *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* are preserved on the obverse.

MM 487b is a fragment of a two-column tablet housed in the Montserrat Museum in Barcelona, probably stemming from Babylon.²⁹⁸ Only part of the obverse is preserved whereas the reverse is broken away. This manuscript preserves lines 20-33 and 56-68 of *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta*, but it probably included *Counsels of Wisdom*.²⁹⁹ The text presents several Akkadian glosses.

As it stands, the MB manuscripts belong to a different textual tradition from source A which is written in phonetic orthography and comes from Northern Babylonia. Phonetic writings are also attested in C.³⁰⁰ Here follows the list of variants among manuscripts written in standard orthography:

Line	D	E	B	C
21	x	siškur	siškur-ra	x
23	[...-d]e ₃	ku ₅ -ru-da	<i>Line Omitted</i>	x
25	in-na-a[b-...]	im-ma-ab-su-su	in ^ˀ -na-ab- [...]	x
25	x	[niĝ ₂ -ug]u-	x	u ₂ ^ˀ -[gu-...]
26	mu-da- ^ˀ an-daḥ ^ˀ -[e]	mu-un-da-an-daḥ-e	mu-da-an- [...]	<i>Line Omitted</i>
27	[...-n]i	[...-r]a-na	x	<i>Line Omitted</i>
27	mu ^ˀ mu-a	mu	mu mu	<i>Line Omitted</i>
27	ib ₂ -diri-diri	bi-ib ₂ -diri-diri-ge	ib ₂ - [...]	<i>Line Omitted</i>
28	[eĝir-a-n]i	[eĝir-r]a-na	x	<i>Line Omitted</i>
28	šu-gi ₄	šu	šu-gi ₄ -a	<i>Line Omitted</i>
28	bi ₂ -ib ₂ -su ₃ -su ₃	mu-ub-gi ₄ -gi ₄	bi ₂ ^ˀ - [...]	<i>Line Omitted</i>
29	mu-na- ^ˀ de ₂ ^ˀ -e	mu-na-an-de ₂ -e	mu-un-na-d[e ₂ -e]	x
29a	mu-un-ši-bar-re	<i>Line Omitted</i>	ba-an-[ši-bar-re]	<i>Line Omitted</i>
29b	ḥe ₂ -bi ₂ -ib-gub-b[e ₂]	<i>Line Omitted</i>	ḥe ₂ -em- ^ˀ x ^ˀ - [...]	(x)
31	nu-mu-na-kal-le	x	nu-mu-un-na- [...]	x
32	nu-mu-na-geg-ga	[nu-m]u-un-na-geg-ga	nu-mu-u[n-...]	x
33	[...-l]a-ni	x	x	til-la- ^ˀ a ^ˀ
57	x	gud-da- [...]	[...]-da-si ₃ -ke-bi	gud ^ˀ -ba ^ˀ (-)-da ^ˀ
60	x	ki a-du ₁₁ -ga	x	ki-za de ₂ K[A]
62	x	šu na-ab-ta ₃ -ta ₃	x	n[am-...]
63	x	mur ^ˀ	x	lu ₂ ^ˀ
65	x	-	x	lu ₂ ^ˀ

297 Si 331 Rev. 6, van Dijk 1989, 448, cf. fn. 83.

298 Civil 1997, 43-44.

299 Alster 2005, 225.

300 25: u₂^ˀ-[gu] ~ ugu; 31: šu-wi-l[e] ~ šu-il₂-la; 33: til ~ til₃; 66: erin₂ ~ iri/eri^{ki}.

Line	D	E	B	C
66	x	eri-na-ka	x	erin ₂
67	x	šu-kin-dab ₅ -ba	x	šu-ku-[...]²

1 Cf. mu-ri (A), Alster 2005, 239.
2 Cf. šu-ku-un-di-ip-pa (A).

Only lines 23-33 are preserved in the two MB manuscripts D and E. The only phonetic writing attested in the MB tablets is ere-na-ka for erin₂ in E (l. 66). On the contrary, in lines 25 and 67 where the Sippar manuscript C has phonetic writings E reports the text in standard orthography. Manuscript E diverges from C also in lines 60 and 63. Manuscript A shows some textual variants from the MB tablets, in addition to phonetic writings: 27. D-E: mu-(a) (bi₂)-ib₂-diri-diri-(ge) VS A: mu im-ma-^{si}; 32. D-E: nu-mu-(un)-na-geg-ga VS A: nu-mu-un-na-teĝ₃-ĝi₆-e; 35. D: si nu-sa₂-e VS A: a nu-mu-un-de-e. In these passages the OB Nippur tablet B agrees with the MB manuscripts. It can be said that manuscripts B, D and E belong the same stream of tradition.³⁰¹ However, B shows closer similarities to D than to E, as in the following instances: 25. B-D: in-na-ab- VS E im-ma-; 26. B-D: mu-da-an- VS E: mu-un-da-; 27. B-D: mu mu-(a) ib₂-diri-diri VS E: mu bi-ib₂-diri-diri-ge; 28. B-D: šu-gi₄-(a) bi₂-ib₂-su₃-su₃ VS E: šu mu-ub-gi₄-gi₄.³⁰² Moreover, B and D are the only manuscripts to report lines 29a-c even though they display variants. The close relation between B and D is obviously tied to their common provenance from Nippur.³⁰³ MM 487b perhaps represents a variant within this stream of tradition.³⁰⁴ It seems plausible that the text of MM 487b was modified where the tablet was copied.

It is worth noting that *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta*, a composition poorly attested in Nippur³⁰⁵ in the Old Babylonian period, is known from the MB Nippur documentation. Despite the limited number of OB sources, its possible quotation in a catalogue and presence on *Sammeltafeln* suggest that this text could have been used in scribal training at least in Sippar. As will be pointed out in the following section this composition possibly survived into the first millennium, even though no duplicates are preserved.

1.1.6.3 Counsels of Wisdom

As stated above *Counsels of Wisdom*³⁰⁶ was written on the same *Sammeltafeln* as *The Instructions of Ur Ninurta*. *Counsels of Wisdom* comprises two sections which probably were independent compositions before they were combined in *Sammeltafeln*.³⁰⁷ The first section deals with the building of a palace by the king whereas the second includes precepts concerning religious duties. This composition is preserved on seven manuscripts, inscribed either on *Sammeltafeln* or on single column tablets. Two OB single-column tablets stem from Nippur: UM 29-15-979;³⁰⁸ Ni 4193 = ISET I p. 136. Three multicolumn tablets are probably from Sippar: the aforementioned *Sammeltafeln* VS 10 204; VAT 6448 (+) VAT 6479 + VAT 6503 = VS 10 205; VAT 6464 + 6604 = VS 10 206.³⁰⁹ The only MB manuscript is the aforementioned UM 29-13-419A but, as seen above, MM 487b perhaps contained *Counsels of Wisdom* along with *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta*. CBS 11945 (J) is a bilingual tablet

301 For differences between B and C see Alster 2005, 238: 57.

302 Cf. šu mu-un-di-ib-gi₄-gi₄ (A).

303 Note however line 32 where E is closer to B than D.

304 The only mistake in MM 487b is -ni- for the genitive -na- (l. 24), see Alster 2005, 237.

305 Alster 2005, 224.

306 ETCSL 5.6.2.

307 Alster 2005, 223-224.

308 See Sjöberg 1974-75, 180, this is the only manuscript inscribed with the first section alone.

309 VS 10 205 and VS 10 206 are two-column tablets.

from Nippur published by Cavigneaux³¹⁰ as a NB fragment, but which according to Civil is a MB tablet.³¹¹ Paleography reveals that is a NB manuscript.³¹²

UM 29-13-419A preserves the first lines of the composition on the obverse and lines 204-225 on the reverse. Unfortunately, the tablet is too poorly preserved and no parallel lines can be found in the other manuscripts for comparison. For the present work it is worth noting that this composition, as shown by CBS 11945, survived until the first millennium. Hence it is not excluded that *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* were also transmitted to first-millennium libraries due to the relation between these two compositions.

1.1.6.4 The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab

The tale *The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab*,³¹³ which presents the king in his traditional role as judge after a litigation of three men, is known from only three manuscripts.³¹⁴ CBS 1601 (B)³¹⁵ is an OB tablet belonging the Khabaza collection, hence probably from Sippar. **AO 7739 + AO 8149 = TCL 16 80+83** (A) is a tablet of unknown provenance containing a monolingual recension of the composition. Despite the date of Amīšadūqa year 8 in the colophon, Cavigneaux³¹⁶ attributes the tablet to the Kassite period on paleographical grounds³¹⁷ but unfortunately photographs are not available.³¹⁸ A new source has been recently published by Peterson:³¹⁹ UM 29-16-719, an OB fragment of a lenticular tablet (Type IV) containing an extract of one or two lines, is the only known Nippur manuscript of the composition. It demonstrates that this text was known at Nippur during the Old Babylonian period and was utilized as a school exercise. This composition is treated in the present study by considering source A as a MB tablet, but I am aware that this may not prove to be the case.

As noted by Alster the two main sources 'follow each other so closely that one has the impression that they came from the same site, or even that one of them was copied from the other'.³²⁰ A very limited number of only orthographic variants occur:

Line	TCL 16 80+ (A)	CBS 1601 (B)
12	u ₃ -un-du-du-ru	u ₃ -un- ^ˊ dur ₂ -dur ₂ - ^ˊ ru
14	ba-a-la ₂ -e	ba-a-la ₂ -a
15	a-ba-kam	a-ba-a-kam
15	a-ba-am ₃	a-ba- ^ˊ a ^ˊ
80	e ₂ -a- ^ˊ ni ^ˊ ?	e ₂ -a-na
82	u ₃ -un-d[u-du-ru]	um-ku ₅ -ku ₅ -ru

³¹⁰ Cavigneaux 1996b, 18-21.

³¹¹ Civil 1997, 43.

³¹² Beaulieu's insight. I thank Prof. P. A. Beaulieu for his help in dating the tablet. Indications of NB date are the following: signs have slanting shapes typical of NB manuscripts; the form of MU in Rev. 17 is NB. Moreover, there is no clear separation between Sumerian and Akkadian: the Akkadian translation runs immediately after the Sumerian text so that the first sign of each Akkadian line is not aligned; this format is unusual in MB tablets. Scholarly texts are attested in Nippur in the Neo Babylonian period, see Gesche 2000, 21-22, 37-38.

³¹³ ETCSL 5.6.5.

³¹⁴ For the plot see Alster 2005, 374-376.

³¹⁵ Hand-copy in Alster 1991c, 28; sources and lineation according to Alster 2005, 373-383.

³¹⁶ Cavigneaux 1987, 52.

³¹⁷ For a similar case see *Incantation to Utu*, § 1.1.10.2.

³¹⁸ The diagnostic sign KUR does not occur in this tablet and the sign NE does not show the typical Kassite form as often in Middle Babylonian manuscripts.

³¹⁹ Peterson 2010a, 565.

³²⁰ Alster 2005, 374; in line 12, u₃-un-dur₂-dur₂ in B and the corresponding phonetic spelling u₃-un-du-du-ru in A misunderstood ku₅ (attested in B 82, um-ku₅-ku₅-ru) as KU then read as dur₂, Alster 2005, 381.

83	me	me-ni
83	u ₃ -da-an-tum ₂	u ₃ -ba-tum ₂
84	bi ₂ -in-tum ₄ -mu- [˘] da/uš [˘] ?	bi ₂ -in-tum ₃ - [˘] tum ₃ - [˘] a-ni
86	ki-šub-ba-ni-ta ¹	ki-gub-ba- [...]
1 Alster suggests that this line needs collation, Alster 2005, 382: 86.		

This composition likely does not belong to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. Manuscripts A and B clearly reflect the same textual tradition. Unfortunately, these tablets cannot be compared with the only preserved Nippur manuscript because of its fragmentary nature. Nevertheless, line 10=25 inscribed on UM 29-16-719 exactly duplicates the text of manuscript A and B. The grammar is usually correct even though some lines are problematic³²¹ and phonetic writings are attested in A.³²² No first-millennium copies are so far known.

1.1.6.5 The Fowler and his Wife

UM 29-15-848 is a lentil-shaped tablet from Nippur containing on the obverse a one-line extract from the tale *The Fowler and his Wife* in monolingual Sumerian.³²³ The reverse of the tablet has an extract from *Urra. The Fowler and his Wife* exists both as a single text and as a part of Proverb Collections 21 and 24. It was inscribed on several OB manuscripts³²⁴ including excerpts³²⁵ and a Type II tablet 3N-T 168 (A 30175).³²⁶ The tablets' format indicates that this composition was used in the Old Babylonian curriculum, notably in the Intermediary Phase. The same function is retained in the Middle Babylonian period as is clear from the tablet format of UM 29-15-848. The MB manuscript quotes line 5 of the composition, dam mušen-du₃ dam-a-n[i-ir²], 'The fowler's wife spoke to her husband', which although incomplete adheres to the Nippur manuscripts. Nevertheless, UM 29-15-848 omits -ke₄ after mušen-du₃. The University of Iowa manuscript,³²⁷ possibly from Larsa, and an unprovenanced tablet in Copenhagen³²⁸ report a different text for this line.

UM 29-25-848	dam mušen-du ₃ dam-a-n[i-ir ²]
Ni 3206 ³²⁹	dam mušen-du ₃ -ke ₄ dam-a-ni-[ir] // gu ₃ mu-un-na-de ₂ -e
UM 29-15-667	dam mušen-du ₃ -ke ₄ dam-a-ni / [...]
N 1237	dam mušen-du ₃ -ke ₄ dam-a-ni-ir gu ₃ mu-un-na-de ₂ -e
UM 29-13-254B	dam mušen-[...] gu ₃ mu-un-n[a ...]
N 7918	[dam muš]en-du ₃ -ke ₄ pa ₄ -[...]
Cop.	dam-a-ni ka paḥ-a-ka im-ma-na [˘] x [˘] [(x)]
Iowa	dam-a-ni ka ₂ pa ₄ -paḥ-ka // gu ₃ mu-na-de-e

³²¹ For instance ll. 22-24, 79, 87, 90, 92, Alster 2005, 381-383.

³²² gi ~ gi₄ (ll. 3, 13, 17, 88); -ni₃ ~ -ni (l. 86); u₃-un-du-du-ru ~ u₃-un-dur₂-dur-(ru) (l. 12).

³²³ ETCSL 5.6.9.

³²⁴ Alster 1997, 253-254, Alster 2005, 371-372, 398, with previous bibliography.

³²⁵ Kroch-05, University of Iowa No. 18 (= JCS 31, 143).

³²⁶ MSL 15, 9.

³²⁷ See fn. 325.

³²⁸ National Museum, Copenhagen, 10068.

³²⁹ ISET II Pl. 121.

No first-millennium duplicates are known, but the composition *The Fowler* which is closely related to *The Fowler and his Wife*, or perhaps a rephrased version of the same text, is attested at Emar and is possibly quoted in the first-millennium catalogue of the series of Sidu.³³⁰

1.1.7 Proverbs

1.1.7.1 CBS 8039

CBS 8039 is a pillow-shaped tablet from Nippur containing a one-line extract from a text which seems to be a proverb. Even though it does not duplicate any of the extant OB manuscripts, it looks similar to the beginning of Proverb Collection 1. The text contains the phonetic writing si-li-im for silim. According to Veldhuis³³¹ this line may have existed in one of the non-Nippur recensions of Proverb Collection 1. Nevertheless it is attested on a Nippur tablet during the Middle Babylonian period.

1.1.7.2 N 3395

N 3395³³² is a fragment from the lower edge of a bilingual tablet discovered in Nippur. The format is quite unusual: the text is divided into paragraphs by means of horizontal rulings, but the Akkadian version follows the Sumerian text on the same line without any clear separation. This fragment contains a proverb collection of which no duplicates are known from either Old Babylonian or first-millennium sources.³³³ The Sumerian and Akkadian versions are often difficult to harmonize. The Sumerian text presents rare equivalents to the Akkadian words, often attested only in lexical lists, or even as *hapax legomena*,³³⁴ and it is often understandable only through the Akkadian version. Sequences of signs such as 𒄩 IR BU (Rev. 3), and BU² KUN² KA²-na KA-KA ba²-NIM-ma (Rev. 4) likely contain scribal mistakes. Moreover, as noted by Lambert³³⁵ the scribe was none too skilled because identical signs are written in different ways even in the same line.³³⁶ Features of the text and the lack of parallels perhaps indicate that this proverb was composed during the Kassite period. The Akkadian text seems to be the primary version.

1.1.7.3 N 3783 + N 5031

N 3783 + N 5031 is a fragment from a lentil-shaped tablet from Nippur inscribed on the obverse with four lines containing extracts from three different texts.³³⁷ Horizontal rulings are traced after the first and the last line. The first line cites an unidentified text followed by two lines from Proverb Collection 3.150. The last line quotes the incipit of *Lugal-e*.³³⁸ The proverb is not quoted in full. The reverse has an extract of *Syllabary B*.³³⁹

³³⁰ See § 6.2.3.

³³¹ Veldhuis 2000a, 73.

³³² ETCSL 6.2.1. Lineation according to Alster 1997, 288-290.

³³³ On the date of the manuscript see the remarks in Veldhuis 2000b, 394.

³³⁴ Obv. 2.1, 2.3, 2.4; Rev. 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, see Alster 1997, 460-461.

³³⁵ Lambert 1960, 272.

³³⁶ This, however, can be characteristic of the Kassite scribes as noted above, see for instance § 1.1.1.2 fn. 107 and § 1.1.1.3.

³³⁷ Peterson 2007.

³³⁸ See § 1.1.1.5.

³³⁹ See Veldhuis 2000a, 80.

1.1.7.4 N 5447

N 5447 is a fragment of a lentil-shaped tablet from Nippur. The obverse preserves the first words of Proverb Collection 2.113 and 114³⁴⁰ in monolingual Sumerian, unusually followed by an extract of *Urra*. The reverse is uninscribed. The date of this fragment is uncertain and it could turn out to be Old Babylonian. The first proverb adheres to the OB manuscripts, whereas it is possible that the second one slightly differs from the OB recension of SP 2.114:

SP 2.114	ur ki tuš-bi nu-mu-zu-a
N 5447	ur ki tuš-tuš ʾx x ³⁴¹

1.1.7.5 UM 29-16-561

UM 29-16-951 is a pillow-shaped extract tablet from Nippur. The obverse is broken away, but originally had a two-line excerpt text. The reverse is inscribed with three unilingual Sumerian proverbs of which only the third has been identified as a duplicate of Proverb Collection 2.134. The text presents some variants which can be classified as omissions or additions of signs. Due to their features, it seems likely that the variants are to be attributed to the scribe who improperly copied the text rather than to a different textual tradition.

UM 29-16-951	OB Text
saĝ siki sar-ra ¹	saĝ-sar-ra
ba-an-tuku-tuku-a	ba-an-tuku-tuku
u ₃ še ²	u ₃ lu ₂ še
ri-ri	ri-ri-ga

¹ The addition of siki is probably due to a copying mistake as this sign also appears in the following line.

1.1.7.6 Ni 679

Ni 679 is a pillow-shaped tablet from Nippur containing, on the obverse, a two-line extract from Proverb Collection 19 (Sec. E 2) in monolingual Sumerian. The reverse is uninscribed. The OB parallels are too badly preserved to be used for comparison. The only variation which can be noted is the different spelling of the first word ku₃-zu as NA₂.SAL-ni.³⁴² No first-millennium duplicates are known.

1.1.7.7 VAT 17353

VAT 17353 = VS 24 113, discovered in Babylon, is a fragment of a bilingual tablet in parallel column format. For the preserved part, the tablet is only inscribed on the obverse. The Sumerian version, on the left, is only poorly preserved and is separated from the Akkadian translation in the right column by a double ruling.³⁴³ Lines 1-9 duplicate Proverb Collection 3.149 and 14.6 and lines 10-18 contain Proverb Collection 7.77.³⁴⁴ SP 3.149 is also attested in the NA bilingual manuscript BM 38283 (Rev. 11-14).³⁴⁵ Two variants are not attested in any of the OB manuscripts:³⁴⁶ al-šeĝ₃ (l.

³⁴⁰ SP 2 is quoted in the Series of Sidu, Finkel 1986.

³⁴¹ According to Veldhuis 2000a, 73, traces of signs in N 5447 cannot be reconciled with the OB manuscript (CBS 10972+).

³⁴² Alster 1997, 440.

³⁴³ The MB date seems to be confirmed on the basis of the form of the sign RU; note also the sign KAR, see BE 14 No. 220.

³⁴⁴ Cf. SP 1.179.

³⁴⁵ Lambert 1960, 262-264.

³⁴⁶ nu-du₈-a VS nu-du₈ is attested in SP 14.6; [id₂idig]na VS id₂idigna-a is attested in SP 3.149 source II.

2) VS nu-šeĝ₃-šeĝ₃ and [(mu-un)]-ḫub³⁴⁷ (l. 7) VS mu-un-zur-re.³⁴⁸ It is interesting to note that these variants are not attested in the NA manuscript either, which, however, has nam-b[ir-re] instead of mu-un-zur-re. Conversely the Akkadian translation is identical in the MB and NA manuscripts.

In the Sumerian column only the ends of lines 10-18 (= SP 7.77) are preserved, therefore a comparison with the OB recension is not possible. The text seems to be very close to the OB version although a few variants are possibly attested.³⁴⁹ It is worth noting the writing [b]a-da-su₃ for OB ba-da-an-su.

1.1.7.8 MS 2065

MS 2065 is a pillow-shaped tablet of unknown provenance, possibly Middle Babylonian in date, containing an Emesal proverb on the obverse whereas the reverse is uninscribed. What makes this tablet unique is the fact that the text is written in phonetic Sumerian, standard orthography, and Akkadian. Each version comprises three lines separated by horizontal rulings. The three versions are therefore arranged top-to-bottom on the tablet with phonetic Sumerian preceding the standard orthography text. The proverb relates to *The Song of the Millstone*, an *ululamama*-song³⁵⁰ known from only four manuscripts mainly from Nippur.³⁵¹ To my knowledge this is the only MB manuscript and one of only three tablets from Mesopotamia³⁵² that contain parallel versions in phonetic Sumerian and standard orthography. The phonetic Sumerian version differs from the standard orthography text in the spelling of merely two signs without any phonetic alteration:

SS	PhS
-de ₂ -	-de-
nu-geg-ga	nu-ge-ga

1.1.7.9 MS 3310

MS 3310 is a square tablet of unknown provenance, possibly Middle Babylonian. The obverse contains two monolingual proverbs of three lines each separated by a horizontal ruling. The reverse has three monolingual proverbs of two, four and two lines respectively. Two additional lines are inscribed on the lower edge, possibly continuing the last proverb on the reverse. With the exception of the fifth proverb, an abbreviated version of SP 1.84,³⁵³ the other proverbs are unknown so far.

1.1.7.10 MS 3323

MS 3323 is a pillow-shaped tablet of unknown provenance inscribed with a six-line bilingual proverb on the obverse whereas the reverse is left blank. The text is arranged in interlinear format with a Sumerian line followed by two Akkadian lines. According to Alster³⁵⁴ this tablet is an exercise in translating from Akkadian into Sumerian due to the difficulty in harmonizing the two versions and the several mistakes in the Sumerian text. No duplicate of this proverb are known from either earlier or later sources.

³⁴⁷ The Akkadian *iš-ta-ra* is probably a verbal form from *sāru*, 'to whirl, to circle'; šu ḫub-ḫub = *sa-a-ru*, *Erimḫuš* II 244, see CAD S, 190.

³⁴⁸ See also the omission of -re in [a]-gar₃ which, however, is documented in the NA manuscript.

³⁴⁹ See Alster 1997, 110.

³⁵⁰ For this type of song see § 1.1.5.1.

³⁵¹ Civil 2006.

³⁵² The others are UM 29-15-174 and CBS 11319+, see § 4.5.

³⁵³ Alster 2007, 49.

³⁵⁴ Alster 2007, 52-54.

1.1.8 Unidentified Literary Texts

A number of manuscripts, mostly extract tablets, contain unidentified Sumerian literary texts.³⁵⁵

1.1.8.1 3N-T 195

3N-T 195 = OIP 97 No. 42 is a fragment from the lower right corner of a pillow-shaped tablet from Nippur containing an unidentified monolingual Sumerian literary text on the obverse³⁵⁶ and a bilingual version of *Urra XIII* on the reverse¹. Of the literary text only the phrases šu-sikil-la-kam (l. 4) and u₃-du₂-ud-da can be safely read.³⁵⁷

1.1.8.2 CBS 4615

CBS 4615 = PBS 12/1 44 is a pillow-shaped tablet from Nippur inscribed, on the obverse, with a two-line extract of an unknown composition, possibly a proverb, in monolingual Sumerian.³⁵⁸ The reverse is uninscribed.

1.1.8.3 CBS 13990

CBS 13990, unearthed in Nippur, is a small fragment from the lower right corner of its tablet. One side preserves a bilingual text in interlinear format whereas the other side is broken away.

1.1.8.4 CBS 19831

CBS 19831 is a fragment of a pillow-shaped tablet from Nippur that contains a monolingual Sumerian extract of an unknown literary text, probably a royal inscription or a royal hymn. The reverse is broken away.

1.1.8.5 N 3783 + N 5031

See §§ 1.1.1.5 and 1.1.7.3.

1.1.8.6 N 4529

N 4529 is a pillow-shaped extract tablet from Nippur. The obverse has six monolingual Sumerian lines from an unidentified hymn quoting Nippur and the Ekur; the reverse is broken away.

³⁵⁵ VAT 17460 = VS 24 76, a fragment from a pillow-shaped extract tablet which Veldhuis 2000a, 85, tentatively assigns to the MB period, is not listed here because its archeological context is OB according to Pedersén 2005, 62 No. 39; it contains four broken lines from an unidentified literary text, possibly a hymn.

³⁵⁶ Obverse and reverse of the hand-copy are mislabeled as reverse and obverse.

³⁵⁷ OIP 97, 76; see Veldhuis 2000a, 68.

³⁵⁸ See Veldhuis 2000a, 75-76.

1.1.8.7 UM 29-13-543

UM 29-13-543 is a pillow-shaped tablet from Nippur inscribed on the obverse with a two-line extract from a monolingual Sumerian literary text quoting Enlil. The reverse is uninscribed.

1.1.8.8 UM 29-15-944

UM 29-15-944 is a pillow-shaped tablet from Nippur containing a four-line extract in monolingual Sumerian on the obverse. The reverse has an *Urra* extract.³⁵⁹

1.1.8.9 UM 29-16-383

UM 29-16-383 is a pillow-shaped tablet containing a one-line extract on the obverse. The reverse has an *Urra* extract.

1.1.8.10 BM 81700

BM 81700 = CT 58 61 is a pillow-shaped tablet probably from Sippar inscribed with a one-line extract. The reverse is uninscribed.

1.1.8.11 VAT 17223

VAT 17223 = VS 24 38 is a pillow-shaped tablet from Babylon. The obverse is inscribed with a three-line extract from an unidentified monolingual Sumerian text, possibly a temple hymn. The reverse is uninscribed.

1.1.8.12 VAT 17224

VAT 17224 = VS 24 39 is a fragment from the left edge of a pillow-shaped tablet from Babylon. The obverse is inscribed with a six-line extract from a bilingual text in interlinear format, possibly a temple hymn. The reverse is uninscribed.

1.1.8.13 VAT 17357

VAT 17357 = VS 24 72 is a pillow-shaped tablet from Babylon. The obverse has a two-line extract from a bilingual text in interlinear format mentioning Anzu, ^dim-dugud^{mušen}, which is glossed as zu-ge-ne₂ on the upper edge. This name is rendered as *a-zi* in Akkadian. The reverse is uninscribed.

1.1.8.14 VAT 17563

VAT 17563 = VS 24 15 is a fragment of a pillow-shaped extract tablet from Babylon. The obverse preserves seven broken lines probably from a monolingual Sumerian hymn. The reverse has a bilingual extract from the lexical list lu₂=ša.

³⁵⁹ Veldhuis 2000a, 78.

1.1.8.15 IM 13365

IM 13365 = TIM 9 29 is the upper right corner from a single-column tablet of unknown provenance. The date is uncertain and a NB date is also possible.³⁶⁰ The text contains Akkadian glosses.

1.1.8.16 MS 3362

MS 3362 is an almost square tablet³⁶¹ inscribed with a five-line text in monolingual Sumerian on the obverse whereas the reverse is uninscribed. The nature of the text, included in the publication of the proverbs in the Schøyen Collection, is unclear and according to Alster³⁶² is possibly partially in Akkadian.

1.1.8.17 MS 3405

MS 3405 is a fragment from a two-column tablet preserving 16 lines of the right column on the obverse whereas the reverse only preserves traces possibly from a colophon. The text, in monolingual Sumerian, is too badly preserved to be identified but according to Alster it may be a proverb or a fable of the cycle of the Fox.³⁶³

1.1.8.18 Unpublished Extract Tablets

A number of extract tablets from Nippur are still unpublished. The following list is taken from DCSL and Veldhuis (2000a).³⁶⁴ With the exception of 2N-T 345 which has an extract from a Dumuzi/Inana composition, the other texts are unidentified. As mentioned above several school texts from Babylon, including extract tablets, are unpublished.³⁶⁵

Excavation Number	Bibliographic Source	Language	Format	Description
2N-T 345 (A 29976)	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	SA	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Dumuzi/Inana
2N-T 348 (IM 58953)	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Literary
2N-T 357 (IM 57961)	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Hymn
2N-T 358	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Lament
2N-T 363 (IM 58955)	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Literary
2N-T 364 (IM 58956)	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Literary
12N 580	OIC 23, 119	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Four-line Extract
12N 587	OIC 23, 120	S	Pillow-Shaped	Rev: Two-line Extract
12N 589	OIC 23, 120	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Three-line Extract
12N 597	OIC 23, 120	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Two-line Extract
12N 599	OIC 23, 121	S	Pillow-Shaped	Rev: Two-line Extract

³⁶⁰ See Summary Catalogue to TIM 9.

³⁶¹ I would tend to regard this source as a square tablet due to its dimensions (65 x 55 x 24 mm), contrary to Alster 2007, 10, who includes it among the Type III tablets (*imgidda*).

³⁶² Alster 2007, 67.

³⁶³ Alster 2007, 70.

³⁶⁴ This list is incomplete: in Babylon, Merkes 25n1, more than one hundred exercise tablets have been found, but most of them remain unpublished, see Pedersén 2005, 85-92.

³⁶⁵ Kassite school texts are the subject of Alexa Barthelmus's PhD dissertation at LMU University, Munich (unavailable to me).

Excavation Number	Bibliographic Source	Language	Format	Description
12N 653	OIC 23, 121	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Proverb (?) Rev: Three-line Extract
12N 655	OIC 23, 122	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Literary Rev: Literary
CBS 7133	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Two-line Extract
CBS 7884	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Literary
UM 29-13-322	Veldhuis (2000a), 84	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Literary

1.1.9 Emesal Liturgies

Only two MB Emesal texts, BM 78164 and a Sealand tablet, have been edited. Three additional tablets from Sippar, Nippur and Babylon are known:³⁶⁶

BM 83021 is a small fragment, probably from Sippar, preserving only ten lines on one side; the other side is broken away.

CBS 8547 is a tablet from Nippur; the obverse only preserves the right edge and a few lines of the upper edge but the reverse is fairly well preserved.

VAT 17119 = VS 24 25, from Babylon, is a fragment of the central part of its tablet. It preserves eighteen lines on the obverse and eight on the reverse. The text has Akkadian glosses.

1.1.9.1 Eršahuġa to Enki – BM 78164

BM 78164 = CT 58 70 is a tablet probably from the Sippar collection in the British Museum containing a bilingual *Eršahuġa*³⁶⁷ to Enki in interlinear format. The Akkadian is written in small script underneath Sumerian lines. The Middle Babylonian date is assured by the form of the sign RU.³⁶⁸ *Eršahuġa* prayers are mainly attested in late second-millennium and first-millennium copies, but this genre already existed in the Old Babylonian period in a relatively standardized form.³⁶⁹ Although similar passages are attested in other texts of the same genre,³⁷⁰ no duplicates are known. A few anomalies are found in the Sumerian version:

- In ši-ba mu-e-ši-[de₆], ‘He offered his life to you’ (Obv. 13), the non-human possessive suffix is used to refer to a human being.
- In lum-ma ba-zi-ga-an-ni-i[b₂] = *ina ta-ba-aš-ta-n[i] šu-ut-bi-[šū]*, ‘remove [him] from excrement’ (Rev. 7), the imperative begins with ba- against Sumerian grammar.
- In ka-tar-zu ka-en-si-il-le₂ // *da-li-li-ka lid₂-lul*, ‘may he sing your praise’ (Rev. 11), the Akkadian 3sg. precativum corresponds to the Sumerian prefix ka- which seems to be a phonetic writing for the cohortative prefix ga- that in standard Sumerian is confined to the first person. Moreover the cohortative is normally written with the *hamtu* stem but forms with the *maru* stem, as in this case, are not rare from the Old Babylonian period onward.³⁷¹ The same expres-

³⁶⁶ The tablet BM 79037 is likely a Neo Babylonian manuscript, see Gabbay 2015, 72 n. 71.

³⁶⁷ For this type of text see Maul 1988.

³⁶⁸ Obv. 5, see BE 14 No. 196.

³⁶⁹ Michalowski 1987.

³⁷⁰ See Geller 1992, 531-532.

³⁷¹ Attinger 1993, 292 § 190c.

sion with the prefix *ka-* is found in an Assyro-Mitannian incantation from Ḫattuša.³⁷² As is clear from the context of both texts and from the Akkadian translation in BM 78164 the expected form would be a 3sg. precativ.³⁷³ Several explanations could account for the *ka-* prefix:

- 1) In the post-Old Babylonian period the cohortative *ga-* perhaps also indicates the 3sg. person. This possibility depends on three factors: first, the opposite use of *ḫa-* instead of *ga-* to indicate the 1sg. is attested, although rarely, already in the third millennium;³⁷⁴ in Emesal there is a single form for precativ and cohortative;³⁷⁵ in Akkadian 1sg. and 3sg. precativ are both formed with the prefix *lū*. It is therefore not excluded that under the influence of these factors, particularly the Akkadian form, the difference between the Sumerian cohortative and precativ was no longer perceived and *ga-* was extended to indicate the 3sg. person. In our text *ka-* is a phonetic writing for *ga-*.
- 2) *ka-* is a phonetic writing for *ḫa* with shift $k > ḫ$. This may derive from a possible phonetic similarity between /*ga*/ and /*ḫa*/.³⁷⁶
- 3) It is a case of dittography of the preceding *ka-* in *ka-tar-zu*. However this explanation is highly improbable in view of the presence of the same form in the tablet from Ḫattuša. It seems unlikely that the same scribal mistake was produced independently in two different manuscripts.

Akkadian has a mix of Old Babylonian and later features: mimation is usually lost but is retained in *i-na e-re-em pa-nim* (Obv. 8) and *su-mu-uk-ta-am* (Rev. 8); the possessive suffix is the OB *-šu* throughout the text; the sign *ša* is normally used but *ša₂* is attested in *iš-ša₂-ak-nu-šu*; the sign GA is used for /*qa*/ (Rev. 4) instead of the MB *qa*; CvC signs are attested: *piš* (Obv. 13), *ṭir*, *šiṭ* (Rev. 6), *lak* (Rev. 10), *lid₂*, *lul* (Rev. 11).

As suggested by the provenance of the tablet this text, like the majority of Emesal liturgies,³⁷⁷ relies on the Northern Babylonian tradition.

1.1.9.2 Balaĝ to Enlil

A tablet housed in a private collection has been identified as part of a lot of texts from the Sealand dynasty.³⁷⁸ The provenance is unknown but it likely stems from the area south of Nippur on the Tigris side. The fragment is from the upper right corner of a two-column tablet containing the monolingual *Balaĝ* *am-e para₁₀-an-na-ra* to Enlil that is known from first-millennium duplicates. No OB source is preserved but parallels are known from other Emesal texts. The Sealand tablet contains an abbreviated version of the *Balaĝ*. However it is unclear whether the tablet originally contained the entire composition or whether the text was inscribed on more than one tablet. On the basis of its abbreviated form, Gabbay concluded that the tablet was written as a mnemonic aid for the *kalû*.³⁷⁹

This is an extraordinary document as it is the only Sumerian text from the Sealand dynasty published so far.³⁸⁰ The text is written in standard orthography and is close to the first-millennium duplicates; however, in a few instances it resembles the OB parallels.³⁸¹ Gabbay suggests that the

372 KBo 36 11+ Rev. 22, *ka-tar-zu ka-an-[sil]*, § 5.2.1.

373 Note that BM 78164, 5, 10, have 3sg. precativ forms both in Sumerian and Akkadian.

374 Thomsen 1984, 200 § 386, Attinger 1993, 292 § 190a.

375 Thomsen 1984, 200 § 385, 204 § 395.

376 Thomsen 1984, 200 § 386.

377 For an explanation of why Emesal texts were written down in Northern Babylonia see Michalowski 2003, 112, nevertheless note the remarks in Tinney 2011, 587-588; on this point see Introduction.

378 Gabbay 2014a, 148.

379 Gabbay 2014a, 150-151.

380 A *kirugu*-hymn of the king Aadaragalama is unpublished, see Gabbay 2014a, 148 and n. 13.

381 For differences with duplicates and parallels see commentary in Gabbay 2014a, 157-168.

incorporation of the Ninurta toponym litany – the text mentions temples associated with Ninurta in Nippur, Lagaš, Kiš, Kutha and Dilbat – in an Enlil *Balaĝ* is perhaps a step toward the integration of Ninurta into the *Balaĝ* corpus from which the god was virtually absent during the Old Babylonian period. This is the major difference between the Sealand text and the first-millennium *Balaĝs* to Enlil that usually exhibit the sequence Nippur, Sippar and Babylon.³⁸² Although no OB duplicates are known, it is clear that the Sealand tablet represents an intermediate stage between an OB version of the *Balaĝ* and the first-millennium recension.

1.1.10 Incantations

1.1.10.1 Udug-ĥul Tablets VII-VIII

The only tablet of possible MB date that contains *Udug-ĥul* incantations³⁸³ is **Ni 2676 + Ni 2997 + Ni 4017 + Ni 4018**. This is a four-column tablet from Nippur containing a forerunner to *Udug-ĥul* Tablets VII-VIII. Akkadian glosses are written in small script underneath Sumerian lines. This manuscript is here treated with some restraint as its date is uncertain. Nevertheless, some pieces of evidence may point to a Middle Babylonian date:³⁸⁴ this is the only bilingual manuscript among the tablets containing forerunners to *Udug-ĥul*; its sign forms resemble Kassite ductus; the word for ‘man’ is spelled both lu_2-u_{18} - lu (779), as is typical of late texts,³⁸⁵ and lu_2-ulu_3 , the traditional Old Babylonian writing; this manuscript includes lines attested in the canonical recension of *Udug-ĥul*, but not in the OB forerunners; the Marduk-Ea speech is abbreviated as in late sources.

Ni 2676+ (C) duplicates the OB tablets Ni 631 (B), CBS 591 (E), CBS 1532 (F) and BM 92671 (I). Here follows the list of variants according to the columns of C:³⁸⁶

Line	C i	B	E	I
655	igi ba-an-si ₃	im-ma-an-si ₃	im-ma-an-[s]i ₃	im-ma-an-si ₃
656	ba-ši-in-ku ₄	ba-ši-in-ku ₄	ba-an-ši-ku ₄	x
656	[...](-)na-an-de ₂ -e	[...-u]n- ^ˁ na-de ₂ -e	mu-un-na-an-de ₂ -e	x
657	sil-a si-ga	^ˁ sil-a ^ˁ -si-gen ₇	x	x

Line	C ii	B	E
709	lu ₂	lu ₂ -zu	lu ₂ -[ul]u ₃
710	ba-an-ĝen		x ba-an-teĝ ₃ -ĝe ₂₆
711	ĝeš-ge-en-ge-en-na-na	ĝeš-ge-en-ge-en-n[a ...]	ĝeš- ^ˁ ge-en ^ˁ -na-ni
712	i ₃ -bad-bad	i ₃ -bad-b[ad]	bad-bad
713	ĝal ₂ taka ₄ -a	ĝal ₂ t[aka ₄]	ĝa[l] bi ₂ -[taka ₄]
714	šū nam-tar-ra-ka-na	šū nam-tar-r[a ...]	š[ū nam-ta]r-ra-ka
715	niĝ ₂ -geg mu-un-šū ₂ -šū ₂	m[i ...]	mu-un-šū ₂ -šū ₂
721	igi ba-an-si ₃		<i>Line Omitted</i> ^ˁ igi im-ma-an-si ₃ ^ˁ
722	<i>Sign Omitted</i>	u ₃	u ₃
723	šū u ₃ -me-e-ti	^ˁ šū ^ˁ u ₃ -me- ^ˁ ti ^ˁ	u ₃ -me-ni-si
724	u ₃ -me-ni-tum ₂	^ˁ u ₃ ^ˁ -me-e- ^ˁ tum ₂ ^ˁ	u ₃ -me-ni-tum ₂

382 Gabbay 2014a, 151-153.

383 For this series and canonization of incantations see Falkenstein 1931, 7-15; for the OB forerunners to *Udug-ĥul* see Geller 1985; for the canonical series see Geller 2007.

384 Geller 1985, 7-8.

385 See Geller 1985, 131.

386 Lines preserved in C = Col. I: 635-675; Col. II: 704-727; Col. III: 739-746, 767-779; Col. IV: 796-808; Col. V: 823-839; Col. VI: 840-856; Col. VII: 857-871; Col. VIII: 872-883, Geller 1985, 18.

Line	C ii	B	E
726	ġeš-nu ₂ -da-ne-ne	ġeš-nu ₂ -ka-na-ba	ġeš-nu ₂ -k[a-na]-ba
726	[...]u ₃ -me-ni-su ₃	a u ₃ -me-ʾni-su ₃ -su ₃ ʾ	u ₃ -me-ni-[s]u ₃ -su ₃

Line	C iii	B	E
739	ʾnam-baʾ-k[u ₄ ...]	[na]m-ba-k[u ₄ -ku ₄]	nam-mu-un-da-ku ₄ -ku ₄ -de ₃
740	nam-mu-[...]	x	nam-ba-dur ₂ -u ₃ -de ₃
742	nam-ba-e ₃ -d[e ₃]	x	nam-[ba-ba]l-le-de ₃
743	e ₂ -ki-tuš-še ₃	e ₂ -ki-tuš-ʾše ₃ ʾ	e ₂ -ki-tuš-a-na

Line	C iv	F
802	ʾa-nun-na-ke ₄ -e-[ne]	ʾa-ʾnunʾ-na-ke ₄ -ne
802-803	urugal-la	urugal ₂ ^{gal} -la
802	a-ri-a	ri-a
806	nam-ba-ne-ne	[...b]a-ne-ne-e
807	ur-ra	ur ₂ -ra

Line	C v	F
828	[hul-ġa]l ₂ -ʾeʾ	hul-ġal ₂

The OB manuscripts are generally close to one another even though they have different origins; manuscript B is in fact a Nippur tablet, whereas CBS 591 (E) and CBS 1532 (F) belong to the Khabazacollection, therefore they probably stem from Sippar. Variants are limited to orthographic differences. As expected, C agrees with B in most cases and usually differs from E.³⁸⁷ However, in some instances C adheres to E.³⁸⁸ As noted above C shares with late duplicates lines which are not included in the OB manuscripts,³⁸⁹ while in other passages C resembles the OB text: in line 674, C seems to follow the OB recension which has the ambiguous verbal form *zi-zi* against late manuscripts which read differently;³⁹⁰ C, like the OB manuscripts, reports line 744 that is omitted in the canonical recension. It is clear that Ni 2676+ rely on the Nippur textual tradition³⁹¹ but it presents some modifications common to the canonical recension of *Udug-ḫul*. To conclude, the tablet reflects an intermediate stage between the OB and first-millennium recensions even though it is closer to the OB manuscripts.

387 Note that lu₂-zu in B, 709, is probably an error for -lu₃, Geller 1985, 128; in line 726, C has the common form ġeš-nu₂,d instead of the unusual ġeš-nu₂.k in B and E; note that lines 704-705 are attested in B and C but omitted in E.

388 Ll. 656, 724, 739; lines 716-20 are attested in B only but omitted in C and E; C and E report line 744 contrary to B and late manuscripts.

389 Lines 653-654, see Geller 1985, 125; in lines 828-831 C resembles late manuscripts whereas F has a different formula, see Geller 1985, 134-135; C also agrees with late manuscripts in line 742, see Geller 1985, 129.

390 Geller 1985, 127.

391 Note that only one unorthographic spelling is attested: ur-ra ~ ur₂-ra (l. 807).

1.1.10.2 Incantation to Utu

The composition *Incantation to Utu*³⁹² is an incantation-hymn to the god Utu as judge of the dead in the Netherworld.³⁹³ The text survives in several manuscripts from the Old Babylonian period to the first millennium. The oldest known and best preserved manuscript is CBS 563 (A), a LOB two-column tablet containing the whole composition which is dated to the first year of the king Ammišaduqa (1646 B.C.). As it belongs to the Khabaza collection it probably comes from Sippar. CBS 589 (B) is a two-column tablet, probably Neo Babylonian, which contains the complete text. Three manuscripts, all two-column tablets, are possibly Middle Babylonian in date: **AO 7738 + CBS 1521 = TCL 16 79 + PBS 12/1 25 (C+E), CBS 587 + CBS 353 (D) + D fragment**,³⁹⁴ **CBS 1686 + CBS 1533 (F)**. Like the other two manuscripts all the CBS tablets are probably from Sippar because they are part of the Khabaza collection. The date is uncertain and according to Kramer manuscript C+E could be Neo Babylonian.³⁹⁵ These tablets are badly damaged and the surface is in many cases effaced, hence a comprehensive paleographical analysis is precluded.³⁹⁶ As far as the sign forms are concerned there is no clear distinction between CBS 563 and the supposed MB tablets.³⁹⁷ Neither of them shows the typical Kassite shape of the signs KUR and NE. However, compared to A, manuscripts C+E, D and F share a common ductus: wedges are more slanted and vertical signs are longer. In particular C+E and D show a very similar manner of incision. Although the distinction on paleographical grounds between LOB and MB tablets is generally very difficult, the three possible Kassite manuscripts seem to have common features. To complicate matters further manuscript D bears the same colophon as A. According to the date of the tablet we need to assume that source D is a verbatim copy of an earlier manuscript without any change in the colophon.³⁹⁸

Texts closely related to *Incantation to Utu* are: YBC 9875, an OB tablet known as *Incantation to Utu B*;³⁹⁹ BM 63606 + BM 66888 = CT 58 80, a LB manuscript probably from Sippar⁴⁰⁰ known as *Incantation to Utu C*;⁴⁰¹ and the hymn to Utu ^dutu ur-saĝ ^dutu maš₂-saĝ⁴⁰² preserved in several monolingual manuscripts from Meturan, Susa and Sippar and on one OB bilingual tablet from Sippar, BM 78614.⁴⁰³

The provenance of the manuscripts indicates that *Incantation to Utu* was likely composed in Sippar, obviously in connection with Utu's cult center in the city, the Ebabbar⁴⁰⁴ that is mentioned

392 Manuscripts and lineation follow Alster 1991a. Previous edition with photographs of the manuscripts in Castellino 1969; new photographs are provided in Alster 1993.

393 The purpose of this incantation has been interpreted differently: Alster 1991a, 27, regards this text as an attempt 'to establish the proper funeral cult, which permitted the spirits to find peace in the netherworld, and to cease to be a threat to the living'; on the contrary, Geller 1995, 102-107, sees in the incantation a 'plea to Utu to make a correct judgment regarding the human victim' who has been 'falsely accused by ghosts before Utu, although he is innocent, and as a result the dead have caused him problems'.

394 This fragment has no separate museum number, it belongs to the obverse of D but does not physically join; photograph in Castellino 1969, Pl. XII and Alster 1993, 266.

395 Castellino 1969, 4-5.

396 Photographs in either Castellino 1969 or CDLI are not clear.

397 GI is the only sign with different shapes in A (one *Winkelhaken* under three small *Winkelhaken*, see ll. 47, 57, 63, 250) and the MB tablets (an oblique wedge from the lower left to the upper right under the three small *Winkelhaken*, see C+E, 103, 231, 243; D, 31; F, 145, 225A). Possibly also DA differs between A (ll. 110, 111, 113, 126, 127, 130) and C+E (ll. 111, 113, 129B, 130), D (ll. 39-50) and F (l. 142). TI shows the same shape with a subscribed *Winkelhaken* in all the manuscripts.

398 For a similar case see § 1.1.6.4.

399 Cohen 1977, Geller 1995, 107-109.

400 Geller 1995, 109-114; source G in Alster 1991a. The reverse has a different text.

401 The closest manuscript to CT 58 80 is C+E even though the line order is different: C+E 39-46 and CT 58 80, 4-12, have nu-me-a instead of nu-e₃ in B.

402 Cavigneaux 2009, 7-13, cf. Bonechi 2010.

403 Wasserman 1997.

404 On this point see § 1.1.10.3 and fn. 422.

in the colophon of CBS 563.⁴⁰⁵ All the manuscripts are in monolingual Sumerian and no Akkadian translation has been added even in the first millennium copies, although A presents a few glosses. The only known bilingual version is inscribed on a tablet from Ḫattuša, KUB 4 11.⁴⁰⁶ Manuscript A is the most complete source and the only one that contains lines 52-64 while manuscripts B, C+E, D and F contain shortened versions. Phonetic writings characterize manuscripts B, C+E and D but a few are also attested in A and F.⁴⁰⁷

According to Alster, two different streams of tradition can be identified: one represented by manuscripts A and F and another one comprising manuscripts B, C+E and D.⁴⁰⁸ This picture is confirmed by the distribution of phonetic writings across sources. Manuscripts B, C+E and D usually agree⁴⁰⁹ even though they are not exact duplicates since several variants are documented.⁴¹⁰ Phonetic writings show many alterations such as substitution of voiced consonants with the corresponding voiceless consonants and vice versa, vowel alterations, *sandhi*⁴¹¹ and abbreviations.⁴¹²

Incantation to Utu can be considered a product of the Northern Babylonian scribal schools unknown to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. Its grammar shows several anomalies:

- The genitive is indicated by $-ke_4$ in the following lines:

19	${}^dutu \check{s}a_3 an-na-ke_4 gal-bi zu$
20	$\check{s}a_3 kur-ra-ke_4 buru_3 dagal-bi i_3-zu$

Utu, you know the expanse of the inner of heaven
You know the depth and width of the inner of the mountains

Both are cases of anticipatory genitives: $*an-na-ka$ and $kur-ra-ka$ would be expected.⁴¹³

- $/ani/$ is used for the genitive $/ana(k)/$ in $gidim ama-ni$ (l. 111), $gidim ad-da-ni$ (l. 112) $kur gi[dim]-a-ni-ke_4$ (C+E, 113).⁴¹⁴
- In lines 70 and 71 $-ta$ is appended to person class substantives.⁴¹⁵
- $u_4-da-ta$ (A-F, 142) is probably a late form corresponding to u_4-da .⁴¹⁶
- A 142-144 end with the form $-gub-be_2$ that probably stands for $-gub$.⁴¹⁷

405 Castellino 1969, 1.

406 See § 5.3.8.

407 For a complete list of phonetic writings see Alster 1991a, 91-94; note that in line 120 A has the phonetic writing $b[a-a]n-gi-a$ whereas C+E probably has the orthographic form $ba-gi_4$.

408 Cf. Castellino 1969, 46-47.

409 C+E appears to have a higher number of phonetic writings compared to B and D, but this is probably due to the fact that the text in these two manuscripts is often not preserved or is omitted in the passages in which C+E presents phonetic writings, see for instance ll. 95 (Alster 1991a, 84: 95), 97, 131, 140, 141, 256.

410 See for instance ll. 7, 8, 10, 14, 17, 16 (see Alster 1991a, 79-80: 16, 79-80: 16), 24 (see Alster 1991a, 79-80: 16, 80: 24), 102, 165, 249.

411 See C 44: $a_2-gal_2-la-ba-gal_2 \sim a_2-aga_2 la-ba-gal_2$.

412 See D 10 $di \sim di-gir$.

413 Note that manuscripts B, C+E and E have $an-ke_4$ and $kur-ke_4$.

414 See Alster 1991a, 85: 111, 113.

415 Castellino 1969, 38.

416 Alster 1991a, 86: 142.

417 Alster 1991a, 86: 142-144.

Even though manuscripts C+E, D and F cannot be assigned to the Kassite period with all confidence, the bilingual tablet from Ḫattuša witnesses that this composition was known during the LBA.

1.1.10.3 Kiutu-incantation – HS 1512

The tablet **HS 1512** contains a bilingual *Kiutu* incantation,⁴¹⁸ a text type that is mostly known from post-Old Babylonian sources, especially the first-millennium ritual series *Bīt rimki*. According to Krebernik⁴¹⁹ internal evidence indicates either a Late Old Babylonian or a Middle Babylonian date. However, a Middle Babylonian date is assured by the presence of the typical Kassite KUR.⁴²⁰ This sign is a later trait on a tablet characterized by archaizing signs like those in other Kassite tablets. Signs have different shapes in the Sumerian and Akkadian versions showing a mix of old and late variants. The provenance of this tablet from Nippur, argued by Krebernik,⁴²¹ should be probably revised in light of the Northern Babylonian origin of the corpus of the second-millennium prayers, hymns and letters dedicated to the Sun-god, as seen in the case of *Incantation to Utu*. Neither of the manuscripts listed by Krebernik comes from Nippur, on the contrary most of them stem from Sippar.⁴²² Moreover, according to Krebernik⁴²³ signs in HS 1512 have shapes very close to CBS 1529, a forerunner to the ‘Third and Sixth House’ of the series *Bīt rimki*⁴²⁴ likely from Sippar.⁴²⁵

The tablet probably contains different prayers of the same genre on each side. The obverse has a full Akkadian translation in small script underneath Sumerian lines whereas the reverse shows a script bigger than the obverse and does not contain a full translation but only Akkadian glosses. HS 1512 is probably a forerunner of the ‘First House’ of the series *Bīt rimki*.⁴²⁶ No duplicates are known thus far, but lines 7-9 of the obverse are close to a *Kiutu* incantation of the ‘Second House’ attested in copies from Ḫattuša (CTH 794 Obv.),⁴²⁷ Nineveh and Sultantepe. HS 1512 does not exactly duplicate any of the other manuscripts and a few variants are attested in both Sumerian and Akkadian versions. As with the Nineveh manuscript HS 1512 is written in standard orthography contrary to the Sultantepe tablet that is written in phonetic writing. This text is also tied to a *Kiutu* incantation from Alalah, AT 453.⁴²⁸ The last line of the reverse [e]n gal an-ša₃-ku₃-ga-ra e₃-da-zu-ne finds its closest parallel in the incipit of the Alalah text: eš-ša-an-ku₃-ga-t[a] e-da-zu-[ne].

The grammar shows late features:⁴²⁹

- 2sg. possessive suffix is written -a-zu (Rev. 6) on the model of -a-ni.
- 1sg. verbal forms begin with the prefix a- (Obv. 6-9) probably under the influence of Akkadian; it is worth noting that manuscripts from Nineveh and Sultantepe have the same prefix.
- The verbal form a-ra-ab-dub-dub-bu (Obv. 6) omits the 1sg. personal suffix.

418 For this genre see Kunstmann 1932, 48-53, Krebernik 2001 and Shibata 2008, 191-195.

419 Krebernik 2001, 240.

420 Obv. 4, 9.

421 Krebernik 2001, 238.

422 This reflects the presence of Ebabbar, the temple of Šamaš in Sippar. On the common origin of several compositions related to the Sun-god see Alaura, Bonechi 2012, 17 and n. 72 with further bibliography.

423 Krebernik 2001, 242 n. 15.

424 Geller 1995, 114-126.

425 It belongs to the Khabaza collection.

426 Krebernik 2001, 242 and n. 18.

427 § 5.2.4.

428 Krebernik 2001, 242.

429 Krebernik 2001, 240.

This text was not only drafted in a Kassite scribal school but it was also likely composed during the post-Old Babylonian period. As with *Incantation to Utu*,⁴³⁰ this composition reflects a Northern Babylonian tradition likely unknown to the Nippur scribal circles.

1.1.10.4 BM 54692

The fragment **BM 54692** is the lower left corner of a tablet from Sippar of uncertain date. According to Lambert,⁴³¹ it could be either Middle Babylonian⁴³² or a LB copy of a MB tablet. This fragment preserves the end of a ritual section followed by an incantation and another ritual section. The incantation is an eight-line text in monolingual Sumerian and is duplicated in K 9041, a NA fragment probably from Aššurbanipal's library. Both manuscripts are badly preserved. The grammar shows some anomalies:

- In line 2 [diġir-n]e-ne-a (BM) and diġir-bi-ne-ne-a (K) are incorrect forms for the expected plural marker -re-(e)-ne; -a at the end is unclear.
- In [ġeš-ġur] an-ki-ke₄, 'the designs of heaven and earth' (l. 4), -ke₄ is used as the genitive marker.
- In mu-ni-šu-du₇-da-ta (l. 5) the nominal element of the compound verb šu--du₇ is transferred before the verbal base.

This incantation reflects a late theological tradition. Enki and Marduk/Asalluġi are equated as rulers of the universe in contrast with Asalluġi's portrayal in the Old Babylonian forerunners to the series *Udug-ġul* in which he plays a submissive role to Enki.⁴³³ Marduk's equivalence with Ea is a late development which is accomplished in the *Enūma Eliš* with Marduk's rise as the foremost god of the Babylonian pantheon.⁴³⁴ Moreover, the nature of the god Enbilulu as described in this text has no parallels.⁴³⁵

Both grammar and literary context indicate that this incantation was likely composed or re-adapted in the post-Old Babylonian period. I wonder whether BM 54692 is a tablet from the Second Dynasty of Isin. This date would agree on the one hand with the cultural ideology reflected in the incantation and on the other hand with both paleography⁴³⁶ and grammar.⁴³⁷

1.1.11 Omina

1.1.11.1 UM 29-13-542

UM 29-13-542 is a pillow-shaped extract tablet containing a monolingual liver-omen on the obverse. This is the oldest example of a Sumerian omen and the only one so far known in the Late Bronze Age.⁴³⁸ The reverse probably has a lexical text.

⁴³⁰ For the connection with *Incantation to Utu* see for instance the list of Viziers of Utu, Krebernik 2001, 250-251.

⁴³¹ Lambert 2006, 237.

⁴³² Lambert's dating to the Middle Babylonian period is based on the form of the signs LU₂, LUGAL and ĤAR.

⁴³³ Geller 1985, 14-15.

⁴³⁴ See Lambert 2006, 239.

⁴³⁵ Lambert 2006, 239-240.

⁴³⁶ Note the form of the sign MU in BM 54692, 8, which according to Lambert's copy seems later than the MB shape, see BE 14 No. 26.

⁴³⁷ See the bilingual royal inscriptions of the Second Dynasty of Isin, RIMB 2.4.8, 2.4.9, 2.4.10, 2.8.5, Jacobsen 1991.

⁴³⁸ For other examples of omina see Veldhuis 2000a, 74.

1.1.12 Royal Inscriptions

Middle Babylonian Sumerian royal inscriptions are not included in the present work due to their formulaic dedicatory nature. Only one text, the inscription of Kurigalzu, is here addressed for its particular traits which make it close to literary texts.

1.1.12.1 Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription

Several fragments of an inscribed diorite statue of King Kurigalzu were recovered in the E'ugal, the Enlil Temple, at Dūr-Kurigalzu during the excavation in the 1940s. An additional fragment (Fragment B) was discovered in the palace on Mound A; even though it looks very similar to the other fragments there is no proof that it belongs to the same statue since none of the pieces physically join. Four fragments are inscribed with a monolingual Sumerian text:⁴³⁹ **IM 50009** (A), **IM 50140a-b** (Ba, Bb), **IM 50010** (C), **IM 50011** (D).⁴⁴⁰ The statue, apparently destroyed in antiquity, provides the longest Kassite Sumerian royal inscription. The king depicted in the statue is probably Kurigalzu I who reigned in the first half of the 14th century.⁴⁴¹

In the inscription the king presents himself as the traditional Mesopotamian king and heir of the Sumerian tradition. The text mentions the gods of the Sumerian pantheon with Enlil and Ninlil described as supreme deities.⁴⁴² The ideology behind the inscription aims to present Kurigalzu as the king who restored the rites of Sumerian gods, the one who 'set up the old days'. By referring to the faraway past the king legitimates his present power. This ideology is reflected even in the style of the inscription. The text is case-ruled and is inscribed in archaizing monumental script imitating the style of royal inscriptions of the third and early second millennium.⁴⁴³ However, unlike early monumental inscriptions, noun clusters are often divided between cases. The text can be restored as follows:⁴⁴⁴ Fragment A concerns Igigi gods and Nanna; Fragments Bb deals with the Moon-god; Fragment Ba describes the duties assigned to an unknown deity; Fragment C lists the powers assigned to the gods Ninisinna and Nergal; Fragment D mentions the goddess Inana.

The text is often hardly intelligible and several passages are still obscure. Many words in the inscriptions are extremely rare. Veldhuis⁴⁴⁵ argued that lexical lists were used to compose Sumerian texts in the Kassite period and this inscription in particular. He identified in the lexical list *Nabnitu* one of the sources used to write the Kurigalzu inscription. Several words turned out to be artificial creations and are found in other lexical lists such as *Izi* and *Proto-Aa*. Parallel to the paleography, the orthography also often displays archaisms such as -me-en₃ for the common -me-en.⁴⁴⁶ A few unorthographic writings are attested⁴⁴⁷ with a very limited number of phonetic alterations.

Line	Phonetic Writing	Orthographic Writing
A ii 9-10	su-ḥu-ul-	suḥul-
A iv 20	[za]-ra-aḥ ¹	zarah
A vii 24-26; D v 10-12	za nu-un-ša-ša-a-de ₃	za ₃ nu-un-ša _{2/4} -ša _{2/4} -a-de ₃

⁴³⁹ The text was first published by Kramer 1948; a new edition has been provided by Veldhuis 2008 which is the basis of the present work.

⁴⁴⁰ There is an additional small fragment whose only legible signs are DA and ŠU, see Kramer 1948, 3.

⁴⁴¹ Veldhuis 2008, 25.

⁴⁴² Veldhuis 2008, 25-27.

⁴⁴³ The possibility that the direction of script was vertical, as in the early monumental inscriptions, cannot be ruled out, Veldhuis 2008, 27.

⁴⁴⁴ Kramer 1948, 2-3.

⁴⁴⁵ Veldhuis 2008, 28-31.

⁴⁴⁶ Veldhuis 2008, 31-32.

⁴⁴⁷ Veldhuis 2008, 32, 47-48.

Line	Phonetic Writing	Orthographic Writing
A viii 10	bi ₂ -gi ₄ -gi ₄	bi ₂ -ge-en-gen ₆
A viii 26	za ₃ -za ₃ -ga	sa ₆ -sa ₆ -ga (?) ²
C iii 23	ġeš-zal	ġissal ^{sal4}
C iii 26-29	NI-NI	nu-nu (?)
C iii 30	šu-ur ₂	sur
C v 19	za-ra	zara ₆
C v 20-22	du ₂ -du ₂ -da	? ³
C x 12-13	še gal	eš ₃ gal
D iii 1-4	dara ₄ -ra-aš	da-da-ra-aš (?) ⁴
D iv 2-4	ba-ad-ra	ba-da-ra

1 One might also read [la]-ra-aḥ = 'difficulty', Veldhuis 2008, 46.

2 The phonetic writing is dubious, Veldhuis 2008, 47.

3 Veldhuis 2008, 48.

4 Veldhuis 2008, 48.

The scribe's reproduction of Sumerian grammar is remarkable; however, late features and errors are documented. Examples are: the use of -bi with human class words (A ii, A viii, Bb iii);⁴⁴⁸ /ene/ (A viii) and -ra (C iv) incorrectly placed (i.e. not at the end of words);⁴⁴⁹ ablative -ta with locative meaning.⁴⁵⁰

Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription provides an important attestation of how new Sumerian texts were composed in the Kassite period. This is an outstanding tentative looking back to the bygone days of the classical Sumerian tradition that could be described as mannerist, but which, however, cannot hide the artificial nature of the language. Clearly inspired by the Nippur tradition, the text represents the ideological project of restoring the past pursued by the Kassite kings and Kurigalzu in particular. It is probably not a coincidence that the statue was found in the temple of Enlil built at Dūr-Kurigalzu as a mirror of the one in Nippur.

1.2 The Middle Babylonian Sumerian Literary Tradition

This section presents a summary of the Sumerian literary tradition during the Kassite period on the basis of published texts. Because a considerable number of tablets from Babylon are unpublished, the reader must be aware that what is said here is tentative and future studies may substantially change this interpretation.

During the Kassite period the city of Nippur remains the major source for Sumerian literary texts, but the Old Babylonian repertoire is only partially attested in the Middle Babylonian documentation. Old Babylonian curricular compositions have come down to us to a limited extent in MB copies.

448 Veldhuis 2008, 45; see also -bi-ne-ne (A vi) as the plural of -bi typical of the Late Old Babylonian period, Veldhuis 2008, 46.

449 Veldhuis 2008, 47; see also the wrong use of -ke₄ (A ii), Veldhuis 2008, 45, and the unclear function of -ta (B iii).

450 Veldhuis 2008, 45.

Curricular Texts		MB Manuscripts
Composition	Intermediary Phase	
The Fowler and his Wife	Nippur (1)	
The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab (?)	Unprovenanced (1)	
Decad		
Lipit-Ištar A	Nippur (1) Unprovenanced (1)	
Enlil A	Nippur (2)	
House F Fourteen		
Lugal-e	Nippur (2)	
Šulgi B	Nippur (2)	
The Instructions of Šuruppak	Unprovenanced (1)	
Six to ten Exemplars in House F		
Enlil and Sud	Nippur (4)	
Angim	Nippur (1)	
Inana C	Nippur (2) Unprovenanced (1)	
Dialogue 5	Nippur (1)	
Others		
Enlil and Ninlil	Nippur (3)	
Inana's Descent to the Netherworld	Nippur (1)	
Šulgi O (?)	Nippur (2)	
Lipit-Ištar F	Nippur (3)	

Only five out of the twenty-eight literary works included in the Tetrad, the Decad and the House F Fourteen are attested in Middle Babylonian copies. This number increases to nine out thirty-six including the compositions documented in six to ten exemplars in House F. No member of the Tetrad is known from Middle Babylonian sources and only two exemplars of the Decad, *Lipit-Ištar A* and *Enlil A*, are documented. The MB recension of *Enlil A* is preserved in two Nippur tablets while *Lipit-Ištar A* is known from a manuscript from Nippur and from an unprovenanced extract tablet. Of the so called House F Fourteen, three compositions are documented: *Lugal-e*, *Šulgi B*, *The Instructions of Šuruppak*. *Lugal-e* and *Šulgi B* are attested only in copies from Nippur, while the preserved manuscript of *The Instructions of Šuruppak* is unprovenanced. Literary compositions documented in six to ten exemplars in House F preserved in MB copies are *Enlil and Sud*, *Angim*, *Inana C*, *Dialogue 5*.⁴⁵¹ With the exception of one unprovenanced manuscript of *Inana C*, all the MB tablets containing these compositions stem from Nippur. Other OB popular compositions attested in MB copies are *Enlil and Ninlil* and *Inana's Descent to the Netherworld*. Both texts are quoted in literary catalogues and are preserved on MB Nippur tablets. A text that was part of the Intermediary Phase in the curriculum at Nippur, as shown by its recovery on a Type II tablet, is *The Fowler and his Wife*. This is a short wisdom text that must have been quite popular because it also exists as part of proverb collections. Perhaps *The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab* was also used as a curricular text in the Intermediary Phase because it was inscribed on an OB Type IV tablet from Nippur.⁴⁵² However, this finding does not imply that this composition was universally adopted in the Old Babylonian Sumerian curriculum, but rather that at a certain point it was utilized as an exercise in Nippur. A further composition quoted in a literary catalogue is the royal praise poem *Šulgi O* although it was scarcely used in pedagogical activities. This hymn is preserved in two possible MB fragments from Nippur. Another royal praise poem that was adopted in the school, even though to a limited extent and only in Nippur, is *Lipit-Ištar F*.

451 CDLI reports the unpublished tablet CBS 9899 as belonging to *Dialogue 5 - Two Women B*.

452 Peterson 2010a, 565.

Proverbs and unidentified literary texts inscribed on extract tablets must be added to the number of Kassite curricular texts.⁴⁵³

The curricular texts discussed so far reflect the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition and belong to the core of the Nippur documentation. Indeed, in the Kassite period these compositions are almost exclusively attested in tablets from Nippur.⁴⁵⁴ Despite the apparent dearth of OB curricular texts, these compositions are better attested in the Middle Babylonian documentation than in the Middle Assyrian texts or in any other LBA corpus. It is difficult to establish whether the limited survival of OB curricular texts in the MB corpus is due to an accident of discovery or to a process of selection. Pieces of evidence support the co-occurrence of both processes. Among the aforementioned OB curricular texts that survived in MB sources only *Lugal-e*, *Enlil and Sud* and *Angim* are known from the first-millennium documentation.⁴⁵⁵ Moreover no member of either the Tetrad or the Decad is attested in the first millennium. Therefore, it seems that a select part of the OB corpus was discarded during the Middle Babylonian period. On the other hand the absence from the MB documentation of *Lugalbanda and the Anzu Bird*, a text of the six-to-ten-exemplar compositions in House F that is attested in Neo Assyrian copies, indicates that some popular compositions of the Old Babylonian period transmitted to first-millennium libraries are by chance not preserved in MB sources or have not yet been found.⁴⁵⁶ The same holds true for other literary compositions attested in first-millennium copies but unknown from the MB corpus.⁴⁵⁷ The accident of archeological discovery also influenced our knowledge of *Lugal-e* which is only known from two MB extract tablets but is well attested in the Middle Assyrian documentation. The most outstanding piece of evidence that only a limited part of the actual textual production of the Middle Babylonian period survived or has not yet been recovered is provided by the Sumerian literary texts from the Western periphery. Indeed several compositions preserved in first-millennium copies are only known from the Western periphery during the LBA.⁴⁵⁸

A possible MB catalogue of hymnic liturgies (i.e. non-curricular) further shows that we are missing a substantial part of the Middle Babylonian Sumerian literature. HS 1477 + HS 1478⁴⁵⁹ is a tablet from Nippur containing incipits of hymns addressed to deities listed according to the praised god and the generic and performative subscripts: *šir*, *tigi* and *adab*.⁴⁶⁰ Of over fifty entries only a very limited number of hymns can be surely identified. These are: *A Hymn for Šu-Sîn*,⁴⁶¹ *An adab to Nanna (Nanna H)*,⁴⁶² *An adab to Ninurta for Lipit-Ištar (Lipit-Ištar D)*,⁴⁶³ *An adab (?) to Iškur for Ur-Ninurta (Ur-Ninurta F)*,⁴⁶⁴ *An adab to Nergal for Šu-ilīšu (Šu-ilīšu A)*⁴⁶⁵ and *An adab to Ninlil (Ninlil A)*.⁴⁶⁶ Additionally the incipit in line 39, ur-saĝ [...], in the section dedicated to Lugal-irra and Meslamta-ea, can be perhaps identified with *Nergal B*⁴⁶⁷ and the title in line 78, en eš₃-maḥ-ta mu-du₁₀ še₂₁-a, is possibly the missing incipit of

453 *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* are perhaps quoted in a literary catalogue, see § 1.1.6.2.

454 Only *Inana C* and *The Instructions of Šuruppak* are preserved in non-Nippur tablets.

455 See DC SL.

456 Another possible mode of transmission is the rediscovery of lost texts, Hallo 1976, 194; this hypothesis implies that some texts transmitted to the first millennium were not preserved in the Kassite documentation but copied from earlier manuscripts.

457 See for instance *Nintur A*, *Enki and Ninmah* and *Išbi-Erra E*.

458 See for instance *LI-LN* (§ 5.3.4) and *SI-Utu* (§ 6.2.4).

459 TMH NF 3 53 + TMH NF 4 53; see Bernhardt, Kramer 1956-57, 391-393; only HS 1477 is edited.

460 For these terms see Shehata 2009, 227-234, 251-257.

461 L. 35; ETCSL 2.4.4.a; this text is also quoted in the OB catalogue from Nippur (N6), ETCSL 0.2.13, l. 4.

462 L. 62; ETCSL 4.13.8.

463 L. 67; ETCSL 2.5.5.4; this text is also cited in the OB catalogue from Ur (U3), ETCSL 0.2.5, Seg. A, l. 3.

464 L. 69; ETCSL 2.5.6.6; this text is also cited in the OB catalogue from Ur (U3), ETCSL 0.2.5, Seg. A, l. 7.

465 L. 70; ETCSL 2.5.2.1.

466 L. 80; ETCSL 4.24.1.

467 ETCSL 4.15.2.

A *šir-gida to Nuska (Nuska A)*.⁴⁶⁸ All these incipits refer to either divine hymns or royal hymns (Type A) that, as expected for non-curricular texts, are poorly documented in the Old Babylonian period. Additional titles are quoted in other OB catalogues but are not identified: line 9, ^dgibil₆ ^dgibil₆ is the incipit of an *adab* hymn to Nanna cited in catalogue N3: 9;⁴⁶⁹ line 72, ur-saĝ en-nir-ĝal₂-[...] is an *adab* hymn to Ninĝešzida quoted in the catalogue U3: 11; line 81, ^dnin-lil₂ nin nibru^{ki}, is the title of an *adab* hymn to Ninlil quoted in N3: 14. Although these are non-curricular texts it is outstanding that of all the hymnic liturgies quoted in this catalogue, not one is known from either MB, MA or first-millennium documentation.

In addition to the curricular texts discussed above the Middle Babylonian corpus also preserves non-curricular texts and minor compositions.

Composition	OB Tablets	OB Nippur Tablets	MB Tablets	MB Nippur Tablets
Inana and An	3	0	1	1
Sargon and Urzababa	2	1	1	0
A Praise Poem of Ḫammu-rābi	2	0	1	0
The Song of the Plowing Oxen	3	3	3	3
The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta	3	1	2	1
Counsels of Wisdom	5	2	1	1
The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab	2	1	1	0

The only text that is clearly associated with the Nippur tradition is *The Song of the Plowing Oxen* that was composed to be recited in the *gusisu*-festival at Nippur and is only known from Nippur manuscripts. The other compositions were less popular in the Old Babylonian Nippur documentation. Nevertheless, most of the MB manuscripts of these compositions stem from Nippur. Outstandingly, *Inana and An* which is unknown from the OB Nippur documentation is preserved in the Kassite period in a tablet from Nippur. This indicates that our knowledge of the OB Sumerian repertoire and its curricular setting remains limited. The aforementioned recovery of *The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab* on an OB lenticular tablet from Nippur shows that poorly known compositions could also have been sporadically used as school texts. In the Middle Babylonian period, Nippur also represents the primary source for non-curricular texts and compositions that were likely not associated with the Nippur tradition.⁴⁷⁰ It is worth noting that compositions that were not primarily curricular texts are associated with school activities in the Middle Babylonian period.⁴⁷¹

The only text that can be assigned with confidence to the group of hymnic liturgies is *The Song of the Plowing Oxen* because of the *ululamama* subscript. However, as shown by the aforementioned catalogue many hymnic liturgies were known in the Middle Babylonian period but are not preserved. Perhaps to be associated with hymnic liturgies is the unique praise poem to Šulgi PBS 1/1 11. The remainder of the royal praise poems preserved in MB copies can be classified as Type B hymns⁴⁷² in which the praise is centered on the king himself: *Šulgi B* and *Lipit-Ištar A* which end with the za₃-mi₂ doxology, *Šulgi O* and *Lipit-Ištar F* in which the presence of the za₃-mi₂ doxology is uncertain and the *Praise Poem of Ḫammu-rābi* which is a self-praise hymn (Type B.II) inscribed on an OB stele (*narua*). Contrary to what was argued by Hallo,⁴⁷³ this type of hymn did not disappear after the Old Babylonian period but no sources are so far known from the first-millennium documentation.⁴⁷⁴ Therefore only three kings, Šulgi, Lipit-Ištar and Ḫammu-rābi, are mentioned in MB royal hymns.

468 ETCSL 4.29.1, see Bernhardt, Kramer 1956-57, 393.

469 ETCSL 0.2.6, see Kramer 1956-57, 389-391.

470 In this regard it is possible that Northern Babylonian compositions were transmitted to Nippur when the city fell under control of the first dynasty of Babylon.

471 The tablet format is evidence for the curricular setting of texts in the Middle Babylonian period.

472 See fn. 191.

473 Hallo 1976, 191-193.

474 According to DCSL only one Type A royal hymn, *Išbi-Erra E*, is attested in the first millennium.

The group of non-curricular texts clearly includes incantations and Emesal liturgies that served practical functions.

Even though the city of Nippur yielded most of the material several tablets stem from other centers such as Babylon and Sippar. The material from Babylon is very scanty because quite a number of tablets are unpublished. There are only nine published tablets among which five contain either unidentified compositions or texts unknown from earlier and later sources. Only four compositions are known from the Old Babylonian documentation: *Sargon and Ur-Zababa, A Praise Poem of Hammu-rābi, The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* and the proverbs inscribed in VAT 17353. None of the compositions attested in the MB tablets from Babylon can be assigned to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. Nevertheless there are hints that may suggest a connection between the scribal schools in Nippur and Babylon. It is known that in the latter part of the Old Babylonian period Nippur scholars left their city and settled in Babylon.⁴⁷⁵ The MB manuscript, possibly from Babylon, of *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta*⁴⁷⁶ belongs to the same stream of tradition as the Nippur sources. Furthermore MA manuscripts of the hymn *Ninisina C*⁴⁷⁷ are copied from exemplars from Nippur and Babylon as stated in the colophons. Yet, with much of the material from Babylon still unpublished, there is no sufficient ground to state that texts from the two schools represent the same stream of tradition.

Middle Babylonian tablets from Sippar inscribed with Sumerian texts are limited to six or seven exemplars. The only genres preserved in MB Sippar manuscripts are incantations, Emesal texts and an unidentified composition. None of them duplicate any of the extant OB or MB compositions from Nippur. The most outstanding pieces of a literary tradition independent from Nippur are the compositions centered on Utu, because the Ebabbar at Sippar was the main temple of the Sun-god. *Incantation to Utu* and a *Kiutu* incantation are representative of the Northern Babylonian tradition and are unknown in Nippur. Sippar or more generally Northern Babylonia is also the main source for Emesal texts. This probably reflects the tendency of the Emesal OB texts to come from Sippar as a consequence of 19th century excavations.⁴⁷⁸ Northern Babylonian Emesal texts present several orthographic features that set them apart from the Nippur tradition.⁴⁷⁹ The *Eršahuġa* BM 78164 provides an interesting link to a text from Ḫattuša that, as explained below, is representative of a non-Nippur tradition.

Two Sumerian texts, an Emesal *Balaġ* and a royal praise poem, are known to be from the period of the Sealand dynasty and likely stem from the area south of Nippur.

New Sumerian texts were composed in the Kassite period as shown by *Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription* and by the Middle Assyrian documentation that yielded two pieces of Kassite scribal art: the *Hymn to Ninurta* (KAR 97) and *A Hymn to Ninurta with Ethical Instructions* (KAR 119) - the latter a MB tablet imported to Assur.⁴⁸⁰ The unpublished hymn mentioning the Sealand king Aadaragalam is an additional text composed in the post-Old Babylonian period.

Transmission of texts from the Middle Babylonian period to the first millennium was not influenced by their duplication rate: both those texts with a high a duplication rate - curricular - in the Old Babylonian period and those with but a few exemplars are attested in first-millennium libraries. Only a limited number of compositions from the Middle Babylonian corpus are also known in the first-millennium documentation. But it is likely that several compositions transmitted to the first millennium are no longer preserved or have not yet been found.

475 Pientka 1998, 190-195, Charpin 1999-2000, 324.

476 See § 1.1.6.2.

477 KAR 15 - KAR 16, see § 2.1.2.1.

478 Emesal texts are known from the South as well, see Introduction.

479 See § 2.1.4.2.

480 See §§ 2.1.2.2 and 2.1.2.3.

Composition	Old Babylonian	Middle Babylonian	First Millennium
Enlil and Ninlil	+	+	+
Enlil and Sud	+	+	+
Inana and An	+	+	-
Inana's Descent to the Netherworld	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
Lugal-e	+	+	+
		(Only Extract)	
Angim	+	+	+
Sargon and Urzababa	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
Šulgi B	+	+	-
Šulgi O	+	+	-
Hymn to Šulgi (PBS 1/1 11)	-	+	-
Lipit-Ištar A	+	+	-
Lipit-Ištar F	+	+	-
A Praise Poem of Ḫammu-rābi	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
Enlil A	+	+	-
Inana C	+	+	-
			(Only lexically)
The Song of the Plowing Oxen	+	+	+
A Litigant's Prayer	-	+	-
The Instructions of Šuruppak	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta	+	+	(+)
Counsels of Wisdom	+	+	+
The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab	+	+	-
The Fowler and his Wife	+	+	? ¹
		(Only Extract)	
SP 1 ²	-	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
SP 1.84 ³	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
SP 2.113-114 ⁴	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
SP 2.134 ⁵	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
SP 3.149 = 14.6 ⁶	+	+	+
SP 3.150 ⁷	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
SP 7.77 ⁸	+	+	-
SP 19 (Sec. E 2) ⁹	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
Proverb (N 3395)	-	+	-
Proverb (MS 2065)	-	+	-
Proverbs (MS 3310)	-	+	-
Proverb (MS 3323)	-	+	-
Eršahuĝa to Enki (BM 78164)	-	+	-
Balaĝ to Enlil	-	+	+

Composition	Old Babylonian	Middle Babylonian	First Millennium
UHF VII-VIII	+	+	+
Incantation to Utu	+	+	+
Kiutu Incantation (HS 1512)	-	+	-
BM 54692	-	+	+
Omen	-	+	-

1 The closely related composition *The Fowler* attested at Emar (§ 6.2.3) is possibly quoted in the catalogue of the series of Sidu.

2 CBS 8039 is probably a variant to Proverb Collection 1, see § 1.1.7.1.

3 § 1.1.7.9

4 § 1.1.7.4.

5 § 1.1.7.5.

6 § 1.1.7.7.

7 § 1.1.7.3.

8 § 1.1.7.7.

9 § 1.1.7.6.

As shown by the table, only a few compositions are unknown in the Old Babylonian corpus.⁴⁸¹ Some of them were perhaps composed by Kassite scribes. To be added to the list of texts unknown in the Old Babylonian period are the aforementioned hymns to Ninurta discovered at Assur (KAR 97 and KAR 119).

Middle Babylonian Sumerian literary texts are usually quite similar to their OB duplicates; variants are attested but they are not different from those found among OB manuscripts. These variants result from variation occurring in textual transmission over time⁴⁸² and from the adaptation and modification of OB texts by Kassite scribes. Texts do not display the same degree of variation: in some cases MB copies exactly duplicate the OB models, in other instances they differ to a greater extent such as in *Enlil and Ninlil* and *Angim*.⁴⁸³ When first-millennium duplicates are available, MB manuscripts are generally closer to the OB recension, but occasionally they share features with late manuscripts.⁴⁸⁴ The MB texts represent an intermediate stage between the Old Babylonian and first-millennium corpora. This clearly implies that the process of canonization was not yet accomplished in the Kassite period but occurred later.⁴⁸⁵ The Middle Babylonian Sumerian literary texts are usually preserved in only one manuscript, often fragmentary, and when more than one tablet has come down to us, they rarely overlap.⁴⁸⁶ As a consequence, in most cases it is not possible to discern whether several different recensions were known in the Middle Babylonian period.

The grammar of the Middle Babylonian Sumerian literary texts from Nippur agrees in terms of morphology, syntax, and orthography with the OB models. Phonetic writings are very limited. As expected, greater divergence from the standard Sumerian grammar is found in texts created in the Middle Babylonian period.⁴⁸⁷ In these cases the Sumerian looks artificial and is characterized by rare words often attested only in lexical lists. Therefore, a dichotomy between the use of Sumerian in new compositions and in texts copied from earlier models comes to light.

The addition of an Akkadian translation is one of the major differences from the Old Babylonian texts.⁴⁸⁸ Bilingual tablets are attested in both parallel column and interlinear formats, but the lat-

481 Note that some proverbs were probably already attested in the Old Babylonian period on unpreserved tablets.

482 Between the OB texts and the Late Kassite duplicates there are more than four hundred years.

483 For examples of different degrees of variation in Sumerian literature see Hallo 1976.

484 See for instance *Enlil and Ninlil* (§ 1.1.1.1) and *Angim* (§1.1.1.6), see also the case of a manuscript of *Inana C* which is closer to its first-millennium duplicate.

485 This fits the process of canonization of omina, see Heeßel 2011.

486 See *Lipit-Ištar F* (§ 1.1.3.5), *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* (§ 1.1.6.2).

487 See for instance *Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription* (§ 1.1.12.1), the hymn to Ninurta KAR 97 (§ 2.1.2.2) and perhaps N 3395 (§ 1.1.7.2).

488 Only a few examples of bilinguals come from the Old Babylonian period, see Cooper 1971, 7.

ter is more frequent. An Akkadian translation in interlinear format is often written in small script underneath the Sumerian text. Some manuscripts do not give a full Akkadian translation but only have glosses. The exercise tablet Peiser Urkunden 92⁴⁸⁹ has the odd format of Sumerian and Akkadian on different sides and MS 2065 has phonetic Sumerian, standard Sumerian and Akkadian arranged in lines from top to bottom.

Composition	Museum Number	Provenance	Format
Inana and An	CBS 3832	Nippur	Columns
Angim	N 6286 (+) CBS 11153	Nippur	Columns
Sargon and Ur-Zababa	VAT 17166 (Extract)	Babylon	Interlinear
Šulgi B	CBS 13509	Nippur	Interlinear
Šulgi O	CBS 10900	Nippur	Glosses
Šulgi O	Ni 13227	Nippur	Interlinear
Hymn to Šulgi (PBS 1/1 11)	CBS 11341	Nippur	Columns
Lipit-Ištar A	CBS 3558 + Ni 9696 (+) Ni 4557	Nippur	Interlinear
Lipit-Ištar F ¹	UM 29-15-399 + Ni 9734	Nippur	Columns
Lipit-Ištar F	N 3498	Nippur	Interlinear
A Praise Poem of Ḫammu-rābi	VAT 19236 (Extract)	Babylon	Interlinear
Enlil A	CBS 10903	Nippur	Glosses
Inana C	CBS 13860	Nippur	Columns
Inana C	KM 89404 (Extract)	?	Interlinear
Inana C	CBS 15203	Nippur	Interlinear
The Song of the Plowing Oxen	UM 29-13-560 (+) N 3529 (+) N 3169	Nippur	Columns ²
The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta	MM 487b	Babylon (?)	Glosses
Proverb	N 3395	Nippur	Columns
SP 3.149=14.6 SP 7.77	VAT 17353	Babylon	Columns
Proverb	MS 2065	?	Atypical
Proverb	MS 3323	?	Interlinear
Unidentified Text	CBS 13990	Nippur	Interlinear
Unidentified Text	VAT 17224 (Extract)	Babylon	Interlinear
Unidentified Text	VAT 17357 (Extract)	Babylon	Interlinear
Unidentified Text	IM 13365	?	Glosses
Eršahuḡa to Enki	BM 78164	Sippar	Interlinear
Emesal Lyric	VAT 17119	Babylon	Glosses
UHF VII-VIII	Ni 2676+	Nippur	Glosses
Kiutu Incantation	HS 1512	?	Interlinear Glosses
Incantation	VAT 1514	Babylon	Interlinear

¹ Possibly also N 3495 is a bilingual tablet in parallel columns.

² This is a multicolumn tablet with Sumerian and Akkadian arranged in sub-columns.

Not all the MB manuscripts contain an Akkadian translation and several texts are preserved in a monolingual version.⁴⁹⁰ Additionally, monolingual Sumerian texts were composed in the Middle

⁴⁸⁹ See § 1.1.5.2.

⁴⁹⁰ *Enlil and Ninlil*, *Enlil and Sud*, *Inana's Descent*, *Enlil A* (CBS 10457 only), *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* and *Counsels of Wisdom* (UM 29-13-419A only), *The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab*, *The Fowler and his Wife*; to this list are to be added

Babylonian period as the *Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription* clearly shows. Single compositions can be copied in both interlinear and parallel column format⁴⁹¹ or even in monolingual and bilingual format.⁴⁹² Transmission of a composition into the first millennium is not ensured by the addition of an Akkadian translation. Texts preserved in the MB documentation only in a monolingual version such as *Enlil and Ninlil* and *Enlil and Sud* were transmitted to the first millennium in bilingual format. Conversely, many of the bilingual texts are unknown in the first-millennium documentation. This is additional evidence that the process of selection and canonization was not fully accomplished in the Kassite period. There was no standardized tablet format as in some of the MA texts. Akkadian versions often display a mixture of old and late orthographic forms.⁴⁹³ Similarly, some MB manuscripts have an odd mix of earlier and later sign shapes⁴⁹⁴ and at times show carelessness in writing.⁴⁹⁵

To sum up, the majority of the published Middle Babylonian Sumerian literary texts stem from Nippur and reflect the Nippur tradition. Nevertheless, tablets from Sippar witness a different tradition typical of Northern Babylonian centers. Sumerian texts from the Middle Babylonian period represent an intermediate stage between the Old Babylonian and the first-millennium corpora, but are closer to the OB recensions.

some proverbs, incantations and exercise tablets among which are those containing *Lugal-e*, *Lipit-Ištar A* and *The Instructions of Šuruppak*.

491 For instance *Lipit-Ištar F* and *Inana C*.

492 *Enlil A*.

493 See for instance *Inana and An* (§1.1.1.3), *Hymn to Šulgi* (§ 1.1.3.3), BM 78164 (§ 1.1.9.1).

494 N 2341 (*Enlil and Sud*), PBS 1/1 11 (*Hymn to Šulgi*), HS 1512.

495 *Enlil and Ninlil*.

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

2 Middle Assyrian Sumerian Literary, Liturgical and Magical Texts

The city of Assur, the capital of the Assyrian kingdom during the Late Bronze Age, is the main source for the Middle Assyrian Sumerian literary texts. They belong to a group of Middle Assyrian tablets discovered in Neo Assyrian archeological contexts in different find-spots from two main areas in the northern part of the city.⁴⁹⁶ About one hundred MA tablets were unearthed together with NA manuscripts in the southwest courtyard of the Assur Temple (N1).⁴⁹⁷ An additional sixty tablets were found in an earlier NA archeological context in the area southwest of the Anu-Adad Temple (M2).⁴⁹⁸ To this group probably belong five more tablets without correct excavation numbers, three of which are bilingual.⁴⁹⁹ However, many Sumerian literary texts from Assur have unrecorded or unknown find-spots or their archival context cannot be reconstructed.⁵⁰⁰ In addition to literary texts, the collection includes palace and harem regulations, royal inscriptions, omens, lexical lists, astronomical and astrological texts, and several other typologies.⁵⁰¹ According to Weidner (1952-53) this collection, consisting of Assyrian manuscripts and tablets imported from Babylonia, once belonged to a single library assembled by the king Tiglath-Pileser I (1114-1076 B.C.). This view was questioned by Lambert⁵⁰² who suggested that scribes wrote tablets for their own libraries. Now it is generally agreed upon that this collection stems from the reign of various kings. A large part of it, including several Sumerian literary texts, is the work of the sons of the royal scribe Ninurta-uballissu. It is unclear, however, whether all the tablets had belonged to a single library or whether they were part of different private libraries compiled by scribal families such as Ninurta-uballissu's family.⁵⁰³ In the Neo Assyrian period part of this collection was used in the Assur temple, while other tablets were discarded southwest of the Anu-Adad temple.⁵⁰⁴ In the area of the Assur temple, a library with an archive was formed from a collection of Middle Assyrian texts supplemented with later texts. A few tablets from this collection were brought to Nineveh⁵⁰⁵ where they entered into the library of Aššurbanipal which represents the second major source for the Middle Assyrian literary texts.⁵⁰⁶

A further one hundred MA tablets, still unpublished, were unearthed in the same area of the Anu-Adad temple but it is unclear whether they belong to the same collection or to a separate archive.⁵⁰⁷ Two tablets (VAT 10038 and KAR 91) have been found in the Old Palace as part of a small separate collection of incantations (M1).⁵⁰⁸

496 Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. I, 31, Pedersén 1998, 83-84.

497 Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. II, 11-28.

498 Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. I, 31-42.

499 These tablets are indicated as M2 (?) in the text list.

500 See Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. I, 19 n. 1; these tablets are indicated as (?) in the text list.

501 Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. I, 31-38, Vol. II, 11-19.

502 Lambert 1976, 85 n. 2.

503 Pedersén 1998, 84.

504 Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. I, 38.

505 Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. I, 41-42.

506 See *Catalogue of the cuneiform tablets in the Kouyunjik collection of the British museum: Second-Third Supplement*.

507 Pedersén 1998, 83; these tablets are listed in Pedersén 1985-1986, 32 n. 5.

508 Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. I, 29-31.

Unlike MB manuscripts, MA tablets are in some cases dated according to the *līmu* system. Eponyms go back to the reigns of different Middle Assyrian kings up to Tiglath-Pileser I.⁵⁰⁹ Imported Babylonian tablets date to a time spanning the Late Old Babylonian and Kassite periods; some of them were brought to Assur before Tukulti Ninurta (1243-1207 B.C.), but a substantial portion derive from his conquest of Babylon.⁵¹⁰ Tablets varying in content were imported to Assur from Babylonia after Tukulti-Ninurta's campaign as part of the loot, as the king himself describes in his epic.⁵¹¹ Palace and harem regulations dated from Aššur-uballit I (1363-1328 B.C.) to Tiglath-Pileser I indicate that this collection spans a period of about 250 years. Even though tablets stem from different periods and some are perhaps copies of earlier manuscripts, attempts to date them on paleographical grounds have failed.⁵¹² Literary texts are known in Assyria before the Late Middle Assyrian period, even outside Assur,⁵¹³ and under Mitannian domination as well, as the presence of Assyro-Mitannian texts at Ḫattuša testifies.⁵¹⁴

Middle Assyrian Sumerian texts include divine narratives, divine praise poems, wisdom texts, proverbs, Emesal liturgies and incantations. Additionally, some texts were composed for the Assyrian court.

The following list is based on Weidner's article, the DCSL web-site, the *Catalogue of the cuneiform tablets in the Kouyunjik collection of the British Museum: Second-Third Supplement* (Cat. II-III suppl.)⁵¹⁵ which includes the MA tablets imported to Nineveh, the work of Pedersén (1985-1986) on the archives of Assur and the list of bilingual texts compiled by Cooper (1971). For several tablets no proper edition is available.⁵¹⁶

Provenance	Museum Number	Composition	Hand-copy	Edition	Language
Assur – M2	VAT 9306	Lugal-e	KAR 13	van Dijk (1983)	SA
Assur – N1	VAT 9710	Lugal-e	KAR 14	van Dijk (1983)	SA
Nineveh	BM 122625 + BM 122651 + BM 123380	Lugal-e	BM 122625 = van Dijk (1983), Pls. LXIV-LXIX	van Dijk (1983) (BM 122625 only)	SA
Assur – (?)	VAT 10565	Lugal-e	KAR 17	van Dijk (1983)	SA
Assur – (?)	VAT 10628	Lugal-e	KAR 363	van Dijk (1983)	SA
Assur – (?)	VAT 10643a-c + VAT 10959	Lugal-e	KAR 370a-c + KAR 251	van Dijk (1983)	SA
Nineveh	BM 123372	Lugal-e	van Dijk (1983), Pl. LX	van Dijk (1983)	
Nineveh	BM 122652 + BM 98745	Angim	Photo: Cooper (1978), Pl. XV Hand-copy: WOO 6, 693	Cooper (1978)	SA
Assur – M2 (?)	VAT 9441 (+) VAT 10648 + VAT 11216	Angim	VAT 9441 = KAR 12 Photo: VAT 9441 (+) VAT 10648 = Cooper (1978), Pls. XVI-XVII Hand-copy: VAT 9441 (+) VAT 10648 + VAT 11216 = Freydank (1990)	Cooper (1978)	SA
Assur – M2 (?)	VAT 8884	Angim	KAR 18	Cooper (1978)	SA

509 See Freydank 1991, 94-97.

510 Weidner 1952-53, 199-200.

511 See Foster 2005, 315.

512 Machinist 1978, 14.

513 See Machinist 1978, 52 n. 52; the Epic of Adad-nirari I is one of the most outstanding example of literary texts predating Tukulti-Ninurta I, Machinist 1978, 5 n. 9.

514 For Assyro-Mitannian texts see §§ 3.1, 5.2. A possible MA scholarly text from the 14th century is BM 121034, a tablet of *Enūma Anu Enlil*, Schwemer 1998, 15 n. 47, see also Weeden 2012, 235 n. 44.

515 Cat. II suppl. = Lambert, Millard 1968; Cat. III suppl. = Lambert 1992.

516 Museum numbers in bold refer to texts taken into consideration; this study is limited to edited texts.

Provenance	Museum Number	Composition	Hand-copy	Edition	Language
Assur – N1	VAT 9307	The Creation of Mankind	KAR 4	Lambert (2013), 350-359 Pettinato (1971), 74-81	SA
Assur – N1	VAT 9308	Ninisina C	KAR 15 WZKM 98, 294	Wagensonner (2008) Cohen (1975), 609-611 Ebeling (1918), 52-57 Maynard (1917), 53-58	SA
Assur – N1	VAT 9304	Ninisina C	KAR 16 WZKM 98, 292-293	See above	SA
Assur – (?)	VAT 10176	Hymn to Ninurta	KAR 97	Ebeling (1918), 75-78	SA
Assur – (?)	VAT 10610	A Hymn to Ninurta with Ethical Instruction	KAR 119 Lambert (1960), Pl. 32	Lambert (1960), 118-119 van Dijk (1953), 114-118 Ebeling (1918), 78-81	SA
Assur – (?)	VAT 10251	Proverb	KAR 103 Lambert (1960), Pls. 58-59	Lambert (1960), 225-233	SA
Assur – (?)	VAT 10810	Proverb	Lambert (1960), Pls. 67-68	Lambert (1960), 260-262	SA
Assur – (?) ¹	VAT 8243	Balaġ to Enlil	KAR 375	Nötscher (1927), 99-108	SA
Assur – M2 (?)	VAT 9440 + VAT 10607 + VAT 11573	Eršaġuġa to Enlil	KAR 9 Maul (1988), Pls. 65-66	Maul (1988), 82-89 Ebeling (1918), 57-58	SA
Nineveh	BM 123365	Emesal Text (?) ²	NP	NE	S (A)
Assur – (?)	VAT 9942 + 10103	Prayer to Assur for Tukulti-Ninurta I	KAR 128 + KAR 129	Chang (1981), 174-210 Ebeling (1918), 62-73	SA
Nineveh	BM 98496	A Praise Poem of Tukulti-Ninurta I	Iraq 38, 93	Lambert (1976)	SA
Assur – N1	VAT 9833	Incantation	KAR 24	Ebeling (1952-53), 295-298	SA
Assur – (?)	BM 130660	Incantation	Iraq 42, 43-44	Geller (1980)	SA
Assur – N1	Ass. 4532	Kiutu Incantation	LKA 75	Borger (1967)	SA
Assur – M1	VAT 10038	Mīs pī Incantation	Maul (2003), 190-191	Maul (2003), 188-194	SA
Nimrud	Rm 376	Incantation	AS 16, 287-288	Lambert (1965)	SA
Assur – M1	VAT 10035	Incantation	KAR 91 ZA 103, 32-33	Maul (2013)	S
?	MLC 1301	Incantation	YOS 11 74	NE	SA
Assur – M2	VAT 10066	Unidentified Text	KAR 113	NE	SA
Assur – (?)	VAT 9508	Unidentified Text	KAR 333 NABU 2014, 37	Ponayotov, Geller (2014)	SA
Nineveh	BM 134793 ³	Unidentified Text	NP	NE	SA
Nineveh	BM 121117	Unidentified Text	WOO 6, 701	Wagensonner (2011b), 678	SA

Provenance	Museum Number	Composition	Hand-copy	Edition	Language
Nineveh	K 19848 ⁴	Unidentified Text	NP	NE	SA

¹ For the find-spot see Weidner 1952-53, 200 No. b.
² Lambert, Millard 1968, 20.
³ This is an unpublished tablet discovered in Nineveh, labeled in Cat. II suppl. as MA (see Lambert, Millard 1968, 82 and Cooper 1971, 1-2 n. 2). This tiny fragment, preserving only twelve incomplete lines on one side, gives a bilingual text in interlinear format which is duplicated in the NA manuscript K 8959. The text is probably a religious or mythological composition, cf. l. 3 [...]gal-gal-e-ne.
⁴ MA script, see Lambert 1992, 41.

2.1 Text Analysis

2.1.1 Divine Narratives

2.1.1.1 Lugal-e

The myth of *Lugal-e* is one of the best known compositions of Sumerian literature as it was transmitted from the Old Babylonian period up to the Seleucid era in around 200 manuscripts. The OB manuscripts are mostly from Nippur, but a number of tablets stem from Ur, Uruk, Sippar and unknown sites. Three different recensions can be identified, one monolingual⁵¹⁷ – Old Babylonian – and two bilingual – Middle Assyrian and first-millennium (Neo Assyrian, Neo Babylonian, Late Babylonian).

Two different editions are known from MA sources, both in interlinear bilingual format: one edition is divided into four tablets written on two-column tablets containing a quarter of the composition each, whereas the other edition spreads over 16 tablets as in the first-millennium recension, written on single-column tablets containing one tablet each. The four-tablet edition consists of **VAT 9306 = KAR 13** (h),⁵¹⁸ **VAT 9710 = KAR 14** (d₁), **BM 122625 + BM 122651 + BM 123380** (n₁). The sixteen-tablet edition consists of **VAT 10565 = KAR 17** (q), **VAT 10628 = KAR 363** (o₁), **VAT 10643a-c + VAT 10959 = KAR 370a-c + KAR 251** (m₁+s₁+x₁+y₁). The text of *Lugal-e* is not fully preserved in the MA sources; only Tablets I to IV and IX to XVI are known from these manuscripts. A further manuscript is represented by the extract tablet **BM 123372** which only has the end of Tablet X.⁵¹⁹

KAR 14 and BM 122625+ are written by Marduk-balāssu-ēriš, who bears the title *tušarru šeḫru*, ‘young scribe’,⁵²⁰ and was the son of the royal scribe Ninurta-uballissu. The same scribe also copied manuscripts of *Angim* and *Ninisina C*.⁵²¹ Colophons tell us that the tablets were controlled by the scribe’s brother Bēl-aḫa-iddina. Moreover, KAR 14, and probably also BM 122625+, although broken at this point, are dated to the eponym Aššur-aḫa-iddina.⁵²² The scribe’s name of KAR 13 is not preserved, but probably the tablet was copied by the same Marduk-balāssu-ēriš.⁵²³ KAR 17 gives no colophon but only the catchline. Probably also the fragments KAR 363 and KAR 370+ did not report the scribe’s name.

⁵¹⁷ One tablet may be dated to the Ur III period, see Seminara 2001, 28 n. 32.

⁵¹⁸ Manuscripts according to van Dijk 1983.

⁵¹⁹ van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, 7.

⁵²⁰ See van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, 151, 181 and Hunger 1968, 30 No. 43.

⁵²¹ See Pedersén 1985-1986, 32-33 and §§ 2.1.1.2, 2.1.2.1.

⁵²² Saporetti 1979, 151.

⁵²³ Wagensonner 2011b, 666-667.

The division of *Lugal-e* tablets in the MA editions can be summarized as follows:

Manuscript	Tablet(s)	Scribe
Four-tablet Edition		
KAR 13 (h)	I-IV	Marduk-balāssu-ēriš (?)
KAR 14 (d ₁)	IX-XII	Marduk-balāssu-ēriš
BM 122625+ (n ₁)	XIII-XVI	Marduk-balāssu-ēriš
Sixteen-tablet Edition		
KAR 17 (q)	III	Not given
KAR 363 (o ₁)	XII	Not given (?)
KAR 370+ (m ₁ +)	XIII	Not given (?)
Extract Tablet		
BM 123372 (i ₁)	X	Not given

The partition of the text across tablets in the four-tablet edition is the same as in the sixteen-tablet edition and the late recension. The end of each of the sixteen tablets is indicated in the four-tablet edition with the subscript *im-gid₂-da X-kam₂-ma lugal-e u₄ me-lam₂-bi nir-ġal₂ šu-niġen X mu-bi-im*. The subscript of Tablet I is preserved in KAR 13, Tablets XI and XII in KAR 14, Tablets XV and XVI in BM 122625+.⁵²⁴ The number of lines of each tablet according to the preserved subscripts is quite similar to the late recension but in some cases they differ as shown in the following table:

Manuscript	Tablet	Catch-line	MA Lines	NA Lines
Four-tablet Edition				
KAR 13	I	YES	45	45
KAR 14	XI	NO	49	50 ¹
	XII	YES	36 (?)	44
BM 122625+	XV	NO	36	36
	XVI	-	45	45
Sixteen-tablet Edition				
KAR 17	III	YES	45	46 ²

¹ van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, 11 counts 49 lines, but according to source j₁ the number of lines of Tablet XI in the NA recension was 50, see van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, Pls. XLI-XLII.

² van Dijk's numeration (van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, 10) is based on the MA colophon.

The four-tablet edition, therefore, simply represents a collection of the sixteen-tablet edition on multicolumn cuneiform tablets. The division into sixteen tablets or columns⁵²⁵ thus corresponds to that of the first-millennium recension. The interlinear bilingual format is further evidence of the closeness between the MA and first-millennium recensions. In the OB period a standardized division into tablets was not yet attested as *Lugal-e* was inscribed on different tablet formats.⁵²⁶ In addition to tablets of twelve columns containing the entire composition, tablets with half, 1/12 or 1/16 of the text are known. There also existed an OB edition on four tablets of four columns each, but due to the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts it is not clear on which line each tablet and column ended.⁵²⁷

⁵²⁴ I: KAR 13 Rev. 14-15; XI: KAR 14 Rev. III, 44-45; XII: KAR 14 Rev. IV 23-24; XV: BM 122625+ Rev. 3; XVI: BM 122625+ Rev. 4.

⁵²⁵ Note, however, that in the four-tablet edition each column does not always correspond to one tablet due to the different number of lines for each tablet; for instance Tablet XVI on BM 122625+ begins on Col. III (l. 684) and not on Col. IV, see van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, Pl. LXVI.

⁵²⁶ Seminara 2001, 31.

⁵²⁷ See van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, 1-7.

The major differences between the MA four-tablet edition and the first-millennium recension are the inversion of the order of Tablets XIII and XIV and the transposition of lines 524-530, belonging to Tablet XII, between lines 568 and 569 in Tablet XIII.⁵²⁸ Moreover, Tablet XIII in BM 122625+ omits lines 571, 574, 575 and 576. The MA sixteen-tablet edition (KAR 370+) presents the same line order for Tablet XIII as in the four-tablet edition.⁵²⁹ These features clearly indicate that both MA editions report the same text and reflect the same textual tradition. It is important to note that if we add the seven lines 524-530 to the number of 36 (?) lines reported in the colophon of Tablet XII in KAR 14, we obtain 43 lines which are very close to the 44 lines of the first-millennium recension and reflect the one-line-difference between MA and NA recensions occurring in the other tablets. As a consequence, one may answer ‘nothing’ to the question placed by van Dijk: ‘Mais qu’a-t-il mis à la place des ll. 524-530?’⁵³⁰ Unfortunately, the subscripts of Tablets XIII and XIV are not preserved in the MA manuscripts, therefore it is impossible to know the effective number of lines of Tablet XIII and whether the tablet numbers were also reversed or this was simply an idiosyncrasy of the Middle Assyrian copyists.

The two MA editions only overlap for sixteen lines in Tablets III, XII and XIII⁵³¹ in very damaged contexts. A very limited number of purely orthographic variants are attested.

Line	KAR 13 (h)	KAR 17 (q)
92	mušen-dal-l[a-...]	mušen-dal-a-bi

Line	BM 122625+ (n _i)	KAR 370+ (m ₁ +s ₁ +x ₁ +y ₁) ¹
525	[mu]-un-na-ni-ib ₂ -be ₂	[...]-mi-ib ₂ -[...] (m ₁) ²
526	[a]m ₃ -mi-ni-ib ₂ -sar-re	[...-m]i-ib ₂ -[...]
530	[...]-še ₂₁ -a	ḫe ₂ -nam-[me] ³
530	<i>lu ni-ba-at</i> ⁴	<i>lu-u₂n[a²-...]</i>
569	^{na4} m[aš-d]a ₃ -a ⁵	^[na4] maš-da-[...]

1 m₁ = KAR 370a; s₁ = KAR 251; x₁ = KAR 370c; y₁ = KAR 370b.
 2 van Dijk reads [...]-ni-ib₂-[...], but on the basis of the hand-copy -mi- is clear; the tablet has not been collated by van Dijk.
 3 The verbal form in m₁+ is restored on the basis of the monolingual recension (ḫe₂-me-en) but the Akkadian translation seems to report *nabû* = še₂₁, as in all the bilingual manuscripts.
 4 This is an anomalous form for *lū nabâta*, see Seminara 2001, 352.
 5 The sign da₃ (DU₃) is no longer visible according to van Dijk's copy; -da₃ is attested in the first-millennium manuscript r₁ and lexical lists, see Seminara 2001, 360 whereas -da appears in the OB manuscripts.

Another comparison can be made between the four-tablet edition and the extract tablet BM 123372 which overlap for eight lines (435-442). The extract tablet consistently spells Akkadian words syllabically or by means of the sign MIN, whereas the four-tablet edition uses logograms:

Line	KAR 14 (d _i)	BM 123372 (i _i)
436	EN	<i>be-lum</i>
437	^d NIN.URTA	^d MIN
438	^{na4} su-u	MIN
438	<i>a-na</i>	<i>ana</i>
438	^{geš} TUKUL.MEŠ-ia	<i>kak'-ki-i[ā]</i>
439	<i>ka-sur-ru-u₂</i>	MIN

528 The catch-line in the colophon of Tablet XII (KAR 14) is the first line of Tablet XIV, and BM 122625+ begins with Tablet XIV followed by Tablet XIII, see van Dijk 1983, Vol II, 8.

529 van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, 8-9.

530 van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, 8.

531 Lines 92-93, 524-530, 546-550, 568-569.

Line	KAR 14 (d ₁)	BM 123372 (i ₁)
440	am-gen ₇	am-gal-gen ₇
440	saḥar-ra	[ša]-ḥa-ra
440	ki-i	ki-ma
440	GAL-i	ra-bi-i
441	e-mi-iš-ku-nu-ši	e-mi-is-ku-nu-ši

These conventions, especially the use of MIN, are also documented in KAR 370+⁵³² and are a tendency typical of the first-millennium recension as opposed to the MA.⁵³³ Consequently the existence of a slightly different textual tradition limited to sources BM 123372 and possibly to KAR 370+ must not be ruled out. As an extract tablet, BM 123372 does not belong to any of the aforementioned editions.⁵³⁴ If KAR 370+ reflects a different textual tradition, its inclusion in the same edition as KAR 17 and KAR 363 may be reconsidered.⁵³⁵ However, on the basis of so little evidence it is better not to draw any far-reaching conclusions.⁵³⁶ Despite orthographic variations, it appears that a common text was shared by all manuscripts and editions. Moreover, both KAR 14 (four-tablet edition) and KAR 363 (sixteen-tablet edition) omit the Akkadian translation for line 548.

The closeness of the MA and first-millennium recensions is also evident in the Sumerian text, as demonstrated by Seminara on the basis of the common variants in contrast to the OB recension.⁵³⁷ The Sumerian text, however, is quite stable from the OB period up to the first millennium⁵³⁸ and was transmitted to Assur by the Nippur school.⁵³⁹ The Sumerian version of the MA recension depends on the extant OB text which was partially modified and adapted over time.⁵⁴⁰ The MA editions clearly result from modification and adaptation of the text which occurred during the Middle Babylonian period, as evidenced by its greater closeness to the first-millennium recension than to the OB one. Unfortunately, only two extract tablets are known from the Kassite documentation⁵⁴¹ but *Angim* offers a comparable parallel. The single MB tablet of *Angim*⁵⁴² represents an earlier stage compared to the MA sources, hence probably also the MA manuscripts of *Lugal-e* reflect a later stage in the process of selection and transmission of the Old Babylonian corpus. The Sumerian text of the NA recension is usually more correct and faithful to the monolingual version compared to the MA sources.⁵⁴³ But as pointed out by Seminara⁵⁴⁴ some passages would provide evidence for the dependence of the NA recension on the MA manuscripts. Three MA tablets excavated in Nineveh were imported from Assur and probably used as one of the models⁵⁴⁵ for the NA manuscripts. Finally, some unorthographic writings attested in the MA manuscripts are also known from the first-millennium duplicates.⁵⁴⁶

532 Seminara 2001, 34 n. 67.

533 Seminara 2001, 33-34.

534 Note the phonetic spelling ša-ḥa-ra for the MA and OB saḥar-ra and am-gal-gen, VS am-gen, (MA, OB).

535 Note, however, that KAR 17 (q) also has the spellings *ina* and *ana*, see Seminara 2001, 35 n. 68.

536 Note that in the only case where a comparison with a late manuscript is possible (l. 459), this (o₂) has SAĜ.DU for *qaq-qad* in BM 123372, see Seminara 2001, 34.

537 Seminara 2001, 33-39, see also Caplice 1980, 136-138.

538 Caplice 1980, 136.

539 See van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, 12.

540 Seminara 2001, 40; for a list and discussion of variants see Seminara 2001, 378-412.

541 See § 1.1.1.5.

542 See § 1.1.1.6.

543 Caplice 1980, 137.

544 Seminara 2001, 38-39.

545 Seminara 2001, 39, suggests that the NA scribes also had OB manuscripts at their disposal; for the presence of Nippur manuscripts at Nineveh see Seminara 2001, 41 n. 87.

546 See the list of unorthographic writings in Seminara 2001, 380-381.

The Akkadian translation seems to have had a different history.⁵⁴⁷ In the MA manuscripts the Akkadian often does not translate the Sumerian inscribed on the same tablet, but rather the text of the OB monolingual version.⁵⁴⁸ The Akkadian translation perhaps reflects a tradition independent from the Sumerian text.⁵⁴⁹ This is possibly supported by the existence of Akkadian translations of Sumerian literary texts transmitted independently from the Sumerian version,⁵⁵⁰ as witnessed even in Assur by a copy of *The Instructions of Šuruppak*.⁵⁵¹ In several passages in which the Akkadian translates the OB monolingual version,⁵⁵² the Sumerian of the MA sources agrees with the first-millennium recension.⁵⁵³ This indicates that the variants in the MA sources are not idiosyncratic but belong to a stream of tradition. They are not only shared by Nineveh manuscripts, which, as seen above, perhaps had MA manuscripts as *Vorlagen*, but they are also attested in Nimrud⁵⁵⁴ and most important in the NB source k₁.⁵⁵⁵ Occasionally the MA Sumerian differs from both the OB and NA text although the bilingual recensions have the same Akkadian translation.

- 378. ba-an-TA (MA) VS ba-an-du₂-ud (NA) = *rubbû*, is probably a scribal mistake.
- 383. dili-ŠA₄.AB (MA) VS dili-mu-de₃ (NA) = *ēdiššija*.
- 386. gaba im-ma-da-an-ri (MA) VS gaba-(bi) ḫe₂-em-ma-da-an-ri (NA) = *lū(-)* (precativ) cannot be considered a mistake of the Assyrian copyist but is part of a tradition.
- 507. di-ku₃-maḫ (MA) VS di-ku₅-gen₇ (NA) = *kīma dajjāni* is a stylistic variant belonging to a tradition.
- 530. ḫe-kar₂-ru (MA) VS i₃-gur₃-ru (NA) = *našû* is perhaps due to the phonetic similarity between the two signs and also to the presence of kar₂-kar₂ in line 515.⁵⁵⁶ It is unclear whether this variant was present in the Babylonian model of the MA text or is due to the Assyrian scribe.
- 550. dugud (MA) VS us₂ (NA) = *ummudu* is a lexical variant.
- 555. sim¹ (MA) VS sa₆/sa₇ (NA) = *dummuqu*; the OB text, sa₁₀, ‘to buy’, was modified to sa₆/sa₇, ‘good’, in the bilingual recension of which sim (NAM) is a phonetic writing possibly due to the copyist.

Most of these variants seem to be part of a stream of tradition and were likely attested in the Babylonian models of the Assyrian manuscripts. A common Akkadian text is shared by all the Middle Assyrian sources as is evident where they report the same translation against different

547 For the relation between Sumerian and Akkadian in Late Babylonian sources see Geller 2010.

548 Caplice 1980, 137-138.

549 Seminara 2001, 39, 413-416.

550 Differently Seminara 2001, 413, 557, who thinks that Sumerian and Akkadian translations were always written on the same tablets.

551 KAR 27, see § 1.1.6.1.

552 Ll. 95, 97, 377, 378, 383, 384, 386, 391, 427, 438, 439, 496, 506, 507, 509, 510, 530, 551, 555, 675, see Seminara 2001, 414-415.

553 Ll. 95, 391, 496, 506, 510, 555; note that in line 510 both recensions omit the same portion of text. Lines 97, 427, 438, 439, 675 are broken in the NA recension.

554 Manuscript e₁ (l. 384).

555 Line 555.

556 Seminara 2001, 353.

Sumerian versions.⁵⁵⁷ This is a further piece of evidence that MA manuscripts reflect a common textual tradition. A few Assyrianisms⁵⁵⁸ are attested: *ūme* (n₁, 530, 674),⁵⁵⁹ *nukurte* (q, 96; d₁, 490),⁵⁶⁰ *kalbe* (d₁, 430).

To sum up, the Middle Assyrian documentation yielded two editions of *Lugal-e* that contain the same text, and consequently reflect the same tradition, but are inscribed on different tablet formats. An additional textual tradition that, however, only presents different orthographic conventions, is perhaps attested at Assur. The MA recension is based on a Babylonian bilingual text which reflects the OB Nippur tradition of the composition. The Babylonian bilingual model, however, adapted and modified the OB text. Comparison with the other recensions has shown that the MA text is closer to the first-millennium recension than to the OB. Likewise *Angim*, the MA recension of *Lugal-e*, probably reflects a later stage than the MB one. Finally, some of the MA manuscripts were brought to Nineveh in the first millennium and were used to compile the NA recension.

2.1.1.2 Angim

The mythological text *Angim*⁵⁶¹ is known from three Middle Assyrian tablets belonging to two different editions.⁵⁶² The first edition consists of **BM 122652 + BM 98745** (aA)⁵⁶³ which is the upper left corner of a large two-column tablet containing the entire composition in interlinear bilingual format. This tablet was found in Nineveh, but imported from Assur.⁵⁶⁴ According to the colophon⁵⁶⁵ the tablet was written by the scribe of *Lugal-e*, Marduk-balāssu-ēriš son of Ninurta-uballissu.⁵⁶⁶

A second edition spreads over four single-column tablets in interlinear bilingual format, of which two are preserved. Tablet II is contained in **VAT 9441 (+) VAT 10648 + VAT 11216 = KAR 12+ (bB)**⁵⁶⁷ which according to its colophon⁵⁶⁸ originally contained 43 lines. Unfortunately the scribe's name is not preserved. Tablet IV is inscribed on **VAT 8884 = KAR 18** (cC), a large fragment from a tablet copied by the scribe Nabû-nādin-šumē.⁵⁶⁹

MA manuscripts preserve 76 out of 209 lines⁵⁷⁰ of the composition but they overlap each other for only nine lines (201-209). It is unknown if each tablet of the one-tablet edition had a subscript label similar to that found in the *Lugal-e* four-tablet edition because the manuscript is broken away at the point where each tablet ends. MA manuscripts of *Angim* may be summarized as follows:

557 Line 440, see Seminara 2001, 415.

558 A full list of Assyrianisms of all sources is provided in Seminara 2001, 505.

559 This form is also documented in the first-millennium manuscript k₁.

560 This form is also documented in the first-millennium manuscript r.

561 ETCSL 1.6.1; for this composition see also § 1.1.1.6.

562 Text-lines are marked by rulings in all manuscripts.

563 Manuscripts according to Cooper 1978, 54; a new copy of BM 122652+ is provided in Wagensohn 2011b, 693.

564 Cooper 1978, 32 n. 5.

565 Hunger 1968, 30 No. 43, Cooper 1978, 102.

566 For this scribe see also § 2.1.2.1. His brother Bēl-aḥa-iddina controlled the tablet.

567 Photograph of VAT 9441 (+) VAT 10648 in Cooper 1978, Pls. XVI-XVII; hand-copies of all the fragments are provided in Freydank 1990; for the sake of simplicity the manuscript is here indicated as KAR 12+.

568 See Cooper 1978, 33, 102, and copy in Freydank 1990.

569 Hunger 1968, 31 No. 49.

570 To the number quoted in Cooper 1978, 32, two lines restored by VAT 11216 (Freydank 1990) must be added.

Manuscripts	Scribe	Tablet	Catch Line	Lines
BM 122652+ (aA)	Marduk-balāssu-ēriš	I-IV	?	206? ¹
KAR 12+ (bB)	Not given	II	YES (108)	43
KAR 18 (cC)	Nabû-nādin-šumē	IV	-	Not given

1 For the total number of lines of the MA recension see Cooper 1978, 34; the number of 206 lines with emendation of the colophon of manuscript aA is preferable to 196 on the basis of the presence of line 139 in the MB manuscript (§ 1.1.1.6) which, consequently, was probably attested in the MA sources too.

The Sumerian text of *Angim* is very similar in every stage of its textual transmission over a period of 1500 years.⁵⁷¹ The text of the two MA editions is identical and when variants are attested they agree against the OB recension.⁵⁷² This clearly indicates that, as with *Lugal-e*, a text reflecting the same tradition and origin was inscribed on different tablet formats at Assur. Variants show that the MA text can be considered as an intermediate stage between the OB and NA recensions: in some passages it agrees with the OB text, in others with the NA recension, and in others it diverges from both. However, as noticed for *Lugal-e*, the MA and NA recensions are close to each other because they usually agree against the OB recension.⁵⁷³ The Akkadian translation is interlinear in both MA and NA sources that also present the division into four tablets even though the first two tablets have different boundaries in the two recensions.⁵⁷⁴ Neither the division into four tablets nor the interlinear format is present in the MB manuscript which therefore represents an earlier stage in the standardization process. The MA and MB manuscripts only overlap for eight lines (153-154, 162-165, 168-169). Only minor orthographic variants are attested but lines 166-167 are omitted in the MA manuscripts. The LBA sources and the NA recension present the addition of line 165 against the OB recension.⁵⁷⁵ This further evidences the late textual tradition of the MB, MA and NA sources.⁵⁷⁶

The Akkadian translation of the MA manuscripts substantially agrees with the NA recension except for a few passages.⁵⁷⁷ As with *Lugal-e*, the Akkadian occasionally translates the Sumerian text of the OB recension rather than that in the extant MA manuscripts.⁵⁷⁸ This suggests that an independent Akkadian translation predating the Sumerian version of later recensions was codified and transmitted for *Angim* as well.⁵⁷⁹

As pointed out by Cooper the MA recension should be dated to a later phase than the MB manuscript in view of their differences. *Angim* is a typical Nippur composition,⁵⁸⁰ a fact underlined by the Nippur provenance of all the OB manuscripts.⁵⁸¹ Differences among various stages are due to the normal process of transformation and adaptation of texts occurring over time. As suggested by Cooper⁵⁸² the MA tablets likely depend on a Babylonian recension created during the Second Dynasty of Isin.⁵⁸³ Variation between MA and NA recensions indicates that the process of canoniza-

571 Black 1980, 155-156, Caplice 1980, 136, see Cooper 1978, 46.

572 Note in line 203 the presence of eš₂ in both MA sources against e₂ of the OB recension.

573 Cooper 1978, 43, Caplice 1980, 136.

574 Cf. the inversion of Tablet XIII and XIV in the MA recension of *Lugal-e*, § 2.1.1.1.

575 Cooper 1978, 134.

576 The late textual tradition of the MA text was pointed out by Falkenstein 1953, 3: in [gešgal g]i-rin-na-ĝu₁₀ gu₂-en-ner si ħa-b[a-ab-sa₂-e-de₃], 'Let him set up my holy dais the throne room for me!' (KAR 18, 6-7 = *Angim* 156), the dative is appended to a non-human class noun whereas the OB recension has the locative, gu₂-en-na.

577 Cooper 1978, 47-48.

578 Ll. 162-203.

579 Seminara 2001, 40 n. 83, 415-416.

580 The *Sitz im Leben* of *Angim* is possibly the introduction of the cult of Ninurta in Nippur, see Hallo 1981, 255.

581 It is worth noting that the NB sources are from Nippur too.

582 Cooper 1978, 50-51.

583 On this point see § 2.2.

tion was not completed in the Middle Assyrian (and Second Dynasty of Isin) period but occurred later, probably in the first millennium.

2.1.1.3 The Creation of Mankind – KAR 4

The literary composition *The Creation of Mankind*⁵⁸⁴ is known from only four tablets: an OB fragment from the bottom right-hand corner of its tablet excavated at Isin, IB 591,⁵⁸⁵ that contains the text in monolingual Sumerian; KAR 4, a MA tablet from Assur; K 4175 + Sm 57 + 1880-7-19,184 (+) 1882-3-23,146, a NA bilingual tablet from the Aššurbanipal library; A 17634, a NA fragment from the right edge of a bilingual tablet of unknown provenance.⁵⁸⁶

VAT 9307 = KAR 4⁵⁸⁷ is an almost complete single-column tablet in MA script with three sub-columns on each side but the columns are not set off by vertical rulings. The tablet contains two different texts, a copy of the *Sylbenalphabet A* in the left sub-column and a bilingual version of the literary composition *The Creation of Mankind* with Sumerian in the central sub-column and Akkadian in the right sub-column. Lines are marked by rulings and each line of *Sylbenalphabet A* is therefore coupled with a line of *The Creation of Mankind*. According to the colophon⁵⁸⁸ the tablet was copied by the *ṭupšarru šeḫru* Kidin-Sîn, son of the royal scribe Suti'u,⁵⁸⁹ on the basis of an old model.

The same lexical list is also inscribed on IB 591 and K 4175+, but here *Sylbenalphabet A* is replaced by its bilingual version *Sylbenvokabular A*. It is noteworthy that both the OB and NA manuscripts present the same format with *The Creation of Mankind* inscribed in a column between the Sumerian and Akkadian sub-columns of *Sylbenvokabular A*. A 17634 only preserves, on the obverse, lines 25-29 of the composition.⁵⁹⁰ This tablet shows the same layout as K 4175+ with text-lines of the literary composition inscribed in a narrow column with paragraphs marked by rulings in which Sumerian covers two to four lines followed by about the same number of Akkadian lines. The presence of either *Sylbenalphabet A* or *Sylbenvokabular A* in a parallel column in the left-hand side of A 17634 must not be ruled out. However, A 17634 had a different format from IB 591 and K 4175+ as *The Creation of Mankind* was not inscribed between columns of the lexical list.

The mythological text first circulated as a single piece of literature and later was associated with the lexical list. The reason why these compositions were transmitted together is probably tied to their esoteric nature which is well known with respect to *Sylbenalphabet* and *Sylbenvokabular*.⁵⁹¹ The special character of these texts is conveyed in colophons⁵⁹² by means of the formulas *pirištu mūdû mūdâ lukallim*, 'secret knowledge, may the initiated show (this tablet only) to an initiated', in KAR 4 and *niširtu ša barî*, 'secret of the *barû*-priest', in K 4175+.⁵⁹³ These tablets, therefore, testify to the transmission of esoteric compositions in the same format from the OB period until the first millennium. Moreover, the end of K 4175+ contains the catch-line of the *Atra-ḫasis* epic. Indeed according to the colophon *The Creation of Mankind* and *Atra-ḫasis* were part of a series of which they

584 ETCSL 1.7.5.

585 Edzard, Wilcke 1977, 86; copy by Wilcke *apud* Lambert 2013, 601 Pl. 67.

586 New copies of the NA manuscripts are published in Lambert 2013, 599-600 Pls. 65-66; a photograph of K 4175+ is available on The British Museum web site; a photograph of A 17634 is published in Pettinato 1971, Pl. 1; earlier copies are: K 4175 + Sm 57 = PSBA 10 Pls. 1-2; 1880-7-19,184 = CT 18 47; 1882-3-23,146 = RA 17, 189.

587 Lineation according to Lambert 2013, 352-359.

588 Hunger 1968, 31 No. 50.

589 The same Kidin-Sîn is the scribe of K 4349 = CT 24 20-46, the god list *An=Anum* discovered in the library of Aššurbanipal, Weidner 1952-53, 204, 208 No. 41; for the colophon see Hunger 1968, 32 No. 51.

590 The reverse is almost completely broken away.

591 Beaulieu 1995, 6-11.

592 RIA 3, 189, Beaulieu 1992, 98-99.

593 See Gadd 1937.

represent the second and third tablets respectively. These two compositions are in fact thematically related as both describe the creation of the human race by means of the blood of a slain god or gods.⁵⁹⁴

The text in all three stages – OB, MA, NA – shows extensive corruption.⁵⁹⁵ The three recensions strongly diverge from one another. The OB tablet is poorly preserved but some variants can be detected.⁵⁹⁶ Some passages in the MA tablet show discrepancies between the Sumerian and the Akkadian.⁵⁹⁷ Moreover variants are attested between KAR 4 and K 4175+, notably in Sumerian.⁵⁹⁸ Variants are also documented between KAR 4 and A 17634 which unfortunately does not overlap K 4175+.⁵⁹⁹ Lines 22-23 on the reverse suggest that differences between MA and NA recensions probably do not depend on the closeness of the MA text to the OB recension. In these lines the Sumerian of the OB tablet is close to the Akkadian translation of the Nineveh manuscript and diverges from the text in the MA recension.

MA	... ezen-diĝir-re-ne // šu-du ₇ -a ... i-sin-ni DIĜIR.MEŠ a-na šuk-lu-li ₃ <i>That divine festivals may be regulated</i>
NA	[...] gar-ra-ta iš-tu <<ši>> ši-im-ta i-ši-im-mu nim-ma el-la iš-ku-un <i>After they had decreed the destiny and had appointed something pure</i>
OB	tar // niĝ ₂ -<sikil>-la ba-ni-in-ĝar

It is not precluded that some corruptions of the Sumerian in the MA tablet indicate a late reworking of the text.⁶⁰⁰

- ĝar-eš-a-ba = *ukinnū* (Obv. 6, 15) is a non-finite verbal form to which a plural suffix is appended without verbal prefixes;⁶⁰¹ although one may assume a mistake of the scribe who omitted the prefixes, we should note that the same form is written twice and a similar phenomenon is documented in K 4175+, su₈-ge-eš = *izziz(z)ū* (l. 21).
- In ^dalla ^dalla im-ma-an-šum-en-ze₂-en = ^dALLA ^dALLA *i ni-it-bu-ħa*, ‘let us slaughter the Alla gods’ (Obv. 25), the 2pl. suffix in the Sumerian verbal form is incorrect and out of context, as shown by the correct Akkadian form.⁶⁰² The same holds true for ħe₂-en-bala-en-ze₂-en VS *i ni-pu-uš* (Obv. 16, 19), ħe₂-en-dim₂-en-ze₂-en VS *i ni-te-pu-uš*⁶⁰³ / *i ni-ib-ni* (Obv. 17, 20).⁶⁰⁴

594 See Foster 2005, 487.

595 Lambert 2013, 351.

596 Rev. 1 : ki-ur₃ sur gi-na-e-de₃ (MA) VS ki-ur₃ niĝ₂-gi-na kiĝ₂-kiĝ₂ (OB); Rev. 2: guru, nam-mi-ni-ib₂-gur-gur-re (MA) VS guru, du₆ guru, maš-a gu₂ gur-gur-re^l-dam (OB).

597 Lambert 2013, 351.

598 Note for instance: Obv. 16: ħe₂-en-bala-en-ze₂-en (MA) VS ga-ab-du₃-en-ze₂-en (NA), for this line see Seminara 2001, 408-409; Obv. 17: ħe₂-en-dim₂-en-ze₂-en (MA) VS ga-ab-dim₂-en-ze₂-e[n] (NA); Obv. 20: ħe₂-en-dim₂-en-ze₂-en (MA) VS mu-un-me-e-e-ze₂-en (NA), for this line see Seminara 2001, 408-409; Obv. 21: mu-un-sur-re-eš-a (MA) VS su₈-ge-eš (NA), for this line see Lambert 2013, 427, *contra* see Pettinato 1971, 80: 21.

599 Obv. 26: nam-lu₂-u₁₈-lu (MA) VS saĝ (A 17634); Obv. 26: mu₂-mu₂-e-de₃ (MA) VS ħe₂-mu₂-mu₂ (A 17634).

600 One instance is possibly due to the copyist: in ĝeš-ħur-gal-gal mu-un- ni₂-ba -ħur-ħur-re = *i-na ra-ma-ni-šū₂-nu u₂-šū₂-ra-te ra-[ab-ba-te ušširū]*, ‘He has established the great rules among themselves’ (Rev. 59), ni₂-ba corresponding to *ra-ma-ni-šū₂-nu* is misplaced within the verbal form, see Pettinato 1971, 81: 59; cf. the parallel line ni₂-te-a-ni ĝeš-ħur-gal-gal mu-un-ħur-ħur-re (Rev. 24-25).

601 See Pettinato 1971, 80: 6.

602 Pettinato 1971, 80: 25.

603 For this form see Lambert 1972.

604 Pettinato 1971, 80: 16-20.

- In *bara₂-maḥ ni₂-te mu-un-ki-durun mu₂-a*, ‘They set their residence in the mighty seat made up of terror’ (Obv. 10), the position of *mu₂-a* at the end of the sentence is incorrect; moreover, in the compound verb *ki--tuš*⁶⁰⁵ the nominal element is incorporated in the verbal base as in late texts.

This mythological text is a unique composition⁶⁰⁶ that had a limited diffusion in the OB period. The reference to Uzumua (Obv. 24), a part of Nippur, may perhaps suggest that the text was composed in that city despite the fact that no sources were recovered in Nippur. It seems unlikely that this text was used in the curriculum due to the dearth of OB sources. Rather, as references to secret knowledge and to Nisaba at the end of the composition indicate, it should be regarded as a piece of scribal art, the product of literati.⁶⁰⁷ After the OB period this text was probably altered and modified⁶⁰⁸ with the addition of an Akkadian translation⁶⁰⁹ and transmitted to Assur through the Middle Babylonian scribal schools. The language is Babylonian but a few Assyrianisms occasionally appear.⁶¹⁰ After the Middle Babylonian period the text was further modified as shown by the first-millennium documentation.

2.1.2 Divine Praise Poems

2.1.2.1 Ninisina C – KAR 15 - KAR 16

The composition *Ninisina’s Journey to Nippur (Ninisina C)*⁶¹¹ concerns the travel to Nippur of the goddess Ninisina (Ninkarrak in the Akkadian version) from her cella in Isin accompanied by her spouse Pabilsaḡ and her entourage.⁶¹² The text is labeled as a *šir₃-nam-šub* to the goddess Ninisina, a type of composition that was classified as an incantation-hymn but seems rather to be associated with the determination of destiny.⁶¹³ *Namšub*-songs were part of the repertoire of the gala priest and sung in cultic ceremonies. As expected for a hymnic liturgy, only a single tablet from Nippur (CBS 15132) is known from the Old Babylonian documentation. *Ninisina C* is preserved on two MA manuscripts from Assur, KAR 15 and KAR 16, but no first-millennium duplicates are known to date.

The MA tablets were copied by the aforementioned Ninurta-uballissu’s sons, Bēl-aḥa-iddina (KAR 15) and Marduk-balāssu-ēriš (KAR 16).⁶¹⁴ KAR 15 and KAR 16 are dated according to the *līmu* system to the eponym Aššur-aḥa-iddina, who is also attested in a copy of *Lugal-e*. According to the colophons,⁶¹⁵ both tablets are based on *Vorlagen* from Nippur and Babylon and are copied from a tablet drafted by a certain Iqīša-Ninkarrak son of Ninurta-bāni. **VAT 9308 = KAR 15** is a fragment from the right edge of a single-column tablet in interlinear bilingual format. Much better preserved is **VAT 9304 + VAT 4037 = KAR 16** which is also a single-column tablet in interlinear

605 This verb is rarely utilized; more common is *ki-tuš--ḡar*, see ETCSL.

606 See Pettinato 2005, 404.

607 See Tinney 2011, 591.

608 For a possible conflation of different textual traditions see Pettinato 1971, 79: 1.

609 The Akkadian translation differs in some points from the Sumerian, see *ᵀa-nun-na diḡir nam-tar-re = ᵀa-nun-na-ku mu-ši-im ši-ma-ti* (Obv. 22) where *diḡir* (whose function is not clear) is not referred to in Akkadian. For further differences between the Sumerian and the Akkadian and the relations between the MA and NA recensions see Seminara 2001, 408-409.

610 *da-me-šu-nu* (Obv. 26); *šu-me-šu-nu* (Rev. 12); *u₂-šu-ra-te* (Rev. 18, 24); *lu-kal-lim* is a 3sg. D precativ, which in Babylonian would be *likallim*.

611 ETCSL 4.22.3.

612 For the content see Wagensohn 2008, 279-280.

613 For this type of composition see Cohen 1975, Flückiger-Hawker 1999, 261-263, Shehata 2009, 270-272.

614 See §§ 2.1.1.1, 2.1.1.2. Each one appears on his brother’s tablet as a collator.

615 Hunger 1968, 30 No. 44.

format containing a larger portion of the composition. The OB manuscript is a tiny fragment preserving only lines 15-24 of the text.⁶¹⁶

The Sumerian is identical in the MA manuscripts and, for the extant portion, adheres to the OB recension with only a few variants:

Line	KAR 15	KAR 16	CBS 15132
16	x	gu ₂ -tab-min-a-bi	ˈgu ₂ ^ˈ -min ^ˈ -na ^ˈ -bi
17	x	gi-šumun-ku ₃ -ge	gi ₄ ^ˈ -šumun ^ˈ -ku ₃ -[g]e
18	x	kar-ḡeštin-na-ke ₄	kar-ḡeštin-na-ka
18	x	^d en-ki	nibru ^{ki}
21	x	^d en-lil ₂ -la ₂ -ke ₄	ˈden ^ˈ -lil ₂ -la ₂ -ka
22	x	u ₄ -sud-ra ₂ -ke ₄	u ₄ -sud-ra ₂ -ka
22	x	šu mu-ˈši ^ˈ -[...]	šu mu-u[n ^ˈ -...]
23	x	saḡ-ki-zalag ₂ -ga-a-ni	[saḡ-ki-z]alag ₂ -ga-ni

With the exception of ^den-ki VS nibru^{ki} in line 18 which possibly indicates a recensional variant,⁶¹⁷ the other variants are purely orthographic. The most interesting variation is the replacement of the locative with the directive in lines 18, 21, 22, as a reflection of the interchange between -a and -e. It is worth noting that line 17 is more correct in the MA manuscript than in the OB tablet because the word ‘reed’ is written with gi- instead of gi₄. One Emesal form, nu-nus = *sinništu*, is attested in line 7.

The Akkadian version is also very similar in both manuscripts: the only differences are the genitive *šulme* in KAR 16 for *šulmi* in KAR 15 (l. 4) and the writing *i-lak* in KAR 15 for *il-lak* in KAR 16 throughout the text.⁶¹⁸ Wagensonner suggests that these discrepancies are due to oral dictation, but it should be noted that the two manuscripts do not show any other variation even in the use of signs. Such uniformity is hardly achievable by means of dictation. As *šulme* is an isolated Assyrianism in a text written in Babylonian,⁶¹⁹ differences between the two manuscripts perhaps depend on the emerging of the vernacular of the copyists. The Akkadian often mistranslates the Sumerian.⁶²⁰ Sumerian finite verbal forms are often rendered with non-finite Akkadian forms.⁶²¹ Nevertheless, the Akkadian translation was not composed in Assur, but was already present in the MB *Vorlagen*.⁶²²

It is relevant that a hymnic liturgy is attested in the Middle Assyrian documentation. At Assur, however, this text was probably used for scribal training because a cultic function of *Ninisina C* at the Assyrian court seems unlikely. As explicitly stated in the colophons, MA manuscripts rely on the Nippur tradition. This is also evident from the agreement between the OB and MA sources and from the provenance of the OB tablet. For the present study, colophons implicitly suggest that scribal schools in Babylon and Nippur were connected.⁶²³ The scribes’ imperfect knowledge of Sumerian has been evidenced by Wagensonner who noticed that firing-holes on the surface of the MA tablets never separate Akkadian words but in Sumerian lines they are placed within nominal or verbal phrases.

2.1.2.2 Hymn to Ninurta – KAR 97

VAT 10176 = KAR 97 is a two-column tablet containing a bilingual hymn to Ninurta in parallel column format. Paragraphs break every seven to nine lines and are set off by rulings. The tablet

⁶¹⁶ Lineation according to Wagensonner 2008.

⁶¹⁷ See Wagensonner 2008, 289.

⁶¹⁸ Lines 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12.

⁶¹⁹ A further possible Assyrianism is the 3sg. Dt precative *lutta*[ˈid] (l. 2), see Wagensonner 2008, 286-287.

⁶²⁰ For differences between the Sumerian and Akkadian see Cohen 1975, 611, Wagensonner 2008.

⁶²¹ Lines 5, 13, 17.

⁶²² Wagensonner 2008, 278.

⁶²³ See § 1.2.

seems to lack a colophon if obverse and reverse are correctly identified. The name of Ninurta is not preserved but divine attributes listed throughout the text clearly refer to this god.⁶²⁴ Moreover, the text mentions e_2 -saĝ-dim₃-me-er-e-ne (Obv. 7) which is the Emesal form of e_2 -saĝ-diĝir-re-e-ne, the temple of Ninurta in Dūr-Kurigalzu⁶²⁵ built by Kurigalzu I.⁶²⁶ This reference together with the mention of Dūr-Kurigalzu itself (Rev. 10) clearly reveals that this text was composed during the Kassite period, likely under Kurigalzu I.⁶²⁷ The syncretism between Ninurta and Ningirsu illustrated in *Lugal-e* is here reiterated with the mention of Eninnu (Rev. 5), the temple of Ningirsu in Lagaš, which is attested in *Lugal-e* as Ninurta's shrine.⁶²⁸ The text shows an odd mixture of Emesal and main dialect forms which is further evidence for the late date of composition.⁶²⁹

KAR 97 is therefore an Assyrian copy of a MB original probably imported after Tukulti-Ninurta's raid. Indeed the Akkadian version is written in Babylonian throughout the text with only one Assyrianism, *ul-me* 'ax'.⁶³⁰ With this minor exception the Assyrian scribe faithfully reproduced the Babylonian model down to the tablet format as this is one of the few bilinguals in parallel column format attested in the Middle Assyrian documentation.

The result of the Kassite scribe's efforts is remarkable. It is likely that older Sumerian literary compositions and lexical lists were used as references for composing this text. One may notice the presence of rare forms⁶³¹ and words or expressions based on Ninurta's literature.⁶³² Some traits indicate the late date of composition:

- The expression gu_2 -gilim-di in gu_2 -gilim-di ĝa₂-ĝa₂-e-de = *za-a-a-ru e-piš lem-n[a²]* is only attested in the post-Old Babylonian period.⁶³³
- The frequent use of the prefix *al-* with active meaning is common in late texts:⁶³⁴ *al-gu[m-gum]* (Obv. 4); *al-suĝ₃-suĝ₃-ĥa* (Obv. 4); *al-saĝ₃-saĝ₃-ga* (Obv. 11); *al-ak-ak-eš* (Obv. 12); *al-mu₂-mu₂-e-de₃* (Obv. 14); *al-dab₅-dab₅-be₂* (Rev. 14).
- In e_2 -saĝ-dim₃-me-ir-e-ne-ra (Obv. 7) the dative *-ra* is appended to a non-human class substantive corresponding to *ana* in the Akkadian version.⁶³⁵
- In *ur-saĝ dim₃-me-er-e-ne-ra*, 'the hero of the gods' (Rev. 4), the dative *-ra* makes no sense.

624 Note the reference to him as the son of Enlil in Rev. 3.

625 George 1993, 139.

626 Clayden 1996, 114.

627 See Falkenstein 1953, 2-3.

628 *Lugal-e* 477, e_2 -ninnu e_2 giri₁₇-zal su₃-ĝa₂, 'it shall suit you well - in my (referred to Ninurta) temple Eninnu, the house full of grace'.

629 See Falkenstein 1953, 3 n. 12 for a list of forms attested in either dialect.

630 Genitive of *ulmu*, see CAD U/W, 86.

631 See gu_3 --še₂₅ (KAXŠID), 'to bellow', (Obv. 1; *ka-nag₂-ga* in Ebeling's edition); the equation *GIL = muqtablu* is not attested elsewhere according to CAD M/2, 214.

632 The verb *lu₃*, 'to mix', used in Obv. 1 with *ab-ba*, 'sea', frequently occurs in association with water or storms, *Lugal-e* 89, 291; $še_{25}$ --gi₄ (Obv. 3) is attested for instance in *Lugal-e*, 281, *en-e kur-ra dum-dam mu-ni-ib-za še₂₆ gi₄ nu-mu-un-gul-e*, 'the lord howled at the mountains, could not withhold a roar', for the verbal form $še_{25}/še_{26}/še_{27}$ --gi₄ see Thomsen 1984, 303; the joyful entrance into the temple described in Obv. 8 is well known from Ninurta/Ningirsu literature: *Cylinder A* 7.30, e_2 -a ĥul₂-la i₃-na-ni-ku₄, '(Gudea) entered the temple with joy'; *Cylinder B* 21-22, d nin-ĝir₂-su e_2 -zu mu-ra-du₃ // ĥul₂-la ĥa-ni'-ku₄-ku₄, 'Ningirsu, I have built up your house for you, now I shall let you enter it in joy!'. KAR 97 Rev. 8, ni₂ ĝissu^{zu}-bi kur-ra la₂-e, 'The terror of his shadow lies over the lands' is close to *Šulgi B*, 355, d šul-gi ĝissu-a-ni kur-ra la₂-a-me-en, 'I am Šulgi, whose shadow lies over the mountain lands'.

633 Attinger 1993, 519.

634 Lambert 1967, 126.

635 Falkenstein 1953, 2-3.

- The non-human possessive -bi is used to refer to Ninurta in $\hat{g}issu^{zu}$ -bi = $\hat{s}i$ -li- $\hat{s}u$ (Rev. 8).
- A few phonetic or odd writings are attested: tir-ra-an-na instead of tir-an-na, ‘rainbow’ (Obv. 5); $\hat{s}a_4$ (DU; Obv. 12)⁶³⁶ for $\hat{s}a_5$ (AK)⁶³⁷ = $\hat{h}a\hat{s}\hat{a}\hat{s}u$,⁶³⁸ $\hat{s}u$ -nu = i -na qa -ti-[$\hat{s}u$] for $\hat{s}u$ -na (Rev. 13). The first and last cases are possibly due to the Assyrian copyist whereas the second was probably contained in the Babylonian model. Another possible phonetic writing is pa-ra (Obv. 3) perhaps for either bar-ra or para₁₀ in edin-na $\hat{s}e_{25}$ - $\hat{g}i_4$ - $\hat{g}i_4$ pa-ra sag₃-sag₃, ‘The one who makes noise in the steppe, the one who smites in the outside (lands)/the reign’.⁶³⁹

As pointed out above,⁶⁴⁰ Kassite sovereigns and in particular Kurigalzu I looked back at the Old Babylonian religious and cultural tradition of Nippur for their ideological program of restoring the past and presenting themselves as traditional Mesopotamian kings. This text is an important example of this perspective similar to the one encoded in *Kurigalzu’s Statue Inscription*.

2.1.2.3 A Hymn to Ninurta with Ethical Instructions – KAR 119

VAT 10610 = KAR 119, discovered at Assur in an unrecorded find-spot, is a tablet imported from Babylonia, but its place of origin is unknown. On paleographical grounds the tablet shows the typical Middle Babylonian sign forms without any Assyrian traits. The tablet contains a bilingual hymn to Ninurta⁶⁴¹ in interlinear format that according to Civil is duplicated in an unpublished NB tablet from Nippur, N 3462.⁶⁴² No other duplicates are known. References to Ninurta, Nippur (Rev. 8), a Nippur city gate⁶⁴³ and the temple Ešumeša⁶⁴⁴ are evidence that this composition was associated with Nippur scribal circles. Perhaps the tablet itself stems from Nippur. Only one phonetic writing⁶⁴⁵ and minor errors are documented:

- The directive is used with a human-class substantive in lu₂-mašgagen(MAŠ.EN.KAK)-e (KAR 119 Obv. 11).⁶⁴⁶
- In aš-daḥ a- $\hat{s}a_3$ -ga-tab-ba-na-ka [...] = *ar-da-du ša₂ ina A.ŠA₃ tap-pi-šu* [...], ‘The thief, who [...] in the field of his partner’ (KAR 119 Obv. 17-18), the insertion of -(g)a- after $\hat{s}a_3$ is mistaken.
- The ablative is used with locative meaning in ki-bi-ta igi-zu ḡar-ra-[zu-ne], ‘when you set your eyes on this place’ (KAR 119 Rev. 12).⁶⁴⁷

Akkadian displays a mix of old forms such as the preservation of mimation, the use of GA for qa_2 (Obv. 10) instead of the MB qa , and later developments such as CvC signs and the use of $\hat{s}a_2$ for preposition/pronoun.

⁶³⁶ This reading is also attested in the OB incantation YOS 11 70, iii 23, Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995a, 32.

⁶³⁷ For AK= $\hat{s}a_5$ see Attinger 2005, 51-53.

⁶³⁸ CAD H, 130-131; for the expression *kima qanī ḡašāsu* attested in Obv. 12 see CAD Q, 85 ff.

⁶³⁹ Ebeling 1918, 77, translates ‘das Gefilde zerschlägst’.

⁶⁴⁰ See § 1.1.12.1.

⁶⁴¹ The god’s name is not preserved but the reference to his entering the temple Ešumeša clearly points to Ninurta, Lambert 1960, 118; this passage is reminiscent of the procession in *Ninisina C*, § 2.1.2.1.

⁶⁴² The tablet is quoted as a duplicate of KAR 119 in DCSL according to Civil’s unpublished catalogue.

⁶⁴³ ka₂-gal muzug₂(U₂.KA), see RIA 9, 540.

⁶⁴⁴ See George 1993, 147.

⁶⁴⁵ aš-daḥ instead of aš₂-daḥ is attested.

⁶⁴⁶ See van Dijk 1953, 117: 11.

⁶⁴⁷ See van Dijk 1953, 117: 12.

It is not excluded that also text was composed in the Kassite period but contrary to KAR 97 only a few parallel passages can be found in the Sumerian literature.⁶⁴⁸ This tablet was probably imported to Assur at the time of Tukulti-Ninurta as part of his campaign loot.

2.1.3 Proverbs

2.1.3.1 KAR 103

VAT 10251 = KAR 103 is a fragment from the lower left corner of its tablet containing a bilingual proverb in parallel column format. The obverse preserves about twenty lines of the Sumerian column, but only a few signs of the Akkadian version; the reverse preserves around the same portion of the Sumerian text, but a little more of the Akkadian translation. This is the oldest manuscript of the so called *Assyrian Collection*,⁶⁴⁹ a collection of bilingual proverbs known from NA sources from Aššurbanipal's library. No OB duplicates are thus far known, therefore a post-Old Babylonian date for the composition of this text must not be ruled out.

KAR 103 overlaps with the NA sources for only two lines on the obverse and four lines on the reverse. Except for a few minor orthographic variants,⁶⁵⁰ no differences can be evidenced between the two recensions. The text present some anomalies:

- In ib_2 -ga sa₆-ga, 'my thighs (?) are delight' (ii 9 = KAR 103 Obv. 9), -ga after ib_2 is a phonetic writing for -ĝa₂, 1sg. possessive gen./loc., but -ĝu₁₀ (MU) is expected because ib_2 is the subject of the sentence; cf. igi -ĝu₁₀ and e_2 -gar₈-ĝu₁₀ in ii 7-8.
- In numdum-ĝu₁₀ sa₆-sa₆ mu-un-du₁₁-du₁₁-ga, 'my lips speak pleasant things' (ii 16-17 = KAR 103 Obv. 16-17), the human personal prefix -n- is used for a non-human substantive.
- In diĝir ar₂ ak-en = *ila tana''id*, 'you will praise (your) god' (iv 26 = KAR 103 Rev. 2) the Sumerian verbal form has no prefixes but a finite verbal form is intended as is clear from the suffix -en and the Akkadian translation.⁶⁵¹ The NA recension has the same text.
- In [lu₂]-tur-ra dum-u₃-dam-za = *tuttaz[am šiħra]*, 'vex a boy' (iv 31 = KAR 103 Rev. 8), the prefix u₃- is placed within the nominal element of the compound verb dum-dam-za; here probably the scribe miscopied the model resulting in a metathesis. Unfortunately, the NA recension does not preserve this line.

Some of these oddities may speak for a composition or modification of the text during the Kassite period.

2.1.3.2 VAT 10810

VAT 10810 is a fragment from a two-column tablet containing a bilingual proverb in parallel column format. A NA duplicate from the library of Aššurbanipal is inscribed on the unpublished tablet

⁶⁴⁸ ki-bi-ta igi-zu ĝar-ra-[zu-de₃] (Rev. 12) is close to *Enki and the World Order*, 250, ki-bi-ta igi-ni ĝar-ra-[ta], and *Ur-Namma A*, Seg. A 198, Seg. D 12, ki-bi-ta igi-ni ĝar-ra-ni; the expression me-teš₂ ... i-i in Rev. 10 is also attested in *Ibbi-Sin A*, 26, *Šara A*, 32 and in the hymn *Ninisina C*, 2; Obv. 3, [lu₂] dam-lu₂-da na₂-a nam-ta₃-ga dugud-[am₃] is reminiscent of SP 23.8, 19.

⁶⁴⁹ Lambert 1960, 222-225, Foster 2005, 422-424; lineation according to Lambert's edition.

⁶⁵⁰ See Lambert 1960, 227, 229. The major variant is šu an-na-ab-be₂ (MA) VS ba-an-na-ab-be₂ (NA) where šu is probably a phonetic spelling for šudu₃--du₁₁ = *karābu*, see Attinger 1993, 726-727; even though the MA manuscript has a phonetic writing its variant is preferable to the NA one.

⁶⁵¹ For non-finite verbal forms with personal suffixes see KAR 4 (§ 2.1.1.3), KAR 128+ (§ 2.1.5.1).

BM 121076 iii',⁶⁵² whereas no OB manuscripts are known. Unfortunately the Sumerian column on both sides is badly damaged and only a few signs are preserved. The fragmentary nature of the tablet precludes any comparison.

2.1.4 Emesal Liturgies

2.1.4.1 Balaĝ-prayer to Enlil – KAR 375

VAT 8243 = KAR 375 is a two-column tablet containing a bilingual *Balaĝ*-prayer to Enlil in inter-linear format which is only partially edited. Text lines are set off by horizontal rulings. This tablet found in Assur was imported from Babylonia as the typical Kassite shape of the sign KUR clearly indicates.⁶⁵³ Column I is almost completely broken away and Column IV is also badly damaged, whereas Columns II and III are fairly well preserved. The scribe's name is not preserved (or reported). The total number of lines in each column is indicated under Columns I and II as 47. Such an indication is not preserved under columns III and IV due to a break in the tablet. This composition contained at least four *kirugū*, the sections composing a *Balaĝ*-prayer,⁶⁵⁴ of which the first line is preserved for the second, third and fourth *kirugu*.⁶⁵⁵

The first two *kirugū*, KAR 375 Obv. II 34 – Rev. III 41, are duplicated in the NA tablet K 15190 + 1879-7-8, 23 = 5R 52, 2.⁶⁵⁶ No other duplicates are preserved but parallels are known from other Emesal compositions. In particular, several passages are paralleled in the *Balaĝ*-prayer to Enlil ⁴utu-gen₇ e₃-ta⁶⁵⁷ and the *Balaĝ*-prayer to Enlil and Marduk a-ab-ba-ĥu-luĥ-ĥa.⁶⁵⁸ Parallel texts are listed in the following table:

Line	Parallel Text ¹	Date	Composition
II 3-4, 7-8	VS 2 25 VIII 5-6 (S5)	OB	<i>Balaĝ</i> e ₂ -e še am ₃ -ša ₄ ²
	CBS 2218+ Rev. IV 4-5 (N3) ³	OB	<i>Eršemma</i> Collection
II 3-8	4R ² 11 Rev. 15-20 (Ku4)	NA	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 4) ⁴ utu-gen ₇ e ₃ -ta
	[CTMMA 2 3] (B15)	NB	<i>kirugu</i> n+2 ⁴ , ll. 16-18
	BM 40846 I, 1-2 ⁵ (B2)	NB	
	OECT 6 Pl. XXII+ Obv. 56-58 (Ku2 + Ku3) ⁶	NA	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 31B) ⁴ utu-gen ₇ e ₃ -ta (Not canonical)
	BL 194 Obv. 16-17 (Ku7) ⁷	NA	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 36) uru ₂ am ₃ -ma-ir-ra-bi
	BM 38593 Rev. IV 13-14 ⁹ (B1)	NB	<i>kirugu</i> c+12, ll. 266-267 ⁸
	SBH 33 Rev. 17-23 (B12)	LB	Unidentified ¹⁰
II 9-16	SBH I Obv. 16-23, 14 (B8)	LB	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 6) am-e amaš-a-na <i>kirugu</i> 1, ll. 9-12 ¹¹
II 21-24	CNMA 10051 I 4-5 ¹²	OB	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 16) a-ab-ba-ĥu-luĥ-ĥa
	CT 42 I Obv. 32-33 (X9)	LB	<i>kirugu</i> III ¹³ , ll. 32-33

⁶⁵² Lambert, Millard 1968, 8; the NA tablet duplicates VAT 10810 Rev. 5(?) -11, but Sumerian is not preserved.

⁶⁵³ Obv. II, 54, 56.

⁶⁵⁴ For this term see Löhnert 2009, 41-54.

⁶⁵⁵ Obv. II, 55, Rev. IV, 41, Rev. IV, 58, see Löhnert 2009, 126 n. 459.

⁶⁵⁶ Langdon 1909, 214-217, Löhnert 2009, 131. Note that in 5R 52, 2 the second *kirugu*, a še-eb e₂ kur-ra a še-eb e₂ kur-ra, is separated from the preceding one by a dividing ruling deeply impressed in the clay; on the basis of the hand-copy such a dividing ruling does not seem to have been drawn in KAR 375 Obv. II, 55.

⁶⁵⁷ Löhnert 2009; for this composition see also § 2.1.4.2.

⁶⁵⁸ Kutscher 1975.

Line	Parallel Text ¹	Date	Composition
II 25-26	K 3341+ Rev. 9 ¹⁴	NA	<i>Eršahuĝa</i> gi-izi-la ₂ guru ₃ ¹⁴
	K 3517+ Rev. 5 ¹⁵	NA	
	K 4899+ Rev. 7 ¹⁶	NA	
II 25-32 ¹⁷	VS 2 25 VIII 19-22 (S5)	OB	<i>Balaĝ</i> e ₂ -e še am ₃ -ša ₄
	NBC 11433, 4-7 (X6) ¹⁸	OB	<i>Balaĝ</i>
	[CTMMA 2 3] (B15)	NB	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 4) ^d utu-gen ₇ e ₃ -ta <i>kirugu</i> n+2, ll. 30-33 ¹⁹
	4R ² 11 Rev. 39-42 (Ku4)	NA	
	BM 35362, 5-8 (X11) ²⁰	NB	
	SBH 14 Rev. 34-37 (B7)	LB	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 13) am-e para ₁₀ -an-na-ra <i>kirugu</i> b+7, ll. 67-70 ²¹
	CT 42 1 Obv. 33-36 (X9)	LB	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 16) a-ab-ba-ĥu-luĥ-ĥa <i>kirugu</i> III, ll. 34-37
II 33-43	SBH I Obv. 14, 24-35 (B8)	LB	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 6) am-e amaš-a-na <i>kirugu</i> 1, ll. 13-18 ²²
	5R 52, 2 Obv. 1-6 (Ku 14) ²³		<i>Balaĝ</i> to Enlil
II 58- III 5	SBH 29 Rev. 7-15 ²⁴	LB	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 16) a-ab-ba-ĥu-luĥ-ĥa <i>kirugu</i> XI ²⁵ , ll. 163-170
	5R 52, 2 Obv. 12-21 (Ku 14)	NA	<i>Balaĝ</i> to Enlil
III 7-10	VS 2 25 I, 18-19 (S5)	OB	<i>Balaĝ</i> e ₂ -e še am ₃ -ša ₄
	VS 2 7 + VS 2 13 Obv. 10-11 (S6)	OB	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 4) ^d utu-gen ₇ e ₃ -ta <i>kirugu</i> 2, ll. 10-11 ²⁶
	VS 2 5 Rev. III, 44-45 (S7)	OB	
	VS 2 17 Rev. V 1-2 (S9)	OB	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 5) u ₄ -dam ki am ₃ -us ₂ <i>kirugu</i> e+11, ll. 202-203 ²⁷
	PRAK C 32, 8-9 (Ki3)	OB	?
	5R 52, 2 Obv. 22-23 (Ku 14)	NA	<i>Balaĝ</i> to Enlil
	SBH 17 Obv. 13-14 (B10)	LB	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 3) e ₂ -tur ₃ -gen ₇ niĝen-na-am ₃ <i>kirugu</i> 1, ll. 13-14 ²⁸
	SBH 36 Obv. 12-13 (B5)	LB	
III 27-36	PBS 10/2 12 + VS 2 12 + VS 2 16 Obv. II, 29-32 (S3) ²⁹	OB	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 11) uru ₂ -ĥul-a-ke ₄ ³⁰
	5R 52, 2 Rev. 13-16 (Ku14)	NA	<i>Balaĝ</i> to Enlil
	SBH 33 Obv. 17 (B12) ³¹	LB	Unidentified
III 41-46	PBS 10/2 12 + VS 2 12 + VS 2 16 Obv. II, 8-9	OB	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 11) uru ₂ -ĥul-a-ke ₄
	4R ² 11 Obv. 33-34, 38 (Ku4)	NA	<i>Balaĝ</i> (No. 4) ^d utu-gen ₇ e ₃ -ta <i>kirugu</i> n+1, ll. 20, 22-23 ³²
	SBH 33 Obv. 9-13 (B12)	LB	Unidentified

- 1 Where indicated, manuscripts refer to Löhnert's edition. A new edition is provided in Gabbay 2015.
- 2 Krecher 1966b, 53-223.
- 3 Löhnert 2009, Pl. II.
- 4 See Löhnert 2009, 346-349.
- 5 KAR 375 Obv. II 5-8 only.
- 6 OECT 6 Pl. XXII + CLAM 802 + BL 167 + BL 142, see Löhnert 2009, 148.
- 7 KAR 375 Obv. II 5-8 only.
- 8 Cohen 1988, 569-570.
- 9 KAR 375 Obv. II 5-8 only.
- 10 See Löhnert 2009, 140.
- 11 Cohen 1988, 154, 172.
- 12 JCS 8, 82-83.
- 13 See Kutscher 1975, 73-78.
- 14 Maul 1988, Pl. 31-32, see Maul 1988, 216-228, Löhnert 2009, 370: 30.
- 15 Maul 1988, Pl. 33-34.
- 16 Maul 1988, Pl. 35.
- 17 For KAR 375 Obv. II, 31-32, see also Löhnert 2009, 371-372: 33.
- 18 See Löhnert 2009, 145-146.
- 19 Löhnert 2009, 146.
- 20 Löhnert 2009, Pl. I.
- 21 Cohen 1988, 323-324.
- 22 Cohen 1988, 154, 173.
- 23 KAR 375 Obv. II 38-43 only.
- 24 The manuscripts are only partially parallel, see Kutscher 1975, 110-111; lines 165-166 of the *Balaĝ* a-ab-ba-ĥu-luĥ-ĥa are not attested in either KAR 375 or 5R 52, 2, whereas KAR 375 II, 60-61 is not documented in either 5R 52, 2 or the *Balaĝ* a-ab-ba-ĥu-luĥ-ĥa.
- 25 Kutscher 1975, 106-111.
- 26 Löhnert 2009, 264-265.
- 27 Cohen 1988, 133.
- 28 Cohen 1988, 75.
- 29 See Löhnert 2009, 316-317.
- 30 Cohen 1988, 265.
- 31 KAR 375 III, 27-28 only.
- 32 Löhnert 2009, 325-326, 341.

A comparison of sources is hindered by the fragmentary nature of tablets. Moreover, it is to be remembered that in most cases the manuscripts belong to different compositions and only report parallel passages, which may significantly differ. The text of KAR 375 is usually closer to the late manuscripts when both OB and first-millennium parallels are available, as the following examples illustrate:⁶⁵⁹

▪	KAR	II 7	mu-uš-tu ₉ muštu ku ₃ -ga-na ta-am ₃ an-ga-mu-ri-a-bi
		8	<i>ina uz-ni-šu₂ el-le-ti₃ mi-nam iĥ-su-sa-an-ni</i>
	OB S5	VIII 6	^r dmu-ul-lil ₂ ^r -le uš-tu ₉ uštu k[u ₃ ...] ta-a a[n- ...]
	N3	Rev. IV 5	^d mu-ul-lil ₂ -la ₂ ta ^ĝ eš-tu ₉ ĝeštu [...] ta-a an-ga-mu-ri- [...]
	NA Ku4	Rev. 19	mu-uš-tu ₉ muštu ku ₃ -ga-na ta-a an-ga-mu-ri-a-bi
		20	<i>ina uz-ni-šu₂ el-le-ti mi-nam iĥ-su-sa</i>
	Ku2+	Obv. 58	mu-uš-tu ₉ muštu-ga-na ta-am ₃ [...]
	Ku7	17	mu-uš-t[u ₉ ...]
	NB B2	I 2	[.....r]i-a-bi
			[...]
	B12	Rev. 22	mu-uš-tu ₉ muštu ku ₃ -g[a ...]
		23	<i>ina uz-ni-šu₂ el- [...]</i>
	B1	Rev. IV 14	mu-uš-tu ₉ muštu ku ₃ -ga-na ^r ta-a an-ga-mu-ri-a-bi ^r <i>uz-ni-ša₂ el-le-^rti mi-nam iĥ-su-sa-am-ma</i> <i>What did he 'plant' in his pure sense?</i>

⁶⁵⁹ Note that lines reported in KAR 375 Obv. II, 25-32, show very few orthographic variants among manuscripts, see Löhnert 2009, 355.

KAR 375 and the first-millennium manuscripts omit Mullil at the beginning of the line;⁶⁶⁰ also note that Obv. II 5-6 is omitted in the OB tablets but attested in the first-millennium manuscripts.

- KAR II 21 ʿem₃-bi[i₂...] im-ta-ʿe-[-...]
- OB JCS 8 I 4 an-bi-du-ka me-en-ti⁶⁶¹
- NB CT 42 1 Obv. 32 em₃-bi₂-du₁₁-ga-zu im-ta-e-ug₅

Note that the OB source is written in phonetic writing.

KAR 375 usually agrees with its late duplicate 5R 52, 2 although variants, mostly purely orthographic, are attested.⁶⁶² However, some passages such as the list of temples and gates⁶⁶³ as well as the following passages diverge in the two sources:

- KAR III 9 ša₃-biʿ [xʷ] a-še-er am₃-ta-la₂-la₂
- 10 aš-ri ta-ni-ḫu ŠA₃?-baʷ-šu₂ it-ta-aʷ-lal
- 5R 52, 2 Obv. 23 a-še-erʷ kur-ra-k[a] a-še-er-ra [a]m₃-ta-la₂-e⁶⁶⁴

- KAR III 16 a-še-er kur-re *ma-tu₂im-ma-li*⁶⁶⁵ im-ta-la₂-la₂
- im-gen₇ šeĝ₃-šeĝ₃
- 17 ta-ne₂-eḫ-šu ina ma-ti₃ GEN₇ ša₂-mu-ti
- 5R 52, 2 Rev. 1 a-še-er kur-ra im-gen₇ šeĝ₃-šeĝ₃ im-gen₇ la₂-la₂
- 2 ta-ne₂-ḫu ina ma-a-ti₃ ki-ma ša₂-mu-ti u₂-ša₂-az-nin

Lament of the land, like a storm he made rain

The text of KAR 375 is very close to 5R 52, 2, although it reflects a slightly older stage. Unfortunately, no OB manuscript of this *Balaĝ* is known but it was likely composed in the Old Babylonian period. The role of Enlil as addressee of this *Balaĝ* and the mention of several Nippur buildings suggest that this text was associated with Nippur. The standard orthography of the MB tablet KAR 375, as opposed to the phonetic writings attested in many Northern Babylonian manuscripts of Emesal liturgies,⁶⁶⁶ is probably indicative of a Nippur textual tradition.

2.1.4.2 Ritual Eršemma(?) to Enlil ʷutu-gen₇ e₃-ta – KAR 9+

VAT 9440 = KAR 9 + VAT 11573 = KAR 348 + VAT 10607⁶⁶⁷ is a single-column tablet containing the Emesal liturgy ʷutu-gen₇ e₃-ta dedicated to Enlil. The text was edited by Maul as an *Eršahuĝa* but Gabbay, following a previous suggestion of Maul himself, provided some pieces of evidence that it could be a Ritual *Eršemma*.⁶⁶⁸ The scribe opted for a different format on each side: on the obverse

⁶⁶⁰ KAR 375 seems to be closer to the late sources also in Rev. III 7-8 but the manuscripts are badly preserved, see Löhnert 2009, 264-265.

⁶⁶¹ Kutscher 1975, 76.

⁶⁶² See commentary in Nötscher 1927, 99-108.

⁶⁶³ Löhnert 2009, 127 n. 461, see also table fn. 24 at p. 106.

⁶⁶⁴ For other parallels see Löhnert 2009, 265: 11.

⁶⁶⁵ U. Gabbay's suggestion.

⁶⁶⁶ See the list of phonetic writings provided in Löhnert 2009, 453-456; for the non-Nippur origin of the source N1 see § 2.1.4.2.

⁶⁶⁷ A hand-copy of all the fragments is provided in Maul 1988, Pl. 65-66.

⁶⁶⁸ Gabbay 2015, 206; for the Ritual *Eršemma* see Gabbay 2015, 3-4. A new edition of KAR 9+ is provided in Gabbay 2015, 205-208. I would like to express my gratitude to Uri Gabbay for providing me with the manuscript of his book.

the Akkadian version follows the Sumerian text on the same line separated by a *Glossenkeil*, whereas on the reverse the interlinear format is adopted. The colophon bears the name of the *kalû*-priest Nabû-ētir who is not attested elsewhere.⁶⁶⁹

In addition to this Ritual *Eršemma*, under the title ^dutu-gen₇ e₃-ta several different Emesal liturgies are known from the Old Babylonian period until the first millennium, namely *Balaĝ*, *Eršemma*, and *Eršemma kidudê*. Moreover, two entries in OB catalogues refer to *Balaĝ*-prayers with this title.⁶⁷⁰ Unfortunately, the section of the *Eršahuĝa* catalog dedicated to prayers to Enlil is not preserved⁶⁷¹ and no earlier or later duplicates are known, but lines 1-8 and 13-16 on the obverse⁶⁷² are parallel to the beginning of the first *kirugu* of the *Balaĝ*-prayer ^dutu-gen₇ e₃-ta.⁶⁷³ Obv. 13-16 are duplicated in the first *kirugu* of the *Balaĝ*-prayer zi-bu-u₃ zi-bu-u₃ (ll. 7-10).⁶⁷⁴ Further parallels with other texts are known.⁶⁷⁵ The extant portion of the *Balaĝ* ^dutu-gen₇ e₃-ta parallel to KAR 9+, which contains a list of epithets of standards, is known from only OB manuscripts with the exception of one line (l. 13) that is also preserved in a first-millennium tablet. Four OB manuscripts, N₂, N₆, S₇, Ki₂⁶⁷⁶ contain the entire *Balaĝ* ^dutu-gen₇ e₃-ta (*Textvertreter*)⁶⁷⁷ whereas three, X₂, S₄, S₁₁, are only parallel texts containing different compositions.⁶⁷⁸ These manuscripts are from Nippur (N), Sippar (S) and Kiš (Ki); one is of unknown provenance (X).⁶⁷⁹ The only first-millennium manuscript parallel to KAR 9+ (Obv. 16), U₃, is an extract tablet from Ur containing a monolingual version of the text.⁶⁸⁰ KAR 9+ is therefore the only preserved bilingual version of the first 16 lines of the *Balaĝ* ^dutu-gen₇ e₃-ta. All tablets are poorly preserved, but some variants and unorthographic writings are attested in KAR 9+. Although the MA tablet shows the highest degree of variation among the extant manuscripts preserving the beginning of the *Balaĝ* ^dutu-gen₇ e₃-ta, it is to be recalled that these tablets contain different compositions that only include parallel passages. Moreover, only OB manuscripts can be used for comparison.⁶⁸¹ Unorthographic writings of KAR 9+ are not attested in other manuscripts which, however, rarely share such spellings:

Line	Unorthographic Writing	Orthographic Writing
Obv. 2	[uĝ ₃]-ga	uĝ ₃ -ĝa ₂
Obv. 3-4, 6-7	^d mu-ul-li	mu-ul-lil ₂
Obv. 3-5, 8	u-mu-un ¹	u ₃ -mu-un
Obv. 6	i-bi ₂ du ₃	i-bi ₂ du ₈
Obv. 7	am	ama
Obv. 7	di ₃ -di ₅	di-di
Obv. 8	ka-naĝ-ga	ka-naĝ-ĝa ₂
Obv. 11	i-da	id ₂ -da

669 A Nabû-ētir is the scribe of a NA extispicy from Assur, see Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. II, 47, 51.

670 Löhnert 2009, 97-99.

671 Maul 1988, 81.

672 The rest of the obverse is broken but probably adheres to the *Balaĝ*-prayer ^dutu-gen₇ e₃-ta.

673 See Löhnert 2009, 119, 178-179, cf. Maul 1988, 86-87, Cohen 1981, 29-35.

674 Löhnert 2009, 394, 408.

675 For these parallels see Maul's commentary.

676 Manuscripts according to Löhnert 2009, 89-91; N₂: CBS 11359 = PBS 1/1 8; N₆: Ni 9798 = ISET I p. 185; S₇: VAT 1338 + VAT 1406 + VAT 2164 + VAT 1348 = VS 2 5; Ki₂: PRAK B 357, Ki₂ parallels KAR 9+ only in line 13.

677 See Löhnert 2009, XII-XIII.

678 X₂ is the *Eršemma* CT 15 10 (Löhnert 2009, 117); S₄ and S₁₁ are *Textvertreter* of the *Balaĝ* zi-bu-u₃ zi-bu-u₃ (Löhnert 2009, 387-389).

679 Source X₂ is from Southern Babylonia, probably from Larsa, Löhnert 2009, 117 n. 436

680 Löhnert 2009, 113-114.

681 As noticed above U₃ and KAR 9+ overlap for only one line and in a damaged context.

Line	Unorthographic Writing	Orthographic Writing
Obv. 12	guda _x (URxSAĜ ^{gu-da}) ²	guda ₃ (SAĜxUR) = <i>qarrādu</i>
Rev. 9-10	ḥa-ma-gi-gi	ḥa-ma-gi ₆ -gi ₆

1 This writing is perhaps to be rendered as u^{mu-un}, Gabbay 2014a, 149 n. 25; the regular writing in the first millennium is umun (U) as opposed to OB u₃-mu-un, Gabbay 2014a, 149-150.

2 For this writing see Maul 1988, 89 and MesZL, 86 No. 196; see also Seminara 2001, 438.

A few Assyrianisms are documented in the Akkadian version: *mātāte* (KUR.KUR-*te*) (Obv. 3); *māte* (Obv. 5, 8); *serte* (Obv. 8).

Although no OB duplicates are thus far known, parallels with the *Balaĝ* ^dutu-gen₇ e₃-ta and other texts possibly indicate an OB date of composition. The *Balaĝ* ^dutu-gen₇ e₃-ta was probably associated with Nippur as evidenced by the preeminent role of Nippur and Enlil,⁶⁸² but it is known from different textual traditions. In the *Balaĝs* ^dutu-gen₇ e₃-ta and zi-bu-u₃ zi-bu-u₃ unorthographic writings listed by Lönnert⁶⁸³ are only attested in non-Nippur manuscripts, namely from Northern Babylonian centers such as Sippar and Kiš, and in the source N₁. This manuscript, CBS 112 = PBS 10/2 13, listed as Nippurian,⁶⁸⁴ is instead from Sippar because it belongs to the Khabaza Collection. The presence of phonetic writings might suggest that KAR 9+ does not belong to the Nippur textual tradition. However, the number and distribution of phonetic writings in KAR 9+ are very limited compared to the Northern Babylonian tablets. It is therefore possible that KAR 9+ reflects some local variant or that phonetic writings are due to the Assyrian scribe.

2.1.5 Tukulti-Ninurta Texts

Two Sumerian literary compositions⁶⁸⁵ were clearly composed at the behest of the king Tukulti-Ninurta I as a consequence of his project of making Assur a cultural and scribal center equal to Babylon. One of the major literary achievements of this impulse was *The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta* describing the war against the Kassite king Kaštiliaš IV and the conquest of Babylon by the Assyrians.⁶⁸⁶

2.1.5.1 Prayer to Assur for Tukulti-Ninurta I

VAT 9942 + VAT 10103 = KAR 128 (+) KAR 129 is a two-column tablet of unknown find-spot as the Assur number is not recorded. This tablet contains a bilingual prayer to the god Assur on behalf of the king Tukulti-Ninurta I (henceforth *PTN*) who is mentioned twice in the text.⁶⁸⁷ The Sumerian text, composed with a mixture of Emesal and main dialect forms, is inscribed on the left column and the Akkadian on the right. No duplicates are known. The scribe's name is not preserved but similarities in phraseology, leitmotifs and poetic suggest the text could have been composed by the same author of *The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta*⁶⁸⁸ (who could be different from the copyist of KAR 128+). The

682 Lönnert 2009, 55-61.

683 Lönnert 2009, 453-456.

684 Lönnert 2009, 90.

685 K 2657, possibly a copy of a MA tablet, is not considered here as it is a NA manuscript, see Lambert 1976, 92-94.

686 Foster 2005, 298-317, with previous bibliography.

687 KAR 128 Obv. 43, KAR 129 Rev. 5.

688 For parallels see the references in Machinist 1978, 533 n. 7; note that the word *namugatu* is only attested in *PTN* and the Epic, Machinist 1978, 354.

Akkadian is written in Babylonian dialect with the occasional presence of Assyrian forms⁶⁸⁹ which indicate that the scribe was Assyrian and not a Babylonian scholar working at Assur.

The prayer begins with an invocation to the god Assur as son of Enlil (KAR 129). After a break, it continues (KAR 128) with the description of the king and the city of Assur surrounded by enemies. The text ends with a plea to the god Assur to not withdraw his support from the king. *PTN* is reminiscent of the *Eršaḫūga* prayers as it contains a section⁶⁹⁰ for appeasing the god's hearth that is directly addressed.⁶⁹¹ However, this section does not follow the structure of the *Eršaḫūga* prayers in every respect and it uses main-dialect forms instead of the expected Emesal.⁶⁹²

This text is an important attestation of the ability of Assyrian scribes to create original compositions in Sumerian. Text analysis reveals that both lexicon and grammar show several peculiarities.

Lexicon:⁶⁹³

- The correspondence of ma-al (Emesal for $\hat{g}a_2$) to *našāru*, 'to guard' (KAR 128 Obv. 10-11)⁶⁹⁴ is not attested in classical Sumerian but is known from first-millennium lexical and bilingual texts.⁶⁹⁵ In the same line the correspondence sa-par₃ = *šipāru* is only based on phonetic similarity. Indeed sa-par₃ 'net' is equivalent to the Akkadian *saparru*, whereas *šipāru*, which is a quite rare word, is equated to *puḫru*, 'assembly' in a commentary to *Šurpu* II 81⁶⁹⁶ and occurs three times in *PTN* with the meaning 'ordinance' (KAR 128 Obv. 10, 34, Rev. 7). It is worth noting that *šipāru* occurs several times in *The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta*.⁶⁹⁷
- The word *emēšu* equated with $ki\hat{g}_2$ -ak (KAR 128 Obv. 30),⁶⁹⁸ with the meaning 'to strive', is a *hapax* which is not listed in either CAD or AhW.⁶⁹⁹ In the same line $igi-su_3$ -ud-la₂ corresponds to *šebû*, 'to wish', while it is usually equated to *šubbû*, 'to look upon';⁷⁰⁰ as in the aforementioned case this equivalence is based on phonetic similarity.

Grammar:

- In [...] $ki\hat{g}_2$ zu-zi-zi-eš mu-zal-ak-a-meš KI.MIN = *a-na pu-ru-us-su* ^dEN.LIL₂-ti-ka ke-e-ni šit-ḫu-tu u₂-pa-qu K[^I.MIN], 'Standing in awe, they heed the firm decision of your supreme godhead' (KAR 128 Obv. 13), zu-zi is a phonetic writing for su-zi = *šaḫatu*, 'to fear', but it is unclear whether it was deliberately written as such or the signs SU and ZU were confused.⁷⁰¹ Akkadian *puqqu*, 'to heed' usually translates $\hat{g}essal^{sal4}$ ($\hat{G}E\check{S}$.TUG₂.PI.ŠIR₃.SILA₃)--AK; the verbal form mu-zal-ak-a-meš probably derives from the incorporation of the nominal element, usually

⁶⁸⁹ See *de-en-ka* (KAR 128 Obv. 12); *ke-e-ni* (KAR 128 Obv. 13); *e-te-ne₂-ri-ša* (KAR 128 Obv. 28), 3fpl. Gtn present from *erēšu*; *te-me-qu-ia* (KAR 128 Rev. 17; for the spelling -ia - VS MB -a - with nominative plural as an Assyrian trait see Machinist 1978, 453-454); *zi-be* (KAR 128 Rev. 18) genitive from *zību*.

⁶⁹⁰ KAR 128 Rev. 21 ff.

⁶⁹¹ Machinist 1978, 370-371.

⁶⁹² See Falkenstein 1953, 4 n. 13, for the list of the forms of each dialect.

⁶⁹³ I thank Prof. Niek Veldhuis for providing me with an unpublished study on this text; some notes on lexicon are to his credit.

⁶⁹⁴ Lineation of KAR 128 + KAR 129 follows the edition of Chang 1981 which differs from Ebeling's copies.

⁶⁹⁵ See CAD N/2, 34.

⁶⁹⁶ CAD Š/3, 56.

⁶⁹⁷ AhW 1244.

⁶⁹⁸ KAR 128 Obv. 30, [...] $ki\hat{g}_2$ - $\hat{g}a_2$ -a ba-ab-ak-ak-eš i[m-...]gi su₃-ud-la₂-eš KI.MIN = u₃ e-te₄-em-mi-šu a-na ša-ka-an dab-di-e ša-b[u]-u₂, CAD Š, 227.

⁶⁹⁹ Chang 1981, 195: 30; only CDA lists this word.

⁷⁰⁰ CAD Š, 226.

⁷⁰¹ See Chang 1981, 190-191: 13.

spelled in lexical lists as giz-zal,⁷⁰² in the verbal base with the omission of giz(ĜEŠ). However, it is not precluded that in this case mu-uš-zal, the Emesal form for ĝessal^{sal4}, is intended.⁷⁰³

- The finite verbal form *ilte'ū* (KAR 128 Obv. 14) corresponds to the non-finite form *kiĝ₂-kiĝ₂-meš* with the copula probably indicating plurality.
- On the basis of the Akkadian translation, *dekâniššu qablât edê gimiršina*, 'All the onslaughts of the flood are raised against it',⁷⁰⁴ the 2sg. pronominal element -e- in the verbal form [... m]u-e-da-ab-zi-ge-eš (KAR 128 Obv. 25) is apparently not related to any word in the sentence. However, one should note that the Sumerian version is only partially preserved. The Sumerian verbal form was perhaps copied from a lexical list.
- The expression *zi-ir-ra-aš*, 'in order to destroy' (KAR 128 Obv. 27), seems to be built upon the Akkadian version, *a-na ša-lal ma-ti-ka*, with a terminative corresponding to *ana*.⁷⁰⁵
- The verb *al m[u-u]n-di-di-de₃* = *etenerrišā* (KAR 128 Obv. 28) uses the participial form of the verb *du₁₁* in a finite verbal form.⁷⁰⁶
- The morpheme -meš, as often in late texts, is used as a plural marker in *aĝ₂-hul-meš*, 'evils' (KAR 128 Obv. 42).
- The Akkadian enclitic conjunction -ma is appended to a Sumerian word in *in-ne-ĝal₂-ma* (KAR 128 Rev. 3).⁷⁰⁷
- In *[dim₂]-me-er hul-hul-a aia-zu gu₂ nu-ĝar-ra-ke₄ ĝeš-ĝeš saĝ-ĝeš- [...]*, 'the evil gods who do not submit to your father ...' (KAR 129 Obv. 15), the genitive after *nu-ĝar-ra* is misplaced: if 'the evil gods' are the object of the sentence as in Foster's translation, 'Who smo[te?] the evil gods insubmissive to your father',⁷⁰⁸ -e in -ke₄ is a directive incorrectly appended to a human class noun.
- The comitative is written -te- in *ub-te-zi-ge-eš* (KAR 129 Obv. 16).⁷⁰⁹
- In *an-ša₃-ga-ke₄ dim-me-er- [...]-x na-me*, 'in innermost heaven god(s) ...' (KAR 129 Obv. 21), -ke₄ is misplaced as this is not a genitive and the expected locative is indicated by -(g)a.

These examples are indicative of the artificial nature of the Sumerian and reveal the struggle of Assyrian scribes to create new compositions in Sumerian. Most probably the text was composed in Akkadian and only afterward translated back into Sumerian with the aid of lexical lists. The artificiality of the text is also evident in the use of rare words⁷¹⁰ and archaic forms such as the typical Old Sumerian verbal prefix e- in *e-ra-an-ri* = *u₂-ra-k-ku* (KAR 128 Obv. 23), *e-da-an-dim₂-dim₂-ma*

702 CAD P, 512.

703 See Chang 1981, 191-192.

704 CAD E, 35.

705 It seems to me that this case is different from the uses of the terminative listed in Jagersma 2010, 185-187.

706 See Attinger 1993, 429-438.

707 See Chang 1981, 198: 3; the conjunction -ma is rarely attested in literary texts, Attinger 1993, 178.

708 Chang 1981, 225 translates differently: 'Die bösen Götter, die sich deinem Vater nicht unterworfen hatten, haben die Joche ...'

709 See Attinger 1993, 250 n. 645.

710 Rare words are for instance *ir-pag--ak* = *kapādu*, 'to plan' (KAR 128 Obv. 33), CAD K, 172; *ša₃ uš-gu₇--ak* = *libba šušunu*, 'to encourage' (KAR 128 Rev. 10), CAD Š/1, 138; *a₂-kil₃* = *gišpu* 'mass' (KAR 128 Rev. 11; this word, written *a₂-kal-kil₃*, seems to be attested in lexical lists only, CAD G, 85); *nakmasu*, 'kneeling' (KAR 128 Rev. 20), is a form from *kamāsu*

(KAR 129 Obv. 7), e-da-dim₄ (KAR 129 Obv. 9), e-da-ab-e₃ (KAR 129 Obv. 10). The late grammar of the text also emerges from the tendency to use periphrastic constructions with AK as a verbalizer.⁷¹¹ Considering the late date of composition and the level of knowledge of Sumerian in the Late Bronze Age⁷¹² the result is impressive and the grammar often displays nice Sumerian forms. This composition represents a learned intellectual and literary piece of scribal art in which the taste for archaisms and rare words confers a baroque aspect. Obviously this text cannot be traced back to any segment of the Sumerian literary tradition, but it is clear that its phraseology and motifs recall the traditional Sumerian royal hymns and inscriptions. References to Enlil and his sanctuary in Nippur, the Ekur, and the portrayal of the god Assur as having appropriated the role of Enlil and his supremacy in the pantheon, make it clear that the classical Sumero-Babylonian tradition, which is primarily known from the cultural and religious milieu of Nippur, was the main source of inspiration for this text. The composition of texts such as *PTN* and *The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta* must be placed in the context of Tukulti-Ninurta's program of making Assyria the new center of Mesopotamian culture.⁷¹³

2.1.5.2 A Praise Poem of Tukulti-Ninurta I

BM 98496 (Th 1905-4-9, 2) is a bilingual tablet in parallel column format discovered in Nineveh but dated on paleographical grounds to the Middle Assyrian period. Like several other examples, this tablet was imported from Assur for the library of Aššurbanipal. The text is a praise poem to an unnamed king but according to Lambert this must be identified with Tukulti-Ninurta.⁷¹⁴ However, according to Geller⁷¹⁵ the ductus of this tablet is identical with the copies of *Lugal-e* and *Angim* drafted by Marduk-balāssu-ēriš. As this scribe was active in the 12th century, this would imply that Tukulti-Ninurta's texts⁷¹⁶ continued to be copied after his reign. It may be inferred that the scribe maintained the original format in parallel columns as all the manuscripts written by the members of Ninurta-uballissu's family are in interlinear format. On the basis of the present evidence one cannot state with confidence whether this tablet was written under Tukulti-Ninurta I or is in fact a late copy.

In the first preserved section (Obv. 1-10) the king himself is speaking as he remembers the past Assyrian dynasties, echoing the Assyrian King List,⁷¹⁷ and he celebrates his own reign which was marked by an increase in offerings to the gods. The following section (Obv. 11-16) contains a description of statues erected by the king. Probably, this section continues on the reverse.

As evident from its content and its connection with the Assyrian King List, this text was composed at the Assyrian court by order of Tukulti-Ninurta. Tukulti-Ninurta shows the same attitude towards the past as the Kassite kings:⁷¹⁸ the mention of ancient Assyrian rulers and other references to the past have the ideological purpose of legitimating and strengthening Tukulti-Ninurta's kingship. The Sumerian is hardly understandable and clearly shows its artificial nature. The text was likely composed in Akkadian and then translated into Sumerian as is evident in the following examples:

that is only attested in this text, CAD N/1, 189; *namugatu* (KAR 128 Rev. 21), see fn. 688; bu-bu-lu--ak, 'to seek' (KAR 129 Obv. 2), Attinger 1993, 180.

711 KAR 128 Obv. 13, 19, 30, 33, Rev. 10.

712 In this regard note that Sumerian words often have glosses.

713 Machinist 1978, 523-526.

714 For the attribution to Tukulti-Ninurta I see Lambert 1976.

715 Geller 1990, 212.

716 According to Geller 1990, 212 n. 20, it is possible that Marduk-balāssu-ēriš also copied KAR 128 + KAR 129.

717 Lambert 1976, 86-89.

718 See 1.1.12.1.

- -meš is used as plural marker in mu-meš (Obv. 3) as in several late texts. The same anomaly is possibly found in nu-še-ga-meš ri-ri-g[a], ‘to fell the disobedient’ (Rev. 8), but it is not precluded that -meš is the copula.⁷¹⁹
- In ud-ul-li₂-a-ta en a-da-min₃ bala su₂-li-li-ke₄, ‘From the beginning to the *conflict*⁷²⁰ of the dynasty of Sululi’ (Obv. 5), the conjunction en-na is written in the abbreviated form en. In addition -ke₄ seems to indicate the genitive.⁷²¹
- In me ugula-me-e-ne igi ^da-šur₄-ra / en an-ta-ĝal₂ ugu-ni ba-du₁₀-ga = [...] EN ša-qi₂-i e-li-šu ‘i-ti₂-bu’, ‘The duties of the overseers in the presence of Assur, the mighty lord, were pleasing to him’ (Obv. 6-6b), -me- after ugula is unclear;⁷²² moreover the locative -a is placed after ^da-šur₄ and not at the end of the noun-phrase, probably by influence of the inflectional system of Akkadian; finally, the use of ugu-ni in this context is also borrowed from Akkadian *elī-šu*.⁷²³ The whole sentence seems to be a literary translation from Akkadian.
- In mu-gur-gur-re nu-mu-un-ba-ba mu-un-diri-dir(i)-re nam-bala-la₂-e = *ur-te-te-di ul u₂-ne₂-šir₃ u₂-[ta-ta-tir ul u₂-maṭ-ṭi]*, ‘I added to them and did not diminish, I multiplied and did not reduce’ (Obv. 8), the Sumerian is clearly corrupt. On the basis of the Akkadian, preterite forms would be expected, but -re is appended to gur and diri; in the latter case -re is also incorrect as -ge is expected. -bala- in the last verbal form is probably used for -ba- and -la-, the latter as a gloss for la₂. Moreover, a prohibitive form nam-ba- makes no sense here if a 1sg. subject is intended, because this modal prefix is usually used only with 2. and 3. persons. Finally, the equation of the Dtn form of *redû*, ‘to add’, with gur is only attested here.⁷²⁴
- In [5^{ta-a}]^{m3} ur dagal-la gaba-bi-ne-ne-a (Obv. 13), translated by Lambert ‘Five broad-chested lions’, the sequence of words is unclear.
- A further example of the use of -ke₄ as genitive marker is in [...] ^dnun-nam-nir-ra-ke₄ diĝir an-ta-ĝal₂, ‘[...] of Nunamnir, mighty god’ (Obv. 14); in addition, as with Obv. 6-6b, its position is incorrect.
- In [ni]ĝ₂-nam ugu diĝir-e-ne zi-NI-eš ħu-mu-un-ak-ak-eš = *mi-im-ma ša el DIĜIR.MEŠ ṭa-[a-bu i-te-ep-pu-šu]*, ‘People did what was pleasing to the gods’ (Obv. 10), Sumerian ugu is a calque from Akkadian *eli* as in Obv. 6-6b. zi-NI-eš is puzzling as /zin/ = *ṭābu* is a *hapax*; according to Lambert it could be a dialectical variant of ze₂-eb, the Emesal for du₁₀.
- According to Lambert⁷²⁵ nam-e-de₃ (Rev. 4) and lu₂-e-de₃ = *šar-pu-u₂* (Rev. 6) are variants of nam/lu₂-izi.

These examples are comparable to those illustrated in *PTN*. Possibly the Sumerian of this text is even poorer,⁷²⁶ but this impression may be due to the fragmentary nature of BM 98496. As in *PTN* the primary language is Akkadian which strongly influences the Sumerian.⁷²⁷ Babylonian is used in

719 To my knowledge no such form is attested in Sumerian literature.

720 For a-da-min₃ see Lambert 1976, 92: 5.

721 Two genitives are expected here; en-na usually occurs with the terminative, see Jagersma 2010, 612-614.

722 See Lambert 1976, 92: 6; he suggests the reading ugula^{la2}-e-ne.

723 The expression ugu ... du₁₀ is attested in late texts, CAD T, 20, 34.

724 CAD R, 226-227.

725 Lambert 1976, 92: 4.

726 Several other difficulties are attested in Obv. 9, 12 (en-sar-bi), Rev. 5, 6 (ak-ak-ne-ne-a), 7.

727 ^{lu2}LU₂xSIKI.BU-mu = *lahmu* (Obv. 10), seems to indicate the Akkadian reading of the word, Lambert 1976, 92: 10.

the Akkadian version with no Assyrian forms.⁷²⁸ This is another piece of scribal art composed for praising the king.

2.1.6 Incantations

2.1.6.1 Udug-ḫul Tablet XIII-XV – KAR 24 (+) BM 130660

The *Udug-ḫul* series is available in the Middle Assyrian documentation in two manuscripts containing a bilingual recension of Tablet XIII-XV⁷²⁹ otherwise known only from first-millennium sources from Nineveh, Babylon, Borsippa and Nimrud. **VAT 9833 = KAR 24** is a fragment from the left-hand corner of its tablet preserving lines 1-16 of Tablet XIII-XV on the obverse, and lines 212-230 on the reverse. **BM 130660** is a large fragment of a two-column tablet preserving columns II and III in fairly well condition and only the right-hand side of columns I and IV. This manuscript, formerly published as Tablet XII,⁷³⁰ turned out to be a copy of Tablet XIII; column I preserves lines 55-76, column II lines 95-113, column III lines 133-155 and column IV lines 186-203. This tablet was presented to the British Museum and according to the museum web site was discovered in Assur. Even though these two fragments do not physically join, according to Geller⁷³¹ they belong to the same tablet. Indeed they share the same unusual format: each column is divided in two sub-columns, but without vertical rulings, with Sumerian on the left and Akkadian on the right; lines are marked by horizontal rulings and the text often forms two pair of *bicola* instead of the common interlinear format.

The scribe's name as provided by the colophon of KAR 24⁷³² is the *tupšarru šeḫru* Marduk-kabit-aḫḫēšu son of Aššur-ittušunu. The same scribe wrote a copy of the *Paleographic Syllabary A*.⁷³³

A comparison with the canonical recension shows both similarities and differences. Lineation of the MA version is very close to first-millennium duplicates. It is outstanding that in the MA tablet rulings usually occur every two text-lines which exactly correspond to a single line in the canonical recension. When rulings set off one text-line, this also corresponds to a single line in the canonical recension. However, variants are documented: lines UH XIII-XV: 107, 142, 145⁷³⁴ and 222 are omitted in the MA source; UH XIII-XV: 111 (= l. 32)⁷³⁵ containing the *zi-pa₃* formula is not translated into Akkadian in the MA tablet; UH XIII-XV: 137-143 (= ll. 81-87) have no Akkadian translation; UH XIII-XV: 138 is split in two lines in the MA manuscript (= ll. 82-83); UH XIII-XV: 195 is shortened and split in two lines (= ll. 185-188); UH XIII-XV: 200 is split in two lines (= ll. 197-200); the second part of UH XIII-XV: 215⁷³⁶ is omitted (KAR 24 Rev. 7). Most of the variants are purely orthographic and primarily occur in the Akkadian version but recensional variants are also attested as noted by Geller.⁷³⁷ The following instances in KAR 24 may be added here:

⁷²⁸ Lambert 1976, 86.

⁷²⁹ For the combination of tablets 13, 14, 15 see Geller 2007, xv.

⁷³⁰ Geller 1980.

⁷³¹ M. J. Geller's personal communication; I thank Prof. M. J. Geller for sharing with me this important information.

⁷³² Hunger 1968, 32 No. 53.

⁷³³ Ass. 4539, see Weidner 1952-53, 208 No. 44, Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. II, 24 No. 89; for the colophon see Hunger 1968, 32 No. 52.

⁷³⁴ Line 145 is part of the rubric.

⁷³⁵ Lineation according to Geller 1980; unless differently indicated, lineation refers to BM 130660 which is the largest fragment; lineation of KAR 24 is indicated separately.

⁷³⁶ *imin-bi-e-ne lu₂-tu-ra mu-dadag-ga*.

⁷³⁷ Geller 1980, 23-24 and commentary 37-42.

- Verbal forms in UH XIII-XV: 219 and KAR 24 Rev. 13 diverge; this results in different meanings.

MA ugu lu₂-tu-ra-ke₄ mu-un-niĝen // e₂-a mu-un-dadag-ga
[...]
He bound (them) over the patient, he purified (him) in the house.

UH ugu lu₂-tu-ra-ke₄ u-me-ni-niĝen e₂-a u-me-ni-e₃
e-li mar-ši u₂-rak-kis-ma bi-ti uš-bi-'i
He bound (them) over the patient and passed (them) through the house.

- KAR 24 Rev. 15 includes gidim-ḫul in the list of demons, contrary to UH XIII-XV: 221 which has the injunction to the Utukku and Alu demons.

MA udug-ḫul a-la₂-ḫul gidim-ḫul
[...]
The evil Utukku Alu-demon and Ghost

UH udug-ḫul a-la₂-ḫul bar-še₃ ḫe-em-ta-gub
u₂-tuk-ku lem-nu a-lu-u₂ lem-nu ina a-ḫa-a-tu li-iz-ziz-zu
May the evil Utukku and Alu-demon stand aside

Furthermore, the MA source is shorter than the canonical version as it ends with line 230 whereas first-millennium duplicates contain an additional incantation up to line 270. Notwithstanding these differences, the closeness of the MA tablet to the first-millennium recension must be stressed. Even in lines where the two recensions are at variance, the MA text often has the tendency to use signs close to the canonical recension in the common parts of the Akkadian translation. An example is given by UH XIII-XV: 103:⁷³⁸

MA mu₇-mu₇ abzu a-ra-an-si₃ saĝ lu₂-u₁₈-lu pap-ḫal-la-kam₂ ba-an-ĝar-re-eš
ši-pat ap-si-i id-du-u ina SAĜ LÜ₂ mut-tal-li-ki iš-ku-nu
(They) recited the incantation of the Apsu, and placed it on the distraught patient's head.

UH ḡeš-kin₂-bi šu im-ma-an-ti tu₆ abzu ba-an-si₃ saĝ lu₂-u₁₈-lu pap-ḫal-la-ke₄
ba-ni-in-ĝar-re-eš
kiš-ka-nu-u₂ šu₂-a-tu₂ il-qu-u₂ ši-pat ap-si-i id-du-u ina re-eš a-me-lu mut-tal-
li-ku iš-ku-nu
(They) took the kiškanu-tree, cast the spell of the Apsu, and placed it on the distraught patient's head.

The MA tablet has the tendency to use Sumerograms when the canonical text spells words syllabically, but both recensions share the use of the same CvC signs, the writing of *ina* with the sign AŠ, and the use of the sign U in *id-du-u*.

The MA recension reflects the ongoing process of canonization which ended in the first millennium. It represents an intermediate stage⁷³⁹ between the OB and the first-millennium recensions, but very close to the late duplicates. As pointed out by Geller,⁷⁴⁰ the MA tablet is closer to the canonical recension than to its oldest preserved parallel, an Old Akkadian tablet from Susa, containing one of

738 BM 130660 Col. II, 16-18 = ll. 19-20.

739 Geller 1980, 38-39: 18-20.

740 Geller 1980, 24-25.

the incantations inscribed on BM 130660.⁷⁴¹ Indeed the MA manuscript provides the closest version to the canonical recension among all the *Udug-ḫul* sources of the Late Bronze Age (e.g. Ḫattuša, Emar). Compared to the only possible MB *Udug-ḫul* manuscript,⁷⁴² the MA tablet represents a later stage.⁷⁴³ As a consequence, the Babylonian models of the MA tablet are probably to be placed in the post-Kassite period.⁷⁴⁴

Against other MA texts, the Akkadian version shows no local traits, but is written in Babylonian dialect.⁷⁴⁵ Carelessness of writing emerges.⁷⁴⁶ Unfortunately the lack of OB sources for Tablet XIII prevents us from determining whether the MA text reflects an older tradition which was later refined into the canonical recension. We can only notice that the MA text tends toward brevity and usually presents inferior and uncommon readings compared to the canonical recension.⁷⁴⁷

2.1.6.2 Kiutu Incantation for Bīt rimki ‘Third House’ – LKA 75

The ‘Third House’ of the series *Bīt rimki*⁷⁴⁸ is known from several manuscripts from the library of Aššurbanipal and one MA tablet.⁷⁴⁹ As mentioned above⁷⁵⁰ an OB forerunner to the ‘Third and Sixth Houses’ in monolingual Sumerian is contained in CBS 1529, a tablet housed in the Khabaza collection, hence likely from Sippar.⁷⁵¹

Ass. 4532 = LKA 75 (Q) is a one-column tablet containing a bilingual version in interlinear format of the first part of the ‘Third House’ of the series *Bīt rimki* including a *Kiutu* incantation. The scribe’s name is unknown because the colophon is unpreserved. The ductus is typical of the Late Middle Assyrian period.

Variants show that LKA 75 differs from both the OB and the late manuscripts. However LKA 75 is closer to the first-millennium duplicates as exemplified by the presence of the Akkadian translation. Most of the variants, which affect both the Sumerian and the Akkadian, are orthographic, but several textual variants are attested.

LKA usually agrees with late duplicates against the OB manuscript:

- In line 13⁷⁵² the OB manuscript offers a different version from LKA 75 and the late recension:

OB	^d si-si-ig-e ad nam-lu ₂ -ulu ₃ -k[e ₄ šu ma-ra-ni-ib ₂ -gi ₄ -gi ₄]
	<i>Sisig, father of mankind repeats it to you</i>
MA/NA	sag ₃ -sag ₃ -ga ⁷⁵³ niġen nam-lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu-ke ₄ šu-(min) ma-ra-ni-ib ₂ -gi ₄ -gi ₄
	<i>The ghost of all people repeats it to you.</i>

741 Col. II, 1 ff. = ll. 1 ff. = UH XIII-XV: 95 ff.

742 See § 1.1.10.1.

743 The expression ḫa-la--du₁₁ = *zazû*, ‘divide’ (KAR 24 Obv. 1, 3 = UH XIII-XV: 1-2) in which du₁₁ is used as a verbalizer, as is common in late Sumerian, is not documented elsewhere; this form is not attested in Attinger 1993.

744 On this point see §§ 2.1.1.2, 2.2.

745 Geller 1980, 25.

746 Geller 1980, 26, 37-38: 6-7, 39: 23-24, 41: 99-102.

747 See Geller 1980, 37-38: 6-7, 38: 12-13, 38-39: 18-20, 28, 29-30; note however that in a few cases the MA text is preferable, Geller 1980, 39: 26-27.

748 For this series see Laessøe 1955.

749 Borger 1967.

750 § 1.1.10.3.

751 Geller 1995, 114-124.

752 Lineation according to Borger 1967.

753 In light of the OB tablet, perhaps the reading sag₃ should be reconsidered at least in Northern Babylonia.

Additionally, in LKA 75 and the first-millennium recension the word ‘mankind’ is written with the sign -u₁₈- as in late texts instead of ulu₃.

- In MA and NA sources ergative -e, attested in CBS 1529, is written with -a in line 19, lu₂ nam-tar-ra šu bi₂-in-dab-ba, and line 33, lu₂ nam-erim₂-ma šu bi₂-in-la₂-e.
- As with late duplicates LKA 75 appends -ḫul-ĝal₂- to the demons’ names listed in lines 21, 22, 26: lu₂ udug-ḫul-ĝal-e VS lu₂ udug-e (OB); lu₂ a-la₂-ḫul-ĝal-e VS lu₂ a-la₂-e (OB); lu₂ maškim-ḫul-ĝal-e VS lu₂ maškim-e (OB).
- LKA 75 agrees with the late recension in šu ba-an-da-ri-a (l. 28) while CBS 1529 has [n]u-zu ba-an-da-di- [...].
- In line 29 LKA 75 and late manuscripts have sa ba-an-diḫ, while CBS 1529 has ‘sa’ ba-an-da-ra-l[a₂].

In some passages LKA 75 differs from both the OB and late manuscripts:

- In the second half of line 12 the MA tablet diverges from the other manuscripts:⁷⁵⁴ because MA and first-millennium recensions present a very similar Akkadian translation, the Sumerian text of the MA manuscript should be considered to be corrupted; du₃ is probably a phonetic writing for dul.

MA ... inim šu-du₃-du₃ al-ri-ri
 ... a-ma-ta ra-biṣ i-qa-bu

OB ... inim šu dul [al-di du₁₁]
NA ... inim šu-dul-ta al-di du₁₁⁷⁵⁵
 ... amatu rabbiṣ iqqabbû

... the word which is uttered softly

- In line 14 LKA 75 has gu₂ = ar-ḫiṣ₂ while CBS 1529 and the canonical recension have ul₄ = ar-ḫiṣ.⁷⁵⁶
- In line 15 LKA has lu₂ niĝ₂-zi = kittu while the OB and late manuscripts mistakenly have niĝ₂-NAM, to be emended as niĝ₂-zi!⁷⁵⁷
- LKA 75 offers a different Akkadian translation for line 16:

OB/NA lu₂-šaga-ak-a lu₂-še₂₉-(a)-še₃-du₁₁-ga
 ḫab-la u šag-ša₂
 (To) the harmed and ruined man
MA lu₂-šaga-ak-a še₂₉-še₃ du₁₁-ga
 ḫab-la šag-ša ta-qa-bi
 You call (him) ‘the harmed and ruined man’

LKA 75 interprets du₁₁-ga as an independent word.

754 For this line see Geller 1995, 122: 12.

755 Cf. CAD R, 15.

756 Cf. CAD A/2, 255.

757 Geller 1995, 122: 15.

- LKA 75 omits line 23 against the OB and late manuscripts and places line 52 between lines 48 and 49.
- In line 38 LKA 75 offers a different Akkadian translation from the late duplicates: *ša₂ kiš-pu u₂-li-bu-uš* VS *ša₂ e-pe-šu₂ u₂-tab-bi-ku-šu₂*.
- In line 29 LKA 75 presents a different Akkadian verbal form, *il-pu-tu-šu* (MA) VS *il-i-bu-šu₂* (NA), but as seen above the Sumerian is the same in both groups of sources.

In a few cases LKA 75 agrees with the OB manuscript against the late duplicates:

- In line 17 LKA 75 offers a different Sumerian version from late duplicates and accordingly also the Akkadian diverges: *saĝ ba-an(DU)-ne-in-du₃-a = i-i-ru*, 'to advance against'⁷⁵⁸ VS *saĝ ba-an-di-ib₂-du₁₁-ga = i-ru-ru*.⁷⁵⁹ According to Geller⁷⁶⁰ CBS 1529 agrees with LKA 75.⁷⁶¹
- In line 31 the verbal form is *bi₂-in-dab-ba* in LKA 75 and CBS 1529 whereas the late sources have *ba-an-dab-be₂-eš*.

From these examples it is clear that LKA 75 diverges from both CBS 1529 and the late manuscripts. Moreover, contrary to the late recension, a section is added in LKA 75.⁷⁶² An important difference between the MA and first-millennium manuscripts could be the purpose of texts. The MA tablet was apparently not used as a royal ritual because in line 44, which refers to the context of the composition, LKA 75 has *lu₂-u₁₈-lu* instead of *lugal* as in the NA recension.⁷⁶³ A few phonetic writings are documented in LKA 75: *bi-* ~ *bi₂-* (l. 14), *-du-* ~ *-dab-/-du₃-(?)*⁷⁶⁴ (l. 20), *-kar-* ~ *-ĝar* (l. 27) and possibly *-du₃-* ~ *-dul-* (l. 12).⁷⁶⁵

LKA 75, which as seen above frequently offers a different Akkadian translation from the late recension, shows a few Assyrianisms: *e-na-ši-na* (l. 9) VS *i-na-ši-na*; *e-ru-ru-šu* VS *i-ru-ru-šu* (l. 35); *de-en-šu* VS *di-in-šu₂* (l. 44). Compared to the first-millennium manuscripts LKA 75 presents, albeit not consistently, some OB orthographic conventions, displaying a mix of older and later forms. The OB *qa₂* instead of *qa* is used in line 13; *ša* as preposition/pronoun appears in line 13 when normally *ša₂* is used; *-šu* instead of *-šu₂* appears in lines 20, 29, 31, 33, 35, 36, 44, 54(?).

The incantation acquired a standardized form only in the first millennium. As already noted for the texts related to the god Utu⁷⁶⁶ the *Kiutu* incantations likely originated in Northern Babylonia. The Sippar provenance of CBS 1529 further substantiates this claim.

⁷⁵⁸ Cf. CAD A/2, 318.

⁷⁵⁹ Cf. CAD A/2, 234.

⁷⁶⁰ Geller 1995, 122: 17.

⁷⁶¹ Note that CBS 1529 writes *lu₂-niĝ₂-nu-un-zu-a-ra* as late manuscripts, whereas LKA 75 omits *-un-*.

⁷⁶² LKA 75 Rev. 32-37, see Borger 1967, 7.

⁷⁶³ See Cooper 1971, 10 n. 43, and Borger 1967, 2.

⁷⁶⁴ OB and first-millennium manuscripts have *šu--dab = kamû*, 'to size, capture', but it is possible that the MA manuscript intends *šu--du₃* which is also translated with *kamû* in Akkadian.

⁷⁶⁵ Also note the metathesis in line 35, [...] *-an-ba-du₁₁-ga* with the inversion of *ba-* and *-an-*; CBS 1529 has *ba-an-na-d[u₁₁-ga]* whereas late manuscripts have *mu-un-na-ab-du₁₁-ga*.

⁷⁶⁶ For the Northern Babylonian origin of the Šamaš composition see § 1.1.10.3.

2.1.6.3 Incantation of the *Mīs pî*-ritual Tablet III – VAT 10038

VAT 10038 is the upper edge of a single-column tablet inscribed with the incantation u_4 $dîgir$ dim_2 - ma in Sumerian and Akkadian in interlinear format. The tablet is one of the two bilingual incantations⁷⁶⁷ discovered in the Old Palace at Assur as part of the small library of an incantation-priest.⁷⁶⁸ This incantation is *Marduk-Ea* type⁷⁶⁹ but the dialogue between Enki and Asalluḫi is not preserved on the MA tablet. The incantation accompanied Tablet III of the series *Mīs pî*⁷⁷⁰ and VAT 10038 represents the oldest source for this series. The text is close to the first-millennium duplicates but some variants⁷⁷¹ and the insertion of unparalleled passages⁷⁷² in the late sources tell us that the incantation underwent further modifications after the Middle Assyrian period.

2.1.6.4 Rm 376

Rm 376 is a tablet discovered in the area of the Kidmuri temple at Nimrud⁷⁷³ and written in Middle Assyrian script probably imported from Assur. Of the originally four columns, two on each side, only the second and third column are preserved whereas few traces remain on the first and fourth column. The tablet contains a collection of different Akkadian incantations set off by horizontal rulings. Part of the first incantation (l. 1-9) is a forerunner of Tablet VIII/l of the series *Muššu'u*.⁷⁷⁴ Obv. 19-36 includes a version of *A Cow of Sîn*, an incantation for a woman in childbirth also attested at Ḫattuša on KUB 4 13.⁷⁷⁵ One incantation is written in phonetic Sumerian (Obv. 12-15) followed by instructions in Akkadian for performing a ritual (Obv. 16-18). This incantation begins with the label en_2 - e_2 - nu - ru_3 and refers to Ereškigal, but the meaning of the text is still obscure and no duplicates are known. This is the only Sumerian text in phonetic orthography stemming from the Middle Assyrian documentation. The Sumerian shows phonetic and orthographic alterations:

- $b > p$: nu - gu - pa ~ nu - gub - ba
short-writing: zi - na ~ zi - an - na
- $p > b$: $ḫe$ - ba ~ $ḫe_2$ - pa_3

The Akkadian presents a mix of Babylonian and Assyrian forms.⁷⁷⁶ On paleographical grounds the tablet displays the typical ductus of late MA texts, but it presents the short form of LI that is common in the early MA documentation (14th century).⁷⁷⁷ In the late MA period, 13th - 11th century, the usual form of LI is ŠE + ŠA and, to my knowledge, the short form does not occur in any other MA literary text. Lambert⁷⁷⁸ also notes that some writings are reminiscent of Old Assyrian scribal uses. Given these features, I wonder whether Rm 376 is a late copy of an early MA text. This would explain the massive presence of Assyrian forms and the use of phonetic writings, as the text would have reached Assur during a period when the local scribal circles were not as strongly influenced by the classic

767 The other is KAR 91, see § 2.1.6.5.

768 Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. I, 29-31.

769 For this incantation type see Falkenstein 1931, 44-67.

770 For the first-millennium series see Walker, Dick 2001.

771 Note the verbal form ma - ra - ni - in - du_8 in line 93 against the first-millennium duplicates that have ba - ab - $duḫ$ - e - $eš$.

772 Maul 2003, 194: 93a-d.

773 Veldhuis 1991, 5.

774 For this series see Böck 2007; incantations of the series *Muššu'u* are known from the Western periphery, see §§ 5.2.1, 6.2.8.

775 For this incantation see Veldhuis 1991.

776 See Lambert 1965, 285, Veldhuis 1991, 63.

777 See Weeden 2012, 239-240.

778 Lambert 1965, 285.

Babylonian tradition as they would be after Tukulti-Ninurta I. This suits the date of KUB 4 13, which is possibly an Assyro-Mitannian manuscript⁷⁷⁹ or a late Hittite copy of an Assyro-Mitannian tablet.⁷⁸⁰

2.1.6.5 KAR 91

VAT 10035 = KAR 91 is a single-column tablet almost completely preserved in its original extent⁷⁸¹ discovered in the Old Palace at Assur. Much of the obverse surface is effaced while the reverse is entirely preserved. According to the colophon,⁷⁸² the tablet was written by Ribātu son of the royal exorcist (^{lu}2MAS.MAŠ) Rišēia,⁷⁸³ and was copied from an old wood writing-board from Akkad. According to Maul⁷⁸⁴ the tablet shows the ductus of the time of Tiglath-Pileser I. The scribe is known from a document written under Matakil-Aššur, whose eponymy cannot be dated more precisely than 13th - 11th century.⁷⁸⁵ Jakob⁷⁸⁶ tentatively identifies Ribātu son of Rišēia with the homonymous father of Aššur-šumī-ašbat who is attested in a seal that shows the iconography of the second half of the 13th century.

The tablet contains a ritual for purifying a stable for horses⁷⁸⁷ that is duplicated in three NA sources from Assur (VAT 11019), Nineveh (Sm 1708 = 4R² 18, 6) and Nimrud (ND 4405/47 = CTN 4, 101). The text consists of two Sumerian Marduk-Ea incantations⁷⁸⁸ (ll. 1-28; 29-46),⁷⁸⁹ followed by instructions for the ritual in Akkadian (ll. 47-61). Incantations for the purification of horses are cited in two first-millennium catalogues of incantations from Assur.⁷⁹⁰ KAR 91 reports the two incantations in monolingual Sumerian while the first-millennium duplicates are bilingual in inter-linear format. Given that all the Middle Assyrian Sumerian texts are bilingual, it could be perhaps suggested that KAR 91 predates the remainder of the documentation.⁷⁹¹

As noted by Maul⁷⁹² the two Sumerian incantations reflect so closely the language of the OB Sumerian incantations that they must have existed already in the Old Babylonian period. These incantations were likely conceived for the purification of asses and later adapted to horses after their domestication. Middle Assyrian and first-millennium sources are very close to each other for both the Sumerian incantations and the Akkadian ritual. Therefore the text remained very stable at least from the Middle Assyrian period, but most likely earlier, up to the first millennium. The NA manuscripts are likely based on MA sources because they present Assyrianisms and orthographic conventions typical of the Middle Assyrian period.⁷⁹³ Assyrianisms are also documented in the MA tablet.

779 The manner of incision is reminiscent of the Assyro-Mitannian ductus; for the date and provenance of the Assyro-Mitannian tablets see §§ 3.1, 8.5.

780 The sign IL seems to be Hittite.

781 See Maul 2003, 183.

782 Hunger 1968, 34 No. 64.

783 I would tend to assign the title of royal scribe to the father rather than to Ribātu in light of other MA colophons where the title usually follows the person to whom it refers, see Hunger 1968, 30-34 No. 43-64; note that in No. 46 and 55 the same title is borne by both the son and the father.

784 Maul 2013, 19 n. 29.

785 See Maul 2013, 37.

786 Jakob 2003, 259.

787 Texts dealing with horses were found in the same area of the city and in the temple area, Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. I, 30 and n. 7.

788 See Falkenstein 1931, 45.

789 Lineation according to Maul 2013.

790 KAR 44, 24, VAT 13723+ Col. IV, 7, see Geller 2000, 233: iv 7, 258.

791 The phonetic Sumerian incantation inscribed in Rm 376 is the only other monolingual text.

792 Maul 2013, 20.

793 Maul 2013, 20-21.

2.1.6.6 YOS 11 74

MLC 1301 = YOS 11 74 is a central fragment of a tablet that probably was originally inscribed with four columns.⁷⁹⁴ It preserves twelve broken lines on the reverse and only a few signs on the obverse. The text is a bilingual incantation against *samānu*-disease⁷⁹⁵ with Sumerian and Akkadian versions inscribed on the same line.⁷⁹⁶

2.1.6.7 KAR 333

VAT 9508 = KAR 333 is a fragment probably from the right edge of its tablet inscribed with a bilingual text in interlinear format. The designation of obverse and reverse on the hand-copy should perhaps be reversed.⁷⁹⁷ The nature of the text is not fully clear, but it seems to be a magical text, probably an incantation, that relates to a demon, perhaps an incarnation of Ištar, causing several illnesses including paralysis and burning. Occasionally phonetic writings are employed: [s]a₂-sa₂ ~ si-si (Obv.¹ 6); <ḥu>-ul--za ~ ḥul₂--za.

2.1.7 Unidentified Texts

2.1.7.1 KAR 113

VAT 10066 = KAR 113 is a large fragment from a two-column tablet giving a bilingual text in parallel column format. The Akkadian column, on the right, preserves only a few signs on both sides. The text is possibly a hymn or a mythological composition.⁷⁹⁸

2.1.7.2 BM 121117

BM 121117 is a tiny fragment from the upper left corner of its tablet recently edited by Wagensonner.⁷⁹⁹ The fragment preserves a text in monolingual Sumerian with rulings occurring every two lines, but an Akkadian translation was probably given in a parallel column. According to Cat. II suppl.,⁸⁰⁰ the tablet contains a Ninurta myth, probably *Lugal-e*, but actually none of its lines corresponds to any portion of either *Lugal-e* or any other extant Ninurta composition. The attribution of this fragment to *Lugal-e* seems also to be ruled out on the basis of the total number of lines indicated in the colophon: ŠU.NIGEN₂ 1 ŠU.Š[I + × MU.BI.IM]. Wagensonner suggests that the text could be related to *Udug-ḥul* or the like, and if ^ala₂[?]-ḥul[?] may be read in the first line of the obverse his suggestion would be strengthened.

The scribe's name is indicated in the colophon as Sîn-šuma-iddina who is generally identified with one of Ninurta-uballissu's sons, the author of two lexical lists.⁸⁰¹ Although Sîn-šuma-iddina's colophons differ from those of his brothers, the identification of the BM 121117 scribe with the

794 YOS 11 p. 14.

795 Rev. 12, en₂-e₂-nu-ru ka-inim-ma ana sa-ma-ni. Incantations against *samānu* are attested at Ugarit, see § 7.1.3 and fn. 1805, § 7.3.7 and fn. 1842; *samānu*-disease is also mentioned in an incantation from Ḥattuša, KUB 30 1, see fn. 1074.

796 Note the writing NIM.NIM (Rev. 4) for *samānu*, CAD S, 111.

797 Ponayotov, Geller 2014, 36.

798 See Obv. I, 3 kur-ra i₃-urgu₂-e; the verbal form derives from urgu₂(KAXNE)--du₁₁, 'to anger', see Attinger 1993, 571-572.

799 Wagensonner 2011b, 678, hand-copy on p. 701.

800 Lambert, Millard 1968, 10.

801 *Ea* I (VAT 10172), see Weidner 1952-53, 208 No. 45, Hunger 1968, 31 No. 47; *Izi* XII (JON 38); for a new edition of colophons see Wagensonner 2011b, 676-678.

homonymous son of Ninurta-uballissu is in my opinion doubtful for the following reasons:⁸⁰² (1) this would be the only Sumerian text copied by a member of this family that is not in interlinear bilingual format;⁸⁰³ (2) the name Ninurta-uballissu always appears under the scribe's name in all the colophons of this family, even in the two other texts of Šîn-šuma-iddina, but as evident from the hand-copy, BM 121117 does not report the scribe's father's name.

2.2 The Middle Assyrian Sumerian Literary Tradition

The Middle Assyrian documentation yielded a very limited number of Old Babylonian curricular texts. No member of either the Tetrad or the Decad is attested and merely one House F Fourteen composition, *Lugal-e*, which is probably the best documented Sumerian literary text of all periods, is known from MA copies. The only other popular composition of the Old Babylonian period attested in the MA corpus is *Angim* which is included among the texts appearing in six to ten copies in House F at Nippur.⁸⁰⁴ *Lugal-e* and *Angim*⁸⁰⁵ are the only two compositions known from the MA documentation that are listed in the OB literary catalogues. Furthermore these are the only two literary texts documented in both MB⁸⁰⁶ and MA copies.⁸⁰⁷ The reason for such widespread popularity is probably due to their connection with kingship. Proverbs probably also served pedagogical activities. The House F Fourteen composition *The Instructions of Šuruppak* only survives in a monolingual Akkadian version (VAT 10151 = KAR 27)⁸⁰⁸ which is also attested on a MB tablet and on a fragment from the Western periphery.⁸⁰⁹

The remainder of the literary corpus are non-curricular texts including an isolated mythological text, *The Creation of Mankind*; a hymnic liturgy, *Ninisina C*; and two hymns to Ninurta of which one was surely composed in the Kassite period - KAR 97 - while the other was also composed or re-adapted in the post-Old Babylonian period - KAR 119. One of the most prolific genres of Sumerian literature, the royal hymnology is totally absent in the MA documentation. This genre is only evidenced by the texts composed for Tukulti-Ninurta that evoke Sumerian royal hymns and inscriptions. It is not a coincidence that several Sumerian literary texts from the Middle Assyrian period focus on Ninurta, who was very popular at the Assyrian court - as is evident from Tukulti-Ninurta's very name - for his characterization as a warrior and was perhaps elevated to the status of an 'anti-Marduk'.⁸¹⁰ This may suggest that importation of texts from Babylonia did not occur by chance and that a certain degree of selection can be observed.

Hymnic liturgies on behalf of kings - Sumerian royal praise poems Type A - were nevertheless known at the Assyrian court as evidenced by an extraordinary document, KAR 158.⁸¹¹ This is a catalogue of songs that lists compositions according to their musical genre, providing several musical notations.⁸¹² Most of the compositions are Akkadian songs but column III on the obverse is dedicated to Sumerian hymns which are grouped according to two typologies: *tigi* and *adab*. A total of 23 *tigi* hymns, 23 *te-gu-u₂* *šu-me-ru* (KAR 158 III, 31), were listed, grouped in four collections of which 18

802 For two MA scribes bearing the same name see for instance Kidin-Šîn (one is the author of KAR 4), Jakob 2003, 249.

803 For the same problem see § 2.1.5.2.

804 Robson 2001, 56.

805 Note that both compositions are cited in the so-called 'Catalogue of Texts and Authors' (I, 3) as authored by Ea, Lambert 1962, 64.

806 No full recension of *Lugal-e* is known in MB manuscripts, but only two extract tablets are preserved, see § 1.1.1.5.

807 The only other bilingual text known from both corpora is the Astrolabe B: VAT 17081 = VS 24 120 (MB), VAT 9416 = KAV 218, see VS 24 p. 14; note that KAV 218 was copied by Marduk-balāssu-ēriš.

808 Lambert 1960, 95, Pl. 30.

809 See §§ 1.1.6.1, 9.1.

810 Seminara 2001, 40.

811 A full presentation of this text is provided by Limet 1996.

812 Limet 1996, 154-155.

titles are preserved (KAR 158 III, 3-27). Lines 32-36 give instead the titles of 5 *adab* hymns, *a-da-pa šu-me-ra am-nu* (KAR 158 III, 38). The following lines, 40-45, contain titles of an unidentified genre, the last one of which is in Akkadian. Remarkably, incipits of Sumerian hymns are written in phonetic orthography. Falkenstein identified some of the compositions and a few others may be recognized here, but the largest part remain unknown. Neither of the *tigi* hymns⁸¹³ may be identified, but some of them may refer to known literary compositions: KAR 158 III, 5, *lu-gal me-le-em-zu ni-x* [...], may be a variant of the incipit *lugal me-lam₂ huš* quoted in the Ur III Yale catalog;⁸¹⁴ KAR 158 III, 11, *e-ia lu-gal-gu ka-za-al* [...], possibly refers to the incipit *e i lugal-ĝu₁₀ x* [...] (VS 2 3 III, 22) a hymn probably addressed to Ninurta⁸¹⁵ in phonetic orthography.⁸¹⁶ Among the *adab* hymns⁸¹⁷ only two compositions are known from the literature: *An adab to Enki for Išme-Dagan (Išme-Dagan D)*⁸¹⁸ and *An adab to An for Ur-Ninurta (Ur-Ninurta E)*.⁸¹⁹ None of the compositions listed in lines 40-44 can be identified. Additionally, the catalogue seems to have included *balbale* hymns in II 49-52.⁸²⁰ Civil⁸²¹ identified the incipit in KAR 158 II, 52, *ba-lam ba-lal-le ħi-iz-za-me e pa-x* [...], with *The song of the Lettuce: a balbale to Inana (Dumuzi-Inana E)*, *ba-lam ba-lam-lam ħi-iz^{sar}-am₃ a ba-an-du₁₁*.⁸²² Wilcke⁸²³ identified the incipit in KAR 158 II, 49 with *Dumuzi-Inana G*. Column VIII, which summarizes the compositions listed in the catalogue,⁸²⁴ providing the total of entries for each genre, in addition to *tigi* (l. 8) and *adab* (l. 11) hymns,⁸²⁵ refers to other Sumerian songs: *šir gid₂-da* (l. 12), *šir diĝir-galla* (l. 13),⁸²⁶ *a-ra-aḥ-ḥu* (l. 35),⁸²⁷ *šu-ta-ni-du-u* (l. 36) and *ši-qa-tu* (l. 37). Either of them may refer to the compositions listed in Col. III, 40-45. None of the recognizable compositions listed in KAR 158 is known from either the MB or MA documentation or from any of the Late Bronze Age libraries. Moreover, none of the entries corresponds to any title listed in the MB catalog HS 1477+. As this is the only evidence for phonetically written Sumerian texts from the MA documentation, besides the short incantation contained in Rm 376, KAR 158 raises several questions that must unfortunately remain unanswered on the basis of the present evidence. Indeed it is unknown whether this catalog refers to texts actually known at Assur, and if so, what was the role of Assyria in the transmission of Sumerian texts to the Western periphery where, as it will be seen below, phonetic orthography was largely used? One may note that neither *Išme-Dagan D* nor *Ur-Ninurta E* is preserved in phonetically written copies.

A substantial portion of the Sumerian corpus from Assur comprises practical texts – Emesal liturgies and incantations. The latter were most probably performed in magical rituals as evidenced by the recovery of an incantation priest's library in the Old Palace. This includes the oldest source of the series *Mīs pī* and of a ritual for purification of horses, texts that are otherwise known only

813 Falkenstein 1950, 103.

814 Y1: 21 (ETCSL 0.1.2); this entry possibly refers to Ninurta as it recalls the incipit of *Lugal-e*.

815 See VS 2 3 III, 23: *en nin-urta-ra* [...].

816 Krecher 1966a, 29.

817 Falkenstein 1950, 87, 91.

818 KAR 158 III, 34; ETCSL 2.5.4.4; the entry in KAR 158 allows the restoration of the title of the composition as *en-gal maḥ dib diĝir-re-e-ne*, while in the OB manuscripts *dib* is not preserved. Moreover, this catalog confirms the genre of this hymn as *adab* which was unclear in the OB sources.

819 KAR 158 III, 36; ETCSL 2.5.6.5; this composition is quoted in the Nippur catalog N3: 11 (ETCSL 0.2.6). Note that KAR 158 III, 35: *en na-an-su-ul-la ga-li-im si-ga* is reminiscent of the second line of a hymn to Ninurta (ETCSL 4.27.a), [*ur-saĝ*] *en nam-šul-la-ni² diri-ga*, Tinney 1996, 71-74.

820 See Shehata 2009, 283 and n. 1687.

821 Reiner, Civil 1967, 209 n. 28.

822 ETCSL 4.8.5.

823 Wilcke 1976, 278 n. (h).

824 See Limet 1996, 154.

825 The catalogue also refers to so far unknown Akkadian *adab* hymns, see Shehata 2009, 256.

826 Shehata 2009, 264.

827 Shehata 2009, 301-302.

from first-millennium manuscripts. Conversely, it is unclear if Emesal liturgies were actively performed in religious ceremonies. The Emesal literature was not part of the traditional Assyrian cult, but was gradually introduced from the Late Middle Assyrian period according to a process of Babylonization.⁸²⁸ It seems that Assyrians were mainly interested in compositions associated with the king, notably *Eršaḫuḡa* prayers and ritual *Eršemmas*, although they were not part of the main repertoire of the *kalû*.⁸²⁹ Indeed Tukulti-Ninurta claims in his epic to have brought to Assur tablets of *Eršaḫuḡa* prayers.⁸³⁰ A *kalû* priest was active at Assur because this title is borne by the scribe of the Ritual *Eršemma* KAR 9+. The importance of the *kalû* literature in the Assyrian cult grew only in the first millennium when Assyrian religion became more and more Babylonized.⁸³¹

The dearth of curricular texts and the exquisite quality of the tablets which are mostly baked⁸³² suggest that MA Sumerian texts from Assur were part of a collection of library copies. This may account for their preservation in the NA period when a library that included MA tablets was compiled. Moreover, the importation to Nineveh of some tablets in the Neo Assyrian period indicates that these manuscripts were considered worthy of preservation in the library of Aššurbanipal.

The scanty number of curricular texts is a major difference from the MB tablets which contain several curricular compositions and derive from school activities. A further element of difference between the two corpora is format. With the exception of KAR 91 and the spell in Rm 376, MA texts are exclusively bilingual and mainly in interlinear format, whereas several texts are preserved in a Sumerian monolingual version in the MB documentation. Only a limited number of MA bilingual manuscripts are written in parallel column format:

Manuscript	Composition
KAR 4	The Creation of Mankind
KAR 97	Hymn to Ninurta
KAR 103	Proverb
VAT 10810	Proverb
BM 98496	A Praise Poem of Tukulti-Ninurta
KAR 128+	Prayer to Assur for Tukulti-Ninurta
KAR 113	Unidentified Text
BM 121117 (?) ¹	Unidentified Text

¹ An Akkadian column is not preserved but probably existed.

The parallel column format does not pinpoint a specific text-typology as it was used for different genres. Although the tablet format is not a dating criterion *tout court*, it is worth noting that both of the Tukulti-Ninurta texts use the parallel column format. On the contrary, tablets of Ninurta-uballissu's family which surely date to the 12th century are written in interlinear format. It is plausible that the interlinear format, which would become the norm in the first millennium, was progressively adopted during the 12th century. However, both formats are attested in the Middle Babylonian documentation although the interlinear format is more frequent.⁸³³ This demonstrates that tablet format cannot be used as a dating criterion, at least at the present state of research, but it should be simply regarded as a hint of either archaizing or innovative tendencies that can be contemporaneous.

⁸²⁸ For the Emesal literature in Assyria see Gabbay 2014b.

⁸²⁹ *Eršaḫunga* prayers were recited in the presence of the king and often by the king himself with the help of the *kalû*, Maul 1988, 26-27.

⁸³⁰ Gabbay 2014b, 115.

⁸³¹ Gabbay 2014b, 139-140.

⁸³² Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. I, 30 n. 4, 31.

⁸³³ § 1.2.

Middle Assyrian Sumerian literary texts usually have first-millennium duplicates, whereas only five compositions are known from the OB documentation. This stands in contrast with the Middle Babylonian documentation where most of the texts have OB *Vorlagen* while only a few were duplicated in the first millennium.

Composition ¹	OB	MA	First Millennium
Lugal-e		+	+
Angim		+	+
The Creation of Mankind		+	+
Ninisina C		+	-
Hymn to Ninurta – KAR 97			-
Hymn to Ninurta – KAR 119		+	+
		(MB Tablet)	
Proverb – KAR 103		+	+
Proverb – VAT 10810		+	+
Balaġ to Enlil – KAR 375	<i>Only parallels</i>	+	+
		(MB Tablet)	
Eršaġuġa to Enlil – KAR 9+	<i>Only parallels</i>	+	<i>Only parallels</i>
Udug-ġul Tablet XIII-XV	?	+	+
Kiutu Incantation – LKA 75	+	+	+
Mis pi III Incantation	-	+	+
Incantation – Rm 376	-	+	-
Incantation – KAR 91	-	+	+
Incantation – YOS 11 74	-	+	-

1 Obviously Tukulti-Ninurta's texts are not listed.

MA recensions of some compositions – *Lugal-e*, *Angim* and to a lesser extent *Udug-ġul* Tablet XIII-XV – display an elevated degree of similarity to the first-millennium duplicates not only with respect to the text itself but also with respect to the organization in series, the division of the text into tablets, the tablet format and the sequence of lines. Such a level of standardization is unknown in the MB documentation. On the contrary for other compositions such as *The Creation of Mankind* MA copies diverge from the first-millennium sources. Perhaps not coincidentally the MA manuscript of *The Creation of Mankind* is written in parallel column format. This suggests that the MA sources do not represent a homogeneous stage in the standardization of Sumerian literature. Indeed the MA Sumerian texts span a period from about the time of Tukulti-Ninurta (end of the 13th century) to the reign of Tiglath-Pileser I (12th - 11th century) and perhaps later. Sumerian texts from the Middle Assyrian collection depend on Babylonian models whose provenance is occasionally specified in the colophons. *Vorlagen* are identified as originating from Nippur, Babylon and Akkad.⁸³⁴ Some scholarly material reached Assur as part of the booty subsequent to Tukulti-Ninurta's military campaign. Importations of texts may have occurred also later under Tiglath-Pileser I.⁸³⁵ Obviously there is no need to assume that all the Babylonian texts arrived in Assur as a result of wars. On the contrary scholars are known to have moved from Babylonia to Assur⁸³⁶ and perhaps Ninurta-uballissu's family had a Babylonian origin.⁸³⁷

Differences between the MA and the MB corpora are indicative of different stages in the transmission process of Sumerian literature and it is clear that some Middle Assyrian texts reflect a later

834 KAR 15, KAR 16: Nippur and Babylon; KAR 91: Akkad; note also that KAR 4 refers to an 'old model'.

835 Weidner 1952-53, 199-200.

836 Wiggermann 2008.

837 Wagensohn 2011b, 648-649.

stage, close to the first-millennium documentation. This raises the question of when the Babylonian models of these MA Sumerian literary texts are to be dated. Scribes of Ninurta-uballissu's family who copied a consistent part of the MA scholarly material are dated to the first half of the 12th century according to the early work of Freydank followed by Wagensooner.⁸³⁸ The main argument for this early date was the identification of the eponym Aššur-aḫa-iddina,⁸³⁹ who appears in the literary texts written by Marduk-balāssu-ēriš and Bēl-aḫa-iddina,⁸⁴⁰ with the son of Šulmānu-apla²-uṣur² quoted in VAT 15492,⁸⁴¹ a text that can be dated to the reign of Ninurta-apil-ekur (1191-1179/1181-1169).⁸⁴² However, this identification has been rejected by Freydank himself as an erroneous reading in VAT 15492 for Aššur-zēra-iddina, son of Šulmānu-aḫa²-iddina².⁸⁴³ The eponym Aššur-aḫa-iddina mentioned in the texts of Ninurta-uballissu's family bears no patronymic. The other two eponyms attested in tablets written by members of this family, Ikkāru and Aššur-išmānni, are approximately dated to the middle of the 12th century or to the reign of Aššur-dān I (1178-1133/1168-1133).⁸⁴⁴ Moreover, Bēl-aḫa-iddina appears as controller on VAT 9487, a tablet copied by Nabû-šuma-iddina son of Badû and dated to the eponymy of Samnuḫa-ašared who can also be assigned to the reign of Aššur-dān I.⁸⁴⁵ Consequently, the most plausible dating of Aššur-aḫa-iddina, even though it is not certain, is in the reign of Aššur-dān I or even Tiglath-Pileser I (1114-1076 B.C.).⁸⁴⁶

Dating the whole literary production of Ninurta-uballissu's family to the second half of the 12th century has important implications not only for the Middle Assyrian period, but also for the whole transmission history of Sumerian literature. The middle of the 12th century is in fact a turning point in the history of Babylonia as the Elamite king Shutruk-Nakhunte ended the Kassite dynasty and the Second Dynasty of Isin took over. The Second Dynasty of Isin was also a very productive period for literature, especially under Nebuchadnezzar I (1126-1105). To this period can be dated the cultural revolution that finds its paramount expression in the *Enūma-eliš*. Consequently, the Babylonian models of the tablets of Ninurta-uballissu's family may be attributed to the Second Dynasty of Isin. The same view was expressed by Cooper⁸⁴⁷ who assigns the models of the MA recension of *Angim* to the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I.

An early date for the Ninurta-uballissu family's texts would force us to attribute the Babylonian *Vorlagen* to the very late Kassite period. But this study has shown that the extant MB material looks to the glorious past of the Old Babylonian period. Therefore it seems unlikely that Kassite scribal schools in their very last years reworked traditional compositions and created textual versions very similar to the first-millennium recensions as reflected in these MA texts. If post-Kassite texts are the sources of some MA tablets, canonization took place after the Second Dynasty of Isin, namely in the

838 Wagensooner 2011b, 650.

839 Freydank 1991, 68-69.

840 See §§ 2.1.1.1, 2.1.2.1.

841 MARV 5 2.

842 Freydank 1991, 113.

843 Freydank 1997, 48 and n. 13, Freydank 2000, 67-70. I thank Dr. Hervé Reculeau for providing me with this information and for his helpful remarks. Note that another Aššur-aḫa-iddina was eponym in the period between Adad-nirari I and Tukulti-Ninurta I, Saporetti 1979.

844 See Saporetti 1979, 148, 154, 160, Freydank 1991, 118, 140.

845 Freydank 1991, 76-77 n. 205, Wagensooner 2011b, 675-676. In this tablet Bēl-aḫa-iddina does not bear the title of 'young scribe' as he typically does in other tablets, but that of ^{lu2}A.BA, 'scribe'. Even though this might indicate that in the second half of the 12th century Bēl-aḫa-iddina had completed his formation period and was active as a scribe (Jakob 2003, 258), it must be noted that because the title is incomplete due to a break (VAT 9487 Rev. 6, ^{lu2}A.B[A (?)]), other readings are possible. This title (for all the attestations see Jakob 2003, 237) occurs twice more in scholarly texts: in CT 24 46 (cf. fn. 589) it is attributed to the scribe Kidin-Sîn while his father Suti'u bears the title ^{lu2}A.BA LUGAL, 'royal scribe'; in Ass. 4539 (cf. fn. 733) it is the title of the scribe's father, Aššur-ittūšunu, and it also appears as ^{lu2}A.BA TUR, 'young scribe', for the scribe himself, Marduk-kabit-aḫḫešu. Therefore, it cannot be stated with confidence whether Bēl-aḫa-iddina had already completed his formation at the time of VAT 9487 or whether he was still a student.

846 This would make easier the problematic identification of Aššur-aḫa-iddina with the father of Ištu-Aššur-ašāmašu who was eponym in the first year of the reign of Tiglath-pileser I, cf. Freydank 1991, 146. On the other hand it probably precludes the identification of the scribe of BM 121117 with the son of Ninurta-uballissu, cf. § 2.1.7.2.

847 Cooper 1978, 50.

first millennium, because the MA sources are similar but not identical to the first-millennium texts.⁸⁴⁸ It is clear that over the span of a few decades from the extant Kassite sources to the MA documentation, Sumerian literary texts were further modified and adapted. What Assyriologists usually call canonization turned out to be an on-going process which only ended (if it did) in the first millennium. In a dialectic relation between tradition and innovation some Sumerian literary texts continued to be transmitted, modified and organized in series.⁸⁴⁹ Transmission of Sumerian texts to Assur occurred in several waves. Under Tukulti-Ninurta or his successors Kassite scholarly texts were imported to Assur. The two Kassite tablets (KAR 119 and KAR 375) and the model of KAR 97 likely belong to this group. *Vorlagen* of *The Creation of Mankind* and some of the aforementioned texts in parallel column format were presumably imported at this time. The model of the only Sumerian monolingual text from the MA documentation, KAR 91, was probably imported under Tukulti-Ninurta or even earlier. A further wave of transmission occurred later in the post-Kassite period. Texts with a higher degree of standardization close to the first-millennium sources reached the capital of the Assyrian empire. This level of standardization is represented by the texts written by members of Ninurta-uballissu's family, and to a lesser extent by the MA recension of *Udug-hul* Tablet XIII-XV.

Regardless of the chronology of the tablets, the core of the OB Nippur curriculum is not attested in the MA documentation with the exception of *Lugal-e* and *Angim*. Further texts associated with the Nippur tradition are *Ninisina C, A Hymn to Ninurta with Ethical Instructions* (KAR 119)⁸⁵⁰ and perhaps *The Creation of Mankind* and the Emesal liturgies dedicated to Enlil. In addition, the hymn to Ninurta KAR 97, that was composed in the Kassite period, is inspired by the Nippur tradition. Nippur and Babylon were the major sources for Sumerian literature at Assur, as explicitly stated in some colophons. It is clear that a consistent part of the MA Sumerian texts relies on the Nippur tradition. Doubtless the Assyrian kings looked back to the lore of Central-Southern Babylonia. Since the days of Adad-nirari I and Shalmaneser I the temple of the god Assur had been called by the names of Enlil's temple in Nippur.⁸⁵¹ The determination to make Assyria a cultural center to rival Babylon, by appropriating the Babylonian culture and religion, became even more intense under Tukulti-Ninurta I who designated the god Assur as the 'Assyrian Enlil' in his epic and in *PTN*.⁸⁵² Tukulti-Ninurta's bilinguals are clearly inspired by the classical Sumero-Babylonian tradition.

The only text that can be assigned to the Northern Babylonian tradition is the *Kiutu* incantation LKA 75. Other remains of this segment of the Sumerian tradition are perhaps the hymnic liturgies cited in the catalogue KAR 158, as phonetic orthography was common in Northern Babylonia.⁸⁵³

848 On the contrary if the MA texts are based on very late Kassite *Vorlagen* the standardization of the Sumerian literature as known from the first-millennium sources probably occurred during the Second Dynasty of Isin.

849 A different explanation of the difference between the MB and MA documentations requires that all the Babylonian tablets used as models for the MA texts were imported to Assur after Tukulti-Ninurta plundered the south (see Fincke 2003-2004, 137-138). The 12th century MA tablets would be late copies of the tablets brought by Tukulti-Ninurta and probably already copied in his day. This has two implications: (1) the models of the MA texts are the product of the Kassite scribal schools of the late 13th century; (2) all the extant MB tablets reflect a previous stage in the process of canonization and must be dated to an earlier period. However, it seems unlikely that all the late 13th MB Sumerian literary tablets were brought to Assur and no samples remained in Babylonia.

850 See § 2.1.2.3.

851 Machinist 1978, 519.

852 Machinist 1978, 524, see KAR 128 Obv. 39.

853 See § 4.

As already noted, some tablets report scribe's names, most of which belong to the family of Ninurta-uballissu:

Tablet	Find-spot	Composition	Scribe	Title	Father
KAR 14 ¹	N1	Lugal-e	Marduk-balāssu-ēriš	<i>ṭupšarru šeḫru</i>	Ninurta-uballissu Royal Scribe
BM 122625+	Nineveh	Lugal-e	Marduk-balāssu-ēriš	<i>ṭupšarru šeḫru</i>	Ninurta-uballissu Royal Scribe
BM 122652+	Nineveh	Angim	Marduk-balāssu-ēriš	[<i>ṭupšarru šeḫru</i>]	Ninurta-uballissu Royal Scribe
KAR 18	M2	Angim	Nabû-nādin-šumē	-	-
KAR 4	N1	The Creation of Mankind	Kidin-Sin	<i>ṭupšarru šeḫru</i>	Suti'u Royal Scribe
KAR 15 ²	N1	Ninisina C	Bēl-aḫa-iddina	<i>ṭupšarru šeḫru</i>	Ninurta-uballissu Royal Scribe
KAR 16 ³	N1	Ninisina C	Marduk-balāssu-ēriš	<i>ṭupšarru šeḫru</i>	Ninurta-uballissu Royal Scribe
KAR 9+	M2(?)	Eršaḫūga	Nabû-ēṭir	<i>kalû</i>	-
KAR 24(+)	N1	Udug-ḫul Tablet XIII-XV	Marduk-kabit-aḫḫēšu	<i>ṭupšarru šeḫru</i>	Aššur-ittūšunu
KAR 91	M1	Incantation	Ribātu	-	Rišeia Royal Incantation Priest
BM 121117	Nineveh	Unidentified Text	Sin-šuma-iddina	(?)	(?)

1 Eponym: Aššur-aḫa-iddina.
2 Eponym: Aššur-aḫa-iddina.
3 Eponym: Aššur-aḫa-iddina.

Some scribes bear Babylonian names, but they are undoubtedly Assyrians as evident from the linguistic and paleographical characteristics of their tablets. Despite the theonym Marduk/Bēl⁸⁵⁴ in the name of Marduk-kabit-aḫḫēšu, the scribe of KAR 24, his father's name, Aššur-ittūšunu, reveals an Assyrian origin.⁸⁵⁵ However, Babylonian scribes at the Assyrian court are known from the reigns of Aššur-uballiṭ⁸⁵⁶ and Tukulti-Ninurta.⁸⁵⁷ Tablets drafted by members of Ninurta-uballissu's family were unearthed both in the Assur temple and in the Anu-Adad temple.⁸⁵⁸ This and the fact that copies of *Lugal-e* probably written by the same scribe, KAR 13 and KAR 14, come from different spots may indicate that tablets found in the Assur temple and the Anu-Adad temple once belonged to the same collection, or alternatively that the collection of this scribal family was scattered in different places in the Neo Assyrian period.

Most of the scribes whose names are preserved bear the title of 'young scribe'.⁸⁵⁹ Nevertheless, as mentioned above, the excellent quality of manuscripts suggests that these tablets were not exercises but rather library copies.⁸⁶⁰ The title 'royal scribe' probably refers to teachers,⁸⁶¹ but none of them left us samples of their work. The rarity of this title – only four scribes bear

854 Horowitz 1998, 159 n. 17.

855 This, however, could reflect the tendency of members of the third generation to retrieve their legacy by means of names referring to their origin.

856 Wiggermann 2008.

857 Wiggermann 2008, 214-215.

858 Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. I, 32-33.

859 Exception are KAR 9+ where the title is *kalû* and KAR 91 and KAR 18 where the scribes have no titles.

860 See Wagenonner 2011b, 646, 648-649.

861 Wiggermann 2008, 209-210.

the title 'royal scribe' in the whole Middle Assyrian period⁸⁶² – suggests that there was never more than one 'royal scribe' at a time.⁸⁶³ This is a further piece of evidence for assigning KAR 4 to a period different from that of Ninurta-uballissu's family, as the 'royal scribe' Suti'u cannot be contemporaneous with Ninurta-uballissu.⁸⁶⁴

A comparison between texts created by MA scribes, on the one hand, and by MB scribes, on the other hand, shows that the Sumerian proficiency of the MB scribes was higher than that of their Assyrian colleagues.⁸⁶⁵ Babylonian dialect is used in all the Assyrian copies of Sumerian literary texts, but Assyrian forms randomly appear.

The importation to Nineveh of a text such as *A Praise Poem of Tukulti-Ninurta I* shows that Aššurbanipal's scholars were not only interested in the classics of Sumerian literature, but also in new compositions of the Middle Assyrian scribes.

To sum up, the collection of Sumerian texts from Assur represents the remains of one or more libraries. Sumerian texts were transmitted to the Assyrian capital in several phases in the 13th - 12th centuries. Comparison with the MB sources reveals that some texts known from the MA documentation reflect a later stage in the standardization process and likely were received in the post-Kassite period.

862 Wiggermann 2008, 208.

863 Wiggermann 2008, 210.

864 Note that Ribātu also bears the title of 'royal scribe' in his son's seal, Jakob 2003, 259; is the sequence Suti'u, Ribātu, Ninurta-uballissu in the office of 'royal scribe' plausible?

865 Compare for instance KAR 119 and KAR 128+.

3 Corpora of Sumerian Literary Texts from the Western Periphery

3.1 The Corpus of Sumerian Literary Texts from Ḫattuša

Ḫattuša, the capital of the Hittite empire, was located in the center of Anatolia in the vicinity of the modern village of Boğazköy (now Boğazkale) in the province of Çorum. After the identification of the archaeological site at the end of the 19th century, the first regular excavations were conducted by a German team under the direction of Hugo Winckler during 1906-1912. New campaigns were directed by Kurt Bittel from 1931 to 1939. Excavations resumed in 1952 with regular annual campaigns. As the capital of a Great Kingdom⁸⁶⁶ during the Late Bronze Age, the archives of Ḫattuša⁸⁶⁷ yielded one of the largest collections of cuneiform tablets in the ancient Near East, covering over 400 years from the mid-17th to the 13th century B.C. The city was abandoned under King Suppiluliuma II at the end of the 13th century.

The Sumerian literary and magical texts from Ḫattuša were discovered in several find-spots that are located in two main areas: the citadel of Büyükkale and the lower city. Most of the tablets unearthed in Büyükkale come from Building A (Bk. A), a palace situated in the southeast corner of the citadel that housed a large library with a small archive.⁸⁶⁸ Within this building were discovered around 4000 tablets and fragments dated from the Old Hittite (1650-1450 B.C.) up to the Late Hittite period (late 13th century B.C.). Some Sumerian texts were found in the area of Building D (Bk. D), the largest palace of the citadel, located on the northwestern slope. This building did not house a library, but an archive of sealed clay bullae was found in the magazine area. Because Sumerian texts were not stored in this building those discovered at Building D probably came from elsewhere as most of the fragments were discovered over the ruins of the palace in post-Hittite levels. One single fragment comes from the area of Building K (Bk. K), on the southeastern slope of the citadel, which housed a small library containing a selection of literary texts. Other fragments were discovered in the area of Buildings C (Bk. C) and M (Bk. M) on the west side of Büyükkale.

Two buildings in the lower city yielded Sumerian literary and magical texts: Temple I and the so-called Haus am Hang (House on the Slope). Temple I (T. I) was the main temple of the city, located northwest of the citadel, and housed a large library and an archive.⁸⁶⁹ The Haus am Hang (HaH), southeast of Temple 1 was a multifunctional building which included a scribal school and a library⁸⁷⁰ and was active from at least the time of Ḫattušili III (ca. 1265-1240 B.C.) until the end of the empire under Suppiluliuma II.⁸⁷¹ Most of the tablets date back to the late period. Old Hittite texts were also discovered within the building⁸⁷² even though their presence cannot be taken as proof that the Haus am Hang was already in use during the older period.⁸⁷³ These two buildings were part of one religious and administrative district as some of the tablets copied in the Haus am Hang were later stored in Temple I.⁸⁷⁴

⁸⁶⁶ For an introduction to the period see Liverani 1994.

⁸⁶⁷ For a description of the archives see Pedersén 1998, 44-56.

⁸⁶⁸ Košak 1995.

⁸⁶⁹ Pedersén 1998, 51-53.

⁸⁷⁰ Torri 2008, Torri 2010.

⁸⁷¹ Torri 2010, 392.

⁸⁷² For the Old Hittite texts in the Haus am Hang see Torri 2009a.

⁸⁷³ Torri 2009a, 222.

⁸⁷⁴ Torri 2008, 780-781, Torri 2010, 384; there seems to be a chronological difference between documents stored in Temple I which tend towards the period of Tuḫaliya IV and those housed in the HaH that mainly date to the reign of Suppiluliuma II, van den Hout 2008.

The find-spots of several tablets and fragments discovered during the period 1906-1912 are unfortunately unknown as early excavations were poorly and inadequately recorded. No scribal names are known from the Sumerian texts discovered at Ḫattuša and no tablet is dated.

Different Sumerian texts have been found at Ḫattuša such as wisdom compositions, hymns, and literary letters, but incantation is by far the most attested type.

Tablets containing Sumerian literary and magical texts are not exclusively the work of local (i.e. Hittite) scribes, as the paleography clearly indicates. Indeed three different scripts may be identified: Babylonian script, Assyro-Mitannian script, Hittite script. However, it is not always possible to know whether a single manuscript was imported or drafted at Ḫattuša by a foreign scribe.⁸⁷⁵

With the lone exception of KBo 13 37, all the Babylonian script tablets inscribed with Sumerian texts have been found in the citadel of Büyükkale, specifically within Building A.⁸⁷⁶ All these tablets contain incantations, including CTH 800, a group of monolingual incantations written in phonetic orthography.

A group of tablets in non-Hittite script was labeled as Assyro-Mitannian by Wilhelm on the basis of its similarities to both Assyrian and Mitannian scripts although it does not fully correspond to either of them.⁸⁷⁷ A thorough study on the Assyro-Mitannian script has been undertaken by Schwemer who identified similarities with the Middle Assyrian script of the 14th century.⁸⁷⁸ He also suggested that the Assyro-Mitannian tablets were drafted in Mitannian-dominated Assyria during the 15th - 14th century and then imported to the Hittite capital after the Syrian campaigns of Suppiluliuma I in the mid-14th century.⁸⁷⁹ More recently, Weeden revised the concept of Assyro-Mitannian itself on the basis of a larger corpus of tablets, reaching the conclusion that the so-called Assyro-Mitannian ductus is a form of Middle Assyrian. However, he leaves open the question where and by whom these tablets were drafted, namely whether in Assyria, probably during the 14th century, or at Ḫattuša by foreign scribes (i.e. Assyrians). Unfortunately, this is an unsolvable question at the moment.⁸⁸⁰ Nevertheless, as pointed out below,⁸⁸¹ tablet find-spots may serve as hints to the provenance of the Assyro-Mitannian texts. The Assyro-Mitannian tablets were discovered in the citadel of Büyükkale chiefly within Building A. They only contain medical-magical texts, including Sumero-Akkadian incantations.

On the basis of paleography, Hittite script tablets are divided into three periods as follows:

Old Script (OS) 1650 - 1500
Middle Script (MS) 1500 - 1350
New Script (NS) 1350 - 1180

Most of the Sumerian texts written in Hittite script are dated to the Late Hittite period except for a few fragments written in Middle Script. Of the three scripts, only Hittite script was used to write Sumerian literary texts, all of which are bilingual. Indeed the majority of the Sumerian texts in Hittite script are literary compositions; only a few incantations were found to be written by Hittite scribes. Sumerian literary texts include wisdom compositions, hymns, literary letters and school (Edubba) texts. Several compositions - *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad*, *The Message of Lu-diğira to his Mother*,⁸⁸² *Edubba E* - are written on multicolumn tablets containing different versions: standard orthography

⁸⁷⁵ See Klinger 2012, 83-84.

⁸⁷⁶ The fragment KBo 36 12, considered a bilingual incantation, is probably an Akkadian text, see 1. [SAĜ].DU-su₂ u₃ mi- [...], 2. i-na SAĜ.DU-šu š[u]; I owe this suggestion to Father Werner Mayer.

⁸⁷⁷ Wilhelm 1992.

⁸⁷⁸ Schwemer 1998, 7-17.

⁸⁷⁹ Schwemer 1998, 50-52.

⁸⁸⁰ The physical analysis of tablets may have serious limitations when it comes to assigning dates, see fn. 1982.

⁸⁸¹ See § 8.5.

⁸⁸² As is explained in detail below (§ 5.3.2), a manuscript of *The Message of Lu-diğira to his Mother* discovered at Ugarit, RS 25.421 = AuOrS 23 50 is included in the list of the Ḫattuša texts because it was written by a Hittite scribe.

Sumerian, phonetic orthography Sumerian, Akkadian and Hittite. The majority of the Hittite script tablets whose find-spot is known were discovered in the lower city.

The script of several fragments cannot be clearly identified.

CTH	Publication	Composition	Find-spot Area	Edition ¹	Script	Language
314	KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	?	Klinger (2010), 315-318 Schwemer (2001), 191-194 Laroche (1964)	NS	S PhS A H
314	KBo 12 72	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	HaH	Klinger (2010), 320-321 Schwemer (2001), 191-194 Laroche (1964)	NS	(S) (PhS) A H
314	KUB 4 4	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	?	Klinger (2010), 321-324 Schwemer (2001), 191-194 Laroche (1964)	NS	(S) (PhS) A H
314	KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	HaH	Klinger (2010), 318-320 Schwemer (2001), 191-194 Laroche (1964)	NS	(S) PhS H
315	KUB 4 2	The Message of Lu-diĝira to his Mother	?	Klinger (2010), 326-327 AuOrS 23 50	NS	(S) PhS (A) (H)
315	KUB 4 97	The Message of Lu-diĝira to his Mother	?	Klinger (2010), 327-328 AuOrS 23 50 Civil (1964) Lambert (1960), 279 Ebeling (1928), 22-25	NS	(S) (PhS) A H
315	RS 25.421	The Message of Lu-diĝira to his Mother	Ugarit: Lamaštu Archive	AuOrS 23 50 Ugaritica V 169	NS	S PhS A H
807	KUB 57 126	Eduḫba E	?	Civil (1987)	NS	S PhS (A) (H?)
807	KUB 4 39 (RS 17.10; RS 17.80)	The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ	?	AuOrS 23 54-55 Civil (2000a), 109-116 Ugaritica V 15	NS	S (A)
801.3	KUB 4 7	Nergal D	?	Viano (2012b) Klinger (2010), 337-339	NS	S (A)
819	KUB 4 41	Hymn to Nergal (?)	?	NE	NS	S A
801	KUB 4 26 (+) HT 13 (+) KUB 37 112	a) <i>šuilla</i> to Adad (Akk.) b) Hymn (?)	?	a) Schwemer (2001), 671 b) NE	NS	S
795	KUB 37 41	Dumuzi Text (Dumuzi-Inana R?)	Bk. A	§ 5.4.1	(?)	S A
800.1	KUB 30 1	Incantation	Bk. A	Geller (1989) Falkenstein (1939)	LOB/ MB	S
800.4	KUB 37 109	Incantation	Bk. A	Geller (1989)	LOB/ MB	S
800.2	KUB 30 2	Incantation	Bk. A	Falkenstein (1939)	LOB/ MB	S
800.4	KUB 30 3	Incantation	Bk. A	Falkenstein (1939)	LOB/ MB	S
800.3	KUB 30 4	Incantation	Bk. A	Falkenstein (1939)	LOB/ MB	S
800	KBo 36 13	Incantation	Bk. K	NE	LOB/ MB	S
800	KBo 36 15	Incantation	Bk. M	NE	LOB/ MB	S
800	KBo 36 16	Incantation	Bk. D	NE	LOB/ MB	S

CTH	Publication	Composition	Find-spot Area	Edition ¹	Script	Language
800.4	KUB 37 108 + KUB 37 110	Incantation	Bk. A	NE	LOB/MB	S
800	KBo 40 103	Incantation	Bk. A	NE	LOB/MB	S
812	KBo 36 19	Incantation	Bk. M	NE	LOB/MB	S
801	KBo 36 21	Incantation	Bk. D	NE	LOB/MB(?)	S
813	KBo 13 37	Collection of Incantations	HaH	NE	Bab	SA(?)
813	KBo 14 51	Collection of Incantations	Bk.	§ 5.1.5	MB	S
805.1	KBo 36 11 (KUB 37 100a + 103 + 106 L. Col. + 144) + KUB 37 100a Rev. + KUB 37 106 R. Col. + ABoT 2 255	Collection of Incantations	Bk. A	a) Böck (2007), 221-240 Cooper (1971) b) § 5.2.1 c) § 5.2.1 d) Geller (1985) Ms. M	Ass-Mit	SA
805.2	KUB 37 143	Incantation	Bk. C	Geller (1985) Ms. N	Ass-Mit	S (A)
805.2	KUB 37 101	Incantation	Bk. D	NE	Ass-Mit	SA
805.2	KUB 37 102	Incantation	Bk. D	§ 5.2.2	Ass-Mit	SA
805.3	KUB 37 107	Incantation	Bk. A	NE	Ass-Mit	(S) A
812	KUB 4 16	Incantation	?	Fincke (2009a)	Ass-Mit	(S) A
794	KBo 7 1 + KUB 37 115 (+) KBo 7 2	Collection of Incantations	Bk. D	a – b) Cooper (1972) b) Alaura, Bonechi (2012), 86-88	Ass-Mit	SA
813	KUB 34 3	Incantation	Bk. A	§ 5.2.5	Ass-Mit	SA
819	KUB 37 127	Incantation	Bk. A	NE	Ass-Mit	SA
806.3	KUB 37 95	Incantation	Bk. A	NE	Ass-Mit	S (A?)
793	KUB 4 11	Incantation to Utu	?	Klinger (2010), 329-331 Schwemer (2007)	NS	SA
806.2	KUB 4 24	Collection of Incantations	?	§ 5.3.9	NS	S
801.4	KUB 37 111	Collection of Incantations	Bk. D	§ 5.3.10	NS	SA
806.1	KBo 1 18	Collection of Incantations	?	NE	NS	S
819	KUB 4 23	Collection of Incantations	?	NE	MS/NS	SA
813	KUB 37 92	Collection of Incantations	Bk. A	NE	(?)	S
813	KUB 34 4	Incantation	Bk. A	NE	NS	SA
806	KBo 36 20	Incantation	HaH	NE	NS	S
806.4	ABoT 1 43	Incantation	?	NE	NS	S (A?)
801	KBo 36 17	Incantation	T. I	NE	NS	SA
819	KBo 36 14	Incantation	Bk. D	NE	(?)	S
819	KBo 19 98	Unidentified Text	T. I	Westenholz (1997), 284-285	MS	SA
819	KBo 36 24	Unidentified Text	?(Lower City)	NE	NS	S (A)
819	KUB 4 10	Unidentified Text	?	NE	NS(?)	SA(?)

CTH	Publication	Composition	Find-spot Area	Edition ¹	Script	Language
819	KBo 36 18	Unidentified Text	Bk. A	NE	(?)	SA

¹ Letters refer to single compositions inscribed on the same manuscript.

3.2 The Corpus of Sumerian Literary Texts from Emar

The ancient city of Emar, modern Meskene, was situated west of the Middle Euphrates in northern Syria. The modern archeological investigation of the area was undertaken as part of an international salvage campaign prompted by the erection of the Tabqa dam and the creation of Lake Assad. The site of Emar is now located on the shore of the lake. Between 1972 and 1976, a French team under the direction of Jean-Claude Margueron investigated the Late Bronze Age layers. A large number of tablets and fragments, dated to the 14th-12th centuries B.C., were unearthed in several spots on the *tell*.

Two different scribal schools, Syrian (Sy) and Syro-Hittite (SH), have been identified at Emar. In the ephemeral documents these two schools differ in tablet format,⁸⁸³ paleography, syllabary, juridical formulae, dating system and seal impressions.⁸⁸⁴ The Syrian school is the elder of the two and has archaic features deriving from the Old Babylonian tradition, whereas the Syro-Hittite school shows later traits, namely Middle Babylonian. The earliest texts are written according to the Syrian school, while the Syro-Hittite tradition was introduced at Emar during a later phase and replaced the older format over time.⁸⁸⁵ As recently shown by Y. Cohen, the distinction between Syrian and Syro-Hittite schools can be extended to the scholarly material.⁸⁸⁶

Around three hundred scholarly tablets were discovered at Emar and contrary to the situation in Hattuša and Ugarit, all of them are the work of local scribes as no imported manuscripts were found. With the exception of two tablets of unknown provenance,⁸⁸⁷ and a fragment of *Urra* discovered in Area C,⁸⁸⁸ all the scholarly texts, both Syrian and Syro-Hittite tablets, were found in a single area, the so-called Temple M₁ located in the southeast area of the *tell*. This building was actually not a temple but a private elite house,⁸⁸⁹ the residence of a family of diviner-scribes⁸⁹⁰ named after its founder Zu-Ba'la's family. The building fulfilled different functions including scribal activities. This collection includes lexical lists, wisdom texts, rituals, incantations, omina, astrological texts, and literary works in Akkadian and Sumerian as well as bilingual texts.

Only five scribes are known from Syrian scholarly tablets;⁸⁹¹ a larger number of scribes, including the members of Zu-Ba'la's family, are associated with the Syro-Hittite school.⁸⁹²

Most of the literary texts belong to the Syro-Hittite tradition, whereas only a few were written by Syrian school scribes including just one Sumerian composition, *A Prayer for a King*. For the sake of simplicity, fragments that cannot easily be classified will be treated here as Syro-Hittite tablets. As far as the Sumerian texts are concerned, the most popular literary genres are wisdom compositions and incantations, but the latter are preserved on tiny fragments. All the literary compositions are

⁸⁸³ An alternative division into 'Conventional' and Free-format' tablets (not followed here) has recently been proposed by Fleming, Démare-Lafont 2009.

⁸⁸⁴ For extensive treatments of the two schools see Wilcke 1992 and more generally Seminara 1998, 9-20, Cohen 2009, 26-42.

⁸⁸⁵ Seminara 1998, 12.

⁸⁸⁶ Cohen 2009, 28.

⁸⁸⁷ TBR 101, *Tsukimoto Incantation*. There are two other manuscripts of *Urra* of unknown provenance, possibly from Emar, see Cohen 2009, 201 n. 154. One Hittite omen was found in Area N, Salvini, Trémouille 2003.

⁸⁸⁸ Cohen 2009, 12.

⁸⁸⁹ Rutz 2013, 303-308. On the Emar archives see Dietrich 1990, Pedersén 1998, 61-68; for an exhaustive treatment of the archeological context of epigraphic finds in Temple M₁ see Rutz 2013.

⁸⁹⁰ Members of this family bear the title of *barû*.

⁸⁹¹ Cohen 2009, 34-35, 121-146. To this number should be added the unidentified extispicy scribes (Cohen 2009, 35). This number counters data from the ephemeral documentation which provides more scribe names for the Syrian school than for the Syro-Hittite.

⁸⁹² Cohen 2009, 35-36, 147-230.

in bilingual format and some present a phonetic Sumerian version added in a parallel column – *The Ballad of Early Rulers, The Fowler, The Letter of Sîn-iddinam to Utu*. On the contrary the vast majority of Sumerian incantations are monolingual. Several Sumerian literary texts have duplicates from Ugarit, while no parallels are known from Ḫattuša.⁸⁹³

Excavation Number ¹	Composition	Edition	Script	Language
Msk 74243	A Prayer for a King	E 775 Dietrich (1998)	Sy	SA
A: Msk 74127ac + Msk 74128x + Msk 74136b (+) Msk 74153 (+) Msk 74159n (+) Msk 74132t (+) Msk 74137m (+) Msk 74344 B: Msk 74159j	The Ballad of Early Rulers	E 767 Alster (2005) Klein (2000) Dietrich (1992) Alster (1990) Wilcke (1988) Alster, Jeyes (1986)	SH	S PhSA
Msk 74174a (+ ³) Msk 74107al ² (+) Msk 74148r (+) Msk 74238l (+) Msk 74182a + Msk 74122b	Enlil and Namzitarra	E 771 (+) E 772 (+) E 772 (+) E 773 (+) E 774 (+) E 592	SH	SA
Msk 7498b (+) Msk 7478b + Msk 74228b	The Fowler	E 768A + E 538 S	SH	S PhS (A)
Msk 74137b	The Fowler	E 768B	SH	(S) (PhS) A
Msk 74214a	The Fowler	E 769	SH	S (PhS) (A)
Msk 74159c	The Fowler	E 770	SH(?)	SA
ME 94	The Letter of Sîn-iddinam to Utu	TBR 101 Civil (1996)	SH	(S) PhS (A)
Msk 74102a + Msk 74107ai + Msk 74114l ³	Incantation	E 729	SH	S
Msk 74102o	Incantation	E 730	SH(?)	S
Msk 74199q	Incantation	E 731	SH(?)	S
Msk 74107ak	Incantation	E 732	SH(?)	S
Msk 74228a	Incantation	E 733	SH	S
Msk 74107q	Incantation	-	SH(?)	S
Msk 74173e	Incantation	E 734	SH	PhS
Msk 74148f	Incantation	-	SH(?)	Ph(?)S
Msk 74183	Incantation	E 740	SH(?)	S
Msk 74122t	Incantation	E 743	SH	S
Msk 74107t	Incantation	E 744	SH(?)	S
Msk 7499b	Incantation	E 744	SH(?)	S
Msk 74107p	Incantation	E 745	SH(?)	S
Msk 74107m	Incantation	E 746	SH(?)	S
Msk 74107n	Incantation	E 746	SH(?)	S
Msk 74238t	Incantation / Literary Text	E 747	SH(?)	S
Msk 74122bb	Incantation	E 748	SH(?)	S
Msk 74109d	Incantation	E 749	SH(?)	S
Msk 74199r	Incantation	E 751	SH(?)	S
Msk 74234h	Incantation	E 752	SH(?)	S
Msk 74135b	Incantation	E 753	SH(?)	S
Msk 74114b	Incantation	E 756	SH	S

⁸⁹³ Duplicates from Emar and Ḫattuša are, however, known for other genres, e.g. lexical lists and Akkadian omina and literary texts.

Excavation Number ¹	Composition	Edition	Script	Language
Msk 74165g	Incantation	E 757	SH	SA
Msk 74107ac	Incantation	E 759	SH(?)	S
Msk 74117l	Incantation	E 761	SH(?)	S
Msk 74200f	Incantation	E 762	SH(?)	S
Msk 74101a	Incantation	E 763	SH(?)	SA
Msk 7485e	Incantation	E 764	SH	SA
Msk 74232i	Incantation	E 790	SH(?)	S
Msk 74122ar	Incantation (?)	-	SH(?)	S
-	Collection of Incantations	Tsukimoto (1999)	SH	a) S b) PhS
Msk 74103f + Msk 74103x	Unidentified Text	E 776	SH	(S?) PhS (A?)
Msk 74143e	Unidentified Text	E 777	SH(?)	S

1 For the exact find-spots see Rutz 2013.

2 For this fragment see Rutz 2013, 272.

3 For this join see Cohen 2009, 216 n. 242.

3.3 The Corpus of Sumerian Literary Texts from Ugarit

Ugarit, modern Ras Shamra, is situated on the Mediterranean Sea in Syria, to the north of the city of Latakia. Regular excavations have been conducted by a French team since 1929, first under the direction of Claude Shaeffer and from 1978 onwards under Marguerite Yon.⁸⁹⁴ The city was inhabited from the Neolithic period until the Late Bronze Age and was destroyed around 1175 B.C. in the upheaval associated with the migration of the so-called Sea Peoples. During the period with which we are concerned, the Late Bronze Age, Ugarit was the seat of a local monarchy under the influence of Egypt until the conquest of Syria by Šuppiluliuma I in the middle of the 14th century when the city became a vassal of the Hittite empire.⁸⁹⁵ Epigraphic finds were unearthed in various areas of the *tell* and mostly date to the last phase of the city's history, 1230-1175 B.C.

Twenty-two tablets and fragments containing Sumerian literary and magical compositions were discovered at Ugarit. The majority of the Sumerian texts were discovered in several private houses belonging to important officials that were also the venues of scribal schools. Only two such texts were found in the Royal Palace.⁸⁹⁶

Five private archives located in different spots of the city yielded Sumerian texts. The largest collection stems from the Lamaštu archive, a library that owes its name to the presence of several incantations against Lamaštu,⁸⁹⁷ a female demon who afflicts pregnant women and infants causing miscarriage and lethal fever.⁸⁹⁸ This library, discovered during the 25th and 26th campaigns, is situated in the south-western wing of a building located in the southern area of the acropolis. The north-eastern wing of the same building housed the archive of the Hurrian priest.⁸⁹⁹ A total of 116 tablets and fragments, of which only 43 have so far been published,⁹⁰⁰ were found in the Lamaštu archive. The majority of the texts are lexical, literary or religious, but a small number of letters and administrative or juridical texts were also stored in this archive.

894 Pedersén 1998, 68-69.

895 Liverani 1988, 566-567. For a history of Ugarit see Singer 1999.

896 A description of archives and find-spots is provided in van Soldt 1991, van Soldt 1995, van Soldt 1999, van Soldt 2000, van Soldt 2001.

897 van Soldt 1991, 204-210, van Soldt 2000, 237-238.

898 See RIA 6, 439-446.

899 The so called archive of the Hurrian priest contains texts in Hurrian and Ugaritic in alphabetic script, van Soldt 2000, 235-236.

900 van Soldt 2012, 174.

In the center of a residential area denominated Ville Sud excavators discovered a large house, the Maison-aux-tablettes, containing an archive of mostly lexical and scholarly texts,⁹⁰¹ but a small number of international and private letters and administrative texts were also found.

East of the Royal Palace was unearthed a small archive of mostly lexical and literary texts named Bibliothèque du Lettré.⁹⁰²

During the 39th and 40th campaigns (1979-1980) a small lot of tablets was discovered in a pit within Maison A, situated in the 'city center'. These tablets inscribed with literary, religious and scholarly texts⁹⁰³ were found in a secondary context and were not housed inside Maison A, but probably belonged to a near-by library that was destroyed before the last reconstruction of the building.⁹⁰⁴

The largest archive so far discovered at Ugarit is the so called Maison d'Urtenu where over 500 tablets were found.⁹⁰⁵ This building located in the southern area of the *tell* was first identified in 1973 and has been regularly excavated since 1986. The largest portion of the texts consists of international letters from Syria, Mesopotamia and Anatolia as well as private correspondence.⁹⁰⁶ Religious and literary texts in syllabic cuneiform⁹⁰⁷ were found in limited numbers and only two tablets are written in Sumerian.

Five major archives were found in the Royal Palace containing treaties, letters and administrative and legal texts. A scant number of literary texts were unearthed in the central archive.⁹⁰⁸

The literary and religious texts were edited by Nougayrol (1968) in Ugaritica V and recently by Arnaud (2007) = AuOrS 23, to which I refer in the present work. Classification of tablet scripts, hence the identification of their origin, is more complicated for Ugarit than for Ḫattuša and Emar, due to the lack of specific paleographic studies and the inaccessibility of the manuscripts. Moreover, only in a few cases are photographs available, and usually they are not of good enough quality for a paleographic analysis. Therefore, the classification here presented must be considered as tentative and subject to further modification. Arnaud distinguishes four groups of tablets: tablets imported from Babylonia,⁹⁰⁹ Hittite tablets imported from Ḫattuša,⁹¹⁰ texts *assyrisé*⁹¹¹ and local tablets.⁹¹² A paleographic analysis, even though based on hand-copies only, allow us to refine this classification. The so called *assyrisé*-tablets, which according to Arnaud were drafted in Assyria on the basis of Babylonian models, have turned to be Babylonian tablets. We can therefore distinguish between Babylonian script tablets, Hittite script tablets and Ugarit script tablets.⁹¹³

Sumerian texts from Ugarit include wisdom texts, short tales, hymns, literary letters and incantations.

There are five manuscripts from Ugarit written in Babylonian script that contain Sumerian literary texts. As with tablets in non-Hittite script found in the Hittite capital, it is very difficult to establish whether these tablets were imported or copied at Ugarit by foreign scribes. With a single possible exception all the Sumerian texts in Babylonian script stem from the Lamaštu archive.

The only Sumerian text in Hittite script found at Ugarit is a copy of *The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother* imported from the Hittite capital and discovered in the Lamaštu archive.

The largest part of the Sumerian texts from Ugarit were written by local scribes. These tablets

901 van Soldt 1991, 182-191, van Soldt 2000, 234-235.

902 This archive may have originally belonged to the house of Rašap-'abu, van Soldt 1999, 33.

903 Arnaud 1982a.

904 Yon 1987, 39, van Soldt 1991, 224.

905 van Soldt 1991, 221-223, Malbran-Labat 2000, van Soldt 2000, 240-242.

906 Administrative and economic deeds and texts in Ugaritic were also found.

907 Malbran-Labat 2000, 238.

908 van Soldt 1991, 140.

909 Arnaud 2007, 8.

910 Arnaud 2007, 11

911 Arnaud 2007, 9-11.

912 Arnaud 2007, 11-16.

913 The term 'Ugarit script' is adopted instead of 'Ugaritic script' in order to avoid confusion with the alphabetic script.

stem from several archives and include both literary texts and incantations. All the literary compositions are in bilingual format regardless of their script, whereas the incantations are wholly monolingual. In contrast to Emar and Ḫattuša, standard orthography and phonetic orthography versions of a few literary compositions – *The Ballad of Early Rulers*, *A Prayer for a King*, *The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-Nesaĝ* – are inscribed on different tablets.

Excavation Number	Composition	Archive	Edition	Script	Language
RS 79.25	A Prayer for a King	Maison A	AuOrS 23 35 Dietrich (1998) Arnaud (1982a), 209-216	Ug	PhS (A)
RS 79.25C	A Prayer for a King	Maison A	Arnaud (1982a), 209-216	Ug	A
RS 25.130	a) The Ballad of Early Rulers b) Proverbs from Ugarit	Lamaštu	AuOrS 23 48 Alster (2005) Klein (2000) Dietrich (1992) Alster (1990) Wilcke (1988) Alster, Jeyes (1986) Ugaritica V 164	MB	S A
RS 23.34 + RS 23.363 + RS 23.494 + RS 23.721 + RS 23.721B	The Ballad of Early Rulers	Maison-aux-tablettes	Ugaritica V 165 (see above)	Ug	PhS A
RS 25.424	The Ballad of Early Rulers	Lamaštu	Ugaritica V 166 (see above)	Ug	(PhS) A
RS 22.341 + RS 28.053A	Enlil and Namzitarra	Maison-aux-tablettes	Cohen (2010) AuOrS 23 47	Ug	(S) A
RS 25.421 + RS 25.527 A+B	The Message of Lu-diĝira to his Mother	Lamaštu	AuOrS 23 50 Ugaritica V 169	NS	S PhS A H
RS 25?.135A	The Message of Lu-diĝira to his Mother	?	AuOrS 23 50	Ug	S A
RS 17.10	The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ	Bibliothèque du Lettre	AuOrS 23 54-55 Civil (2000a), 109-116 Ugaritica V 15	Ug	PhS (A)
RS 17.80	The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ	Bibliothèque du Lettre	AuOrS 23 54-55 Civil (2000a), 109-116 Ugaritica V 15	Ug	(Ph?)S A
RS 86.2210	The Fox and the Hyena	Maison d'Urtenu	AuOrS 23 52 Arnaud (2001)	Ug	S PhS (A)
RS 26.141	Hymn to Enki (?)	Lamaštu	AuOrS 23 28	MB	S A
RS 17.155	Collection of Incantations	Bibliothèque du Lettre	AuOrS 23 21 Ugaritica V 17	Ug	S
RS 15.152	Collection of Incantations	Royal Palace	AuOrS 23 21 Ugaritica V 17	Ug	S
RS 25.129 + RS 25.456B	Collection of Incantations	Lamaštu	AuOrS 23 25	MB	S
RS 25.418	Collection of Incantations	Lamaštu	AuOrS 23 27	MB(?)	S
RS 16.416	Incantation	Royal Palace	AuOrS 23 13 PRU III, 214	Ug	S
RS 25.517	Unidentified Text	Lamaštu	AuOrS 23 58	MB	S
RS 26.143	Unidentified Text	Lamaštu	AuOrS 23 59	Bab	S
RS 28.053	Unidentified Text	Maison-aux-tablettes	AuOrS 23 61	MB(?)	S
RS 25.462	Unidentified Text	Lamaštu	AuOrS 23 67	Ug	S?
RS 94.2372	Unidentified Text	Maison d'Urtenu	AuOrS 23 68	Ug	S

4 Unorthographic Writings

A number of Sumerian texts from the Western periphery contain unorthographic writings. The study of such writings is an important tool for understanding the transmission of the knowledge of Sumerian in the Western periphery. Transmission of knowledge here does not refer to the transmission of single compositions, which will be the subject of the following chapters, but rather to how Sumerian texts discovered in the Western periphery were written, specifically the orthographic conventions adopted by scribes to copy Sumerian texts. Since Sumerian was essential in teaching the cuneiform script, such a study has implications for the transmission of the cuneiform syllabary, although this issue is not addressed in the present work.

Unorthographic writings represent a modification of the conventional writing system consisting in the substitution of logograms with phonograms. This often leads to phonetic and graphic alterations of the standard orthography. Unorthographic writings are already attested in the third millennium, in the Early Dynastic Period.⁹¹⁴ The second half of the third millennium witnesses a tendency towards unorthographic spellings,⁹¹⁵ perhaps as a result of the so-called Šulgi orthographic reform. Phonetic writings are found in the Ur III administrative texts from Nippur⁹¹⁶ and Garšana,⁹¹⁷ in the Gudea inscriptions⁹¹⁸ and in the Ur III literary texts from Nippur.⁹¹⁹ Nevertheless none of these texts were written in exclusively phonetic orthography. The earliest examples of sources completely written in phonetic orthography are the literary texts from Girsu – mainly Emesal liturgies – that can be dated to the Early Isin Period.⁹²⁰ During the Old Babylonian period orthography underwent a process of standardization towards a logographic system, evident in the literary texts from Nippur.⁹²¹ In this corpus phonetic spellings appear only sporadically.⁹²² On the contrary, unorthographic writings were largely adopted in Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region in cities such as Sippar, Tell Hadad-Meturan, Kiš and Tell Harmal-Šaduppum. Northern Babylonian sources, approximately dated to the Late Old Babylonian period, have provided us with the largest corpus of literary texts exclusively or largely written in phonetic orthography. Northern Babylonian texts are mainly Emesal liturgies, incantations, and some literary compositions. This corpus seems to manifest to a greater extent some of the alterations of the conventional orthography that are already documented in the Ur III and Isin Period.⁹²³ In the Middle Babylonian period phonetically written Sumerian texts are mostly documented outside Mesopotamia, especially in Syria and Anatolia in incantations and literary compositions.

Phonetic orthography served different functions depending on the type of text. In ‘practical’ texts, like incantations and Emesal liturgies which were performed in exorcisms and cultic ceremonies, phonetic writings were presumably intended to ensure the correct pronunciation of words. In literary texts unorthographic writings were possibly used for teaching the basics of the cuneiform syllabary. In the Ur III administrative texts phonetic writings were part of a process of simplifying the writing system.

914 Civil 1984a.

915 Sjöberg 1975b, 166, Thomsen 1984, 281.

916 Wilcke 2000.

917 Sallaberger 2011.

918 Falkenstein 1949, 23-34.

919 Rubio 2000.

920 Krecher 1966a, 19-22; an Ur III date is not precluded, see Tinney 2011, 580.

921 Rubio 2000, 215-219.

922 Only one unorthographic text from Nippur is listed in Krecher 1966a, 27; for other examples see § 4.5.

923 See Krecher 1966a, 21.

The main goal of this study is to illustrate the relation between the unorthographic writings attested in the Late Bronze Age Syro-Anatolian texts and those from the Old Babylonian documentation, in order to determine whether the former are a local development or the product of a scribal tradition rooted in Mesopotamia. The core of this comparison will be the analysis of the alterations found in the two sets of data and their deviation from standard orthography. As for standard orthography, sign readings based on the Nippur documentations will be used. These are provided by Catherine Mittermayer and Pascal Attinger in aBZL = Mittermayer (2006), improved in Attinger (2007).⁹²⁴ Within the corpus of OB unorthographic texts from Northern Babylonia only a selection of sources completely written in phonetic orthography will be used; texts containing only a limited number of phonetic writings, such as some literary compositions from Meturan, will not be taken into account because it is nearly impossible to ascertain whether these writings are intentional or the result of scribal mistakes. Even though, as mentioned above, phonetic writings served different uses in texts of different types, unorthographic spellings from the Western periphery texts and from the Old Babylonian corpus will be collected from different types of texts and classified. This choice is compelled by the lack of sufficient examples of alterations in each text type from the Old Babylonian corpus for comparison with those drawn from the same text type from the Western periphery. Otherwise the Emesal liturgies, which represent the majority of the Old Babylonian unorthographic texts, would be excluded because this genre is unattested in the Western periphery.⁹²⁵ Moreover, at this level the analysis is focused on the knowledge of Sumerian orthography in the Western periphery and not on texts. Unorthographic writings will be analyzed according to the alterations they display, which can be grouped in two main categories: graphic alterations and phonetic alterations.⁹²⁶ For each type of alteration occurrences in manuscripts from Syria and Anatolia will be classified according to two criteria: provenance (Ḫattuša, Emar and Ugarit) and script. In this context the Babylonian tablets discovered at Ḫattuša and Ugarit containing texts completely written in phonetic orthography – CTH 800, AuOr23: 25 – are not only analyzed as peripheral documentation but also as a reflection of an original Babylonian tradition.

Texts containing phonetic writings can be sorted into three different categories:

1) Texts completely written in phonetic orthography. These texts are limited to incantations⁹²⁷ and are mainly written on Babylonian script tablets. The group of monolingual unorthographic incantations from Ḫattuša CTH 800⁹²⁸ represents the vast majority of the Babylonian script tablets. Only a single Babylonian script tablet from Ugarit contains incantations completely written in phonetic orthography. However, this tablet also includes an incantation in standard orthography (AuOrS 23 25, 34-52). Only a very limited number of tablets drafted by local scribes contain incantations completely written in phonetic orthography.⁹²⁹

924 In a few cases phonetic writings provide evidence for different readings; these are exclusively based on Babylonian script tablets: alam (KUB 30 1, I, 8, IV, 12) VS alan (aBZL); gidim (KBo 36 15, Rev. 2) VS kitim (aBZL); gubu₂ (KUB 30 1, IV, 6) VS gabu₂ (aBZL); ḡešimmar (KUB 30 1, IV, 17) VS ḡešnimbar (aBZL); inim (KUB 37 109, 11) VS enim (aBZL); nita (KUB 30 1, I, 12) VS ninta (aBZL); šinig (KUB 30 1, IV, 16; IV, 24) VS šeneg (aBZL). In these cases Nippur readings are regarded as local developments that were not universally adopted.

925 Only alterations that are not attributable to typical Emesal phonetic changes are taken into consideration, see Krecher 1967, Thomsen 1984, 285-294.

926 A preliminary survey of phonetic writings has been presented in Viano 2015.

927 The unidentified script fragment KUB 37 41 is not taken into consideration because no unorthographic writing can be confidently read, see § 5.4.1.

928 For the sake of simplicity the fragment KBo 36 19 is here considered under CTH 800 although listed as CTH 812, because it probably belongs to the same group of incantations, see § 5.1.2.

929 The nature of KUB 4 26 (+) HT 13 (+) KUB 37 112 is unclear, but it is listed under incantations because the tablet also contains an Akkadian *šuilla*, see § 5.3.7. Because the three fragments do not physically join, phonetic writings are listed as if they come from separate sources.

Babylonian Script Tablets

Ḫattuša

Source – CTH 800	Language
KUB 30 1	PhS
KUB 37 109	PhS
KUB 30 2	PhS
KUB 30 3	PhS
KUB 30 4	PhS
KBo 36 13	PhS
KBo 36 15	PhS
KBo 36 16	PhS
KBo 36 19	PhS
KBo 40 103	PhS
KUB 37 108 + KUB 37 110	PhS

Ugarit

Source	Language
AuOrS 23 25, 1-2, 12-14, 22-24	PhS

Local Script Tablets

Ḫattuša

Source	Language
KUB 4 26B (+) HT 13 (+) KUB 37 112	PhS

Emar

Source	Script	Language
E 734	SH	PhS
Tsukimoto Incantation	SH	PhS

Ugarit

Source	Language
AuOrS 23 21, 67-70, 79-96	PhS

2) Phonetic versions added in a parallel column to texts written in standard orthography. This category includes only bilingual literary texts inscribed on local script tablets from all three sites:

Source	Composition
Ḫattuša	
CTH 314	The Hymn to Iškur Adad
CTH 315	The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother
KUB 57 126	Edubba E
Emar	
E 767	The Ballad of Early Rulers
E 768 - E 769 - E 770	The Fowler
E 776	Unidentified
TBR 101	The Letter of Šin-iddinam to Utu
Ugarit	
RS 17.10	The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaġ
RS 23.34+	The Ballad of Early Rulers
RS 79.25	A Prayer for a King
RS 86.2210	The Fox and the Hyena

3) Standard orthography texts occasionally presenting some phonetic writings. These texts include incantations and literary compositions. The Assyro-Mitannian texts are limited to bilingual incantations in standard orthography.

Babylonian Script Tablets

Ugarit		
Source	Composition	Language
RS 25.130	The Ballad of Early Rulers Proverbs from Ugarit	S A
AuOrS 23 25, 34-52	Incantations	S
AuOrS 23 27	Incantation	S
AuOrS 23 59	Unidentified	S

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

Source	Language
CTH 794	SA
KBo 36 11+	SA
KUB 37 102	SA

Local Script Tablets

Ḫattuša		
Source	Composition	Language
KUB 4 7	Nergal D	S (A)
KUB 4 39	The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal Nesaĝ	S A
KUB 4 24	Incantation	S A
KUB 34 4	Incantation	S A
KUB 37 111	Incantation	S A

Emar			
Source	Composition	Script	Language
E 771+	Enlil and Namzitarra	SH	S A
E 775	A Prayer for a King	S	S A
E 729	Incantation	SH	S
E 733	Incantation	SH	S
E 740	Incantation	SH	S
E 743	Incantation	SH	S
E 751	Incantation	SH	S

Ugarit		
Source	Composition	Language
AuOrS 23 13	Incantation	S
AuOrS 23 21	Incantation	S

Here follows the list of OB unorthographic texts under consideration:

Provenance	Museum Number	Composition	Hand-copy	Edition	Language
Kiš	Ashm 1930-362	Song(s) to Šulpae and Aruru	OECT 5 10	Black (2005), 56-61	S
Meturan	H 139	Farmer's Instructions	AuOr 9, 44-45	Cavigneaux (1991)	S
Meturan	H 178	Farmer's Instructions	AuOr 9, 44-45	Cavigneaux (1991)	S
Meturan	H 110	Farmer's Instructions	AuOr 9, 46	Cavigneaux (1991)	S
Meturan	H 97	Collection of Incantations	ZA 83, Pls. I-III	I-II: Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi (1993b) III: Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi (1995a) IV-VI: Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi (1995b)	S
Meturan	H 179 + H 188 (+) H 186 (+) H 187 (+ fragments without number)	Collection of Incantations	ZA 83, Pls. IV-V	See H 97	S
Meturan	H 74	Incantation	Hand-copy: ZA 92, 22 fig. 3 Photo: ZA 92, 23, Pl. III	Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi (2002)	S

Provenance	Museum Number	Composition	Hand-copy	Edition	Language
Meturan	H 103	Incantation	Hand-copy: ZA 92, 18, 20, fig. 1-2 Photo: ZA 92, 19,21, Pl. I-II	Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi (2002)	S
Meturan	H 77	Hemerology	Iraq 55, 101	Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi (1993a), 100-104	S A
Meturan	H 83	Hemerology	Iraq 55, 98	Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi (1993a), 97-100	S A
Sippar	VAT 608 + VAT 1345	Nanna M	VS 2 1	Sjöberg (1982), 74-75 Sjöberg (1960), 90-96	S
Sippar	VAT 613 + VAT 1335 + VAT 1349	Nanna N	VS 2 4	Sjöberg (1960), 97-101	
Sippar (?)	MMUM 35516 + Völkerkundemuseum Vienna No. 25363	Dumuzi-Inana Text	Manchester Memoirs 48 Pl. 1-7 NABU 1990-20	Alster (1992)	S
Sippar	CBS 112	Balaĝ (No. 15) zi-bu-u ₃ zi-bu-u ₃	PBS 10/2 13	Löhnert (2009), 439-445 Cohen (1988), 287-290 Bergmann (1964), 13-43	S
Sippar	VAT 1372	Balaĝ ¹	VS 2 75	Bergmann (1965), 31-33 Sjöberg (1960), 102-103	S
Sippar	VAT 1419	Balaĝ	VS 2 94 ²	Krecher (1966a)	S
Sippar	CBS 35	Eršaḥunga to Marduk	PBS 10/2 3	Bergmann (1965), 33-42	S
Sippar	BM 78198	Eršaḥunga	CT 44 14	Lambert (1974a), 291-293	S
Sippar	VAT 1320	Eršaḥunga	VS 2 47	Lambert (1974a), 291-293	S
Sippar	VAT 1437	Emesal Lyric	VS 2 48	Bergmann (1964), 1-13	S
Sippar	VAT 604 + VAT 614 + VAT 1350 + VAT 1370	Emesal Lyric	VS 2 3 I, 1-17	Falkenstein (1952-1953)	S
Sippar	S 7/1600 (IM 95317)	Incantation	Obv: Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi (1994), 75 Rev: Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi (1994), 83	Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi (1994), 73-85	S
Susa (?) ³	AO 24146	Dumuzi's Dream	RA 84, 138-139	Alster (2006)	S
Tell Harmal	IM 55403	Instructions of Ur-Ninurta	TIM 9 1 Sumer 11, Pl. XIII No. 9	Alster (2005), 221-240 Alster (1991b)	S
Tell Harmal	IM 53977	Šulgi 54 (Inscription)	TIM 9 35 Sumer 11, Pl. XVI No. 10	RIME 3/2.1.2.38 Gelb, Kienast (1990), 344-347 Kärki (1986), 59-61	S A
Tell Harmal	IM 51545	Inana C ⁴	TIM 9 20 Sumer 13, 69 Pl. I	Sjöberg (1975a) – Ms. C	S A
Tell Harmal	IM 51543	Inana C	TIM 9 21 Sumer 11, Pl. VI No. 4	Sjöberg (1975a) – Ms. O	S A
Tell Harmal	IM 51176	Inana C	TIM 9 24 Sumer 13, 73 Pl. III	Sjöberg (1975a) – Ms. R	S A
Tell Harmal	IM 51529	Inana C	TIM 9 23 Sumer 13, 75 Pl. IV	Sjöberg (1975a) – Ms. Ra	S A
?	CNMA 10051 ⁵	Balaĝ (No. 16) a-ab-ba-ḥu-luḥ-ḥa	JCS 8, 82-83	Kutscher (1975)	S

Provenance	Museum Number	Composition	Hand-copy	Edition	Language
?	VAT 4596	Balaĝ (No. 11 or 42) ¹ uru ₂ ħul-a-ke ₄	VS 10 182	Krecher (1968), 255-259	S
?	AO 3925 (+ ?) Edin. 09-405, 27	Šulpae A	AO 3925: TCL 15 3 Edin. 09-405,27: BL VI	Falkenstein (1963)	S
?	AO 6316	Ur-namma B	TCL 15 38 ASJ 9, 60	Flückiger-Hawker (1999), 183-203 Sjöberg (1961b)	S
?	BM 79949	Incantation	Finkel (1999b), 245, Fig. 7a	Finkel (1999b), 230	S

1 See Black 1987, 74.

2 BM 78173 = CT 44 15 is a partially unorthographic duplicate of VS 2 94, see Krecher 1966a. This text is probably a *Balaĝ*, Black 1987, 73.

3 See Cavigneaux 2003, 53 n. 1.

4 Further manuscripts are: Ms. Oa: IM 51530 = TIM 9 26 (Sumer 13, 70 Pl. II), which only preserves lines 121-125 with some phonetic Sumerian glosses; IM 51650 = TIM 9 52, which is not included in Sjöberg's edition.

5 For a complete list of unorthographic spellings see Kutscher 1975, 32-43.

6 See Black 1987, 42.

4.1 List of Unorthographic Writings

Here follows a list of the unorthographic writings attested at ʕattuša, Emar and Ugarit with the corresponding reconstructed form in standard orthography. Entries are listed according to the alphabetic order of sources.

4.1.1 ʕattuša

4.1.1.1 Babylonian Script Tablets

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
za-la-ag	zalag (?)	KBo 36 13	L. Col. 2
[a-sa-al-l]u-uḥ-ḥi	^d asal-lu ₂ -ḥi	KBo 36 13	L. Col. 3
-gi-im	-gen ₇ (?)	KBo 36 13	L. Col. 4, 14, 15
[i-ni-k]i-ik-ke	^d en-ki-ke ₄	KBo 36 13	L. Col. 6, 15
gi-bi-il-la	gibil	KBo 36 13	L. Col. 12
lu	lu ₂ (?)	KBo 36 13	L. Col. 12
ur-ma-aḥ	ur-maḥ	KBo 36 13	L. Col. 13
ḥi-en-še ₃ ² -ud-da	?	KBo 36 13	L. Col. 14
u ₃ -uṣ-ṣu-bi	uṣ ₇ -zu-bi	KBo 36 13	R. Col. 3, 11
uṣ-ra-a-bi	uṣ ₇ -ri-a-bi	KBo 36 13	R. Col. 4
ni-ĝa ₂ -ak-ka	niĝ ₂ -ak-a	KBo 36 13	R. Col. 5
ḥi-e-en-x	ḥe ₂ -en-x	KBo 36 13	R. Col. 6
ka-ḥu-ul	ka-ḥul	KBo 36 13	R. Col. 7
e-gi-ir-b[a]	egir-ba	KBo 36 13	R. Col. 8
lu-ul-lu-bi	lu ₂ -ulu ₃ / lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu	KBo 36 13	R. Col. 9
u ₃ -tu-[ug]	udug	KBo 36 13	R. Col. 10
ba-ar-su	bar-zu	KBo 36 13	R. Col. 12
e-mi-bi	eme-bi	KBo 36 13	R. Col. 13
ni-ka-as-si	?	KBo 36 13	R. Col. 14
gi-il-ga-m[i-(iṣ)]	^d Gilgameš _{2/3}	KBo 36 13	R. Col. 15

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
[n]a-am-ta-a[r]	nam-tar	KBo 36 13	R. Col. 18
[g]i-ri-bi	ĝiri ₃ -bi	KBo 36 15	Obv. 5
u ₃ -tu-uk-ka	udug-(ga) (?)	KBo 36 15	Obv. 6
gi-di-ma	gidim-(ma)	KBo 36 15	Rev. 2
lu-ul-lu-bi	lu ₂ -ulu ₃ / lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu	KBo 36 15	Rev. 2
i-gi	igi	KBo 36 15	Rev. 3
du-mu-	dumu-	KBo 36 15	Rev. 4
-gu	-ĝu ₁₀	KBo 36 15	Rev. 4
ˈkiˈ-si-ki-il	ki-sikil	KBo 36 15	Rev. 5
ni-ka-la-qa	niĝ ₂ -kala-ga	KBo 36 16	4, 5
i-gi-ḥu-ul	igi-ḥul	KBo 36 19	6
e-si-ra	e-sir ₂ -ra	KBo 36 19	8
a-sa-al-lu-ḥi	˚asal-lu ₂ -ḥi	KBo 40 103	3
i-gi	igi	KBo 40 103	3, 7
du-mu-ĝu ₁₀	dumu-ĝu ₁₀	KBo 40 103	4
gi-in-na	ĝen-na	KBo 40 103	4
[i]n-e ₂ -nu-ru	en ₂ -nu-ru	KUB 30 1	I, 1
ḥa-la-am-ma-ak-ke	ḥalam-ak-e	KUB 30 1	I, 2
ḥu-ul-ĝa ₂ -al	ḥul-ĝal ₂	KUB 30 1	I, 2
u ₃ -ḥu-ul	udug-ḥul (?)	KUB 30 1	I, 2
i-gi	igi	KUB 30 1	I, 2, 20, III, 13
du-mu	dumu	KUB 30 1	I, 2 II, 3
u ₃ -uṣ-ṣu	uṣ ₇ -zu	KUB 30 1	I, 3 II, 17
šu-ta-ta-ak-ke	šu dag-dag-ge	KUB 30 1	I, 3
le-e-la-a	lil ₂ -la ₂	KUB 30 1	I, 4
i-bu-bu	i ₃ -bu ₍₂₎ -bu ₍₂₎	KUB 30 1	I, 4
a-la-al-le-ˈde ₅ ˈ	a ₂ -la ₂ -e-de ₃	KUB 30 1	I, 5
ki-si-ki-il	ki-sikil	KUB 30 1	I, 5
le	guruš	KUB 30 1	I, 5
šu-da	šu-du ₃ -a	KUB 30 1	I, 5
uṣ-ra-a	uṣ ₇ -ri-a	KUB 30 1	I, 5
i-gi-in	i ₃ -ĝen	KUB 30 1	I, 6
im-ma-ab-[zu]	im abzu	KUB 30 1	I, 6
ḥa-ma-an-zi ₂ -ir	ḥamanzir	KUB 30 1	I, 7, 8
mu-un-gi-im	mu-un-dim ₂	KUB 30 1	I, 8
šu ma-an-g[u-ur]	šu ba-an-gur	KUB 30 1	I, 8
a-la-am	alam	KUB 30 1	I, 8, IV, 12 IV, 14
ba-ki-ik-[ki-ir]	ba-an-gir ₁₁ -gir ₁₁	KUB 30 1	I, 9
mu-su-ub-an-ni	munsub-a-ni	KUB 30 1	I, 9
lu	lu ₂	KUB 30 1	I, 9, 16
i-niˈ(IR)-di	i-ni-in-de ₂	KUB 30 1	I, 10
uṣ	uṣ ₇	KUB 30 1	I, 10, 11, 12

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
ni-gu-ug-g[u]	niĝ ₂ -gu ₇ -gu ₇	KUB 30 1	I, 11
du-ut-tu	du ₁₁ -du ₁₁	KUB 30 1	I, 11
i-UŠ(-)ta-aq-qa	?	KUB 30 1	I, 12
ḥu-ul	ḥul	KUB 30 1	I, 13
i-ni-im-ĝa ₂ -ar	eme-ĝar	KUB 30 1	I, 13
lu-ul-lu	lu ₂ -ulu ₃ / lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu	KUB 30 1	I, 14
n[u-u]n-za-a	nu-un-zu-a	KUB 30 1	I, 14
pa-ap-ḥa-al-la	pap-hal-la	KUB 30 1	I, 14
ba-ni-ib-di-ib-be ₂	ba-ni-ib-dib-be ₂	KUB 30 1	I, 15
ba-an-še	ba-an-ser ₃ (?)	KUB 30 1	I, 16-17
-si-iq-qa	sag ₃ -ga	KUB 30 1	I, 16-17
im-šu-ub	im-šub	KUB 30 1	I, 18
sa-ad-ni-im	sa-ad-nim	KUB 30 1	I, 18
a-ge-ga	a-geg	KUB 30 1	I, 19
i-i	e ₃ (?)	KUB 30 1	I, 19
im-g[u]-g[u-r]a	im-gi/(u [?])gurum-(a)	KUB 30 1	I, 19
za- ^r ag ^r -še	za ₃ -še	KUB 30 1	I, 19
a-sa-al-lu-ḥi	^d asal-lu ₂ -ḥi	KUB 30 1	I, 20-21 II, 3
-si	-si ₃	KUB 30 1	I, 20
g[i-in-na]	ĝen-na	KUB 30 1	I, 21
-gu	-ĝu ₁₀	KUB 30 1	I, 21
si-ki-il-la-a-ta	sikil-la-ta	KUB 30 1	I, 22
gi-su-[ul-ḥi]	gi-sul-ḥi	KUB 30 1	I, 25
sa-šu-uš-[ga-al]	sa-šuš-gal	KUB 30 1	II, 1
a-an-su	an-su ₃	KUB 30 1	II, 2
-gi-im	-gen ₇	KUB 30 1	II, 2, 18
uš-zu	uš ₇ -zu	KUB 30 1	II, 4
gi-iš-šu-ub	ĝeš-šub	KUB 30 1	II, 18
di-iq-q[u]	di-ku ₅	KUB 30 1	II, 19
u ₃ -tu	^d utu	KUB 30 1	II, 19
ka-ar-ga-al	kar-gal	KUB 30 1	II, 20
ni-in-nu-u[r-ta]	^d nin-urta	KUB 30 1	II, 21
[šu]-lu-ba-ak-ke	šu-lu ₂ -ba-ak-ke ₄	KUB 30 1	III, 8
u ₃ -mi-ig-ma	?	KUB 30 1	III, 9
u ₃ -še-em-x-[...]	?	KUB 30 1	III, 10
nu-lu-uḥ-ḥa	nu-luḥ-ḥa	KUB 30 1	III, 10 IV, 24
ga-zi-ḥu-ur-saĝ	gazi-ḥur-saĝ	KUB 30 1	III, 11
ša-ab-ba	ša ₃ -ba	KUB 30 1	III, 12
i-gi-u ₃ -tu-uš-še	igi- ^d utu-še ₃	KUB 30 1	III, 13 IV, 9 IV, 27
di-be ₂ -de	dib-be ₂ -de ₃	KUB 30 1	IV, 5
a-gu-bu-un-ni	a ₂ -gubu ₃ ^{bu} -ni	KUB 30 1	IV, 6
u ₃ -me-ni-sa-ar	u ₃ -me-ni-sar	KUB 30 1	IV, 7

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
u ₃ -me-ni-ĝa ₂ -ar	u ₃ -me-ni-ĝar	KUB 30 1	IV, 8 IV, 9
še-em-li	šem-li	KUB 30 1	IV, 9
ni-ig-na	niĝ ₂ -na	KUB 30 1	IV, 9 IV, 23
di-in-gi-ra-a-na	diĝir-ra-na	KUB 30 1	IV, 10
gi-ri-ĝu ₁₀	ĝiri ₃ -ĝu ₁₀	KUB 30 1	IV, 13
e-si-ir	e-sir ₂	KUB 30 1	IV, 15
ši-in-ni-ig	šinig	KUB 30 1	IV, 16 IV, 24
ge-ši-im-[ma-ar]	ĝešimmar	KUB 30 1	IV, 17
gi-iš-ḫu-[ur]	ĝeš-ḫur	KUB 30 1	IV, 18
ka-ab-bi	ka-bi	KUB 30 1	IV, 19
u ₃ -gu-bi	ugu-bi	KUB 30 1	IV, 20
gi-z[i-la ₂]	gi-izi-la ₂	KUB 30 1	IV, 23
ḫa-aš-ḫu-ur	ḫešḫašḫur	KUB 30 1	IV, 25
e-ta	a-ta	KUB 30 1	IV, 26
u ₃ -me-ni-šu-ub	u ₃ -me-ni-šub	KUB 30 1	IV, 26
u ₃ -me-ni-na-ag	u ₃ -me-ni-naĝ	KUB 30 1	IV, 27
in-di-id-di	?	KUB 30 2	I, 6
mu-un-ši-ib-gu	mu-un-ši-ib-gu ₇	KUB 30 2	I, 8
ḫa-ab-ru-ud-da	ḫabrud-da	KUB 30 2	I, 10
bi-in-gi-id	bi ₂ -in-kid ₂	KUB 30 2	I, 11
gi-ri	ĝiri ₃	KUB 30 2	I, 12
di-in-gi-re	diĝir-re	KUB 30 2	II, 3
lu-ul-lu	lu ₂ -ulu ₃ / lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu	KUB 30 2	II, 4
ki-is-ki-il	ki-sikil	KUB 30 2	II, 5
gu-ru-uš	ĝuruš	KUB 30 2	II, 7
lu-le-e-la	lu ₂ -lil ₂ -la ₂	KUB 30 2	II, 9
mu-un-ši-ib-na-ag	mu-un-ši-ib-naĝ	KUB 30 2	II, 9
ba-tu-uḫ	ba-tuḫ (?)	KUB 30 3	5
šu-tu-ul	šu-du ₃ (?)	KUB 30 3	5
-ga-am	gam	KUB 30 3	6
u ₃ -su-a-na	uzu-a-na	KUB 30 3	7
i-ĝa ₂ -al	i ₃ -ĝal ₂	KUB 30 3	8
i-gi	igi	KUB 30 3	9
i-ni-ki-ir-ra	^d en-ki-ra	KUB 30 3	10
-ĝa ₂ -ar	-ĝar	KUB 30 4	L. Col. 9
u ₃ -mi-ig-m[a]	?	KUB 30 4	L. Col. 11
du-m[u-ĝu ₁₀]	dumu-ĝu ₁₀	KUB 30 4	R. Col. 7
g[i-i]n-na	ĝen-na	KUB 30 4	R. Col. 7
nu-lu-uḫ-ḫa	nu-luḫ-ḫa	KUB 30 4	R. Col. 8
ga-zi-ḫu-ur-s[aĝ]	gazi-ḫur-saĝ	KUB 30 4	R. Col. 9
e	a	KUB 30 4	R. Col. 10
a-šu-g[i-ri ² -a(n) ² -ni]	a ₂ -šu-ĝiri ₃ -a-ni	KUB 30 4	R. Col. 13
i-g[i]	igi	KUB 30 4	R. Col. 14

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
i-gi-ḫu-la	igi-ḫul-(a)	KUB 37 108+110	L. Col. 2
-gu-ub	-gub	KUB 37 108+110	L. Col. 3, 5
ka-ḫu-la	ka-ḫul-(a)	KUB 37 108+110	L. Col. 4
iš-še-e	?	KUB 37 108+110	L. Col. 6
iš-ša-a	?	KUB 37 108+110	L. Col. 8
ka-ḫu-ul	ka-ḫul	KUB 37 108+110	R. Col. 1
su-na-ni	su-a-ni	KUB 37 108+110	R. Col. 2
ni-ḡa ₂ -aq-q[a]	niḡ ₂ -ak	KUB 37 109	2
[uš-r]i-a	uš ₇ -ri-a	KUB 37 109	2
[di-i]m-ma-an-ni	(dumu)-diḡir-ra-ni	KUB 37 109	3
[gi-i]l-ga-mi-iš-še	^d Gilgameš _{2/3}	KUB 37 109	4
iš-še-ba(-)[...]	?	KUB 37 109	4
[a]-sa-al-lu-ḫi	^d asal-lu ₂ -ḫi	KUB 37 109	6
[lu-u]l-lu	lu ₂ -ulu ₃ / lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu	KUB 37 109	7
du-mu	dumu	KUB 37 109	7, 12
di-i[n-gi-ir-ra-ni]	diḡir-ra-ni	KUB 37 109	7, 9
ḫe ₂ -em-d[u [?]]	?	KUB 37 109	8
[si-l]i-ma-an-ni	silim-ma-ni	KUB 37 109	9
i-ni-im	inim	KUB 37 109	11

4.1.1.2 Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
ab-ba-si-il-le	a-ba-si-il-le	CTH 794	Obv. 1, 2, 3
-dal	-dar	CTH 794	Obv. 3
inim ^l -gal	inim-ḡar	CTH 794	Obv. 20
mu-un-ni	mu-un-ne	CTH 794	Rev. 3
nam-me-en	nam-en	CTH 794	Rev. 8
kiḡ ₂ ^l -b[u]-ru-ta	kiḡ ₂ -bur ₂ -ru-da	KBo 36 11+	Obv. 20
zi-ki-[ḡal ₂]	zi-ša ₃ -ḡal ₂	KBo 36 11+	Obv. 21
[šū-t]a-ga	šū-ta ₃ -ga	KBo 36 11+	Obv. 22
(-)gi-gi	(-)gi ₄ -gi ₄	KBo 36 11+	Obv. 24, 35
nam-ri-ma	nam-erim ₂	KBo 36 11+	Obv. 25, 30
(-)dub-dub-be ₂	(-)tub ₂ -tub ₂ -be ₂	KBo 36 11+	Obv. 26, 27, 36
dadag	da-da	KBo 36 11+	Obv. 29
za-za	za ₃	KBo 36 11+	Obv. 28
za ₃ -sī ₁₁	za ₃ -še ₃	KBo 36 11+	Obv. 31
su-gu ₂	su-gu ₇ (?)	KBo 36 11+	Obv. 33
sa-a	sa	KBo 36 11+	Obv. 36
saḡ-še	za ₃ -še ₃	KBo 36 11+	Obv. 37
a ₂ -šū-šū	a ₂ -su ₃ -su ₃	KBo 36 11+	Obv. 39
ka-an-s[i-il]	ga-an-si-il	KBo 36 11+ (KUB 37 100a)	Rev. 22
teḡ ₃ -ge-ta-a [?] -[ni [?]]	teḡ ₃ -ḡe ₂₆ -da-ni	KBo 36 11+ (KUB 37 100a)	Rev. 28
ta-na-ta	da-ni-ta (?)	KBo 36 11+ (KUB 37 100a)	Rev. 32, 33
uš-bi	uš ₂ -bi	KBo 36 11+ (KUB 37 100a)	Rev. 39

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
e ₂	a	KBo 36 11+ (KUB 37 100a)	Rev. 40
za-lim	ulutim ₂ /uktim (SIG ₇ ,ALAM)	KBo 36 11+ (KUB 37 100a)	Rev. 41
u-gug ₂	udug	KBo 36 11+ (KUB 37 100a)	Rev. 44-45
šu-nam-tar-<ra>-ga-a-ni	šu-nam-tar-ra-ka-ni	KBo 36 11+ (KUB 37 100a)	Rev. 20
^d dim ₃ -ma-me ²	^d dim ₃ -me-lagab	KUB 37 102	L. Col. 4
-ĝar-ra	-kar-ra	KUB 37 102	L. Col. 5

4.1.1.3 Hittite Script Tablets

4.1.1.3.1 Literary Texts

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
ma-aš-am-ši	maš-anše	CTH 314 - KUB 4 5	II, 7
niĝ ₂ -ur ₂ -lim ₃ -ma	niĝ ₂ -ur ₂ -limmu ₂	CTH 314 - KUB 4 5	II, 7
ki-ki	gi ₄ -gi ₄	CTH 314 - KUB 4 5	II, 8
ti-la-a-bi-iš-ši	til-la-bi-še ₃	CTH 314 - KUB 4 5	II, 8
lu-na-me	lu ₂ -na-me	CTH 314 - KUB 4 5	II, 9
in-pa-a-da	in-pa ₃ -da	CTH 314 - KUB 4 5	II, 10
du-uš-ka-ra	tuš-ĝar-ra	CTH 314 - KUB 4 5	II, 11
giri ₁₇ -za-al	giri ₁₇ -zal	CTH 314 - KUB 4 5	II, 12
iš-gur	^d iškur	CTH 314 - KUB 4 5	II, 12
ĥe-in-gal	ĥe ₂ -ĝal ₂	CTH 314 - KUB 4 5	II, 13
me-ta-ši-im-ši-im	mu-ta-šeĝ ₃ -šeĝ ₃	CTH 314 - KUB 4 5	II, 14
ka-la-ma	kalam-ma	CTH 314 - KUB 4 5	II, 15
ni-ig-g[e-(na-ni)-iš-ši]	niĝen-(na-ni)-še ₃	CTH 314 - KUB 4 5	II, 16
i-te-[en-na]	edin-na	CTH 314 - KUB 4 5	II, 18
a-ia	aia	CTH 314 - KUB 4 6	Obv. II, 1
iš-gur	^d iškur	CTH 314 - KUB 4 6	Obv. II, 1, 6
a-ni	diĝir-re-ne	CTH 314 - KUB 4 6	Obv. II, 4
ni-gal-a-ni	ni ₂ -gal-a-ni	CTH 314 - KUB 4 6	Obv. II, 4
nu-kal	abgal (NUN.ME)	CTH 314 - KUB 4 6	Obv. II, 4
ri-ib-x-ba	kala-ga	CTH 314 - KUB 4 6	Obv. II, 5
ga-lam-ma	kalam-ma	CTH 314 - KUB 4 6	Obv. II, 6
ku-gal	gu ₂ -gal	CTH 314 - KUB 4 6	Obv. II, 6
lu-gal	lugal	CTH 314 - KUB 4 6	Obv. II, 6
it-ta	i ₇ -da	CTH 314 - KUB 4 6	Obv. II, 7
[ga ²]-mu-ra-an-šu	ga-mu-ra-ab-šum ₂	CTH 315 - KUB 4 2	2
im-u-a-ab-ba ¹	im-a u ₄ a ₂ -ba	CTH 315 - KUB 4 2	3
[š]a-ag-ga-ak-ke	saĝ-ĝa ₂ -ke ₄	CTH 315 - KUB 4 2	4
zar-tab-ba	ĤE(sar ₂)-NUN(daba _x)	CTH 315 - KUB 4 2	5
ša-a	diri (SI.A)	CTH 315 - KUB 4 2	8
[za-l]a-qa	zalag-ga	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 28
a-ni-ma-za-an-qa-ak-ke	a-numun-saĝ-ĝa ₂ -ke ₄	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 33
e-m[u x x]	im-a u ₄ a ₂ -ba	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 33

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
am-ma-an-ku	ama-ĝu ₁₀	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 33 II, 41 II, 48
e-bu-ur	buru ₁₄	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 34
še-ag-na	še-gu-nu	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 34
za-ar-tap-pa	ĤE(sar ₂)-NUN(daba _x)	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 34
ki-ri	kiri ₆	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 35
la-li-(me-a)	la-la	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 35
a-ši-la	asila	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 35 II, 41
ša-a	diri (SI.A)	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 35 II, 41
a-šu-uĥ	ē ^ē u ₃ -suĥ ₅	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 36
ši-da-a	a-de ₂ -a	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 36
ši-da-q-q-a	šu ta ₃ -ga	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 36
pa-ra-za-an-kar	para ₁₀ -za ₃ -ĝar	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 37
ku-ru-um	gurun	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 37
mu-ut-ĥu	niĝ ₂ -tu-ĥu-um	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 37
za-an-ku	za ₃ -mu	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 37
[m]a-[š]a-ra	mu ₂ -sar-ra	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 38
pa-a	pa ₅	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 38
ti ² -a	tum ₂ -a	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 38
šen	saĝ	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	I, 39
ku-[u]k-ku	ku ₇ -ku ₇	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 39
ša ₃ -an-ki-ki-ne ₂	saĝ kiĝ ₂ -kiĝ ₂ -e	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 39
te-el-mu-na	delmun-na	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 39
[z]u-lum-	zu ₂ -lum-	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 39
lam-ma-qa-ma	4-kam	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 40
na-aš-ke-ma-am-ma-an-ku	ĝešgem-ama-ĝu ₁₀	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 40 II, 47
i-ši-en	izim	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 41
š[a-aš ² -gur]-ra	siškur-re	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 41
-a-ki-i-du	-a ₂ -ki-tu ₍₄₎	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 42
ĥu-us ₂ -sa-a	ĥuš-a	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 42
i-ki-	igi	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 42
ša ¹ -aš-gu[r]	siškur	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 42
du-um-mi-me	dumu-munus	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 43
ĥe ₂ -in-[gal-la]	ĥe ₂ -ĝal ₂	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 43
-ĥu-la	-ĥul ₂ -la	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 43
lu-gal	lugal	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 43
NI-in-NI-bu	?	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 43
ša-	ša ₃ -	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 43
ĥu-ul-ĥ[u]-la	ĥul ₂ -ĥul ₂ -la ₂	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 44
ki-e-ne ₂ -en-ti	ešemen (KI.E.NE.DI)	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 44
ki-en-te-me-en	ki-aĝ ₂ ša ₃ -ki-aĝ ₂	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 45
nu-ki-ki-it-ti	nu-gĭ ₄ -gĭ ₄ -da	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 45

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
am-ma-ni-še	ama-ni-še ₃	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 46
i-ni-im-[du]-u	inim-DU-a ²	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 46
ku-u-ra	gur-ra-(am ₃)	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 46
lu-na-am-ra	lu ₂ -nam-ra	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 46
e-e-qa-ma	5-kam-ma	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 47
qa-mu-ra-an-šum ₂	ga-mu-ra-ab-šum ₂	CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50	II, 47
ni ₃ -ḥuš	ni ₂ -ḥuš	KUB 4 7	1, 3
u ₃ -du ₂ -ud-ta	u ₃ -du ₂ -ud-da	KUB 4 7	4
^d nun-dim ₂ -mud	^d nu-dim ₂ -mud	KUB 4 7	9
me ₅ -lim ₄ -maḥ	me-lim ₄ -maḥ	KUB 4 7	11
mul ^l -mul ^l (-) ^E -NE	mul-ma-al-(?)	KUB 4 7	11
ḥe ₂ -za-a(-)za-a-e-me-en	ḥe ₂ -(?)za za-e-me-en	KUB 4 7	12
ša ₃ -dub-pa	ša ₃ -dub-ba	KUB 4 39	11
kut-ta	gu ₇ -da (?)	KUB 57 126	Obv. I, 2
[saḡ]-ki-kut-ta	saḡ-ki-gud-da	KUB 57 126	Obv. I, 3
a-uš	i ₃ -(e)-zu	KUB 57 126	Obv. I, 3
ad-	i ₇ -(d)	KUB 57 126	Obv. I, 8
ga-na	gana ₂	KUB 57 126	Obv. II, 2, 4
uš-kar	u ₄ -šakar	KUB 57 126	Obv. II, 2
ša-an-ki-ku-ut-ta	saḡ-ki-gud-da	KUB 57 126	Obv. II, 3
pa-a-na	pana	KUB 57 126	Obv. II, 4
ša-an-ku-uš-ši	saḡ-mu-še ₃	KUB 57 126	Obv. II, 5
mu-un-ta	gi-un-ta	KUB 57 126	Obv. II, 6
e-du[r...]	e ₂ -du ₃ -a	KUB 57 126	Obv. II, 8
ša-an	saḡ	KUB 57 126	Rev. II, 7

1 See Nougayrol 1968, 317: 32.

2 The Old Babylonian manuscripts have inim-DU-(a).

4.1.1.3.2 Incantations

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
lu-u-gal	lugal	HT 13 ¹	4, 5, 9, 10, 14
ab-zu	abzu	HT 13	5
nu-un-[gal-e-ne]	^d nun-gal-e-ne	KUB 4 24	Rev. 8
li-u[ḥ-a]	lu ₂ -ug ₇ -a (?)	KUB 4 24	Rev. 10
[tu-(du)]-a-ga-a-ni	tu ₆ -du ₁₁ -ga-a-ni	KUB 4 24	Rev. 10
lu-u-gal	lugal	KUB 4 26B	1, 4, 8, 9
ke-eš-tu-u ₄ -ku	ḡeštug _{2/3}	KUB 4 26B	3
ti-in-qa-ri-ni	diḡir-ra-ni	KUB 4 26B	7
ti-en-kar	diḡir	KUB 4 26B	10, 11
ki-iš-tu-ug	ḡeštug _{2/3}	KUB 4 26B	13
ul-la-al	?	KUB 4 26B	14
u-me-ni-en-zu	u ₃ -me-ni-en-zu	KUB 34 4	4
te-li	til	KUB 37 111	Obv. R. Col. 3
zi-iG-pa	saḡ-ba	KUB 37 111	Obv. R. Col. 5, 7
pax(GAM)-ta	pa ₃ -da	KUB 37 111	Obv. R. Col. 5

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
ḥu-u-la-a ²	?	KUB 37 111	Obv. R. Col. 7
bi-id-da ₂	bi- <su ₍₃₎ -su ₍₃₎ >-da-ta	KUB 37 111	Obv. R. Col. 9
i ₇ -ti	i ₇ -da	KUB 37 111	Obv. R. Col. 9
ba-su ₂ -šu-ud-ta	ba-su(3)-su(3)-da-ta	KUB 37 111	Obv. R. Col. 10
ab-ba-a	ab-ba	KUB 37 111	Obv. R. Col. 12
u ₂ -za-ag-ga	a su ₃ -ga	KUB 37 111	Obv. R. Col. 12
[na]-an-gub-ba	na-an-gub-be-(en)	KUB 37 111	Rev. R. Col. 3
na-an-tu-uš-ta-a	na-an-tuš-de ₃ -(en)	KUB 37 111	Rev. R. Col. 3
nam-ba-ki-ki-ti	nam-ba-gi ₄ -gi ₄ -de ₃ -(en)	KUB 37 111	Rev. R. Col. 4
nam-ba-še-šu-še-šu-de ₃	nam-ba-šu ₂ -šu ₂ -de ₃ -(en)	KUB 37 111	Rev. R. Col. 4
e ^l -ri-ba	i-ri-pa ₃	KUB 37 111	Rev. R. Col. 6
IZI	zi	KUB 37 111	Rev. R. Col. 6
e-ri-ib-ba	i-ri-pa ₃	KUB 37 111	Rev. R. Col. 8, 10
za-aG-pa	saĝ-ba	KUB 37 111	Rev. R. Col. 14
lu-gal	lugal	KUB 37 112	3
lu-u ₂ -gal	lugal	KUB 37 112	3

1 HT 13 (+) KUB 4 26B (+) KUB 37 112 contain other unorthographic writings but word boundaries cannot be clearly identified.
2 See § 5.3.10.

4.1.2 Emar

4.1.2.1 Syrian and Syro-Hittite Script Tablets

4.1.2.1.1 Literary Texts

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
en ^l -ki-ik-ke	^d enki-ke ₄	E 767	II, 1
ki-iš-ḥur-ḥu-r[e]	ĝeš-ḥur-ḥur-re	E 767	II, 1
sur-šu-r[e]	sur-sur-re	E 767	II, 2
te-em-ma	dima	E 767	II, 2
ti-gi-re-e-ni	diĝir-re-e-ne	E 767	II, 2
i ₃ -ig-gal-[a]	i ₃ -ĝal ₂ -la	E 767	II, 3
i-gi-du-ud-du ₅	igi-du-ta	E 767	II, 3
i-nim	inim	E 767	II, 3
u-du	u ₄ -da	E 767	II, 3
-igi-du-a-ni	-igi-du-ka-ni	E 767	I, 4
-i-gi-du-ga-an-ni	-igi-du-ka-ni	E 767	II, 4
ki-iš	ĝeš	E 767	II, 4, 13
lu-	lu ₂ -	E 767	II, 4
me-na-a	me-na-am ₃	E 767	II, 4
-tu-ka-a	-tuku-a	E 767	II, 4
[dir]i(g)-ia-na-an-ni	diri-ge-ne-ne (?)	E 767	II, 5
lu-gal	lugal	E 767	II, 5, 17
e-da-ra-ga- ^r an-ni ^r	e ₂ -da-ri ₂ -ke ₄ -ne-ne	E 767	II, 6
-e-ne	-ne-ne	E 767	I, 6
[e-u]r-ra-k[e]- ^r e ^r -en	e ₂ -ur ₃ -ra-ke ₄ -e-ne	E 767	II, 6
^r e ₂ - ^r da-ri ₂ -ke-e-ne	e ₂ -da-ri ₂ -ne-ne	E 767	I, 6

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
-ki-im	-gen ₇	E 767	II, 7
ša-ud-ta-	su ₃ -ud-da-	E 767	II, 7
me-na	na-me	E 767	I, 8
nu-un-zu-wa-a	nu-un-zu-a	E 767	II, 8
ni-ik-k[e]	niĝen	E 767	II, 9
da-ri-iš	da-ri ₂ -eš ₂	E 767	II, 10
nam-lu-x [...]	nam-lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu	E 767	II, 10
[x-(x)-d]a-e-de ₃	bi ₂ -in-da-e ₁₁ -de ₃	E 767	I, 12
nam-ka-lag	nam-kala-ga	E 767	II, 15a
e-ne-e-še-ta	i ₃ -ne-eš ₂	E 767	I, 17a
-e [˘] ni-e [˘] -ni	-e-ne	E 767	II, 17
e-ni-e-š[e]-ta	i ₃ -ne-eš ₂	E 767	I, 17a
u ₄ -saĝ ⁱ -ga-ta	u ₄ -saĝ-ĝa ₂ -ta	E 767	II, 17
-men ₅	-me-en	E 767	I, 18
nu-da-da-am-m[e-en]	nu-du ₂ -du ₂ -me-en	E 767	II, 18
-peš-ša-	-peš ₄ -a	E 767	II, 18
me-d[a-ri]	me-diri	E 767	II, 19a
na-ma-uš-ša	nam-uš ₂ -(a)	E 767	II, 19a
u-ga	ugu	E 767	II, 19a
za-la-aq-qa	zalag-ga	E 767	II, 19
ku-ru-uš	ĝuruš	E 767	II, 20
šu-zi-gir-še	?	E 767	II, 20
ti-kar-	diĝir-	E 767	II, 20
lu-ul-bi	li ^{ib} LUL	E 767	I, II, 21, 22
mu-un-na-ak-ke	mu-un-na-ak-e	E 767	II, 21
ša-ra	šar-ra	E 767	I, II, 21
zi-ki-ib-ta	? ¹	E 767	I, II, 21
ša	ša ₃	E 767	II, 22
-ḥu-la-al	-ḥul ₂ -la ₂	E 767	II, 22
u ₂	u ₄	E 767	II, 22
u ₃ -šar-šar	šar ₂ ×u=3600×10	E 767	II, 22
u ₃ -ser ₃ -ser ₃	šar ₂ ×u=3600×10	E 767	I, 22
za-[-...]- [˘] il ₂ [˘]	(niĝ ₂)-saĝ-ki-il ₂ -la	E 767	I, 22
za-an-ki-el-la	(niĝ ₂)-saĝ-ki-il ₂ -la	E 767	II, 22
lu-u ₂ -tur-ra-bi	lu ₂ -tur-ra-bi	E 767	I, II, 23
[˘] i ₃ [˘] -in-gen ₇ ¹⁷	e-ne-gen ₇	E 767	I, 23
i ₃ -in-ke	e-ne-gen ₇	E 767	II, 23
[˘] e [˘] -[e]n-ni	e-ne	E 767	II, 24
ge-na	ĝen-na	E 767	II, 24
ki-iš-ḥu-ur	ĝeš-ḥur	E 767	II, 24
[nam]- [˘] lu-ul-lu [˘]	nam-lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu	E 767	II, 24
u ₂ -za-an-du	usandu (ḤU.DU ₃)	E 768A	II, 1
ib-ta-na ₂	ib ₂ -ta-na ₂	E 768A	I, 2
ib-ta-na	ib ₂ -ta-na ₂	E 768A	II, 2
in-ta-ba-an-ki	im-ma-(ta [˘])-an-ĝi ₄	E 768A	I, 3

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
u-du	^d utu	E 768A	II, 3, 4
i-zi-...]	izim	E 768A	II, 4
za-la-aq-qa	zalag	E 768A	II, 4
ib-dib-ba	ib ₂ -dib-ba	E 768A	I, 5
ib-te-...]	ib ₂ -dib-ba	E 768A	II, 5
mu-š[i-in-x-]-a	mušen-ḫi-a ²	E 768A	II, 5
[du]-mu-ḡu ₁₀	dumu-ḡu ₁₀	E 768A	II, 6
ib-...]	ib-...]	E 768A	I, II, 6
buru ₃ -mušen-e-ne	buru ₄ ^{mušen} -e-ne	E 768A	I, 7
bu-ru-e-en-ni	buru ₄ ^(mušen) -e-ne	E 768A	II, 7
buru ₃ -mušen-...]	buru ₄ ^{mušen}	E 769	7
mi-en-na-a	me-en-am ₃	E 770	3
duq-qa-gen ₇	du ₁₁ -ga-gen ₇	E 770	8
ḫe-ib-[tar-re]	ḫe ₂ -ib ₂ -tar-re	E 771+	11
ḫe-a	ḫe ₂ -a	E 771+	24
ki-u ₄ -ta-ta	ki-u ₄ -da-ta	E 771+	25
e'-na	en-na	E 771+	26
i ₃ -in-eš ₂	i-ne-eš ₂	E 771+	26
til ₃ -la-e-ni	til ₃ -la-ni	E 771+	26
ub-be ₂	ul ₄ -le	E 771+	28
mu-tal ₂	mu-zal	E 773	3
ḫe-mu ₂ -me-en-na-an-da	?	E 775	2
ḫe ₂ -ne-tar-re	ḫe ₂ -ni-tar-re	E 775	3
nu-bal(a)-ta	nu-bala-e-da	E 775	3
an-na	an-e	E 775	8
ne-ne	?	E 775	10
gi-dub-ba-a	gi-dub-ba	E 775	11
edin-na	edin-e	E 775	16
a-na	a-an	E 775	19
ga-a-ni-šur-ra-ke ₄	ga-ni-šur-ra ak (?)	E 775	19
gu-la-kam ₂	gu-la-am ₃	E 775	20
mu-un-DU-a-DU	?	E 775	22
tum-	tum ₂	E 775	22
ḡa ₂ -ra	ḡar-ra	E 775	23
ti-la-ši	til ₃ -la-še ₃	E 775	23
ni-ta-aḫ-aq-qa-...]	nita(ḫ)-kala-ga	E 776	3
kala-ke	kala-ge	E 776	4
mu-un-ke-ne ₂ -e	mu-un-ge-ne ₂	E 776	4
ni-in-gur	niḡ ₂ -gur ₁₁	TBR 101	Obv. 2
ši-ma-aš-ki	šimaški (LU ₂ .SU.(A))	TBR 101	Obv. 3
t[i-(in)-gi-ir]	diḡir	TBR 101	Obv. 3
nu-ke-eg	nu-geg	TBR 101	Obv. 4
e-ri-ma-a-ni	erin ₂ -a-ni	TBR 101	Obv. 5
nu-un-ku-a-ni	numun-a-ni	TBR 101	Obv. 6
al-du-uš	al-tuš	TBR 101	Obv. 8

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
du-uk-ta	taka ₄ -(a-bi)	TBR 101	Rev. 4
tu-ku-ut-t[a]	taka ₄ -(a-bi)	TBR 101	Rev. 5

1 See Alster 2005, 318: 21.

2 This reading is adopted because it is attested in the standard orthography version, but it is obviously incorrect in Sumerian, see § 6.2.3.

4.1.2.1.2 Incantations

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
-e ₃ -de ₃	-e-de ₃	E 729	1, 2
mu _x -mu _x	mu ₇ -mu ₇	E 729	3
ḥa-a	ḥe ₂ -a	E 729	5
in-na-an-ga	en-nu-uḡ ₃	E 729	5
ḥe ₂ -en-da ₃ -su ₂ -ge-eš	ḥe ₂ -en-ta-su ₈ -su ₈ -ge-eš	E 729	6
nin-<a>-gub-ba	nin-a-gub ₂ -ba	E 729	8
e-re-a	eri/iri-a	E 729	11
e-re-e-du-ga-	eridu-ga	E 729	12
tiḡ ₄ -ke-ta-mu-ni	teḡ ₃ /tiḡ ₄ -ḡe ₂₆ -da-mu-ne	E 729	14
ʾzuʾ-zu-ta-ni	zu-mu-da-ne (?)	E 729	14
-e-ri-du-ga	eridu-ga	E 729	15
šu-bu-da ₃ -mu-ni	šub-bu-da-mu-ne	E 729	15
[kuʾ di-m]u-ni	gu ₃ di-mu-ne	E 729	16
ra-ra-ta-mu-ʾniʾ	ra-ra-da-mu-ne	E 729	16
mu-un-niḡ[en]-ʾnaʾ-aš ₂	mu-un-niḡen ₍₂₎ -niḡen ₍₂₎ -ne-eš	E 729	24
baʾ-anʾ-du-gaz	ba-an-da-gaz	E 729	26
mu-un-zi-ge-eš	mu-un-sag ₃ -ge-eš	E 729	26
ʾšu-gegʾ	zu ₂ -geg	E 729	41
mu-gib (Emesal)	mu-gib ₃	E 733	8
mu-nu-še	?	E 733	14
ti-el-la-ga-an-ni	til-la-ke ₄ -e-ne	E 734	2
ki-da-an-ni	gid ₂ -da-ni	E 734	3
za-aš	za ₃ -še ₃	E 734	3
da-ra	da-ri ₂ -a (?)	E 734	4
it-ti	iti (?)	E 734	4
nu-mu-un-du-we	nu-mu-un-du _(8?) -e	E 734	5
nu-mu-un-pa-ap-li-ia	nu-mu-un-bala-bala-e-(da)	E 734	6
uš-	uš ₇ -	E 734	7
du-u-ga	du ₁₀ -ga	E 734	8
nu-mu-un-ba-da-en-ze ₂ -en	nu-mu-un-pa ₃ -de ₃ -en-ze ₂ -en	E 734	10
nu-gib	nu-geg / mu-gib ₃	E 740	2
ḥe ₂ -en-da-gub	ḥe ₂ -en-ta-gub	E 743	3
gan-me-ta	gan-me-da	E 751	5
ša ₂ -gu	?	Tsukimoto	25
pa-da-dal	ba-da-dal	Tsukimoto	37
i-ki-du (2)	igi-ḡu ₁₀	Tsukimoto	37
ba-da-an-za-aḥ	ba-da-(an)-zaḥ ₂	Tsukimoto	37

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
me-te	me-še ₃ (?)	Tsukimoto	37
an-nu	an	Tsukimoto	38
u ₂ -min	imin	Tsukimoto	38
u ₂ -me-en (2)	imin	Tsukimoto	38
bar-da	bar-ta	Tsukimoto	38
i-ki	igi	Tsukimoto	38
-gu-ub	-gub	Tsukimoto	40

4.1.3 Ugarit⁹³⁰

4.1.3.1 Babylonian Script Tablets

4.1.3.1.1 Literary Texts

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
ʾi ₃ ʾ-ti ₂ -eš	i-ti(l) ₃ -eš	RS 25.130	3
nu-peš ₄ -peš ₄ -e-ne	nu-peš ₄ -peš ₄ -me-eš	RS 25.130	5
šu-kur ₂	šu-kar ₂	RS 25.130	30
-kur-	-ukur ₃ -	RS 25.130	36

4.1.3.1.2 Incantations

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
dar-da-rak-ku	dar-dar-ra-ĝu ₁₀	AuOrS 23 25	12
u ₂ -sun ₂ -na-pi	usan-bi	AuOrS 23 25	12
si-ga-ab	sag ₃ -ga-ab (?)	AuOrS 23 25	13
si-li-ib	?	AuOrS 23 25	13
ap-pap-ma-aš ₂	pap-meš	AuOrS 23 25	14
ḫe ₂ -kul-la	ḫe ₂ -gul-la	AuOrS 23 25	14
ḫa-za-ar-na-aš ₂	?	AuOrS 23 25	22, 23, 24
im-te-mu	im-te-mu ₄ (?)	AuOrS 23 25	36
im-te-ta	im-te-ta ₃	AuOrS 23 25	36
kal-la	gurus	AuOrS 23 25	37
nu-i ₃ -zu	nu-e-zu	AuOrS 23 25	43-44
-ke	-ke ₄	AuOrS 23 25	51
-ku	-ke ₄	AuOrS 23 25	52
^d u ₂ -u ₂ -u ₄ -du	^d utu	AuOrS 23 27	7
a-ga	aĝ ₂ -a	AuOrS 23 27	14
e ₂ -ḫal-la-ak-e	e ₂ -ḫal-la-ke ₄	AuOrS 23 59	3

⁹³⁰ As far as AuOrS 23 21 is concerned, only phonetic writings from Sumerian (§§ 6, 8) and partially written Sumerian incantations (§§ 1, 3) are listed in the table, see § 7.3.7.

4.1.3.2 Ugarit Script Tablets

4.1.3.2.1 Literary Texts

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
-še	-še ₃	RS 17.10	Obv. 4
-du-uš-ša ₂ -a	-tuš-a	RS 17.10	Obv. 5
[ki?]-in ^ˀ -nim-kalam-kalam-ab-bi	ki niĝ ₂ -galam-galam-ma-bi	RS 17.10	Obv. 7
-ba-ba-ta	-pa ₃ -pa ₃ -da	RS 17.10	Obv. 8
ni-ik-ki	niĝ ₂	RS 17.10	Obv. 9
-bi-i-di	-bi-da	RS 17.10	Obv. 10
mu-un-za-am-za-a	mu-un-na-an-šen-šen	RS 17.10	Obv. 10
[d]al-dal-bi	dul-dul-bi	RS 17.10	Obv. 11
de-en-ni-ig	dinig	RS 17.10	Obv. 12
ka-<aš>-al-ḥi-a	gi-šul-ḥi-a	RS 17.10	Obv. 12
ri-iq-qa	riĝ ₇ -ga	RS 17.10	Obv. 13
na-aš-ki	ĝeš-gi	RS 17.10	Obv. 14
na-aš-bi-<ša>-a	ĝeš-peš-a	RS 17.10	Obv. 14
[igi-zu-u]n-na-an-ti-ki-aš	igi-zu na-ba-an-tiĝ ₄ -ĝa ₂ -(aš)	RS 17.10	Obv. 16
-ki-	-gi ₄ -	RS 17.10	Obv. 16
nu-uz-za-a	nu-zu-a	RS 17.10	Obv. 17
nam-dub-sar-re-eš-še	nam-dub-sar-ra-še ₃	RS 17.10	Obv. 18
šu bur-ra	šu bur ₂ -ra	RS 17.10	Rev. 1
at-ta-an-ni	ad-da-ni	RS 17.10	Rev. 2
gu-ru-uš ^ˀ	ĝuruš	RS 23.34+	A, 4
ga-la-[...]	ga-ra-an-zu	RS 23.34+	A, 5
a-li-im	isiš ₂ (A.IGI)	RS 23.34+	A, 6
ša-ra	šar-ra	RS 23.34+	A, 6
zi-k[i-ib]-ti	?	RS 23.34+	A, 6
lu-ul-bi	?	RS 23.34+	A, 7
ḥu-ul-la	ḥul ₂ -la	RS 23.34+	A, 8
saĝ-ki-il-la	niĝ ₂ -saĝ-il ₂ -la	RS 23.34+	A, 8
ḥe-in-du	ḥe ₂ -en-du	RS 23.34+	A, 9
u ₂ -	u ₄ -	RS 23.34+	A, 9
mi-nim-ru [?]	mi-ni-diri	RS 23.34+	A, 11
i ₃ -[i]g-gu	e-ne-gen ₇	RS 23.34+	A, 12
en-na	e-ne	RS 23.34+	A, 14
nam-u ₁₈ -lu- ^ˀ lu ^ˀ	nam-lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu	RS 23.34+	A, 14
ki-i[n-na]	ĝen-na	RS 23.34+	A, 15
te-[em...]	dima	RS 23.34+	B 3
u ₂ -tu	u ₄ -da	RS 23.34+	B, 5
^ˀ lu ^ˀ	lu ₂	RS 23.34+	B, 6
me-e-tum	me-na	RS 23.34+	B, 6
ki-iš	ĝeš	RS 23.34+	B, 7
luḥ-ba-an-[...]	la-ba-an-[...]	RS 23.34+	B, 7
lu-gal	lugal	RS 23.34+	B, 8

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
-ni-in-ni	-(e)-ne-ne	RS 23.34+	B, 8
e-ur-ra-ga- [˘] an-ni [˘]	e ₂ -ur ₃ -ra-ke ₄ -ne-ne	RS 23.34+	B, 10
[a]n-š ₂ -u ₄ -ta- [˘] ke [˘] -[...]	an-su ₃ -u ₄ -da-gen ₇	RS 23.34+	B, 11
u ₄ -ta	u ₄ -da	RS 23.34+	B, 12
lu-ga-la-gu	lugal-ĝu ₁₀	RS 79.25	1
ti-il-la	til ₃ -la	RS 79.25	1
-gi-id-du ₅	-gid ₂ -da	RS 79.25	2
u ₂ -mu	u ₄ -	RS 79.25	2
ħa-a	ħe ₂ -a	RS 79.25	2, 3
-aħ-bi-lu	-gibil	RS 79.25	3
u ₂ -mi-za-	mu-mu-za	RS 79.25	3
il-li-il	^d en-lil ₂	RS 79.25	4
šu nam-ba-le-e	šu nam-bal-le-de ₃	RS 79.25	4
(šu-)nam-tar-ta-re-e-ni	nam-tar-re-de ₃	RS 79.25	5
ka-du-gi-ni	ka-du ₁₀ -ga-ni	RS 79.25	6
mu-li-li	^d mu-ul-lil ₂	RS 79.25	6
šu-da-ia-ku	šudu ₃ -ak	RS 79.25	6
kala-ma	kalam-ma	RS 79.25	7
šu-da-ia-ak	šudu ₃ -ak	RS 79.25	7
ti-ga-ar	diĝir	RS 79.25	7
a-ru-ri	^d a-ru-ru	RS 79.25	8
-du-ud-du ₅	-du ₈ -du ₈	RS 79.25	8
e-re-eš	ereš	RS 79.25	8, 25
ma-aħ	maħ	RS 79.25	8, 25
[a-š]a-lu-uħ-ħe ₂	^d asal-lu ₂ -ħi	RS 79.25	10
e-kur	e ₂ -kur	RS 79.25	10
a-ša-a-li	^d asal	RS 79.25	12
ma-an-a-gal-ta-qa-a	ĝal ₂ mu-un-taka ₄ -a	RS 79.25	12-13
ab-zu-ke	abzu-ke ₄	RS 79.25	14
in-ki	^d en-ki	RS 79.25	14
lu-gal	lugal	RS 79.25	14, 21, 44
gi-il-tun ₃	ĝeštug _{2/3} (?)	RS 79.25	15
-du ₅	-du ₁₀	RS 79.25	15
la-le-e	la-la	RS 79.25	16
a-nu-	^d an	RS 79.25	17
-ga-al	-gal	RS 79.25	17
-zu	-si	RS 79.25	17
la-li-a-ni	la-la-a-ni	RS 79.25	18
ta-a-bi	du ₃ -a-bi	RS 79.25	18
-kur-ku-ra-ak-ka	-kur-kur-ra-ke ₄	RS 79.25	19
su-pa-	sipa-	RS 79.25	19
u ₂ -du	^d utu	RS 79.25	19
ħe-za-la-qa	ħe-zalag ₂ -ge	RS 79.25	20
u ₄ -za-la-qa-ka	u ₄ -zalag ₂ -(ga)-gen ₇	RS 79.25	20
[a-k]a	^d ak	RS 79.25	21

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
-gi-du-ba-a	-gi-dub-ba	RS 79.25	21
-gi-da	-gid ₂ -da	RS 79.25	22
ta-r[i]	tar	RS 79.25	22
a-[kala-zu]	a ₂ -kala-zu	RS 79.25	23
ni-nu-ur-ta	^d nin-urta	RS 79.25	23
ka-la-qa-e-ni	kala-ge-de ₃	RS 79.25	24
[i ² -n]a-na	^d inana	RS 79.25	25
ḥu-uš	ḥuš	RS 79.25	26
su-lu-um	su-lim	RS 79.25	26
gi-in-ni-in-mi-ni	ḡe ₆ ni ₂ me-lim ₄	RS 79.25	27
a-te-na	edin-e	RS 79.25	28
ni ₂ -te-na	ni ₂ -te-a-ni	RS 79.25	28
-ki-im	gen ₇	RS 79.25	29
a-ia-i-du	a-i ₇ -da	RS 79.25	29, 30
za-e-me-in	za-e-me-en	RS 79.25	31
du-ga	du ₁₁ -ga	RS 79.25	32
i	i ₇	RS 79.25	32
ḥe-gal	ḥe ₂ -ḡal ₂	RS 79.25	34, 44
-ḥu-la	-ḥul ₂ -la	RS 79.25	35
ša-	ša ₃ -	RS 79.25	35
ku-ug-bi	gu ₂ -un-bi	RS 79.25	36
i-da-me-en	i ₇ -da-me-en	RS 79.25	37
u ₂ -na-me-e	mu nam-mu	RS 79.25	39
i-da-[na-mi-da]	iti nam-iti	RS 79.25	40
u ₂ -da-gi	u ₄ -da-kam	RS 79.25	40
ki-il-za	gil-sa	RS 79.25	41
u ₂ -du-ra-am-me	u ₄ -da-ra-am	RS 79.25	42
ḥe ₂ -ga-al	ḥe ₂ -ḡal ₂	RS 79.25	43
iz-kur	^d iškur	RS 79.25	44
nu-dim-ma	nu-dim ₂ -ma	RS 86.2210	I, § 1
ki-	gi-	RS 86.2210	I, § 3
gi-ku-du- [...]	^g ge ₂ -ma ₂ -šū ₂ -a (?)	RS 86.2210	II, § 3
ni-ge-na	niḡen-na	RS 86.2210	II, § 3
si-si-id-[da]	zi-zi-da	RS 86.2210	II, § 3
du-ma	tum ₂ -ma	RS 86.2210	II, § 4
dur	dur ₂	RS 86.2210	I, § 4
ga-pa-a	gab-a	RS 86.2210	II, § 5
kar-kar	gir ₅ -gir ₅	RS 86.2210	II, § 5
ma-aš-rab-ba	maš-tab	RS 86.2210	II, § 5
pa-a-tar	ba-tar	RS 86.2210	I, § 5
pa-ta	ba-tar	RS 86.2210	II, § 5
ur-ku-ul-la	ur-gu-la	RS 86.2210	II, § 6
ba-an-gu	ba-an-ku ₄	RS 86.2210	II, § 7
gu-gu-ut-ta	ku ₅ -ku ₅ -de ₃	RS 86.2210	II, § 7
gi-ri	giri ₁₇	RS 86.2210	II, §§ 7-8

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
ḥa-am-bu-ru-ud-da-ni-iš	ḥabrud-da-ne ₂ -eš ₂	RS 86.2210	II, § 7
ku-ku-ut-ta	ku ₅ -ku ₅ -de ₃	RS 86.2210	I, § 7
zi-an-ni	zi-a-ni	RS 86.2210	I, II, § 7
-da	-du ₈	RS 86.2210	I, § 8
ga ^(a)	ka ₅ ^a	RS 86.2210	II § 8, 9
i-ki	igi	RS 86.2210	II, § 8
-ge-en-na	-ĝen-na	RS 86.2210	II, § 9
u ₂ -gu-uš-še	ugu-še ₃	RS 86.2210	II, § 9
[da]m-lugal-ke ₄	dam-lugal-la-ke ₄	RS 86.2210	I, § 10
da-am	dam	RS 86.2210	II, § 10
lu-gal-la-[ke]	lugal	RS 86.2210	II, § 10
u ₂ -du-ud-[da]	u ₃ -du ₂ -ud-da	RS 86.2210	II, § 10
al-la-al	al-lal ₂	RS 86.2210	I, § 11
e-	e ₂ -	RS 86.2210	II, § 11

4.1.3.2.2 Incantations

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
e-ni-nu-ru ₃	en ₂ -e ₂ -nu-ru	AuOrS 23 13	1
nu-tu ₄ -ga	nu-du ₁₁ -ga	AuOrS 23 13	2
i-na-ka-re	i ₃ -na-kar-e	AuOrS 23 13	3, 4
ka-la	kala(g)	AuOrS 23 13	5
si-il-lal-i-kat-ta	asila-ka-ta	AuOrS 23 21	6
i-ri-du-ka-ak-ke	eridu-ka-ke ₄	AuOrS 23 21	7
niĝ ₂ -nu-saĝ-ga	niĝ ₂ -nu-sa ₆ -ga	AuOrS 23 21	7
ta-mu-zi-ig	dumu-zi(g)	AuOrS 23 21	7
-aš	-še ₃	AuOrS 23 21	8
ki-ik-ki	ĝi ₄ -ĝi ₄	AuOrS 23 21	8
niĝ ₂ -nu-ti-il-la-ag-ga	niĝ ₂ -nu-til ₃ -la-ka	AuOrS 23 21	8
šu nu-tu-ga-ga	šu nu-du ₁₀ -ga-ka	AuOrS 23 21	8
zi-nam-nu-na-ku-ru-na	?	AuOrS 23 21	46
it-te-ta-ni-eš	i ₃ -te-da-ni-eš ₂	AuOrS 23 21	47
du-mu	dumu	AuOrS 23 21	54
e-ri-du-ga	eridu-ga	AuOrS 23 21	54
lu-ul-lu-ra-da-ke	lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu-ra ₂ -da-ke ₄ ¹	AuOrS 23 21	55
si-la-a-e	sil-a-e	AuOrS 23 21	55
ba ^l -ri-an-teĝ ₃	bara-an-teĝ ₃ -(ĝe ₂₆)	AuOrS 23 21	67
ḥa-an-da-bu-re	ḥa-an-da-bur ₂ -re	AuOrS 23 21	67
ḥa-an-du-bu-ra	ḥa-an-da-bur ₂ -ra	AuOrS 23 21	67
bur-bur-ni-ik-ke	bar-bar-e-ne-ke ₄	AuOrS 23 21	68
pi-in-du	bi ₂ -in-du ₈	AuOrS 23 21	68
ab-su-ke	abzu-ke ₄	AuOrS 23 21	69
[en-ki]-ik-ke	^d enki-ke ₄	AuOrS 23 21	69
lu-gal	lugal	AuOrS 23 21	69
mu-um-mu-ke	mu ₄ -mu ₄ -(ke ₄)	AuOrS 23 21	69
ni-ig-gi-ri-ma-re-eš	niĝ ₂ -ĝir ₂ -ĝar-eš ₂	AuOrS 23 21	69

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
a-še-in-zu	uš ₇ -nu-zu (?)	AuOrS 23 21	70
[a-sa-ki-i]k-ku	a ₂ -sag ₃ -ge	AuOrS 23 21	70
ḥa-an-da-bur-re	ḥa-an-da-bur ₂ -re	AuOrS 23 21	70
ḥe ₂ -RU	ḥe ₂ -pa ₃ (IGI.RU)	AuOrS 23 21	70
ki-ia	ki-a	AuOrS 23 21	70, 97
aš-gar ₃	aš-ĝar	AuOrS 23 21	79
<gu>-u ₂ -ru-ud-ta	gurud-da	AuOrS 23 21	79
ne-zu	nu-zu	AuOrS 23 21	79
saĝ-ke-dab	saĝ-geg-dab	AuOrS 23 21	79
lu-u ₂ -	lu ₂ -	AuOrS 23 21	80
lu-u ₂ -	nu-	AuOrS 23 21	80
lu-ug-gen ₇	lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu-gen ₇	AuOrS 23 21	80
mu-un-du-du	mu-un-du ₆ -du ₆	AuOrS 23 21	80
ti-kar	diĝir	AuOrS 23 21	80
-tu-ku-ra	-tuku-ra	AuOrS 23 21	80
a-lim	alam	AuOrS 23 21	81
ku ¹ -u ₂ -ba-ni	gub-ba-ni	AuOrS 23 21	81
mu-ut-ta-ša-a	mud-da-še ₃	AuOrS 23 21	81
nu-k[e-eš-da]	nu-keš ₂ -da	AuOrS 23 21	81
si-la-si-si-an-	sil-a-si-sa ₂	AuOrS 23 21	81
mu-saĝ-ĝa ₂	muš-a-ĝa ₂	AuOrS 23 21	82
mu-saĝ-ke	muš-a-gen ₇	AuOrS 23 21	82
a-ia-an-ni-gi-re-a-ab-ba-sag ₁₀ -ga	aia-ni ^d enki-ra e ₂ -a ba-ši-ku ₄ -a	AuOrS 23 21	83
i-gi	igi	AuOrS 23 21	83
ku mu-n[a-de]	gu ₂ mu-na-de ₂	AuOrS 23 21	83
muš-šu	mu-šum ₂	AuOrS 23 21	83
a-ia-ku	aia-ĝu ₁₀	AuOrS 23 21	84
a-ra-me-ek-mu-aš-šu	a-ra ₂ -min-kam ₂ -aš	AuOrS 23 21	84
-gi-gi	-gi ₄ -gi ₄	AuOrS 23 21	85
in-ki	^d enki	AuOrS 23 21	85, 87
a-na-a	a-na-am ₃	AuOrS 23 21	86
an	ana	AuOrS 23 21	86
ga-ra-bi-ta-aḥ-ḥe	ga-ra-ab-taḥ-e	AuOrS 23 21	86
na-i-zu	na-e-zu	AuOrS 23 21	86
tu-mu-ga	dumu-ĝu ₁₀	AuOrS 23 21	86
za	za-e	AuOrS 23 21	86
ka	ĝa ₂ -e	AuOrS 23 21	87
ni-ga-e-za-i	niĝ ₂ -ĝa ₂ -e i ₃ -zu-(a-ĝu ₁₀)	AuOrS 23 21	87
li-UR-ma	?	AuOrS 23 21	90
u ₂ -me-na-si ₁₂ -si ₁₂	u ₃ -me-ni-si ₁₂ -si ₁₂	AuOrS 23 21	91
giz-za-na	i ₃ -ĝeš-ta (?)	AuOrS 23 21	92
u ₂ -me-na-ḥe ₂ -ḥe ₂	u ₃ -me-ni-ḥi-ḥi	AuOrS 23 21	92
saĝ-ĝa ₂ -gu ₂ -bi	saĝ-ki-a ₂ -gub-bi	AuOrS 23 21	93
ti-iš-bur	?	AuOrS 23 21	93

Phonetic Writing	Standard Orthography	Source	Line
šu-un-ni	šu-ni	AuOrS 23 21	94
sa-si-qa	za ₃ -sa _g ₁₀ -ga	AuOrS 23 21	95
za-al-za-al-li-bi	zal-zal-a-bi	AuOrS 23 21	95

1 Cf. Arnaud 2007, 85: 55.

4.2 Graphic Alterations

Graphic alterations are here defined as modifications of the Sumerian standard orthography which do not produce phonetic shifts.

4.2.1 Homophony

Under homophony are listed words spelled out with signs that are homophones of logograms used in standard orthography. Sign values added over time through the extension of the cuneiform system to different languages, primarily Akkadian, will not be considered as homophones.⁹³¹ Examples from Old Babylonian texts are not given here as homophony is by far the most prevalent alteration and is common to all sources.⁹³²

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- **a** ~ a₂ in a-šu-g[i-ri²-a(n)²-ni] ~ a₂-šu-ḡiri₃-a-ni – KUB 30 4, R. Col. 13
- **i**- ~ i₃- in i-bu-bu ~ i₃-bu₍₂₎-bu₍₂₎ – KUB 30 1, I, 4
- **lu** ~ lu₂ – KUB 30 1, I, 9, 16
- **lu** ~ lu₂ – KBo 36 13, L. Col. 12
- **lu-** ~ lu₂- in lu-ul-lu-bi ~ lu₂-ulu₃ / lu₂-u₁₈-lu – KBo 36 13, R. Col. 9
- **lu-** ~ lu₂- in lu-ul-lu-bi ~ lu₂-ulu₃ / lu₂-u₁₈-lu – KBo 36 15 Rev. 2
- **lu-** ~ lu₂- in lu-ul-lu ~ lu₂-ulu₃ / lu₂-u₁₈-lu – KUB 30 1, I, 14
- **lu-** ~ lu₂- in lu-ul-lu ~ lu₂-ulu₃ / lu₂-u₁₈-lu – KUB 30 2, II, 4
- mu-un-ši-ib-**gu** ~ mu-un-ši-ib-gu₇ – KUB 30 2, I, 8
- **-si** ~ -si₃ – KUB 30 1, I, 20
- **-su** ~ su₃ in a-an-su ~ an-su₃⁹³³ – KUB 30 1, II, 2
- **uš** ~ uš₇ – KUB 30 1, I, 10, 11, 12
- **uš-** ~ uš₇- in uš-ra-a ~ uš₇-ri-a – KUB 30 1, I, 5
- **uš-** ~ uš₇- in uš-ra-a-bi ~ uš₇-ri-a-bi – KBo 36 13, R. Col. 4
- **uš-zu** ~ uš₇-zu – KUB 30 1, II, 4

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- (-)**gi-gi** ~ (-)gi₄-gi₄ – KBo 36 11+ Obv. 24, 35
- su-**gu**₂ ~ su-gu₇ (?) – KBo 36 11+ Obv. 33
- [šu-**t**]a-ga ~ šu-ta₃-ga – KBo 36 11+ Obv. 22
- **uš-bi** ~ uš₂-bi – KBo 36 11+ Rev. 39

931 For instance the sign NE will not be considered a homophone of ni with value ni₅, but it can be considered a homophone of bi as the reading bi₂ is not a secondary value.

932 See Krecher 1966a, 43.

933 For this word see Geller 1989, 203: 44.

Hittite Script Tablets

- **-ke** ~ -ke₄ *in* a-ni-ma-za-an-qa-ak-ke - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 33
- **lu-na-me** ~ lu₂-na-me - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 9
- **lu-** ~ lu₂ *in* lu-na-am-ra ~ lu₂-nam-ra - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 46
- **lu-** ~ lu₂- *in* lu-gal ~ lugal - KUB 37 112, 3
- **lu-** ~ lu₂- *in* lu-u₂-gal ~ lugal - KUB 37 112, 3
- **me**₅-lim₄-maḥ ~ me-lam₄-maḥ - KUB 4 7, 11
- **ni-gal-a-ni** ~ ni₂-gal-a-ni - CTH 314 - KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 4
- **ša-** ~ ša₃- - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 43
- **u** ~ u₄ *in* im-u-a-ab-ba ~ im-a u₄ a₂-ba - CTH 315 - KUB 4 2, 3
- **u-me-ni-en-zu** ~ u₃-me-ni-en-zu - KUB 34 4, 4
- **[z]u-lum-** ~ zu₂-lum- - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 39

Emar

- **buru**₃-mušen-[...] ~ buru₄^{mušen} - E 769, 7
- **buru**₃-mušen-e-ne ~ buru₄^{mušen}-e-ne - E 768A, I, 7
- **-da**₃- ~ -da- *in* šu-bu-da₃-mu-ni ~ šub-bu-da-mu-ne - E 729, 15
- **du-** ~ du₁₀- *in* du-u-ga ~ du₁₀-ga - E 734, 8
- **-e**₃-de₃ ~ -e-de₃ - E 729, 1, 2
- [x(x)-d]a-e-de₃ ~ [bi₂-in-da]-e[₁₁-de₃] - E 767, I, 12⁹³⁴
- **-gur** *in* ni-in-gur ~ niĝ₂-gur₁₁ - TBR 101 Obv. 2
- **ḥe**-a ~ ḥe₂-a - E 771+, 24
- **ḥe-ib**-[tar-re] ~ ḥe₂-ib₍₂₎-tar-re - E 771+, 11
- **ib-** ~ ib₂- *in* ib-ta-na₂ / ib-ta-na - E 768A, I, II, 2
- **ib-** ~ ib₂- *in* ib-dib-ba - E 768A, I, 5
- **ib-** ~ ib₂- *in* ib-te-[...] ~ ib₂-dib-ba - E 768A, II, 5
- **ib-** ~ ib₂- *in* ib-[...] - E 768A, II, 6
- **lu-** ~ lu₂- - E 767, II, 4
- **-lu-** ~ -lu₂- *in* nam-lu-x [...] ~ nam-lu₂-u₁₈-lu - E 767, II, 10
- **-lu-** ~ -lu₂- *in* [nam]-lu-ul-lu' ~ nam-lu₂-u₁₈-lu - E 767, II, 24
- mu-**gib** (Ēmesal) ~ mu-gib₃ - E 733, 8
- **mu**_x-**mu**_x ~ mu₇-mu₇ - E 729, 3
- **-na** ~ -na₂ *in* ib-ta-na ~ ib₂-ta-na₂ - E 768A, II, 2
- nin-<a>**gub**-ba ~ nin-a-gub₂-ba - E 729, 8
- **-peš**-ša- ~ -peš₄-a- - E 767, II, 18
- **-su**₂- ~ -su₈- *in* ḥe₂-en-da₃-su₂-ge-eš ~ ḥe₂-en-ta-su₈-su₈-ge-eš - E 729, 6⁹³⁵
- **ša-** ~ ša₃- - E 767, II, 22
- **tum-** ~ tum₂- - E 775, 22
- **u**₂ ~ u₄ - E 767, II, 22
- **-uš**- ~ -uš₂- *in* na-ma-uš-ša ~ nam-uš₂-(a) - E 767, II, 19a
- **uš-** ~ uš₇- - E 734, 7

934 Note that standard orthography and phonetic Sumerian are inverted, see § 6.2.1.

935 The sign su₂ (ZU) for su₈ is listed here and not under the shifts s > z because in the Old Babylonian syllabary ZU is the sign used for /su/, although this use is limited to Akkadian texts.

Ugarit

Babylonian Tablets

- **-ke** ~ -ke₄ - AuOrS 23 25, 51
- im-te-**mu** ~ im-te-mu₄ - AuOrS 23 25, 36
- im-te-**ta** ~ im-te-ta₃ - AuOrS 23 25, 36
- 'i₃'-ti₂-eš ~ i-ti(l)₃-eš - RS 25.130, 3⁹³⁶

Ugarit Script Tablets

- **a**-[kala-zu] ~ a₂-kala-zu - RS 79.25, 23
- **-bur-** ~ -bur₂- in ḥa-an-da-bur-re - AuOrS 23 21, 70
- **-du** ~ -du₈ in pi-in-du - AuOrS 23 21, 68
- **-du₅** ~ du₁₀ (?) - RS 79.25, 15
- **-du-du** ~ du₆-du₆ in mu-un-du-du - AuOrS 23 21, 80
- **du-ga** ~ du₁₁-ga - RS 79.25, 32
- **dur** ~ dur₂ - RS 86.2210, I, § 4
- **e-** ~ e₂- - RS 86.2210, II, § 11
- **e-kur** ~ e₂-kur - RS 79.25, 10
- **-gi-gi** ~ -gi₄-gi₄ - AuOrS 23 21, 85
- **ḥe-** ~ ḥe₂- in ḥe-gal - RS 79.25, 34, 44
- **i** ~ i₇ - RS 79.25, 32
- **i-da-me-en** ~ i₇-da-me-en - RS 79.25, 37
- **i-** ~ i₃- in i-na-ka-re ~ i₃-na-kar-e - AuOrS 23 13, 3, 4
- **-ke** ~ -ke₄ in [en-ki]-ik-ke - AuOrS 23 21, 69
- **-ke** ~ -ke₄ in ab-su-ke - AuOrS 23 21, 69
- **-ke** ~ -ke₄ in mu-um-mu-ke - AuOrS 23 21, 69
- **-ke** ~ -ke₄ in lu-ul-lu-ra-da-ke ~ lu₂-u₁₈-lu-ra₂-da-ke₄ - AuOrS 23 21, 55
- **-ke** ~ -ke₄ in ab-zu-ke ~ abzu-ke₄ - RS 79.25, 14
- **ku-ku-** ~ ku₅-ku₅- in ku-ku-ut-ta ~ ku₅-ku₅-de₃ - RS 86.2210, I, § 7
- **'lu'** ~ lu₂ - RS 23.34+ B, 6
- **lu** ~ lu₂ in lu-ul-lu-ra-da-ke ~ lu₂-u₁₈-lu-ra₂-da-ke₄ - AuOrS 23 21, 55
- **lu** ~ lu₂ in lu-ug-gen₇ ~ lu₂-(u₁₈-lu)-gen₇ - AuOrS 23 21, 80
- nu-**dim**-ma ~ nu-dim₂-ma - RS 86.2210, I, § 1
- **-ra-** ~ ra₂ (?) in lu-ul-lu-ra-da-ke ~ lu₂-u₁₈-lu-ra₂-da-ke₄ - AuOrS 23 21, 55
- **ša-** ~ ša₃- - RS 79.25, 35
- **-še** ~ -še₃ - RS 17.10 Obv. 4
- šu **bur-ra** ~ šu bur₂-ra - RS 17.10 Rev. 1
- **u₂-** ~ u₄- - RS 23.34+ A, 9
- **u₂-** ~ u₄- in u₂-da-gi ~ u₄-da-kam - RS 79.25, 40
- **u₂-** ~ u₄- in u₂-du-ra-am-me ~ u₄-da-ra-am - RS 79.25, 42
- **u₂-** ~ u₃- in u₂-me-na-si₁₂-si₁₂ ~ u₃-me-ni-si₁₂-si₁₂ - AuOrS 23 21, 91
- **u₂-** ~ u₃- in u₂-me-na-he₂-he₂ ~ u₃-me-ni-ḥi-ḥi - AuOrS 23 21, 92
- **u₂-du-ud**-[da] ~ u₃-du₂-ud-da - RS 86.2210 II, § 10

936 Cf. OBGT 653-655: me-a an-se₁₂-eš = a-li₂ šu-nu; me-a an-til₃-eš = a-li₂ šu-nu; me-a i₃-til₃-eš = a-li₂ šu-nu.

4.2.2 Syllabification of Logograms

Syllabification of logograms is the substitution of a logogram with two or more phonograms usually according to the pattern CvC > Cv-vC. As with homophony no examples from Old Babylonian texts are provided. Words containing the phoneme /ĝ/ when it is rendered by /ng/ are listed both here and under *ĝ* > *ng*. Cases of *scriptio plena* may be also listed here.

Hattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- a-ge-ga ~ a-geg-ga - KUB 30 1, I, 19
- a-gu-bu- ~ a₂-gubu₃^{bu.937} in a-gu-bu-un-ni - KUB 30 1, IV, 6
- a-la-am ~ alam⁹³⁸ - KUB 30 1, I, 8; IV, 12
- a-sa-al-lu-ĥi ~ ^dasal-lu₂-ĥi - KBo 40 103, 3
- a-sa-al-lu-ĥi ~ ^dasal-lu₂-ĥi - KUB 30 1, I, 20-21; II, 3
- a-sa-al-lu-ĥi ~ ^dasal-lu₂-ĥi - KUB 37 109, 6
- ba-ni-ib-di-ib-be₂ ~ ba-ni-ib-dib-be₂ - KUB 30 1, I, 15
- ba-tu-uĥ ~ ba-tuĥ (?) - KUB 30 3, 5
- di-be₂-de ~ dib-be₂-de₃ - KUB 30 1, IV, 5
- di-in-gi-ra-a-na ~ diĝir-ra-na - KUB 30 1, IV, 10
- di-in-gi-re ~ diĝir-re - KUB 30 2, II, 3
- di-i[n-gi-ir-ra-ni] ~ diĝir-ra-ni - KUB 37 109, 7, 9
- du-mu- ~ dumu- - KBo 36 15 Rev. 4
- du-mu ~ dumu - KUB 30 1, I, 2, II, 3
- du-mu- ~ dumu - KUB 30 4, 7
- du-mu ~ dumu - KUB 37 109, 7, 12
- du-mu-ĝu₁₀ ~ dumu-ĝu₁₀ - KBo 40 103, 4
- e-gi-ir-b[a] ~ egir-ba - KBo 36 13, R. Col. 8
- e-si-ir ~ e-sir₂ - KUB 30 1, IV, 15
- e-si-ra ~ e-sir₂-ra - KBo 36 19, 8
- -ga-am ~ gam - KUB 30 3, 6
- -ĝa₂-ar ~ -ĝar - KUB 30 4, L. Col. 9
- ga-zi-ĥu-ur-s[aĝ] ~ gazi-ĥur-saĝ - KUB 30 4, R. Col. 9
- ga-zi-ĥu-ur-saĝ ~ gazi-ĥur-saĝ - KUB 30 1, III, 11
- gi-di-ma ~ gidim-(ma)⁹³⁹ - KBo 36 15 Rev. 2
- gi-il-ga-m[i-iš] ~ ^dGilgameš_{2/3} - KBo 36 13, R. Col. 15
- [gi-il]-ga-mi-iš-(še) ~ ^dGilgameš_{2/3} - KUB 37 109, 4
- gi-su-[ul-ĥi] ~ gi-sul-ĥi - KUB 30 1, I, 25
- -gu-ub ~ -gub - KUB 37 108+110, L. Col. 3, 5
- ĥa-ab-ru-ud-da ~ ĥabrud-da - KUB 30 2, I, 10
- ĥa-aš-ĥu-ur ~ ^{ĝeš}ĥašĥur - KUB 30 1, IV, 25
- ĥa-la-am- ~ ĥalam- in ĥa-la-am-ma-ak-ke ~ ĥalam-ak-e - KUB 30 1, I, 2
- ĥa-ma-an-zi₂-ir ~ ĥamanzir - KUB 30 1, I, 7, 8
- ĥu-ul-ĝa₂-al ~ ĥul-ĝal₂ - KUB 30 1, I, 2
- ĥu-ul ~ ĥul - KUB 30 1, I, 13
- i-gi ~ igi - KBo 36 15 Rev. 3
- i-gi ~ igi - KBo 40 103, 3, 7
- i-gi ~ igi - KUB 30 1, I, 2, 20, III, 13

937 aBZL: gabu₂.

938 aBZL: alan.

939 aBZL: kitim.

- i-gi ~ igi - KUB 30 3, 9
- i-g[i] ~ igi - KUB 30 4, R. Col. 14
- i-gi-ḥu-ul ~ igi-ḥul - KBo 36 19, 6
- i-gi-ḥu-la⁹⁴⁰ ~ igi-ḥul-(a) - KUB 37 108+110, L. Col. 2
- i-ḡa₂-al ~ i₃-ḡal₂ - KUB 30 3, 8
- im-šū-ub ~ im-šub - KUB 30 1, I, 18
- i-ni-im ~ inim⁹⁴¹ - KUB 37 109, 11
- ka-ar-ga-al ~ kar-gal - KUB 30 1, II, 20
- ka-ḥu-ul ~ ka-ḥul - KBo 36 13, R. Col. 7
- ka-ḥu-ul ~ ka-ḥul - KUB 37 108+110, R. Col. 1
- ka-ḥu-la ~ ka-ḥul-a - KUB 37 108+110, L. Col. 4
- 'ki'-si-ki-il ~ ki-sikil - KBo 36 15 Rev. 5
- ki-si-ki-il ~ ki-sikil - KUB 30 1, I, 5
- [n]a-am-ta-a[r] ~ nam-tar - KBo 36 13, R. Col. 18
- ni-in-nu-u[r-ta] ~ ^dnin-urta - KUB 30 1, II, 21
- nu-lu-uḥ-ḥa ~ nu-luḥ-ḥa - KUB 30 1, III, 10; IV, 24
- nu-lu-uḥ-ḥa ~ nu-luḥ-ḥa - KUB 30 4, R. Col. 8
- pa-ap-ḥa-al-la ~ pap-hal-la - KUB 30 1, I, 14
- pa-ra- ~ para₁₀ - in pa-ra-za-an-kar ~ para₁₀-za₃-ḡar - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 37
- si-ki-il- ~ sikil- in si-ki-il-la-a-ta ~ sikil-la-ta - KUB 30 1, I, 22
- sa-ad-ni-im ~ sa-ad-nim - KUB 30 1, I, 18
- sa-šū-uš-[ga-al] ~ ^{ḡeš}sa-šuš-gal - KUB 30 1, II, 1
- še-em-li ~ šem-li - KUB 30 1, IV, 9
- [šū]-lu-ba-ak-ke ~ šū-lu₂-ba-ak-ke₄ - KUB 30 1, III, 8
- šū ma-an-g[u-ur] ~ šū ba-an-gur - KUB 30 1, I, 8⁹⁴²
- -šū-ub ~ -šub in gi-iš-šū-ub ~ ḡeš-šub - KUB 30 1, II, 18
- u₃-gu-bi ~ ugu-bi - KUB 30 1, IV, 20
- u₃-me-ni-ḡa₂-ar ~ u₃-me-ni-ḡar - KUB 30 1, IV, 8, 9
- u₃-me-ni-sa-ar ~ u₃-me-ni-sar - KUB 30 1, IV, 7
- u₃-me-ni-šū-ub ~ u₃-me-ni-šub - KUB 30 1, IV, 26
- u₃-tu ~ ^dutu - KUB 30 1, II, 19
- ur-ma-aḥ ~ ur-maḥ - KBo 36 13, L. Col. 13
- za-^rag-^r-še ~ za₃-še - KUB 30 1, I, 19⁹⁴³
- za-la-ag ~ zalag (?) - KBo 36 13, L. Col. 2

Hittite Script Tablets

- a-ia ~ aia - CTH 314 - KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 1
- ab-zu ~ abzu - HT 13, 5
- ga-na ~ gana₂ - KUB 57 126 Obv. II, 2, 4
- giri₁₇-za-al ~ giri₁₇-zal - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 12
- -ḥu-la ~ -ḥul₂-la - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 43
- ḥu-ul-h[u]-la ~ ḥul₂-ḥul₂-la₂ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 44
- i-ni-im- ~ inim- in i-ni-im-[du]-u - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 46
- ka-la-ma ~ kalam-ma - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 15
- ki-ri ~ kiri₆ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 35
- lu-gal ~ lugal - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 43

940 Due to the fragmentary nature of the tablet, it is not possible to establish whether -a was a wrong nominalization or whether it indicated the ergative with shift e > a.

941 aBZL: enim.

942 This writing is listed here because the sign BA is miswritten as MA, see § 5.1.1.

943 This entry is listed here because the spelling za-ag derives from the *Auslaut* g in za₃.g.

- lu-na-am-ra ~ lu₂-nam-ra - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 46
- nu-un-[gal-e-ne] ~ ^dnun-gal-e-ne - KUB 4 24 Rev. 8

Emar

- [du]-mu-ĝu₁₀ ~ dumu-ĝu₁₀ - E 768A, II, 6
- -e-ri-du-ga ~ eridu-ga - E 729, 15
- ĝa₂-ra ~ ĝar-ra - E 775, 23
- -gu-ub ~ -gub - Tsukimoto, 40
- -ḫu-r[e] ~ -ḫur-re *in* ki-iš-ḫur-ḫu-r[e] - E 767, II, 1
- ḫu-ur ~ ḫur *in* ki-iš-ḫu-ur ~ ĝeš-ḫur - E 767, II, 24
- i-gi ~ igi *in* i-gi-du-ud-du₅ - E 767, II, 3
- i-nim ~ inim - E 767, II, 3
- i-zi[...] ~ izim - E 768A, II, 4
- lu-gal ~ lugal - E 767, II, 5, 17
- nam-ka-lag-[x] ~ nam-kala-ga - E 767, II, 15a
- ša-ra ~ šar-ra - E 767, I, II, 21
- ši-ma-aš-ki ~ šimaški (LU₂.SU.(A)) - TBR 101 Obv. 3
- šu-bu- ~ šub-bu- *in* šu-bu-da₃-mu-ni - E 729, 15
- -za-aḫ ~ zaḫ₂ *in* ba-da-an-za-aḫ ~ ba-da-(an)-zaḫ₂ - Tsukimoto, 37

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- a-ia- ~ aia- *in* a-ia-an-ni-gi-re-a-ab-ba-sag₁₀-ga - AuOrS 23 21, 83
- ab-zu- ~ abzu- - RS 79.25, 14
- al-la-al ~ al-lal₂ - RS 86.2210, I, § 11
- -ba-le- ~ -bal-le- *in* šu nam-ba-le-e ~ šu nam-bal-le-de₃ - RS 79.25, 4
- -bu-ra ~ -bur₂-ra *in* ḫa-an-du-bu-ra ~ ḫa-an-da-bur₂-ra - AuOrS 23 21, 67
- da-am ~ dam - RS 86.2210, II, § 10
- du-mu ~ dumu - AuOrS 23 21, 54
- e-re-eš ~ ereš - RS 79.25, 8, 25
- e-ri-du-ga ~ eridu-ga - AuOrS 23 21, 54
- -ga-al ~ gal - RS 79.25, 17
- -gi-da ~ -gid₂-da - RS 79.25, 22
- gi-ri ~ giri₁₇ - RS 86.2210 II, § 7-8
- ḫa-an-da-bu-re ~ ḫa-an-da-bur₂-re - AuOrS 23 21, 67
- -ḫu-la ~ -ḫul₂-la - RS 79.25, 35
- ḫu-ul-la ~ ḫul₂-la - RS 23.34+ A, 8
- ḫu-uš ~ ḫuš - RS 79.25, 26
- i-gi ~ igi - AuOrS 23 21, 83
- i-na-ka-re ~ i₃-na-kar-e - AuOrS 23 13, 3, 4
- [i[?]-n]a-na ~ ^dinana - RS 79.25, 25
- ka-la ~ kala(g) - AuOrS 23 13, 5
- kala-ma ~ kalam-ma - RS 79.25, 7
- lu-gal ~ lugal - AuOrS 23 21, 69
- lu-gal ~ lugal - RS 23.34+ B, 8
- lu-gal ~ lugal - RS 79.25, 14, 21, 44
- lu-gal-la-[ke] ~ lugal - RS 86.2210, II, § 10
- lu-u₂- ~ lu₂ - AuOrS 23 21, 80
- ma-aḫ ~ maḫ - RS 79.25, 8, 25
- ni-nu-ur-ta ~ ^dnin-urta - RS 79.25, 23

- nu-k[e-eš-da] ~ nu-keš₂-da - AuOrS 23 21, 81
- ša-ra ~ šar-ra - RS 23.34+ A, 6
- -ta-aḥ- ~ -taḥ- *in* ga-ra-bi-ta-aḥ-ḥe ~ ga-ra-bi-taḥ-e - AuOrS 23 21, 86
- ti-il-la ~ til₃-la - RS 79.25, 1
- -tu-ku-ra ~ -tuku-ra - AuOrS 23 21, 80
- u₂-gu- ~ ugu- *in* u₂-gu-uš-še - RS 86.2210, II, § 9
- za-al ~ zal *in* za-al-za-al-li-bi ~ zal-zal-a-bi - AuOrS 23 21, 95

As expected, the majority of attestations occur in the Babylonian script tablets from Ḫattuša because they represent the Babylonian tradition. Syllabification is the most common way of rendering logograms with at least three phonemes in the Old Babylonian texts. Consequently, the Babylonian tablets show a low degree of phonetic alteration. In standard orthography, when a closed syllable logogram is followed by a vowel, a morphographemic writing, (C)vC₁-C₁v, is often used; the following syllable repeats the final consonant of the preceding word without any phonetic value.⁹⁴⁴ In all three corpora when logograms are spelled syllabically several cases of morphophonemic writing occur: loss of the additional consonant produces the sequence Cv-Cv.⁹⁴⁵

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- a-ge-ga ~ a₂-geg-ga - KUB 30 1, I, 19
- di-be₂-de ~ dib-be₂-de₃ - KUB 30 1, IV, 5
- di-in-gi-ra-a-na ~ diḡir-ra-na - KUB 30 1, IV, 10
- di-in-gi-re ~ diḡir-re - KUB 30 2, II, 3

Hittite Script Tablets

- -ḫu-la ~ -ḫul₂-la - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 43
- ka-la-ma ~ kalam-ma - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 15

Emar

- ḡa₂-ra ~ ḡar-ra - E 775, 23
- -ḫu-r[e] ~ -ḫur-re *in* ki-iš-ḫur-ḫu-r[e] - E 767, II, 1
- ša-ra ~ šar-ra - E 767, I, II, 21
- šu-bu- ~ šub-bu- *in* šu-bu-ta-mu-ni - E 729, 15

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- -ba-le- ~ -bal-le- *in* šu nam-ba-le-e ~ šu nam-bal-le-de₃ - RS 79.25, 4
- -gi-da ~ -gid₂-da - RS 79.25, 22
- ḫa-an-da-bu-re ~ ḫa-an-da-bur₂-re - AuOrS 23 21, 67
- -ḫu-la ~ -ḫul₂-la - RS 79.25, 35
- kala-ma ~ kalam-ma - RS 79.25, 7
- ša-ra ~ šar-ra - RS 23.34+ A, 6

944 Jagersma 2010, 27.

945 This list is based on § 4.2.2.

The Babylonian tablets from Ḫattuša (CTH 800) show several cases of morphographemic writing:⁹⁴⁶

- ba-ni-ib-di-ib-be₂ ~ ba-ni-ib-dib-be₂ - KUB 30 1, I, 15
- ḫa-ab-ru-ud-da ~ ḫabrud-da - KUB 30 2, I, 10
- nu-lu-uḫ-ḫa ~ nu-luḫ-ḫa - KUB 30 1, III, 10; IV, 24
- nu-lu-uḫ-ḫa ~ nu-luḫ-ḫa - KUB 30 4, R. Col. 8
- pa-ap-ḫa-al-la ~ pap-hal-la - KUB 30 1, I, 14
- si-ki-il-la-a-ta ~ sikil-la-ta - KUB 30 1, I, 22

The presence of morphographemic writings reveals the tendency of the Babylonian tablets CTH 800 to preserve the original spelling of words. Outside of CTH 800, morphographemic writings are attested in only two tablets from Ugarit: ḫu-ul-la ~ ḫul₂-la (RS 23.34+ A, 8); ti-il-la ~ til₃-la (RS 79.25, 1). The presence of morphographemic and morphophonemic writings in CTH 800 echoes the Old Babylonian documentation where both realizations are attested even though morphophonemic writings possibly occur to a larger extent: the sequence Cv-Cv seems more common than Cv-vC in the OB texts.⁹⁴⁷

At Ḫattuša and Ugarit doubled consonants are preserved in few cases when they have a semantic value: [a]-sa-al-lu-ḫi ~ ^dasal-lu₂-ḫi (KBo 40 103, 3; KUB 30 1, I, 20-21, II, 3; KUB 37 109, 6), me₅-lim₄-maḫ ~ me-lim₄-maḫ (KUB 4 7, 11),⁹⁴⁸ al-la-al ~ al-lal₂ (RS 86.2210, I, § 11).

4.2.3 CvC-signs for Cv-C(v) – Cv-vC

Ḫattuša

Hittite Script Tablets

- **kut**-ta ~ gu₇-da (?) - KUB 57 126 Obv. I, 2⁹⁴⁹

Emar

- **-men**₅ ~ -me-en - E 767, I, 18

Ugarit

Babylonian Tablets

- dar-da-**rak**-ku ~ dar-dar-ra-ḡu₁₀ - AuOrS 23 25, 12

Ugarit Script Tablets

- **-sag**₁₀- ~ -ši-k(u₄)- in a-ia-an-ni-gi-re-a-ab-ba-sag₁₀-ga ~ aia-ni ^denki-ra e₂-a ba-ši-ku₄-a - AuOrS 23 21, 83

⁹⁴⁶ The reader should note that spellings like C₁v-vC₂-C₂v for standard Sumerian (C₁)vC₂-C₂v are not here considered as bindings.

⁹⁴⁷ See for instance the lists of phonetic writings in Falkenstein 1952-1953, 65-67, Sjöberg 1961b, 10-11, Alster 1992, 35-42.

⁹⁴⁸ See § 4.2.1.

⁹⁴⁹ kut is chosen instead of kud because of the following -ta.

Old Babylonian

- -geg ~ -gi₄-gi₄ - H 97 I, 27, 35; IV, 21
- ħe₂-si₂₂-gen₇ ~ ħe₂-si₂₂-ge-en - VS 10 182, 1-2
- -men₃ ~ -me-en - MMUM 35516+, *passim*⁹⁵⁰

The use of CvC signs for the sequence Cv-C(v) or Cv-vC is very limited. Occurrences from Ugarit are probably to be considered as bindings, as a reflection of an extensive use of phonetic writings.⁹⁵¹ This spelling is rarely attested also in the Old Babylonian period.

4.2.4 Additional Vowels

Additional vowels are here considered cases of paragoge, anaptyxis and prosthesis occurring in some words without any lexical or morphological explanation.

Additional a

Ḫattuša

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- nam-ri-ma ~ nam-erim₂ - KBo 36 11+ Obv. 25, 30

Hittite Script Tablets

- [tu-(du)]-a-ga-a-ni ~ tu₆-du₁₁-ga-a-ni - KUB 4 24 Rev. 10

Emar

- in-na-an-ga ~ en-nu-uġ₃ - E 729, 5
- na-ma-uš-ša ~ nam-uš₂-(a) - E 767, II, 19a

Ugarit

Babylonian Tablets

- ap-pap-ma-aš₂ ~ pap-meš - AuOrS 23 25, 14
- u₂-sun₂-na-pi ~ usan₃-bi - AuOrS 23 25, 12

Ugarit Script Tablets

- a-ia-i-du ~ a-i₇-da - RS 79.25 29, 30⁹⁵²
- lu-ga-la-gu ~ lugal-ġu₁₀ - RS 79.25, 1

950 See Alster 1992, 39.

951 CvC signs are used in Akkadian translations of some texts such as E 775.

952 This spelling probably results from metathesis of the binding writing **a-a-i-i-du.

Old Babylonian

- bu-lu-**ḫa** ~ bu-lu-uh₂ - AO 24146 Obv. 17 (17) (Susa)
- ki-su-**ba** ~ ki-su-ub - TIM 9 1, 67

Additional e

Ḫattuša

Hittite Script Tablets

- **e**-bu-ur ~ buru₁₄ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 34

Emar

- til₃-la-**e**-ni ~ til₃-la-ni (?) - E 771+, 26

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- [a-k]**a** ~ ^dak - RS 79.25, 21
- a-š**e**-in-zu ~ uš₇-nu-zu (?) - AuOrS 23 21, 70⁹⁵³
- u₂-du-ra-am-**me** ~ u₄-da-ra-am - RS 79.25, 42

Old Babylonian

- e-**re** ~ ir₂ - AO 24146 Obv. 1-2 (1-2) (Susa)
- gu₂-**e**-da ~ gud-da - TIM 9 1, 57⁹⁵⁴
- mi-ri-**e**- ~ ḡiri₃- - TCL 15 38 Obv. 4-6 (55, 57)

Additional i

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- i-**ni**-ki-ir-ra ~ ^den-ki-ra - KUB 30 3, 10

⁹⁵³ This entry is listed both here and under additional *i*.

⁹⁵⁴ Cf. Alster 2005, 238; I consider -da here as part of the word and -e- as an additional vowel although Alster transliterates gu₂-e da.

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- a-ša-a-li ~ ^dasal - RS 79.25, 12
- a-še-in-zu ~ uš₇-nu-zu (?) - AuOrS 23 21, 70⁹⁵⁵
- ga-ra-bi-ta-aḥ-ḥe ~ ga-ra-ab-taḥ-e - AuOrS 23 21, 86⁹⁵⁶
- ni-ig-gi-ri-ma-re-eš ~ niġ₂-ġir₂-ġar-eš₂ - AuOrS 23 21, 69
- ni-ik-ki ~ niġ₂ - RS 17.10 Obv. 6
- si-il-lal-i-kat-ta ~ asila-ka-ta - AuOrS 23 21, 6
- si-la-si-si-an- ~ sila-si-sa₂ - AuOrS 23 21, 81
- šu-da-ia-ak ~ šudu₃-ak - RS 79.25, 7⁹⁵⁷
- šu-da-ia-ku ~ šudu₃-ak - RS 79.25, 6
- ta-r[i] ~ tar - RS 79.25, 22

Old Babylonian

- a-ia-aš-tub₂ ~ a-aštub - TIM 9 1, 58⁹⁵⁸
- za-pa-ri ~ zabar - BM 79949, 3

Additional u

Ḫattuša

Hittite Script Tablets

- ke-eš-tu-u₄-ku ~ ġeštug_{12/13} - KUB 4 26B, 3

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- -aḥ-bi-lu ~ -gibil - RS 79.25, 3
- a-nu ~ ^dan - RS 79.25, 17⁹⁵⁹
- a-ra-me-ek-mu-aš-š^u ~ a-ra₂-min-kam₂-aš - AuOrS 23 21, 84
- šu-da-ia-ku ~ šudu₃-ak - RS 79.25, 6

Old Babylonian

- a-du-bu ~ adabu^{ki} (UD.NUN.KI) - OECT 5 10 Rev. 9

955 This entry is listed both here and under additional *e*.

956 -bi- is probably to be construed as an error for OO.

957 Here and in the following entry the additional *i* is perhaps a way of rendering a semivowel.

958 This perhaps represents a further example of rendering the semivowel.

959 The addition of /u/ is probably due to the Akkadian *Anu*.

Occurrences of additional vowels are quite limited – only 29 examples.

Corpus	a	e	i	u	Total
Ḫattuša: Babylonian Script	0	0	1	0	1
Ḫattuša: Ass-Mit. Script	1	0	0	0	1
Ḫattuša: Hittite Script	1	1	0	1	3
Total Ḫattuša	2	1	1	1	5
Emar	2	1	0	0	3
Ugarit: Babylonian Script	2	0	0	0	2
Ugarit: Ugarit Script	2	3	10	4	19
Total Ugarit	4	3	10	4	21
Total	8	5	11	5	29

The distribution of entries shows that the vast majority of occurrences stem from Ugarit. With only two exceptions documented in a Babylonian script tablet which contains several errors and anomalies,⁹⁶⁰ all the occurrences from Ugarit are attested in tablets drafted by local scribes. Half of them (11) derive from a single text, the unorthographic version of *A Prayer for a King*, RS 79.25. Seven entries are attested in the collection of incantations RS 17.155 = AuOrS 23 21. It is unknown why this alteration is concentrated at Ugarit: perhaps the scribes there were less able than their peers elsewhere, but the practice of copying under dictation cannot be ruled out. Conversely, in the Babylonian tablets from Ḫattuša, which provide the largest number of phonetic writings from the Hittite capital, only one case of an additional vowel is documented. The scant attestation of additional vowels in the Babylonian script tablets echoes the OB texts in which this anomaly is rarely documented.

Occasionally, additional vowels result from using open syllables, Cv, to spell out closed syllable words like CvC or polysyllables like CvCvC: na-ma-uš-ša ~ nam-uš₂-(a) (Emar), lu-ga-la-gu ~ lugal-ġu₁₀, ta-r[i] ~ tar (Ugarit). As a consequence the final vowel of the Cv syllables has no phonological or lexical value.⁹⁶¹ Cv syllables are not only used in CvC words but also in word clusters with an initial vowel: i-ni-ki-ir-ra ~ ^den-ki-ra (Ḫattuša), a-še-in-zu ~ uš₇-nu-zu, a-ša-a-li ~ ^dasal (Ugarit). Another manifestation of additional vowels, apparently limited to Ugarit but found in both Babylonian and local tablets, consists in the addition of a syllable whose consonant is already spelled out in the preceding or following sign; no explanation can be advanced for this writing: ap-pap-ma-aš₂ ~ pap-meš, u₂-sun₂-na-pi ~ usan₃-bi, u₂-du-ra-am-me ~ u₄-da-ra-am, ni-ik-ki ~ niġ₂. It is worth noting that additional vowels occur between lexemes and never within words.

One writing, e-bu-ur for buru₁₄ (CTH 315 – AuOrS 23 50, II, 34), probably renders *ebûru*, the Akkadian correspondence for the Sumerogram buru₁₄.

960 AuOrS 23 25, see § 7.1.3.

961 Representation of closed syllable words was problematic since the beginning of cuneiform culture, Jagersma 2010, 19-23.

4.2.5 Scriptio Plena

Hattuša*Initial Position*

Babylonian Tablets

- **a-an-su** ~ an-su₃ - KUB 30 1, II, 2

Middle Position

Babylonian Tablets

- di-in-gi-ra-**a-na** ~ diġir-ra-na - KUB 30 1, IV, 10
- ħe-**e-en-x** ~ ħe₂-en-x - KBo 36 13, R. Col. 6
- le-**e-la-a** ~ lil₂-la₂ - KUB 30 1, I, 4
- lu-le-**e-la** ~ lu₂-lil₂-la₂ - KUB 30 2, II, 9
- si-ki-il-la-**a-ta** ~ sikil-la-ta - KUB 30 1, I, 22

Hittite Script Tablets

- -a-ki-**i-du** ~ -a₂-ki-tum - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 42
- ħe₂-za-a(-)za-**a-e-me-en** ~ ħe₂-(?)-za za-e-me-en - KUB 4 7, 12
- in-pa-**a-da** ~ in-pa₃-da - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 10
- ku-**u-ra** ~ gur-ra-(am₃) - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 46
- lu-**u-gal** ~ lugal - HT 13, 4, 5, 9, 10, 14
- lu-**u-gal** ~ lugal - KUB 4 26B, 1, 4, 8, 9
- pa-**a-na** ~ pana - KUB 57 126 Obv. II, 4

Final Position

Babylonian Tablets

- **i-i** ~ e₃ (?) - KUB 30 1, I, 19
- le-e-la-**a** ~ lil₂-la₂ - KUB 30 1, I, 4

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- sa-**a** ~ sa - KBo 36 11+ Obv. 36

Hittite Script Tablets

- ħe₂-za-**a(-)za-a-e-me-en** ~ ħe₂-(?)-za za-e-me-en - KUB 4 7, 12
- ti-la-**a-bi-iš-ši** ~ til-la-bi-še₃ - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 8⁹⁶²
- pa-**a** ~ pa₅ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 38⁹⁶³

962 This entry is considered as a *scriptio plena* in final position because -a- occurs at the end of the word.

963 This entry is not listed under 'Homophony' because the whole sequence pa-a is considered to be a writing for pa₅.

Emar*Middle Position*

- du-**u**-ga ~ du₁₀-ga - E 734, 8
- e-ne-**e**-še-ta ~ i₃-ne-eš₂ - E 767, I, 17a
- e-re-**e**-du-ga ~ eridu-ga - E 729, 12
- [e-u]r-ra-k[e]´**e**´-en ~ e₂-ur₃-ra-ke₄-e-ne - E 767, II, 6
- ´e₂´-da-ri₂-ke-**e**-ne ~ e₂-da-ri₂-ke₄-ne-(ne) - E 767, I, 6

Final Position

- ga-**a**-ni-šur-ra-ke₄ ~ ga-ni-šur-ra ak (?) - E 775, 19⁹⁶⁴
- gi-dub-ba-**a** ~ gi-dub-ba - E 775, 11
- lu-**u**₂-tur-ra-bi ~ lu₂-tur-ra-bi - E 767 I, II, 23
- mu-un-ke-ne₂-**e** ~ mu-un-ge-ne₂ - E 776, 4

Ugarit*Initial Position*

Babylonian Tablets

- ^du₂-u₂-u₄-du ~ ^dutu - AuOrS 23 27, 7

Middle Position

Ugarit Script Tablets

- a-ša-**a**-li ~ ^dasal - RS 79.25, 12
- -bi-**i**-di ~ bi-da - RS 17.10 Obv. 10
- ku¹-**u**₂-ba-ni ~ gub-ba-ni - AuOrS 23 21, 81
- (šu-)nam-tar-ta-re-**e**-ni ~ nam-tar-re-de₃ - RS 79.25, 5

Final Position

Ugarit Script Tablets

- -du-uš-ša₂-**a** ~ -tuš-a - RS 17.10 Obv. 5
- -gi-du-ba-**a** ~ -gi-dub-ba - RS 79.25, 21
- la-le-**e** ~ la-la - RS 79.25, 16
- lu-**u**₂-gal ~ lugal - KUB 37 112, 3
- mu-ut-ta-ša-**a** ~ mud-da-še₃ - AuOrS 23 21, 81
- pa-**a**-tar ~ ba-tar - RS 86.2210, I, § 5
- si-la-**a**-e ~ sila-e - AuOrS 23 21, 55
- u₂-na-me-**e** ~ mu nam-mu - RS 79.25, 39

Old Babylonian

- **a**-aš₂-pa-la-ba-ke ~ aš-bala-ba-ke₄-eš - TIM 9 35, 16

⁹⁶⁴ This writing is listed here as the *scriptio plena* occurs at the end of the morpheme ga-.

- na-ab-be₂-e ~ na-an-na-ab-be₂ - H 178 Obv. 9 (37)
- [t]u-u₃-tu ~ du_{3/8}-du_{3/8} - H 97 II, 2

4.2.6 Additional Consonants

Hattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- su-na-ni ~ su-a-ni - KUB 37 108+110, R. Col. 2

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- dadag ~ da-da - KBo 36 11+ Obv. 29⁹⁶⁵

Hittite Script Tablets

- e-du[r ...] ~ e₂-du₃-a - KUB 57 126 Obv. II, 8
- ^dnun-dim₂-mud ~ ^dnu-dim₂-mud - KUB 4 7, 9

Emar

- gu-la-kam₂ ~ gu-la-am₃ - E 775, 20
- nu-mu-un-du-we ~ nu-mu-un-du(₈?)-e - E 734, 5
- nu-un-zu-wa-a ~ nu-un-zu-a - E 767, II, 8
- -ḫu-la-al ~ -ḫul₂-la₂ - E 767, II, 22⁹⁶⁶

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- ḫa-am-bu-ru-ud-da-ne₂-iš ~ ḫabrud-da-ne₂-eš₂ - RS 86.2210, II, § 7
- luḫ-ba-an-[...] ~ la-ba-an-[...] - RS 23.34+ B, 7
- si-la-si-si-an- ~ sila-si-sa₂ - AuOrS 23 21, 81

Old Babylonian

- ba-ne-gu-UL ~ ba-ni-ib-ku₂ - CT 44 14, 6
- nu-un-ku ~ nu-ku₅ - H 77, 30

Only a few occurrences of additional consonants are attested in the three corpora, and no common explanation can be suggested. This alteration is rare in the OB texts as well.

Some occurrences are perhaps due to pronunciation: nu-mu-un-du-we ~ nu-mu-un-du(₈?)-e, nu-un-zu-wa-a ~ nu-un-zu-a, ša-ḫu-la-al ~ ša₃-ḫul₂-la₂ (Emar).

965 Because of the phonetic similarity da-da is misunderstood as dadag (UD.UD).

966 The additional /l/ is influenced by the reading lal of la₂.

4.2.7 Analytic Writings

Ḫattuša

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- dur₁₁-ra-a-ni-ta ~ dur₁₁-ra-ni-da - KBo 36 11+ Rev. 28
- igi-a-ni-še₃ ~ igi-ni-še₃ - KBo 36 11+ Rev. 10
- šu-nam-tar²-<ra>-ga-a-ni ~ šu-nam-tar-ra-ka-ni - KBo 36 11+ Rev. 20

4.2.8 Bindings⁹⁶⁷**Ḫattuša**

Babylonian Tablets

- a-la-**al-le**-^rde₅ ~ a₂-la₂-e-de₃ - KUB 30 1, I, 5
- a-gu-bu-**un**-ni ~ a₂-gubu₃^{bu}-ni - KUB 30 1, IV, 6
- [a-sa-al-l]u-**uḫ**-ḫi ~ ^dasal-lu₂-ḫi - KBo 36 13, L. Col. 3
- gi-bi-il-**la** ~ gibil-a - KBo 36 13, L. Col. 12
- ḫa-la-am-**ma**-ak-**ke** ~ ḫalam-ak-e - KUB 30 1, I, 2
- i-gi-u₃-tu-**uš**-še ~ igi-^dutu-še₃ - KUB 30 1, III, 13; IV, 9, 27
- im-**ma**-ab-[zu] ~ im abzu - KUB 30 1, I, 6
- [i-ni-k]i-**ik**-ke⁹⁶⁸ ~ ^den-ki-ke₄ - KBo 36 13, L. Col. 6, 15
- i-ni-ki-**ir**-ra ~ ^den-ki-ra - KUB 30 3, 10
- i-nita(UŠ)-ta-**aq**-qa ~ i₃-ni-ta₃-ta₃-ga⁹⁶⁹ - KUB 30 1, I, 12
- ka-**ab**-bi ~ ka-bi - KUB 30 1, IV, 19
- lu-**ul**-lu ~ lu₂-ulu₃ / lu₂-u₁₈-lu - KUB 30 1, I, 14
- lu-**ul**-lu ~ lu₂-ulu₃ / lu₂-u₁₈-lu - KUB 30 2, II, 4
- [lu-**u**]l-lu ~ lu₂-ulu₃ / lu₂-u₁₈-lu - KUB 37 109, 7
- lu-**ul**-lu-bi ~ lu₂-ulu₃ / lu₂-u₁₈-lu - KBo 36 13, R. Col. 9
- lu-**ul**-lu-bi ~ lu₂-ulu₃ / lu₂-u₁₈-lu - KBo 36 15 Rev. 2
- mu-su-ub-**an**-ni ~ munsub-a-ni - KUB 30 1, I, 9
- ni-ḡa₂-ak-**ka** ~ niḡ₂-ak-a - KBo 36 13, R. Col. 5
- ni-gu-**ug**-g[u] ~ niḡ₂-gu₇-gu₇ - KUB 30 1, I, 11
- saḡ-**an**-na ~ saḡ-ḡa₂-na - KBo 36 12, 4
- [si-l]i-ma-**an**-ni ~ silim-ma-ni - KUB 37 109, 9
- ša-**ab**-ba ~ ša₃-ba - KUB 30 1, III, 12
- ši-**in**-ni-ig ~ šinig⁹⁷⁰ - KUB 30 1, IV, 16, 24
- uš-du-**ut**-tu ~ uš₁₁ du₁₁-du₁₁ - KUB 30 1, I, 11

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- **ab**-ba-si-il-le ~ a-ba-si-il-le - CTH 794 Obv. 1, 3, 5

967 Note that under bindings are listed entries that include phonetic alterations.

968 This entry is only listed under bindings because the initial part of the word is restored.

969 aBZL: ninta.

970 aBZL: šeneg.

Hittite Script Tablets

- -**ab**-ba ~ a₂-ba *in* im-u-a-ab-ba ~ im-a u₄ a₂-ba - CTH 315 - KUB 4 2, 3
- am-**ma**-ni-še ~ ama-ni-še₃ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 46
- a-ni-ma-za-an-qa-**ak**-ke ~ a-numun-saĝ-ĝa₂-ke₄ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 33
- ba-su₂-šu-**ut**-ta ~ ba-su₍₃₎-su₍₃₎-da (?) - KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 10
- e-ri-**ib**-ba ~ i-ri-pa₃ - KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 8, 10
- ĥu-us₂-**sa**-a ~ ĥuš-a - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 42
- ku-[**u**]k-ku ~ ku₇-ku₇ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 39
- nam-**me**-en ~ nam-en - CTH 794 Rev. 8
- na-aš-ke-**ma**-am-**ma**-an-ku ~ ĝešgem-ama-ĝu₁₀ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 40, 47
- ni-**ig**-g[e-(na-ni)-iš-ši] ~ niĝen-(na-ni)-še₃ - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 16
- nu-ki-ki-**it**-ti ~ nu-gi₄-gi₄-da - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 45
- [š]a-ag-ga-**ak**-ke ~ saĝ-ĝa₂-ke₄ - CTH 315 - KUB 4 2, 4
- ša-an-ku-**uš**-ši ~ saĝ-mu-še₃ - KUB 57 126 Obv. II, 5
- ti-la-a-bi-**iš**-ši ~ til-la-bi-še₃ - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 8
- u₂-za-**ag**-ga ~ ad su₃-ga - KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 12

Emar

- bu-ru-e-**en**-ni ~ buru₄^(mušen)-e-ne - E 768A, II, 7
- [dir]i(g)-**ia**-na-**an**-ni ~ diri-ge-ne-ne - E 767, II, 5
- e-da-ra-ga-**an**-ni' ~ e₂-da-ri₂-ke₄-ne(ne) - E 767, II, 6
- 'e'-[**e**]n-ni ~ e-ne - E 767, II, 24
- edin-**na** ~ edin-e - E 775, 16
- en¹²-ki-**ik**-ke ~ ^denki-ke₄ - E 767, II, 1
- e-ri-**ma**-a-ni ~ erin₂-a-ni - TBR 101 Obv. 5
- i₃-**ig**-gal-l[a] ~ i₃-ĝal₂-la - E 767, II, 3
- -i-gi-du-ga-**an**-ni ~ -igi-du-ka-ni - E 767, II, 4
- i-gi-du-**ud**-du₅ ~ igi-du-ta - E 767, II, 3
- it-**ti** ~ iti (?) - E 734, 4
- ki-da-**an**-ni ~ gid₂-da-ni - E 734, 3
- mi-en-**na**-a ~ me-en-am₃ - E 770, 3
- mu-un-na-ak-**ke** ~ mu-un-na-ak-e - E 767, II, 21
- [nam]-'lu-ul-lu' ~ nam-lu₂-u₁₈-lu - E 767, II, 24
- na-ma-uš-**ša** ~ nam-uš₂-(a) - E 767, II, 19a
- ni-ta-aḥ-**aq**-qa[...] ~ nita-kala-ga - E 776, 3
- -peš-**ša** ~ -peš₄-a- - E 767, II, 18
- te-**em**-ma ~ dima - E 767, II, 2
- ti-**el**-la-ga-an-ni ~ til-la-ke₄-e-ne - E 734, 2
- za-an-ki-**el**-la ~ (niĝ₂)-saĝ-ki-il₂ - E 767, II, 22

Ugarit

Babylonian Tablets

- ^du₂-**u**₂-u₄-du ~ ^dutu - AuOrS 23 27, 7

Ugarit Script Tablets

- [a-š]a-lu-**uh**-ḥe₂ ~ ^dasal-lu₂-ḥi - RS 79.25, 10
- at-ta-**an**-ni ~ ad-da-ni - RS 17.10 Rev. 2
- bur-bur-ni-**ik**-ke ~ bar-bar-e-ne-ke₄ - AuOrS 23 21, 68

- de-**en**-ni-ig ~ dinig - RS 17.10 Obv. 12
- -du-**ud**-du₅ ~ -du₈-du₈ - RS 79.25, 8
- -du-uš-**ša**₂-a ~ -tuš-a - RS 17.10 Obv. 5
- e₂-hal-la-**ak**-e ~ e₂-ḥal-la-ke₄ - AuOrS 23 59, 3
- [en-ki]-**ik**-ke ~ ^denki-ke₄ - AuOrS 23 21, 69
- **en**-na ~ e-ne - RS 23.34+ A, 14
- e-ur-ra-ga-**an**-ni ~ e₂-ur₃-ra-ke₄-ne-ne - RS 23.34+ B, 10
- ga-ra-bi-ta-**aḥ**-**he** ~ ga-ra-ab-taḥ-e - AuOrS 23 21, 86
- gi-**in**-ni-**in**-mi-ni ~ ḡe₆ ni₂-me-lim₄ - RS 79.25, 27
- i-ri-du-ka-**ak**-ke ~ eridu-ka-ke₄ - AuOrS 23 21, 7
- [igi-zu-**u**]**n**-na-an-ti-ki-aš ~ igi-zu na-ba-an-tiḡ₄-ḡa₂-(aš) - RS 17.10 Obv. 16
- **it**-te-ta-ni-eš ~ i₃-te-da-ni-eš₂ - AuOrS 23 21, 47
- ki-**ia** ~ ki-a - AuOrS 23 21, 70, 97
- ki-**ik**-ki ~ gi₄-gi₄ - AuOrS 23 21, 8
- [ki?]-**in**-nim-kalam-kalam-**ab**-bi ~ ki niḡ₂-galam-galam-ma-bi - RS 17.10 Obv. 7
- -kur-ku-ra-**ak**-ka ~ -kur-kur-ra-ke₄ - RS 79.25 19
- lu-**ug**-gen₇ ~ lu₂-(u₁₈-lu)-gen₇ - AuOrS 23 21, 80
- lu-**ul**-lu-ra-da-ke ~ lu₂-u₁₈-lu-ra₂-da-ke₄ - AuOrS 23 21, 55
- mu-**saḡ**-ḡa₂ ~ muš-a-ḡa₂ - AuOrS 23 21, 82
- mu-**saḡ**-ke ~ muš-a-gen₇ - AuOrS 23 21, 82
- mu-**um**-mu-ke ~ mu₄-mu₄-(ke₄) - AuOrS 23 21, 69
- nam-dub-sar-re-**eš**-še ~ nam-dub-sar-ra-še₃ - RS 17.10 Obv. 18
- i₃-[**il**g]-gu ~ e-ne-gen₇ - RS 23.34+ B, 12
- niḡ₂-nu-ti-**il**-la-**ag**-ga ~ niḡ₂-nu-til₃-la-ka - AuOrS 23 21, 8
- ni-**ik**-ki ~ niḡ₂ - RS 17.10 Obv. 9
- -ni-**in**-ni ~ -(e)-ne-ne - RS 23.34+ B, 8
- nu-**uz**-za-a ~ nu-zu-a - RS 17.10 Obv. 17
- saḡ-**ki**-il-la ~ (niḡ₂)-saḡ-il₂-la - RS 23.34+ B, 8
- si-**il**-lal-i-kat-ta ~ asila-ka-ta - AuOrS 23 21, 6
- si-si-**id**-[da] ~ zi-zi-da - RS 86.2210, II, § 3
- šu-da-**ia**-ak ~ šudu₃-ak - RS 79.25, 7
- šu-**un**-ni ~ šu-ni - AuOrS 23 21, 94
- ur-ku-**ul**-la ~ ur-gu-la - RS 86.2210, II, § 13
- zi-**an**-ni ~ zi-a-ni - RS 86.2210, I, II, § 7

Old Babylonian

- a-ia-**an**-ne ~ aia-ni - H 97 III, 24; V, 14
- ba-ra-**an**-na ~ bar-ra-na - H 97 III, 19-20
- ^den-lil₂-a-**ak**-ka ~ ^den-lil₂-la₂-ka - TCL 15 38 Obv. Rev. 1 (69)
- gu-za-**an**-ni-a ~ ḡešgu-za-ni-(a) - H 97 VI, 51
- ḥa-la-mi-**it**-te ~ ḥa-lam-e-de₃ - TIM 9 1, 9
- ka-**ap**-pa ~ ka-ba - H 97 III, 45
- mi-**it**-te-en₃-bi ~ ni₂-te-ḡa₂-bi - TIM 9 1, 66
- na-ḡa₂-ra-**ak**-kam ~ nagar-ra-kam - H 97 III, 44
- nam-**mu**-zu ~ nam-a-zu - PBS 10/2 13 Rev. 5
- niḡ₂-**ḡa**₂-ka-ne ~ niḡ₂-ak-a-ni - H 97 III, 39
- ni-in-**ni**-im-ma ~ ^dnin-imma₃-ke₄ - PBS 10/2 13 Obv. 8
- ti-pa-ra-**ak**-kam ~ tibira-kam - H 97 III, 43

Bindings are well attested in all corpora as well as in the OB texts. However, this alteration occurs more frequently at Ugarit, especially (15 entries) in the collection of incantations AuOrS 23 21.

4.2.9 Sandhi

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- a-ia-an-ni-gi-re-a-ab-ba-sag₁₀-ga ~ aia-ni ^denki-ra E₂-a ba-ši-ku₄-a - AuOrS 23 21, 83
- u₂-mi-za-aḫ-bi-lu ~ mu-mu-za gibil - RS 79.25, 3
- ni-ga-e-za-i ~ niġ₂-ġa₂-e i₃-zu-(a-ġu₁₀) - AuOrS 23 21, 86

Old Babylonian

- a-na-ra-ab-taḫ-ḫe ~ a-na a-ra-ab-taḫ-(ḫ)e - H 97 I, 36⁹⁷¹
- a-sa-gaba-ni ~ a-sag₃-ga ba-ni - VS 2 94, 63
- bu-lu-ka-ki ~ buluġ-an-ki - VS 2 48, 10
- i-ni-in-ki ~ en ^denki - H 103 II, 12
- ġuruš-ša-am-du ~ ġuruš ga-am₃-du₁₁ - VS 2 94, 62
- la-la-mi-du ~ lil₂ am₃-mi-in-su-ub - TCL 15 38 Obv. 7, 9 (59, 61)
- na-mi-mu-sa ~ na-aġ₂ im-ma-us₂-sa - VS 2 94, 60
- pa-ša-ka ~ pa₅ a-ša₃-ga - H 77, 6
- šu-bi-ri-te ~ šu u₃-ba-e-re-ti - H 97 V, 19
- u₂-šu-um-ra-de₂ ~ uš₂ um-ra-de₂ - H 97 V, 29

Sandhi-writings are rarely attested and are only known from the documentation of Ugarit. Occurrences are documented on two tablets only, the phonetic version of *A Prayer for a King*, RS 79.25, and the collection of incantations AuOrS 23 21. *Sandhi*-writings are very common at Ugarit in the Akkadian texts.⁹⁷²

4.2.10 Short Writings

Short writings are cases of the omission of either consonants or vowels caused by the phonetic orthography.

Ḥattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- ba-ki-ik-[(ki)-ir] ~ ba-an-ġir₁₁-ġir₁₁ - KUB 30 1, I, 9
- ba-an-še ~ ba-an-ser₃ (?) - KUB 30 1, I, 16-17
- im-g[u]-g[u-r]a ~ im-ġi/(u[?])ġurum - KUB 30 1, I, 19
- i-niⁱ(IR)-di ~ i-ni-in-de₂ - KUB 30 1, I, 10
- mu-su-ub-an-ni ~ munsub-a-ni - KUB 30 1, I, 9
- ni-gu-ug-g[u] ~ niġ₂-gu₇-gu₇ - KUB 30 1, I, 11
- šu-da ~ šu-du₃-a - KUB 30 1, I, 5
- šu-ta-ta-ak-ke ~ šu dag-dag-ge - KUB 30 1, I, 3
- u₃-ḫu-ul ~ udug-ḫul (?) - KUB 30 1, I, 2⁹⁷³

971 For other *sandhi*-writings in the same verbal form see H 97 I, 37; III, 27, 28; IV, 22, 23.

972 Kämmerer 1998, 123-124.

973 This abbreviation is similar to a ~ ama, VS 2 94, 44, and u₃-un ~ u₃-mu-un, PBS 10/2 3 Obv. 3.

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- nam-ri-ma ~ nam-erim₂ - KBo 36 11+ Obv. 25, 30

Hittite Script Tablets

- a-ni-ma-za-an-qa-ak-ke ~ a-numun-saĝ-ĝa₂-ke₄ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 33
- ba-su₂-šu-ud-ta ~ ba-su₍₃₎-su₍₃₎-da-ta - KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 10
- ša₃-an-ki-ki-ne₂ ~ saĝ kiĝ₂-kiĝ₂-e - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 39
- uš-kar ~ u₄-šakar - KUB 57 126 Obv. II, 2

Emar

- nu-bala-ta ~ nu-bala-e-da - E 775, 3
- da-ra ~ da-ri₂-a (?) - E 734, 4
- du-uk-ta ~ taka₄-(a-bi) - TBR 101 Rev. 4
- e¹-na ~ en-na - E 771+, 26
- -e-ne ~ -ne-ne - E 767, I, 6
- -igi-du-a-ni ~ -igi-du-ka-ni - E 767, I, 4
- i₃-in-ke ~ e-ne-gen₇ - E 767, II, 23
- me-na-a ~ me-na-am₃ - E 767, II, 4
- mi-en-na-a ~ me-en-am₃ - E 770, 3
- ni-ik-k[e] ~ niĝen - E 767, II, 9
- nu-mu-un-pa-ap-li-ia ~ nu-mu-un-bala-bala-e-(da) - E 734, 6⁹⁷⁴

Ugarit

Babylonian Tablets

- -kur- ~ -ukur₃- - RS 25.130, 36

Ugarit Script Tablets

- a-ia-an-ni-gi-re-a-ab-ba-saĝ₁₀-ga ~ aia-ni ^denki-ra e₂-a ba-ši-ku₄-a - AuOrS 23 21, 83
- -aḥ-bi-lu ~ gibil - RS 79.25, 3
- an ~ ana - AuOrS 23 21, 86
- a-na-a ~ a-na-am₃ - AuOrS 23 21, 86
- a-ra-me-ek-mu-aš-šu ~ a-ra₂-min-kam₂-aš - AuOrS 23 21, 84
- a-še-in-zu ~ uš₇-nu-zu (?) - AuOrS 23 21, 70
- [da]m-lugal-ke₄ ~ dam-lugal-la-ke₄ - RS 86.2210, I, § 10
- e-ur-ra-ga-^ran-ni^r ~ e₂-ur₃-ra-ke₄-ne-ne - RS 23.34+ B, 10⁹⁷⁵
- mu-saĝ-ke ~ muš-a-gen₇ - AuOrS 23 21, 82
- muš-šu ~ mu-šum₂ - AuOrS 23 21, 83
- mu-un-za-am-za-a ~ mu-un-na-an-šen-šen - RS 17.10 Obv. 10
- ni₂-te-na ~ ni₂-te-a-ni - RS 79.25, 28
- pa-ta ~ ba-tar - RS 86.2210, II, § 5
- saĝ-ĝa₂-gu₂-bi ~ saĝ-ki-a₂-gub-bi - AuOrS 23 21, 93
- saĝ-ke-dab ~ saĝ-geĝ-dab - AuOrS 23 21, 79

974 Final (i)a is here regarded as resulting from metathesis of (bal)a-e, therefore this entry is not listed under additional vowels.

975 Alternately, this could be treated as an omission of the last -ne.

- si-il-lal-i-kat-ta ~ **asila-ka-ta** - AuOrS 23 21, 6⁹⁷⁶
- u₂-da-gi ~ u₄-da-kam - RS 79.25, 40
- u₂-mi-za- ~ **mu-mu-za** - RS 79.25, 3
- u₂-na-me-e ~ **mu nam-mu** - RS 79.25, 39
- za ~ za-**e** - AuOrS 23 21, 86

Old Babylonian

- a ~ **ama** - VS 2 94, 44
- a-aš₂-pa-la-ba-ke ~ aš-bala-ba-ke₄-eš - TIM 9 35, 16
- a-mu ~ **am₃-mu** - VS 2 94, 5
- be₂- ~ **ba-e** - AO 24146 Rev. 9 (53) (Susa)
- bu-lu-ka-ki ~ bulug-**an-ki** - VS 2 48, 10
- di-te-be₂-me-eš ~ **dib-dib-be₂-me-eš** - H 97 I, 4
- du ~ tu**g₂** - CNMA 10051 II, 5 (103)
- du-ra-ki ~ dur-**an-ki** - VS 2 48, 9
- e²-ta-še ~ e₂-**a-tu₅-a-še₃** - H 83A Obv. 6
- gi-bi- ~ **gibil-** - H 97 I 60
- gu-ku-bu-me-eš ~ **gub-gub-bu-me-eš** - H 97 I, 4
- gu-ru ~ **ġuruš** - PBS 10/2 3, 6
- ħe₂-em-ši-ħu-ħu-ul ~ -ħul₂-ħul₂ - PBS 10/2 3 Rev. 5
- i-ri- ~ erim₂ - TCL 15 38 Obv. 10, 12 (63, 65)
- -ke ~ -**gen₇** - PBS 10/2 3 Rev. 9
- ki-ib-la ~ ki-**bala** - TCL 15 38 Obv. 10 (62)
- ki-gi ~ ki-**geg** - H 97 III, 17
- ki-is₃-ki-ra ~ ki-**sikil-ra** - H 97 III 5
- ku-ur-ku ~ kur-**kur** - PBS 10/2 13, 2
- ma-aš-gi-ki-ga ~ maš**kim-gi₆-ga** - PBS 10/2 13 Rev. 6
- mi-li ~ me-**lim₄** - VS 2 4, 7
- mu-na-an-šu ~ mu-na-an-š**um₂** - TCL 15 38 Obv. 4, 5 (54-55)
- na- ~ **nam-** - TCL 15 38 Obv. 7, 9, 13 (59, 61, 66)
- na-mu ~ **nam-mu** - VS 2 94, 63
- -su-su-ub ~ -š**ub-šub** - H 97 I, 39-40
- ša ak-šu ~ ša₃ **kuš₂-u₃** - TIM 9 1, 7
- tu ~ tu**g₂** - H 77, 30
- u₃-un ~ u₃-**mu-un** - PBS 10/2 3 Obv. 3

Most of the short writings involving consonants are concentrated at the end of words. This is possibly an extension of the well-known loss of final consonants in certain Sumerian words. Frequent is the loss of final /m/ - im-g[u]-g[u-r]a ~ im-gi/(u³)gur**um** (Ĥattuša), me-na-a ~ me-na-**am₃** (Emar), a-na-a ~ a-na-**am₃**, muš-šu ~ mu-**sum**, u₂-da-gi ~ u₄-da-kam (Ugarit) - and /n/ - i₃-in-ke ~ e-ne-**gen₇** (Emar), mu-saġ-ke ~ muš-a-**gen₇**, mu-un-za-am-za-a ~ mu-un-na-an-š**en-šen**, (Ugarit). Under the influence of the loss of Akkadian mimation, the 3sg. form of the Sumerian copula /am/ was occasionally shortened to /a/ from the Old Babylonian period onwards.⁹⁷⁷ In the Old Babylonian unorthographic texts the loss of the final consonant extended to other cases as well; for instance the spelling of -gen₇ as -ki was rather frequent.⁹⁷⁸ Loss of consonants other than /m/ and /n/, mainly in final position, is also well attested.⁹⁷⁹ Two consecutive consonants, especially geminated consonants, were frequently reduced to one in the

976 For phonetic writings with apheresis of *a* from the OB period see Attinger 1993, 444.

977 Black, Zólyomi 2007, 22.

978 For spellings of gen₇, see Bergmann 1965, 39 n. 6.

979 Krecher 1966a, 47-48.

Old Babylonian unorthographic texts.⁹⁸⁰ This phenomenon is also attested in the Syro-Anatolian documentation: e¹-na ~ en-na (Emar) and saĝ-ke-dab ~ saĝ-geĝ-dab (Ugarit). Loss of the final consonant in the first form of a reduplicated verbal base, ba-ki-ik-[(ki)-ir] ~ ba-an-gir₁₁-gir₁₁, šu-ta-ta-ak-ke ~ šu dag-dag-ge (Ḫattuša), ša₃-an-ki-ki-ne₂ ~ saĝ kiĝ₂-kiĝ₂-e (Ugarit), is perhaps connected with pronunciation which tends to reduce the sequence C₁v₁C₂-C₁v₁C₂ to C₁v₁-C₁v₁C₂. Partial reduplication⁹⁸¹ is also attested in the OB texts.⁹⁸² It cannot be excluded that the elevated number of occurrences in the local tablets from Ugarit, notably in the collection of incantations AuOrS 23 21, is due to dictation.

Loss of vowels mostly occurs in sequences of vowels of which only one is retained.

The omission of the 1/2 sg. personal suffix -en in verbal forms is independent from phonetic orthography because it is a late development that would become very common in the first-millennium documentation. Examples are: [na]-an-gub-ba ~ na-an-gub-be-en (KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 3); na-an-tu-uš-ta-a ~ na-an-tuš-de₃-en (KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 3); nam-ba-ki-ki-ti ~ nam-ba-gi₄-gi₄-de₃-en (KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 4); nam-ba-še-šu-še-šu-de₃ ~ nam-ba-šu₂-šu₂-de₃-en (KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 4).

4.3 Phonetic Alterations

This section is dedicated to the analysis of phonetic alterations resulting from unorthographic writings. Here phonetic alterations are not understood as phonetic changes similar to those produced in spoken languages, but as changes in the use of the syllabary. For example, when the sign KI is used to write gi₄, it is read here as ki rather than gi₅ because the purpose of the analysis is to show that a sign with an original voiceless consonant was used to write a logogram with a voiced sound. Therefore the shift *g* > *k* is evaluated only in terms of the syllabary, without regard to the actual pronunciation of the sign KI, whether /ki/ or /gi/. As a consequence, only Cv signs are taken into account because the cuneiform script does not distinguish voiced, voiceless and emphatic consonants for vC and CvC signs except when they are followed by a Cv sign.

Phonetic alterations may affect both consonants and vowels. Consonants are listed first according to manner of articulation and secondarily according to place of articulation, with the exception of sibilants which are grouped together.

4.3.1 Consonants

4.3.1.1 Stops

4.3.1.1.1 Dentals

d > *t*

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- šu-ta-ta-ak-ke ~ šu dag-dag-ge - KUB 30 1, I, 3
- šu-tu-ul ~ šu-dul₃ (?) - KUB 30 3, 5
- u₃-tu-[ug[?]] ~ udug - KBo 36 13, R. Col. 10
- u₃-tu-uk-ka ~ udug (?) - KBo 36 15 Obv. 6
- uš-du-ut-tu ~ uš₁₁ du₁₁-du₁₁ - KUB 30 1, I, 11

⁹⁸⁰ Krecher 1966a, 45-49, especially examples on 47-48 and Kutscher 1975, 36-37.

⁹⁸¹ For partial reduplication see Edzard 2003, 80-81, see also Bergmann 1965, 39.

⁹⁸² See PBS 10/2 3, Rev. 5, H 97 I, 4, H 97 I, 39-40 among the examples quoted above.

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- kiĝ₂¹-b[u]-ru-ta ~ kiĝ₂-bur₂-ru-da - KBo 36 11+ Obv.20
- ta-na-ta ~ da-ni-ta - KBo 36 11+ Rev. 32, 33
- teĝ₃-ge-ta-a²-[ni[?]]⁹⁸³ ~ teĝ₃-ĝe₂₆-da-ni - KBo 36 11+ Rev. 28

Hittite Script Tablets

- it-ta ~ i₇-da - CTH 314 - KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 7
- i-te-[en-na] ~ edin-na - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 18
- i₇-ti ~ i₇-da - KUB 37 111 Obv. II, 9
- kut-ta ~ gu₇-da - KUB 57 126 Obv. I, 2
- na-an-tu-uš-ta-a ~ na-an-tuš-de₃-en - KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 3
- nam-ba-ki-ki-ti ~ nam-ba-gi₄-gi₄-de₃-en - KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 4
- nu-ki-ki-it-ti ~ nu-gi₄-gi₄-da - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 45
- pa₃(GAM)-ta ~ pa₃-da - KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 5
- [saĝ]-ki-kut-ta ~ saĝ-ki-gud-da - KUB 57 126 Obv. I, 3
- ša-an-ki-ku-ut-ta ~ saĝ-ki-gud-da - KUB 57 126 Obv. II, 3
- te-el-mu-na ~ delmun-na - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 39
- ti-en-kar ~ diĝir - KUB 4 26B, 10, 11
- ti-in-qa-ri-ni ~ diĝir-ra-ni - KUB 4 26B, 7
- u₃-du₂-ud-ta ~ u₃-du₂-ud-da - KUB 4 7, 4

Emar

- gan-me-ta ~ gan-me-da - E 751, 5
- ib-te-[...] ~ ib₂-dib-ba - E 768A, II, 5
- ki-u₄-ta-ta ~ ki-u₄-da-ta - E 771+, 25
- nu-bala-ta ~ nu-bala-e-da - E 775, 3
- ra-ra-ta-mu-ⁿⁱ ~ ra-ra-da-mu-ne - E 729, 16
- ša-ud-ta- ~ su₃-ud-da- - E 767, II, 7
- šu-bu-ta-mu-ni ~ šub-bu-da-mu-ne - E 729, 15
- te-em-ma ~ dima - E 767, II, 2
- ti-gi-re-e-ni ~ diĝir-re-e-ne - E 767, II, 2
- t[i-(in)-gi-ir] ~ diĝir - TBR 101 Obv. 3
- ti-kar- ~ diĝir- - E 767, II, 20
- tiĝ₄-ke-ta-mu-ni ~ teĝ₃/tiĝ₄-ĝe₂₆-da-mu-ne - E 729, 14
- ^{zu}-zu-ta-ni ~ zu-mu-da-ne (?) - E 729, 14

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- [a]n-šū₂¹-u₄-ta-^{ke}-[...] ~ an-su₃-u₄-da-gen₇ - RS 23.34+ B, 11
- a-te-na ~ edin - RS 79.25, 28
- at-ta-an-ni ~ ad-da-ni - RS 17.10 Rev. 2
- -ba-ba-ta ~ -pa₃-pa₃-da - RS 17.10 Obv. 8
- <gu>-u₂-ru-ud-ta ~ gurud-da - AuOrS 23 21, 79

983 This word is only listed here and not also under *scriptio plena* because -a- is uncertain.

- it-te-ta-ni-eš ~ i₃-te-da-ni-eš₂ - AuOrS 23 21, 47
- ku-ku-ut-ta ~ ku₅-ku₅-de₃ - RS 86.2210, I, § 7
- mu-ut-ta-ša-a ~ mud-da-še₃ - AuOrS 23 21, 81
- nu-tu₄-ga ~ nu-du₁₁-ga - AuOrS 23 13, 2
- šu nu-tu-ga-ga ~ šu nu-du₁₀-ga-ka - AuOrS 23 21, 8
- ta-a-bi ~ du₃-a-bi - RS 79.25, 18
- ta-mu-zi-ig ~ dumu-zi(g) - AuOrS 23 21, 7
- te-[em ...] ~ dima - RS 23.34+ B, 3
- ti-ga-ar ~ diġir - RS 79.25, 7
- ti-kar ~ diġir - AuOrS 23 21, 80
- tu-mu-ga ~ dumu-ġu₁₀ - AuOrS 23 21, 86
- u₂-tu ~ u₄-da - RS 23.34+ B, 5
- u₄-ta ~ u₄-da - RS 23.34+ B, 12

Old Babylonian

- -aš-ta-am ~ eš₂-dam - H 97 I, 47
- -di-tu ~ -du₁₁-du₁₁ - VS 2 3, I *passim*
- ħa-la-mi-it-te ~ ħa-lam-e-de₃ - TIM 9 1, 9
- ta-al-[la] ~ dalla - TCL 15 3 + BL VI, 66
- ^{ġeš}ta-m-zu ~ ^{ġeš}dam-zu - H 178 Obv. 15 (44)
- -te ~ de₃ - TIM 9 1, *passim*
- [t]u-u₃-tu ~ du_{3/8}-du_{3/8} - H 179+ II, 2
- za-te-eb-kur-kur-ra ~ za₃-dib-kur-kur-ra - TIM 9 20, 2
- zi-zi-ta ~ zi-zi-(i)-da - H 178 Obv. 11 (39)

t > d

Ḫattuša

Assyro-Mitannian

- (-)dub-dub-be₂ ~ (-)tub₂-tub₂-be₂ - KBo 36 11+ Obv. 26, 27, 36

Hittite Script Tablets

- -a-ki-i-du ~ -a₂-ki-tum⁹⁸⁴ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 42
- du-uš-ka-ra ~ tuš-ġar-ra - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 11
- ši-da-q-qa ~ šu-ta₃-ga - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 36

Emar

- al-du-uš ~ al-tuš - TBR 101 Obv. 8
- bar-da ~ bar-ta - Tsukimoto, 38
- du-uk-ta ~ taka₄-(a-bi) - TBR 101 Rev. 4
- ħe₂-en-da-gub ~ ħe₂-en-ta-gub - E 743, 3
- ħe₂-en-da₃-su₂-ge-eš ~ ħe₂-en-ta-su₈-su₈-ge-eš - E 729, 6

984 This word is not listed among short-writings as spellings without -m are known: a₂-ki-ti, a₂-ki-te.

- i-gi-du-**ud-du**₅ ~ igi-du-ta - E 767, II, 3
- u-**du** ~ ^dutu - E 768A, II, 3, 4

Ugarit

Babylonian Tablets

- ^du₂-u₂-u₄-**du** ~ ^dutu - AuOrS 23 27, 7

Ugarit Script Tablets

- **du**-ma ~ tum₂-ma - RS 86.2210, II, § 4
- -**du**-uš-ša₂-a ~ -tuš-a - RS 17.10 Obv. 5
- i-**da**-[na-mi-da] ~ iti nam-iti - RS 79.25 40
- u₂-**du** ~ ^dutu - RS 79.25, 19

Old Babylonian

- **de** ~ te - AO 24146 Rev. 27 (69) (Susa)
- **di**-la ~ ti-le - MMUM 35516+, 11, 13
- **du** ~ tug₂ - CNMA 10051 II, 5 (103)
- eri-du₈-**da** ~ eridu-ta - H 97 III, 15
- kuš-**da** ~ kuš-ta - H 97 VI, 20
- (^{ḡeš})niḡ₂-gul-**da** ~ ^{ḡeš}niḡ₂-gul-ta - H 178 Obv. 5, 6 (33, 34)

4.3.1.1.2 Velars

g > k

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- ba-**ki-ik**-[ki-ir] - ba-an-gir₁₁-gir₁₁ - KUB 30 1, I, 9
- šu-ta-ta-**ak-ke** ~ šu dag-dag-ge - KUB 30 1, I, 3
- u₃-tu-**uk-ka** ~ udug (?) - KBo 36 15 Obv. 6

Hittite Script Tablets

- i-**ki**- ~ igi - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 42
- ke-eš-tu-u₄-**ku** ~ ḡeštug_{2/3} - KUB 4 26B 3⁹⁸⁵
- **ki-ki** ~ gi₄-gi₄ - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 8
- **ku-gal** ~ gu₂-gal - CTH 314 - KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 6
- **ku-ru-um** ~ gurun - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 37
- **ku-u-ra** ~ gur-ra-(am₃) - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 46
- **kut-ta** ~ gu₇-da (?) - KUB 57 126 Obv. I, 2
- na-aš-**ke**-ma-am-ma-an-ku ~ ḡešgem-ama-ḡu₁₀ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 40, 47

985 /d/ in the reading ud of the sign UD possibly voices /k/.

- nam-ba-**ki-ki**-ti ~ nam-ba-gi₄-gi₄-de₃-en - KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 4
- nu-**ki-ki**-it-ti ~ nu-gi₄-gi₄-da - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 45
- [saĝ]-ki-**kut**-ta ~ saĝ-ki-gud-da - KUB 57 126 Obv. I, 3
- ša-an-ki-**ku**-ut-ta ~ saĝ-ki-gud-da - KUB 57 126 Obv. II, 3

Emar

- i-**ki** ~ igi - Tsukimoto, 38
- i-**ki**-du (2) ~ igi-ĝu₁₀ - Tsukimoto, 37
- i₃-in-**ke** ~ e-ne-gen₇ - E 767, II, 23
- in-ta-ba-an-**ki** ~ im-ma-(ta[?])-an-gi₄ - E 768A, I, 3
- kala-**ke** ~ kala-ge - E 776, 4
- **ki**-da-an-ni ~ gid₂-da-ni - E 734, 3
- -**ki**-im ~ -gen₇ - E 767, II, 7
- mu-un-**ke**-ne₂-e ~ mu-un-ge-ne₂ - E 776, 4
- nu-**ke**-eg ~ nu-geg - TBR 101 Obv. 4

Ugarit

Babylonian Tablets

- he₂-**ku**-la ~ ĥe₂-gul-la - AuOrS 23 25, 14

Ugarit Script Tablets

- he₂-**ku**-la ~ ĥe₂-gul-la - AuOrS 23 25, 14

Ugarit Script Tablets

- [a]n-š_u¹-u₄-ta-**ke**-[...] ~ an-su₃-u₄-da-gen₇ - RS 23.34+ B, 11
- [a-sa-ki-i]**k-ku** ~ asag-ge - AuOrS 23 21, 70
- i-**ki** ~ igi - RS 86.2210, II, § 8
- **ka**-<aš>-al-ĥi-a ~ gi-šul-ĥi-a - RS 17.10 Obv. 12
- **kar-kar** ~ gir₅-gir₅ - RS 86.2210, II, § 5
- **ki**- ~ gi- - RS 86.2210, I, § 3
- -**ki**- ~ -gi₄- - RS 17.10 Obv. 16
- **ki-ik-ki** ~ gi₄-gi₄ - AuOrS 23 21, 8
- **ki-il-za** ~ gil-sa - RS 79.25, 41
- -**ki**-im ~ gen₇ - RS 79.25, 29
- [ki[?]]-in[?]-nim-**kalam-kalam**-ab-bi ~ ki niĝ₂-galam-galam-ma-bi - RS 17.10 Obv. 7
- **ku** mu-n[a-de] ~ gu₂ mu-na-de₂ - AuOrS 23 21, 83
- **ku**¹-u₂-ba-ni ~ gub-ba-ni - AuOrS 23 21, 81
- **ku**-ug-bi ~ gu₂-un-bi - RS 79.25, 36
- mu-saĝ-**ke** ~ muš-a-gen₇ - AuOrS 23 21, 82⁹⁸⁶
- na-aš-**ki** ~ ĝeš-gi - RS 17.10 Obv. 14
- saĝ-**ke**-dab ~ saĝ-geg-dab - AuOrS 23 21, 79
- ur-**ku**-ul-la ~ ur-gu-la - RS 86.2210, II, § 6

986 Perhaps /ĝ/ voices /k/.

Old Babylonian

- a-ša₃-**ki**-nam ~ a-ša₃-gen₇-nam - TIM 9 1, 49
- bu-lu-**ka**-ki ~ bulug-an-ki - VS 2 48, 10
- -du-**ka** ~ du₁₁-ga - CNMA 10051 I, 4-5 (32-33)
- e-da-**ka** ~ a-du₁₁-ga -TIM 9 1, 60
- geg-**ki** ~ geg-gi - H 97 V, 12
- ka-la-**ak-ka** ~ kala-ga - TIM 9 35, 3
- -**ke**₄ ~ gen₇ - H 97 II, 8
- -**ke** ~ -gen₇ - PBS 10/2 3 Rev. 9
- -**ke** ~ -gen₇ - VS 2 94, 13
- -**ke**-en ~ -gen₇ - H 103 IV, 24
- -**ki**-in ~ -gen₇ - PBS 10/2 3 Rev. 6
- -**ki**-in ~ -gen₇ - H 103 IV, 14, 21
- ki-ni-**ki** ~ ki-en-gi - TIM 9 35, 3
- **ki**-ri ~ giri₁₆ - AO 24146 Obv. 7 (7) (Susa)
- ma-aš₂-gi-**ki**-ga ~ mašgim-gi₆-ga - PBS 10/2 13 Rev. 4
- mi-ni-in-u₃-**ku**₂-ge ~ mi-ni-in-ug₅-ug₅-ge - H 97 I, 16
- ša₃-**ak-ke** ~ sağ₃-ge - AO 24146 Obv. 28 (28) Rev. 2-3 (46-47) (Susa)
- u₃-nu-**ka** ~ unu^{ki}-ga - VS 2 48, 6
- zi-**ka** ~ saga₁₁ - TCL 15 38 Obv. 4, 6 (55-57)
- zi-**ku** ~ zi₃-gu₂ - H 97 IV, 35

g > q

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- i-nita(UŠ)-ta-a**q-qa** ~ i₃-ni-ta₃-ta₃-ga - KUB 30 1, I, 12⁹⁸⁷
- ni-ka-la-**qa** ~ niġ₂-kala-ga - KBo 36 16, 4, 5
- -si-i**q-qa** ~ sağ₃-ga - KUB 30 1, I, 16-17

Hittite Script Tablets

- **qa**-mu-ra-an-šum₂ ~ ga-mu-ra-ab-šum₂ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 47
- ši-da**q-qa** ~ šu-ta₃-ga - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 36⁹⁸⁸
- za-la-**qa** ~ zalag-ga - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 28

Emar

- du**q-qa**-gen₇ ~ du₁₁-ga-gen₇ - E 770, 8
- za-la-a**q-qa** ~ zalag-ga - E 767, II, 19
- za-la-a**q-qa** ~ zalag-ga - E 768A, II, 4

987 aBZL: ninta. Doubling of /q/ is perhaps an attempt at rendering the voiced consonant /g/ through the emphatic /q/.

988 Cf. preceding footnote.

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- ḥe-za-la-**qa** ~ ḥe-zalag₍₂₎-ge - RS 79.25, 20
- ka-la-**qa**-e-ni ~ kala-ge-de₃ - RS 79.25, 24
- ri-i**q-qa** ~ rig₇-ga - RS 17.10 Obv. 13
- sa-si-**qa** ~ za₃-sag₁₀-ga - AuOrS 23 21, 95
- u₄-za-la-**qa**- ~ u₄-zalag₍₂₎-ga- - RS 79.25, 20

Old Babylonian

- du-**qa** ~ dug-a (?) - H 97 IV, 27
- du-**qa**-zu ~ du₁₁-ga-zu - H 103 IV, 13
- -**qa**- ~ -ka- - AO 24146 Obv. 4 (4) (Susa)
- ne-**qa**-al ~ ni₂-gal - TIM 9 24, 10 (161)
- **qa**-na ~ gana₂ - H 74, 17
- **qa**-na ~ gana₂ - H 103 I, 17
- -si-**qa** ~ sag₃-ga - H 97 IV, 15
- su-**qa**-al ~ sugal₇ - H 103 II, 5
- ta-**qa** ~ ta₃-ga - H 97 IV, 14

*g > ḥ***Ḥattuša**

Hittite Script Tablets

- li-a[**ḥ**-a] ~ lu₂-ug₇-a[?] - KUB 4 24 Rev. 10

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- -a**ḥ**-bi-lu ~ gibil - RS 79.25, 3⁹⁸⁹

*g > ḡ***Ḥattuša**

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- sa**ḡ**-še ~ za₃.(g)-še₃ - KBo 36 11+ Obv. 37⁹⁹⁰

989 The shift *g > ḥ* here is hypothetical; see Arnaud 1982a, 213, who regards -aḥ-bi-lu as ḥe₂-gibil.

990 This entry is listed here on account of the *Auslaut* *g* in za₃.*g* even though it was not actually pronounced; the Sumerian reading saḡ is here adopted although the sign SAḠ can be read as sag in Akkadian.

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- niĝ₂-nu-saĝ-ga ~ niĝ₂-nu-sa₆-ga - AuOrS 23 21, 7

Old Babylonian

- a-ĝa₂-ar ~ a-gar₃ - H 97 I, 31

*k > g***Ḫattuša**

Babylonian Tablets

- bi-in-ĝi-id ~ bi₂-in-kid₂ - KUB 30 2, I, 11

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- šu-nam-tar-<ra>-ĝa-a-ni ~ šu-nam-tar-ra-ka-ni - KBo 36 11+ Obv. 46 Rev. 20

Hittite Script Tablets

- ĝa-lam-ma ~ kalam-ma - CTH 314 - KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 6
- iš-ĝur ~ ^diškur - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 12
- iš-ĝur ~ ^diškur - CTH 314 - KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 1, 6
- ša¹-aš-ĝu[r] ~ siškur - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 42

Emar

- e-da-ra-ĝa-^ran-ni^r ~ e₂-da-ri₂-ke₄-ne-(ne) - E 767, II, 6
- -i-ĝi-du-ĝa-an-ni ~ -i-ĝi-du-ka-ni - E 767 II, 4
- ti-el-la-ĝa-an-ni ~ til-la-ke₄-e-ne - E 734, 2

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- a-ia-an-ni-ĝi-re-a-ab-ba-saĝ₁₀-ĝa ~ aia-ni ^denki-ra e₂-a ba-ši-ku₄-a - AuOrS 23 21, 83
- ba-an-ĝu ~ ba-an-ku₄ - RS 86.2210 II, § 7
- e-ur-ra-ĝa-^ran-ni^r ~ e₂-ur₃-ra-ke₄-ne-ne - RS 23.34+ B, 10
- ĝa^(a) ~ ka₅^a- - RS 86.2210 II, 8, 9
- ĝu-ĝu-ut-ta ~ ku₅-ku₅-de₃ - RS 86.2210 II, § 7
- niĝ₂-nu-ti-il-la-aĝ-ĝa ~ niĝ₂-nu-til₃-la-ka - AuOrS 23 21, 8
- šu nu-tu-ga-ĝa ~ šu nu-du₁₀-ga-ka - AuOrS 23 21, 8
- u₂-da-ĝi ~ ud-da-kam - RS 79.25, 40

Old Babylonian

- lu₂-**gu**-ur ~ lu₂-kur₂ - TIM 9 35, 17

k > q

Hattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- di-i**q**-**q**[u] ~ di-ku₅ - KUB 30 1, II, 19
- ni-ĝa₂-a**q**-**q**[a] ~ niĝ₂-ak-(a) - KUB 37 109, 2

Hittite Script Tablets

- e-e**q**a-ma ~ 5-kam-ma - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 47
- lam-ma**q**a-ma ~ 4-kam - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 40

Emar

- ni-ta-aḥ-a**q**-**q**a[...] ~ nita-kala - E 776, 3

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- ma-an-a-gal-ta**q**a-a ~ ĝal₂ mu-un-taka₄-a - RS 79.25, 12-13

Old Babylonian

- -**q**a ~ -ka - AO 24146 Obv. 7 (7) (Susa)

k > ĝ

Hattuša*Assyro-Mitannian*

- -ĝar-ra ~ kar-ra - KUB 37 102, L. Col. 5

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- saĝ-ĝa₂-gu₂-bi ~ saĝ-ki-a₂-gub-bi - AuOrS 23 21, 93

4.3.1.1.3 Bilabials

*b > p***Hattuša**

Hittite Script Tablets

- ša₃-dub-**pa** ~ ša₃-dub-ba - KUB 4 39, 11
- za-aG-**pa** ~ saĝ-ba - KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 14
- zi-iG-**pa** ~ saĝ-ba - KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 5, 7

Emar

- nu-mu-un-**pa-ap**-li-ia ~ nu-mu-un-bala-bala-e-(da) - E 734, 6
- **pa**-da-dal ~ ba-da-dal - Tsukimoto, 37

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- ga-**pa**-a ~ gab-a - RS 86.2210, II, § 5
- **pa**-a-tar ~ ba-tar - RS 86.2210, I, § 5
- **pa**-ta ~ ba-tar - RS 86.2210, II, § 5
- **pi**-in-du ~ bi₂-in-du₈ - AuOrS 23 21, 68

Old Babylonian

- a-aš₂-**pa**-la-ba-ke ~ aš-bala-ba-ke₄-eš - TIM 9 35, 16
- a-**pa**-ar ~ abbar - VS 2 94, 61
- **ap**-si-im ~ ab-sin₂ - PBS 10/2 13 Rev. 13
- aš₂-**pa**-la ~ aš₂-bala - H 97 IV, 4
- ba-**ap**-**pa**-ar ~ babbar₂ - H 103 I, 19
- ba-**ap**-**pa**-ar ~ babbar₂ - H 74, 19
- ḥa-**pa**-ra-e ~ ḥa-ba-ra-e₃ - H 97 I, 48
- **pi**-za-za ~ bi₂-za-za - AO 24146 Obv. 8 (8) (Susa)
- ša₃-**pa** ~ ša₃-ba - CNMA 10051 II, 7 (108)
- šu ku-un-di-**ip**-**pa** ~ šu kiĝ₂-dab₅-ba - TIM 9 1, 67
- za-**pa**-ri ~ zabar - BM 79949, 3

*p > b***Hattuša**

Hittite Script Tablets

- e¹-ri-**ba** ~ i-ri-pa₃ - KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 6
- e-ri-**ib**-**ba** ~ i-ri-pa₃ - KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 8, 10

Emar

- nu-mu-un-ba-da-en-ze₂-en ~ nu-mu-un-pad₃-de₃-en-ze₂-en - E 734, 10

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- -ba-ba-ta ~ -pa₃-pa₃-da - RS 17.10 Obv. 8

Old Babylonian

- bi-eš₃-te ~ peš₁₀-ta - H 97 V, 20
- bi-iš ~ peš₂ - H 103 I, 24
- bi₂-ri-ne[?] ~ piriĝ - VS 2 1, 8

Among stops, phonetic alterations mostly affect dentals and velars. Stops usually shift at the same place of articulation: the most frequent alteration is the voiced > voiceless shift, whereas the opposite shift, voiceless > voiced, is less common.

Corpus	d > t	t > d	g > k	g > q	g > ħ	g > ĝ	k > g	k > q	k > ĝ	b > p	p > b	Total
Ḫattuša: Babylonian Script	5	0	3	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	14
Ḫattuša: Ass-Mit Script	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	7
Ḫattuša: Hittite Script	14	3	12	3	1	0	4	2	0	3	2	44
Total Ḫattuša	22	4	15	6	1	1	6	4	1	3	2	65
Emar	13	7	9	3	0	0	3	1	0	2	1	39
Ugarit: Babylonian Script	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Ugarit: Ugarit Script	18	4	18	5	1	1	8	1	1	4	1	62
Total Ugarit	18	5	19	5	1	1	8	1	1	4	1	64

The Old Babylonian documentation displays a similar picture but with some remarkable differences. Renderings of dentals do not differ in terms of quality or quantity between the Old Babylonian and the Syro-Anatolian corpora. Conversely, velar stops are affected more frequently by the voiceless > voiced shift in the Syro-Anatolian documentation than in the OB tablets, where this shift was rarely attested. However, in the Western periphery the *k > g* shift appears almost exclusively in the tablets drafted by local scribes; the Babylonian script tablets present just one occurrence of this shift, namely in a manuscript from Ḫattuša. More generally, the majority of phonetic alterations concerning stops are concentrated in local tablets whereas the Babylonian script tablets tend to respect the original spelling of words by limiting phonetic shifts. Indeed, the shift *t > d* occurs only twice in the Babylonian tablets from the Western archives. Remarkably, most of the phonetic alterations affecting stops in the documentation of Ḫattuša derive from tablets written by Hittite scribes despite the fact that the Babylonian tablets CTH 800 provide the largest number of examples of phonetic writings from the Hittite capital.⁹⁹¹ It is clear that local scribes adopted to a larger extent the modifications of the conventional writing system that can be found in the Old Babylonian unorthographic texts.

Alterations of dentals in logograms, including CvC signs and polysyllabic logograms, are more frequent at Ugarit than at Ḫattuša and Emar. A large number of entries from Ḫattuša consist in the substitution of the sign DA with TA.

Bilabial stops are seldom affected by alterations; most of them consist in the shift *b > p*, whereas the opposite is very rare in the Syro-Anatolian documentation as well as in the Old Babylonian period.

⁹⁹¹ See § 4.1.1. The list of CTH 800 tablets is provided in the introduction to this chapter and in § 3.1.

The Syro-Anatolian sources display alterations of stops I was not able to trace back to the Old Babylonian corpus, namely $g > h$ and $k > \hat{g}$. These two shifts – three entries overall – are only attested at Ḫattuša and Ugarit and do not occur in the Babylonian script tablets. The shift $g > h$ is found in two local manuscripts from Ḫattuša and Ugarit in unclear contexts whereas the shift $k > \hat{g}$ is only attested in an Assyro-Mitannian tablet. Although there is no conclusive evidence, it is possible that these shifts were produced independently by local scribes. The closely related shift $g > \hat{g}$ is conversely known from an OB tablet. All these alterations, however, emerge very infrequently.

No significant difference in the use of emphatic consonants for either voiced or voiceless velar stops can be observed among the Syro-Anatolian corpora and between these and the OB sources. The shift $g > q$ is more frequent than the shift $k > q$. With the exception of di-iq-q[u] ~ di-ku₅ in the Babylonian script tablet KUB 30 1, II, 19, the representation of the emphatic velar is limited to the sign qa in the Syro-Anatolian and OB sources.

Alterations may affect both Cv and CvC signs (e.g., ša-an-ki-ku-ut-ta ~ saġ-ki-gud-da, Ḫattuša) and both phonograms and logograms.

Stops are not rendered consistently within a single manuscript; moreover, a single manuscript may contain unorthographic writings with or without phonetic alterations.⁹⁹² However, the complementary distribution of different phonetic renderings of the same logogram is rare within a single manuscript; two examples derive from the same tablet, AuOrS 23 21: -gi-gi (l. 85) and -ki-ik-ki (l. 8) for -gi₄-gi₄ and tu-mu (l. 86) and du-mu (l. 54) for dumu.

4.3.1.2 Nasals

4.3.1.2.1 Labials and Dentals

n > m

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- -gi-**im** ~ -gen₇ (?) – KBo 36 13, L. Col. 4, 14, 15
- -gi-**im** ~ -gen₇ – KUB 30 1, II, 2, 18

Hittite Script Tablets

- ku-ru-**um** ~ gurun – CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 37
- ma-aš-**am**-ši ~ maš-anše – CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 7

Emar

- e-ri-**ma**-a-ni ~ erin₂-a-ni – TBR 101 Obv. 5
- -ki-**im** ~ -gen₇ – E 767, II, 7

⁹⁹² For instance *d* is rendered differently in KUB 30 1, I, 15, ba-ni-ib-di-ib-be₂ ~ ba-ni-ib-dib-be₂ and in I, 3, šu-ta-ta-ak-ke ~ šu dag-dag-ge.

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- -ki-**im** ~ gen₇ - RS 79.25, 29
- mu-un-za-**am**-za-a ~ mu-un-na-an-šen-šen - RS 17.10 Obv. 10

Old Babylonian

- ap-si-**im** ~ ab-sin₂ - PBS 10/2 13 Rev. 13
- **em**-si- ~ ensi- - VS 2 94, 64
- **mi**-it-te-en₃-bi ~ ni₂-te-ĝa₂-bi - TIM 9 1, 66

m > n

Ḫattuša

Hittite Script Tablets

- i-ši-**en** ~ izim - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 41

Old Babylonian

- **an**-tu-be₂ ~ am₃-tu₁₁-be₂ - TCL 15 38 Obv. 4 (55)
- šu-ni-**in**-ta ~ šu-nim-ta - TIM 9 1, 59
- **an**- ~ am₃- - CNMA 10051 I, 2, 3, 5 (29, 31, 33)
- na-ab-tu-**un** ~ na-ab-tum₃ - H 77, 6
- [u₃-r]i-**na** ~ uri₅^{ki}-ma - VS 2 48, 11
- **en**-du-du-e ~ im-du₃-du₃-e - VS 2 94, 49

4.3.1.2.2 Velars

ĝ > g

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- **ge**-ši-im-[ma-ar] ~ ĝešimmar⁹⁹³ - KUB 30 1, IV, 17
- **gi**-in-na ~ ĝen-na - KBo 40 103, 4
- **g**[i-in-na] ~ ĝen-na - KUB 30 1, I, 21
- **g**[i-i]n-na ~ ĝen-na - KUB 30 4, R. Col. 7
- **gi**-iš-šu-ub ~ ĝeš-šub - KUB 30 1, II, 18
- **gi**-iš-ḫu-[ur] ~ ĝeš-ḫur - KUB 30 1, IV, 18
- **gi**-ri ~ ĝiri₃ - KUB 30 2, I, 12

993 aBZL: ĝešnimbar.

- **g**[i-ri?] ~ ġiri₃ in a-šu-g[i-ri²-a(n)²-ni] ~ a₂-šu-ġiri₃-a-ni - KUB 30 4, R. Col. 13
- [**g**]i-ri-bi ~ ġiri₃-bi - KBo 36 15 Obv. 5
- **g**i-ri-ġu₁₀ ~ ġiri₃-ġu₁₀ - KUB 30 1, IV, 13
- -**g**u ~ -ġu₁₀ - KUB 30 1, I, 21
- -**g**u ~ -ġu₁₀ - KBo 36 15 Rev. 4
- **g**u-ru-uš ~ ġuruš - KUB 30 2, II, 7
- i-**g**i-in ~ i₃-ġen - KUB 30 1, I, 6
- mu-un-ši-ib-na-**ag** ~ mu-un-ši-ib-naġ - KUB 30 2, II, 9
- ni-**g**u-ug-g[u] ~ niġ₂-gu₇-gu₇ - KUB 30 1, I, 11
- ni-**ig**-na ~ niġ₂-na - KUB 30 1, IV, 9, 23
- u₃-me-ni-na-**ag** ~ u₃-me-ni-naġ - KUB 30 1, IV, 27

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- inim¹-**gal** ~ inim-ġar - CTH 794 Obv. 20
- teġ₃-**ge**-ta-a²-[ni²] ~ teġ₃-ġe₂₆-da-ni - KBo 36 11+ Rev. 28

Hittite Script Tablets

- ħe-in-**gal** ~ ħe₂-ġal₂ - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 13
- ni-**ig-g**[e-(na-ni)-iš-ši] ~ niġen-(na-ni)-še₃ - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 16
- [š]a-**ag-g**a-ak-ke ~ saġ-ġa₂-ke₄ - CTH 315 - KUB 4 2, 4

Emar

- **ge**-na ~ ġen-na - E 767, II, 24
- i₃-**ig-gal**-l[a] ~ i₃-ġal₂-la - E 767, II, 3
- ti-**gi**-re-e-ni ~ diġir-re-e-ne - E 767, II, 2
- u₄-saġ¹-**ga**-ta ~ u₄-saġ-ġa₂-ta - E 767, II, 17

Ugarit

Babylonian Tablets

- a-**ga** ~ aġ₂-a - AuOrS 23 27, 14

Ugarit Script Tablets

- aš-**gar**₃ ~ aš-ġar - AuOrS 23 21, 79
- -**ge**-en-na ~ -ġen-na - RS 86.2210, II, § 9
- **gi**-il-tun₃ ~ ġeštug_{7/23} (?) - RS 79.25, 15
- **gi**-in-ni-in-mi-ni ~ ġe₆ ni₂-me-lim₄ - RS 79.25, 27
- **gu**-ru-uš ~ ġuruš - RS 23.34+ A, 4
- ħe-**gal** ~ ħe₂-ġal₂ - RS 79.25, 34, 44
- ħe₂-**ga**-al ~ ħe₂-ġal₂ - RS 79.25, 43
- lu-**ga**-la-**gu** ~ luġal-ġu₁₀ - RS 79.25, 1
- ni-**ga** ~ niġ₂-ġa₂ in ni-ga-e-za-i - AuOrS 23 21, 87
- ni-**ge**-na ~ niġen-na - RS 86.2210, II, § 3
- ni-**ig-gi**-ri-ma-re-eš ~ niġ₂-ġir₂-ġar-eš₂ - AuOrS 23 21, 69⁹⁹⁴
- ti-**ga**-ar ~ diġir - RS 79.25, 7

994 For niġ-ġir₂ as an alternative writing of nim-ġir₂ see Sjöberg 1976, 422.

- tu-mu-**ga** ~ dumu-ĝu₁₀ - AuOrS 23 21, 86

Old Babylonian

- **ge**₁₇- ~ ĝe₆- - TIM 9 1, 2
- -**gu**-ra ~ ĝu₁₀ - VS 2 94, 23
- sa-**gi**-^riš^r ~ saĝ-e-eš - TCL 15 38 Rev. 1 (69)
- -sa-**gi**-ki-ga ~ -saĝ-gegge-ga - CNMA 10051 II, 4 (102)⁹⁹⁵

ĝ > k

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- ni-**ka**-la-qa ~ niĝ₂-kala-ga - KBo 36 16, 4, 5⁹⁹⁶

Hittite Script Tablets

- du-uš-**ka**-ra ~ tuš-ĝar-ra - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 11
- **ke**-eš-tu-u₄-ku ~ ĝeštug_{12/13} - KUB 4 26B, 3
- **ki**-i[n-na] ~ ĝen-na - RS 23.34+ A, 15
- **ki**-iš-tu-ug ~ ĝeštug_{12/13} - KUB 4 26B, 13

Emar

- **ka** ~ ĝa₂-e - AuOrS 23 21, 87
- **ki**-iš ~ ĝeš - E 767 II, 4, 13,
- **ki**-iš-ḫur-ḫu-r[e] ~ ĝeš-ḫur-ḫur-re - E 767, II, 1
- **ki**-iš-ḫu-ur ~ ĝeš-ḫur - E 767, II, 24
- **ku**-ru-uš ~ ĝuruš - E 767, II, 20
- ni-**ik**-**k**[e] ~ niĝen - E 767, II, 9
- tiĝ₄-**ke**-ta-mu-ni ~ teĝ₃/tiĝ₄-ĝe₂₆-da-mu-ne - E 729, 14
- ti-**kar**- ~ diĝir- - E 767, II, 20

Ugarit

Babylonian Tablets

- dar-da-rak-**ku** ~ dar-dar-ra-ĝu₁₀ - AuOrS 23 25, 12

Ugarit Script Tablets

- a-ia-**ku** ~ aia-ĝu₁₀ - AuOrS 23 21, 84
- [igi-zu-u]n-na-an-ti-**ki**-aš ~ igi-zu na-ba-an-tiĝ₄-ĝa₂-(aš) - RS 17.10 Obv. 16

⁹⁹⁵ Attinger's reading of ĜE₆ as gegge (ZA 88, 184) is based on this text; I wonder if a reading ĝegge rather than gegge is more appropriate. Whatever the reading of ĜE₆ was, it seems that /ĝg/ or /ĝĝ/ was reduced to /g/.

⁹⁹⁶ This entry is listed here as I regard it as resulting from the merging of /ĝk/ into /k/ instead of a simple loss of the final ĝ.

- **ki-iš** ~ **ĝeš** - RS 23.34+ B, 7
- **ni-ik-ki** ~ **niĝ₂** - RS 17.10 Obv. 9
- **ti-kar** - **diĝir** - AuOrS 23 21, 80

Old Babylonian

- **ku-ru-ša** ~ **ĝuruš-a** - PBS 10/2 13 Obv. 9

$\hat{g} > m/n$

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- **[di-i]m-ma-an-ni** ~ (dumu)-**diĝir-ra-ni** - KUB 37 109, 3

Hittite Script Tablets

- **me-ta-ši-im-ši-im** ~ **mu-ta-šeĝ₃-šeĝ₃** - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 14
- **na-aš-ke-ma-am-ma-an-ku** ~ **ĝešgem-ama-ĝu₁₀** - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 40, 47 II
- **ša-an** ~ **saĝ** *in* **ša-an-ki-ku-ut-ta** ~ **saĝ-ki-kud-da** - KUB 57 126 Obv. II, 3
- **ša-an** ~ **saĝ** *in* **ša-an-ku-uš-ši** ~ **saĝ-mu-še₃** - KUB 57 126 Obv. II, 5
- **ša-an** ~ **saĝ** - KUB 57 126 Rev. II, 7
- **ša₃-an-ki-ki-ne₂** ~ **saĝ kiĝ₂-kiĝ₂-e** - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 39
- **šen** ~ **saĝ** - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, I, 39

Emar

- **ni-in-gur** ~ **niĝ₂-gur₁₁** - TBR 101 Obv. 2

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- **[ki?]-in'-nim-kalam-kalam-ab-bi** ~ **ki niĝ₂-galam-galam-ma-bi** - RS 17.10 Obv. 7
- **na-aš-bi-<ša>-a** ~ **ĝeš-peš-a** - RS 17.10 Obv. 14
- **na-aš-ki** ~ **ĝeš-gi** - RS 17.10 Obv. 14
- **ni-ig-gi-ri-ma-re-eš** ~ **niĝ₂-ĝiri₃-ĝar-eš₂** - AuOrS 23 21, 69

Old Babylonian

- **ne-in-ge-ga** ~ **niĝ₂-geg-ga** - TIM 9 24, 5 (160)
- **ne-in-kur** ~ **niĝ₂-kur₂** - TIM 9, 24, 1 (159)
- **ne-mu-li-mu** ~ **niĝ₂-ur₂-limmu₂** - TCL 15 3 + BL VI, 35
- **ni-im-** ~ **niĝ₂** - TIM 9 35, 7, 9⁹⁹⁷
- **ni-iš** ~ **ĝeš** - H 74, 17

997 For a possible reading /iĝ/ of IM in an Emesal context see Krecher 1967, 103.

- **ni-iš** ~ **ġeš** - H 103 I, 17
- **si-im** ~ **saġ** - TCL 15 38 Obv. 3 (53)
- **-teġ₃-na** ~ **teġ₃-ġa₂** (?) - H 97 VI, 45-46

ġ > ng / nk / nq

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- **di-in-ġi-ra-a-na** ~ **diġir-ra-na** - KUB 30 1, IV, 10
- **di-in-ġi-re** ~ **diġir-re** - KUB 30 2, II, 3
- **di-i[n-ġi-(ir)-ra-ni]** ~ **diġir-ra-ni** - KUB 37 109, 7, 9

Hittite Script Tablets

- **am-ma-an-ku** ~ **ama-ġu₁₀** - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 33, 41 II, 48 II
- **a-ni-ma-za-an-ġa-ak-ke** ~ **a-numun-saġ-ġa₂-ke₄** - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 33
- **pa-ra-za-an-ġar** ~ **para₁₀-za₃-ġar** - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 37
- **ġe₂-in-[ġal-la]** ~ **ġe₂-ġal₂** - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, 43
- **na-aš-ke-ma-am-ma-an-ku** ~ **ġešġem-ama-ġu₁₀** - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 40, 47 II
- **ti-en-ġar** ~ **diġir** - KUB 4 26B, 10, 11
- **ti-in-ġa-ri-ni** ~ **diġir-ra-ni** - KUB 4 26B, 7

Emar

- **in-na-an-ġa** ~ **en-nu-uġ₃** - E 729, 5

The following table provides the number of examples of each alteration:

Corpus	n > m	m > n	ġ > g	ġ > k	ġ > m/n	ġ > ng/nk/nq	Total
Ḫattuša: Babylonian Script	2	0	18	1	1	3	25
Ḫattuša: Ass-Mit Script	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Ḫattuša: Hittite Script	2	1	3	4	7	7	24
Total Ḫattuša	4	1	23	5	8	10	51
Emar	2	0	4	8	1	1	16
Ugarit: Babylonian Script	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Ugarit: Ugarit Script	2	0	13	5	4	0	24
Total Ugarit	2	0	14	6	4	0	26

Labial and dental nasals are affected by alterations to a small extent and those alterations are limited to exchanging one for the other. The shift $n > m$ is far more frequent than the opposite, which occurs only once in a Hittite script tablet.

Alterations affecting the velar nasal $ġ$ are the most frequent. The sound $ġ$ is usually retained in the OB unorthographic texts as evidenced by the scant attestation of shifts. This tendency is underscored by the use of \hat{G} -signs such as $\hat{G}A_2$ and $A\hat{G}_2$ to spell syllabically words containing the nasal $ġ$. For the sequence $ġ+i/e$ the sign $MI = \hat{g}i_6$ can be employed:

di-ĝi₆-ir ~ diĝir - H 83A Rev. 3
 ĝi₆-ri-e ~ ĝiri₃ - TCL 15 38 Obv. 4-6 (55, 57)
 ĝi₆-iš ~ ĝeš - H 103 III, 13

Moreover the OB unorthographic texts adopted N-signs that include readings with \hat{g} . The sign UN has a very common reading uĝ₃ with the meaning 'people' that is also used for its phonetic value, as for instance in šu ku-uĝ₃-di-ip-pa ~ šu kiĝ₂-dab₅-ba (TIM 9 1, 67). Emesal but also main dialect OB unorthographic texts occasionally employ the sign NE for /ĝe/⁹⁹⁸ with the reading ĝe₉.⁹⁹⁹ main dialect: di-ĝe₉-er ~ diĝir (TCL 15 3 + BL VI, 4, 5); Emesal: ĥu-ur₂-sa₂-ĝe₉ ~ ĥur-saĝ-e (VS 2 75 Rev. 5). It is unclear if the sign AN in the context of Emesal has the value /aĝ/, as for instance in sa-an ~ saĝ (CNMA 10051 II, 5, 9 - 103, 115).¹⁰⁰⁰ When alterations occur in the OB unorthographic texts, it seems that \hat{g} most frequently shifts towards another nasal, either *m* or *n*. This raises the question of whether the Emesal register, where \hat{g} regularly shifts to *m/n*,¹⁰⁰¹ influenced the main dialect.¹⁰⁰²

On the contrary, texts from the Western periphery display a wider range of alterations in terms of quality and quantity. Data show that Babylonian and local tablets present a comparable quantity of alterations of \hat{g} : 23 in the Babylonian tablets from Ḫattuša (two additional occurrences from the Babylonian tablets from Ugarit may be counted here), 21 in the Hittite script tablets,¹⁰⁰³ 14 in the Emar sources, 21 in the local tablets from Ugarit. It is therefore evident that awareness of the sound [ŋ] was either inaccurate or entirely lost in the Late Bronze Age. Most commonly \hat{g} is replaced by *g*, in particular in the Babylonian tablets from Ḫattuša and in the Ugarit script tablets. The opposite shift $\hat{g} > k$ is less frequent, but it is predominantly attested in the local tablets whereas only two occurrences derive from the Babylonian script tablets.¹⁰⁰⁴ Perhaps this reflects the tendency of the OB unorthographic texts, where the $\hat{g} > k$ shift is almost unknown. The writing of \hat{g} with *ng* which is mainly attested in the Babylonian tablets from Ḫattuša - neither $\hat{g} > nk$ nor $\hat{g} > nq$ is documented in this group of tablets - is likely an attempt to render the voiced sound of [ŋ]. The shift $\hat{g} > m/n$ is mostly documented in the local tablets from Ḫattuša and Ugarit, but its occurrences find an interesting parallel in the OB documentation. As seen above the use of AN for an original sound [aŋ] which is found in two tablets from Ḫattuša is documented in the OB Emesal texts. The sign šen, attested in one of the Hittite script manuscripts of *The Message of Lu-diĝira to his Mother* (AuOrS 23 50, I, 39), regularly corresponds to saĝ in the Emesal register.¹⁰⁰⁵ It is worth noting that this writing occurs in the standard orthography version of the text. Since it is improbable that Hittite scribes had any knowledge of Emesal, this raises the question of whether these writings are local developments or whether some Emesal correspondences were embedded in main dialect lexical lists transmitted to the Western periphery that eventually served as references for the local scribes. The latter hypothesis is obviously tied to the aforementioned question about Emesal influences on the main dialect in the OB documentation. To conclude, the consonant \hat{g} although mostly rendered through voiced consonants was no longer perceived in the post-Old Babylonian period.

998 See Falkenstein 1963, 45, Krecher 1967, 99-101.

999 aBZL No. 116.

1000 Krecher 1967, 93-94, 100.

1001 See Krecher 1967, 103-106, Thomsen 1984, 287.

1002 The examples of alterations of \hat{g} quoted above are only drawn from OB main dialect texts.

1003 Two additional alterations of \hat{g} in Hittite script tablets are za-aG-pa ~ saĝ-ba (KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 14) and zi-iG-pa ~ saĝ-ba (KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 5, 7); these entries cannot be sorted according to the type of alteration because the cuneiform script does not distinguish the quality of consonants in close syllables.

1004 One each from Ḫattuša and Ugarit.

1005 Emesal Vocabulary I, 25, II, 181 (MSL 4), see also MSL 5, 195 and Krecher 1967, 102.

4.3.1.3 Trills and Laterals

 $r > l$ **Hattuša**

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- -da**l** ~ -dar – CTH 794 Obv. 3
- inim^l-ga**l** ~ inim-ĝar – CTH 794 Obv. 20

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- ga-**la**-[...] ~ ga-ra-an-zu – RS 23.34+ A, 5

Old Babylonian

- ħi-za-**a**l ~ ħi-is^{sar} – TCL 15 3 + BL VI, 34

 $l > r$ **Old Babylonian**

- ħu-ur-ĝa₂-**la** ~ ħul-ĝal₂-**la** – TCL 15 38 Obv. 7, 8 (58, 60)
- u₂-**ru**-ne₂ ~ u₁₈-lu-ne₂ – TCL 15 38 Obv. 10-11 (63, 65)

The only alteration affecting trills and laterals attested in the Syro-Anatolian texts is the shift $r > l$. The opposite shift is not documented but was already known in the Old Babylonian period as the above examples show.

4.3.1.4 Sibilants

 $s > š$ **Hattuša**

Babylonian Tablets

- ba-an-**še** ~ ba-an-ser₃ (?) – KUB 30 1, I, 16-17

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- a₂-**šu-šu** ~ a₂ su₃-su₃ – KBo 36 11+ Obv. 39

Hittite Script Tablets

- a-ši-la ~ asila - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 35, 41
- a-šu-uh ~ ^{ġeš}u₃-su¹⁰⁰⁶h₅ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 36
- ba-su₂-šu-ud-ta ~ ba-su₍₃₎-su₍₃₎-da (?) - KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 10
- [m]a-[š]a-ra ~ mu₂-sar-ra - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 38
- [š]a-ag-ga-ak-ki ~ saġ-ġa₂-ke₄ - CTH 315 - KUB 4 2, 4
- ša-an ~ saġ - KUB 57 126 Rev. II, 7
- ša-an-ki-ku-ut-ta ~ saġ-ki-gud-da - KUB 57 126 Obv. II, 3
- ša-an-ku-uš-ši ~ saġ-mu-še₃ - KUB 57 126 Obv. II, 5
- ša¹-aš-gu[r] ~ siškur - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 42
- ša₃-an-ki-ki-ne₂ ~ saġ kiġ₂-kiġ₂-e - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 39
- šen ~ saġ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, I, 39

Emar

- sur-šu-r[e] ~ sur-sur-re - E 767, II, 2
- ša-ud-ta- ~ su₃-ud-da- - E 767, II, 7

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- [a]n-š₂¹-u₄-ta-¹ke¹-[...] ~ an-su₃-u₄-da-gen₇ - RS 23.34+ B, 11
- a-ša-a-li ~ ^dasal - RS 79.25, 12
- [a-š]a-lu-uh-he₂ ~ ^dasal-lu₂-ḥi - RS 79.25, 10

Old Babylonian

- ša₃-ak-ke ~ saġ₃-ge - AO 24146 Obv. 28 (28); Rev. 1-2 (46-47) (Susa)
- ša₃-ḥa-ra ~ saḥar - AO 24146 Rev. 24 (66) (Susa)
- -ši ~ -si - AO 24146 Obv. 1 (1) (Susa)
- šu-u[d] ~ su₃-ud - VS 2 3, I, 17¹⁰⁰⁷

1006 According to D. Schwemer (personal communication) this reading may render the pronunciation more accurately than the usual transliteration.

1007 For an additional attestation see Falkenstein 1952-1953, 63.

S > Z

Ḫattuša

Hittite Script Tablets

- a-ni-ma-za-an-qa-ak-ke ~ a-numun-saĝ-ĝa₂-ke₄ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 33
- u₂-za-ag-ga ~ a su₃-ga - KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 12
- za-aG-pa ~ saĝ-ba - KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 14
- zi-iG-pa ~ saĝ-ba - KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 5, 7

Emar

- mu-un-zi-ge-eš ~ mu-un-saĝ₃-ge-eš - E 729, 26
- u₂-za-an-du ~ usandu (ḪU.DU₃) - E 768A, II, 1
- za-an-ki-el-la ~ (niĝ₂)-saĝ-ki-il₂-(la) - E 767, II, 22
- za-[...]`il₂` ~ (niĝ₂)-saĝ-ki-il₂-(la) - E 767, I, 22

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- ki-il-za ~ gil-sa - RS 79.25, 41
- -zu ~ -si - RS 79.25, 17

Old Babylonian

- [im-ma-a]n-zi ~ im-ma-an-si - H 179+ I, 32
- ku-zi ~ ku₃-si₂₂ - PBS 10/2 13 Obv. 5
- za-za-ge ~ sa₆-sa₆-ge - VS 2 94, 60
- zi-ig ~ si-ig - AO 24146 Obv. 33 (33); Rev. 12 (56) (Susa)
- zi-ka ~ saga₁₁ - TCL 15 38 Obv. 4, 6 (55-57)

š > s

Ḫattuša

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- za₃-si₁₁¹⁰⁰⁸ ~ za₃-še₃ - KBo 36 11+ Obv. 31

Hittite Script Tablets

- ḫu-us₂-sa-a ~ ḫuš-a - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 42

1008 A possible reading še_x (ePSD) would allow us to include this example among the cases of homophony, cf. fn. 1020.

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- mu-saġ-ġa₂ ~ muš-a-ġa₂ - AuOrS 23 21, 82
- mu-saġ-ke ~ muš-a-gen₇ - AuOrS 23 21, 82

Old Babylonian

- ki su-su-sa-mu ~ ki šuš₂-šuš₂-a-mu - TIM 9 35, 12
- -su-su-ub ~ -šub-šub - H 97 I, 39-40

š > z

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- mu-un-za-am-za-a ~ mu-un-na-an-šen-šen - RS 17.10 Obv. 10

š > š

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- u₃-uš-šu ~ uš₇-zu - KUB 30 1, I, 3; II, 17
- u₃-uš-šu-bi ~ uš₇-zu-bi - KBo 36 13, R. Col. 3, 11

z > s

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- ba-ar-su ~ bar-zu - KBo 36 13, R. Col. 12
- saġ-še ~ za₃-(g)-še₃ - KBo 36 11+ Obv. 37
- u₃-su-a-na ~ uzu-a-na - KUB 30 3, 7

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- ab-su-ke ~ abzu-ke₄ - AuOrS 23 21, 69
- sa-si-qa ~ za₃-sag₁₀-ga - AuOrS 23 21 95
- si-si-id-[da] ~ zi-zi-da - RS 86.2210, II, § 3

Old Babylonian

- -su ~ -zu - BM 79949, 3

$z > \check{s}$

Ḫattuša

Hittite Script Tablets

- i-**ši**-en ~ izim - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 41
- a-**uš** ~ i₃-(e)-zu - KUB 57 126 Obv. I, 3

Emar

- 'šu-geg' ~ zu₂-geg - E 729, 41

$z > \check{s}^{1009}$

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- u₃-uš-**šu** ~ uš₇-zu - KUB 30 1, I, 3, II, 17
- u₃-uš-**šu**-bi ~ uš₇-zu-bi - KBo 36 13, R. Col. 3, 11

Alterations of sibilants can be summarized as follows:

Corpus	s > š	s > z	š > s	š > z	š > ṣ	z > s	z > š	z > ṣ	Total
Ḫattuša: Babylonian Script	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	2	8
Ḫattuša: Ass-Mit Script	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Ḫattuša: Hittite Script	11	4	1	0	0	0	2	0	18
Total Ḫattuša	13	4	2	0	2	3	2	2	28
Emar	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	7
Ugarit: Babylonian Script	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ugarit: Ugarit Script	3	2	2	1	0	3	0	0	11
Total Ugarit	3	2	2	1	0	3	0	0	11

Sibilants provide fewer examples of alterations compared to other consonants. Not all alterations of sibilants are attested in each corpus; some are in fact limited to a few examples. The largest number of occurrences is provided by the documentation of Ḫattuša, in particular the Hittite script tablets.

Among sibilants the voiceless fricative alveolar *s* is the one most subject to alteration. To a large extent alterations of *s* consist in the shift $s > \check{s}$ that is predominantly attested in the Hittite script tablets. Although this shift was not unknown in the OB documentation there are only a few attestations, mainly from Susa and in Emesal texts, which are not indicative of widespread diffusion. The concentration of

¹⁰⁰⁹ I follow here Falkenstein and Wilhelm's readings, as the most common value of ZUM is šu instead of zu₃; consequently I read UZ as uš. Alternative readings are u₃-uz-zu₃-(bi), u₃-us-zu₃-(bi).

this shift in the Hittite script tablets¹⁰¹⁰ likely depends on the Hittite syllabary which only employs the Šv sign to render Sv.¹⁰¹¹ Indeed, the local tablets from Ugarit, which usually show data comparable with the tablets written by Hittite scribes, contain far fewer attestations of the *s* > *š* shift. The opposite shift, *š* > *s*, is quite infrequent. The shift *s* > *z* is only attested in tablets written by local scribes.

The only certain occurrence of the shift *š* > *z* is in a local tablet from Ugarit, whereas no attestations are known from the Old Babylonian corpus under examination. Another occurrence is perhaps iZ-kur ~ ⁴iškur (RS 79.25, 44) but due to the different possible readings of the sign ĜEŠ (iz, is) it has not been listed here. The few occurrences of alterations affecting *š* indicate that this phoneme was usually retained.

There are only a few attestations of alterations of *z*, mainly the shift *z* > *s*. The shift *z* > *š* is very rare and I was not able to find any OB examples.

The emphatic sibilant *ṣ* only appears in two instances in Babylonian script tablets from Ḫattuša to replace *š* and *z*. It is worth noting that the same word is spelled identically in two different tablets: u₃-uṣ-ṣu ~ uš₇-zu (KUB 30 1, I, 3; II, 17); u₃-uṣ-ṣu-bi ~ uš₇-zu-bi (KBo 36 13, R. Col. 3, 11).

As shown by the few attestations, sibilants were very rarely altered in the OB texts. In the Western periphery sibilants are affected by alterations to a lesser extent than other consonants. However, Syro-Anatolian texts show a wider range of alterations than the OB documentation, likely because the potential of the cuneiform syllabary was more extensively exploited.

4.3.2 Vowels

4.3.2.1 Alterations of a

a > *i* – *e*

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- **e** ~ a – KUB 30 4, R. Col. 10
- **e**-ta ~ a-ta – KUB 30 1, IV, 26
- **-si-iq**-qa ~ sa₃-ga – KUB 30 1, I, 16-17¹⁰¹²

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- **e**₂ ~ a – KBo 36 11+ Rev. 40

Hittite Script Tablets

- **i**₇-**ti** ~ **i**₇-da – KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 9
- **la-li**-(me-a) ~ la-la – CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 35
- nu-ki-ki-it-**ti** ~ nu-gi₄-gi₄-da – CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 45
- **šen** ~ saĝ – CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, I, 39
- **te-le** ~ til-la – KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 3
- **ti-in-qa-ri-ni** ~ diĝir-ra-ni – KUB 4 26B, 7
- **zi-iG**-pa ~ saĝ-ba – KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 5, 7

¹⁰¹⁰ Attestations from the Hittite script tablets account for 61% of the *s* > *š* shifts and about 24% of all the alterations of sibilants.

¹⁰¹¹ Hoffner Jr., Melchert 2008, 38.

¹⁰¹² Probably here sig₃ was intended.

Emar

- mu-un-**zi**-ge-eš ~ mu-un-sag₃-ge-eš - E 729, 26

Ugarit

Babylonian Tablets

- si-ga-ab ~ sag₃-ga-ab (?) - AuOrS 23 25, 13¹⁰¹³

Ugarit Script Tablets

- a-**lim** ~ alam - AuOrS 23 21, 81
- ba'-**ri**-an-teĝ₃ ~ bara-an-teĝ₃-(ĝe₂₆) - AuOrS 23 21, 67
- ka-du-**gi**-ni ~ ka-du₁₀-ga-ni - RS 79.25, 6
- la-**le-e** ~ la-la - RS 79.25, 16¹⁰¹⁴
- la-**li**-a-ni ~ la-la-a-ni - RS 79.25, 18
- nam-dub-sar-**re-eš**-še ~ nam-dub-sar-ra-še₃ - RS 17.10 Obv. 18
- sa-**si**-qa ~ za₃-sag₁₀-ga - AuOrS 23 21, 95¹⁰¹⁵
- u₂-da-**gi** ~ u₄-da-kam - RS 79.25, 40
- za-al-za-al-**li**-bi ~ zal-zal-a-bi - AuOrS 23 21, 95

Old Babylonian

- a-**ri**-ni ~ ar₂-a-ni - TCL 15 38 Obv. 10-11 (63-64)
- bi-eš₃-**te** ~ peš₁₀-ta - H 97 V, 20
- di-**te**-ne ~ di-da-ni - H 97 VI, 10
- **e** ~ a - H 97 III, 10; IV, 32
- **e** ~ a - PBS 10/2 13 Rev. 10
- **e**-da-ka ~ a-du₁₁-ga - TIM 9 1, 60
- e-di-**ni** ~ edin-na - CNMA 10051 I, 7 (44)
- **e**-mi ~ ama - VS 2 47, 5
- e-ni-im-ku-ku-ti-**e** ~ i₃-ni-ib₂-ku₄-ku₄-de₃-a - TIM 9 35, 10-11
- ga-**ne**-ši ~ gana₂-še₃ - VS 2 3, I, 2
- ḥa-**li** ~ ḥal-la - H 97 III, 38
- pe **e** ~ pa e₃ - TCL 15 38 Obv. 13 (67)
- si-**im** ~ saĝ - TCL 15 38 Obv. 3 (53)
- si-**si** ~ si-sa₂ - H 110 Rev. 5, 6, 7 (55, 56, 57)
- si-**si**-te ~ sa₂-sa₂-de₃ - TIM 9 21 Obv. 3 (116)
- 'ur₂'-na-'am-<<na-am>>-**mi** ~ ur-^dnamma - TIM 9 35, 4-6
- zi-ka ~ saga₁₁ - TCL 15 38 Obv. 4, 6 (55-57)

1013 Probably here sig₃ was intended.

1014 The shift *a* > *e* is perhaps influenced by the Akkadian genitive *lalê*.

1015 In the reconstructed standard orthography form the value saga₁₀/sag₁₀-ga is adopted but probably sig₅ was intended in the unorthographic writing.

a > u

Hattuša

Hittite Script Tablets

- i-ni-im-[du]-**u** ~ inim-DU-a - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 46
- mul¹-mul¹(-)¹E-NE ~ mul-ma-al(?) - KUB 4 7, 11
- **u**₂-za-ag-ga ~ a su₃-ga - KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 12

Emar

- ba¹-an¹-**du**-gaz ~ ba-an-da-gaz - E 729, 26
- **du-uk**-ta ~ taka₄-(a-bi) - TBR 101 Rev. 4
- i-gi-du-ud-**du**₅ ~ igi-du-ta - E 767, II, 3
- **tu-ku**-ut-t[a] ~ taka₄-(a-bi) - TBR 101 Rev. 5
- **u-du** ~ u₄-da - E 767, II, 3

Ugarit

Babylonian Tablets

- šu-**kur**₂ ~ šu-kar₂ - RS 25.130, 30
- **u**₂-**sun**₂-na-pi ~ usan-bi - AuOrS 23 25, 12

Ugarit Script Tablets

- a-ia-i-**du** ~ a-i₇-da - RS 79.25, 29, 30
- **bur-bur**-ni-ik-ke ~ bar-bar-e-ne-ke₄ - AuOrS 23 21, 68
- -gi-id-**du**₅ ~ -gid₂-da - RS 79.25, 2
- ḥa-an-**du**-bu-ra ~ ḥa-an-da-bur₂-ra - AuOrS 23 21, 67
- **luḥ**-ba-an-[...] ~ la-ba-an-[...] - RS 23.34+ B, 7
- **u**₂-**du**-ra-am-me ~ u₄-da-ra-am - RS 79.25, 42

Old Babylonian

- a-**du**-bu ~ adab^{ki} (UD.NUN.KI) - OECT 5 10 Rev. 9
- nam-mu-**zu** ~ nam-a-zu - PBS 10/2 13 Rev. 5
- su-**zu**? ~ su-za - TIM 9 1, 61¹⁰¹⁶
- **zu**-e ~ za-e - H 97 III, 29

1016 This entry is listed here with caution because the change *a > u* is grammatically conditioned and the dative may simply have been left unmarked by mistake.

4.3.2.2 Alterations of u

*u > a***Hattuša**

Babylonian Tablets

- n[u-u]n-**za**-a ~ nu-un-zu-a - KUB 30 1, I, 14
- im-g[u]-g[u-r]**a** ~ im-gi/(u?)gurum - KUB 30 1, I, 19

Hittite Script Tablets

- a-ni-**ma**-za-an-qa-ak-ke ~ a-numun-saĝ-ĝa₂-ke₄ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 33
- **a**-šu-uh ~ ĝeš_u₃-suḫ₅ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 36
- [m]**a**-[š]a-ra ~ mu₂-sar-ra - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 38
- niĝ₂-ur₂-lim₃-**ma** ~ niĝ₂-ur₂-limmu₂ - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 7
- še-ag-**na** ~ še-gu-nu - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 34
- u₂-**za**-ag-ga ~ a su₃-ga - KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 12

Emar

- in-**na**-an-ga ~ en-nu-uĝ₃ - E 729, 5
- nu-**da**-**da**-am-m[e-en] ~ nu-du₂-du₂-me-en - E 767, II, 18
- **ša**-ud-ta- ~ su₃-ud-da- - E 767, II, 7
- -tu-**ka**-a ~ -tuku-a - E 767, II, 4
- u-**ga** ~ ugu - E 767, II, 19a

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- **a**-še-in-zu ~ uš₇-nu-zu (?) - AuOrS 23 21, 70
- -**da** ~ -du₈ - RS 86.2210 I, § 8
- [d]**al**-**dal**-bi ~ dul-dul-bi - RS 17.10 Obv. 11
- ka-<aš>-**al**-ḫi-a ~ gi-šul-ḫi-a - RS 17.10 Obv. 12
- ni-ga-e-**za**-i ~ niĝ₂-ĝa₂-e i₃-zu-(a-ĝu₁₀) - AuOrS 23 21, 86
- nu-uz-**za**-a ~ nu-zu-a - RS 17.10 Obv. 17
- šu-**da**-ia-ak ~ šudu₃-ak - RS 79.25, 7
- šu-**da**-ia-ku ~ šudu₃-ak - RS 79.25, 6
- **ta**-a-bi ~ du₃-a-bi - RS 79.25, 18
- **ta**-mu-zi-ig ~ dumu-zi(g) - AuOrS 23 21, 7
- tu-mu-**ga** ~ dumu-ĝu₁₀ - AuOrS 23 21, 86

Old Babylonian

- **a**-gub-ba ~ ugu-ba - H 178 Obv. 7 (35)
- e-**da**-ka ~ a-du₁₁-ga - TIM 9 1, 60
- **da**-ga-ab ~ du₁₁-ga-ab - H 178 Rev. 4, 6, 7, 9 (64/65, 67/68, 69, 72)
- **da**-ga-ab ~ du₁₁-ga-ab - H 110 Obv. 5; Rev. 13, 15, 16 (27, 64/65, 67/68, 69)

- im-ma-ab-da-a-ta ~ im-ma-ab-du₇-a-ta - H 178 Obv. 10 (38)
- nu-za-a-ni ~ nu-zu-a-ni - H 97 IV, 14¹⁰¹⁷

u > e/i

Hattuša

Hittite Script Tablets

- a-ni-ma-za-an-qa-ak-ke ~ a-numun-saĝ-ĝa₂-ke₄ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 33
- li-u[*h*-a] ~ lu₂-uĝ₇-a² - KUB 4 24 Rev. 10
- ši-daq-qa ~ šu-ta₃-ga - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 36

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- a-ru-ri ~ ^da-ru-ru - RS 79.25, 8
- ne-zu ~ nu-zu - AuOrS 23 21, 79¹⁰¹⁸
- u₂-mi-za- ~ mu-mu-za - RS 79.25, 3
- u₂-na-me-e ~ mu nam-mu - RS 79.25, 39

Old Babylonian

- ab-si-si ~ (im-ma)-ab-su-su - TIM 9 1, 25
- ba-an-zi ~ ba-an-zu - H 97 III, 17
- -di-tu ~ -du₁₁-du₁₁ - VS 2 3, I *passim*
- en-ne-nu-ri ~ en₂-e₂-nu-ru - S 7/1600 Obv. 1
- mu-ri ~ muru₉ - H 97 I, 22
- mur-r[i] ~ muru₉ - H 179+ I, 22
- ni-iš- ~ nu-uš- - CNMA 10051 I, 6 (41)
- -zi ~ -zu - CNMA 10051 II, 6 (104)

4.3.2.3 Alterations of e

e > i

Hattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- a-ni ~ diĝir-re-ne - CTH 314 - KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 4¹⁰¹⁹
- e-mi-bi ~ eme-bi - KBo 36 13, R. Col. 13

1017 Cf. KUB 30 1, I, 14.

1018 This shift derives from an original form *nu-e-zu.

1019 For this reading see § 4.4.

- -**gi-im** ~ -gen₇ (?) - KBo 36 13, L. Col. 4, 14, 15
- -**gi-im** ~ -gen₇ - KUB 30 1, II, 2, 18
- **gi-in-na** ~ ĝen-na - KBo 40 103, 4
- **g[i-in-na]** ~ ĝen-na - KUB 30 1, I, 21
- **g[i-i]n-na** ~ ĝen-na - KUB 30 4, R. Col. 7
- **gi-iš-ḫu-[ur]** ~ ĝeš-ḫur - KUB 30 1, IV, 18
- **gi-iš-šu-ub** ~ ĝeš-šub - KUB 30 1, II, 18
- **i-gi-in** ~ i₃-ĝen - KUB 30 1, I, 6
- **i-i** ~ e₃ (?) - KUB 30 1, I, 19
- **i-ni-ki-ir-ra** ~ ^den-ki-ra - KUB 30 3, 10
- **[i]n-e₂-nu-ru** ~ en₂-nu-ru - KUB 30 1, I, 1

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- za₃-**si**₁₁¹⁰²⁰ ~ za₃-še₃ - KBo 36 11+ Obv. 31

Hittite Script Tablets

- **i-te-[en-na]** ~ edin-na - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 18
- **ki-iš-tu-ug** ~ ĝeštug_{12/3} - KUB 4 26B, 13
- **ma-aš-am-ši** ~ maš-anše - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 7
- **me-ta-ši-im-ši-im** ~ mu-ta-šeĝ₃-šeĝ₃ - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 14
- **mu-un-ni** ~ mu-un-ne - CTH 794 Rev. 3
- **ša-an-ku-uš-ši** ~ saĝ-mu-še₃ - KUB 57 126 Obv. II, 5
- **ti-la-a-bi-iš-ši** ~ til-la-bi-še₃ - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 8

Emar

- **bu-ru-e-en-ni** ~ buru₄^(mušen)-e-ne - E 768A, II, 7¹⁰²¹
- **da-ri-iš** ~ da-ri₂-eš₂ - E 767, II, 10
- **[dir]i(g)-ia-na-an-ni** ~ diri-ge-ne-ne - E 767, II, 5
- **e-da-ra-ga-an-ni** ~ e₂-da-ri₂-ke₄-ne-(ne) - E 767, II, 6
- **e-[e]n-ni** ~ e-ne - E 767, II, 24
- **e-ni-e-š[e]-ta** ~ i₃-ne-eš₂ - E 767, I, 17a
- **in-na-an-ga** ~ en-nu-uĝ₃ - E 729, 5
- **i₃-in-ke** ~ e-ne-gen₇ - E 767, II, 23
- **i₃-in-gen**¹⁷ ~ e-ne-gen₇ - E 767, I, 23
- **-ki-im** ~ -gen₇ - E 767, II, 7
- **ki-iš-ḫur-ḫu-r[e]** ~ ĝeš-ḫur-ḫur-re - E 767, II, 1
- **ki-iš-ḫu-ur** ~ ĝeš-ḫur - E 767, II, 24
- **[ku[?] di-m]u-ni** ~ gu₃ di-mu-ne - E 729, 16
- **mi-en-na-a** ~ me-en-am₃ - E 770, 3
- **mu-š[i-in-x]-a** ~ mušen-ḫi-a - E 768A, II, 5
- **nu-mu-un-pa-ap-li-ia** ~ nu-mu-un-bala-bala-e-(da) - E 734, 6
- **ra-ra-ta-mu-ni** ~ ra-ra-da-mu-ne - E 729, 16
- **šu-bu-da₃-mu-ni** ~ šub-bu-da-mu-ne - E 729, 15
- **ti-el-la-ga-an-ni** ~ til-la-ke₄-e-ne - E 734, 2
- **ti-gi-re-e-ni** ~ diĝir-re-e-ne - E 767, II, 2
- **tiĝ₄-ke-ta-mu-ni** ~ teĝ₃/tiĝ₄-ĝe₂₆-da-mu-ne - E 729, 14

1020 Other possible readings for the sign SIG are se₁₁ (aBZL, 204) and še_x (ePSD), cf. fn. 1008.

1021 The plural marker -ene is incorrect (see § 6.2.3), but it is kept in the reconstructed standard orthography form because it was intended in the unorthographic writing.

- ti-la-š*i* ~ til₃-la-še₃ - E 775, 23
- 'zu`-zu-ta-ni ~ zu-mu-da-ne (?) - E 729 14

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- bur-bur-ni-ik-ke ~ bar-bar-e-ne-ke₄ - AuOrS 23 21, 68
- e-ni-nu-ru₃ ~ en₂-e₂-nu-ru - AuOrS 23 13, 1
- e-ur-ra-ga-`an-ni` ~ e₂-ur₃-ra-ke₄-ne-ne - RS 23.34+ B, 10
- gi-il-tun₃ ~ ġeštug_{12/3} (?) - RS 79.25, 15
- gi-in-ni-in-mi-ni ~ ġe₆ ni₂-me-lim₄ - RS 79.25, 27
- ħa-am-bu-ru-ud-da-ne₂-iš ~ ħabrud-da-ne₂-eš₂ - RS 86.2210, II, § 7
- ħe-in-du ~ ħe₂-en-du - RS 23.34+ A, 9
- in-ki ~ ^denki - AuOrS 23 21 85, 87
- in-ki ~ ^denki - RS 79.25, 14
- i-ri-du-ka-ak-ke ~ eridu-ka-ke₄ - AuOrS 23 21, 7
- i₃-[i]g-gu ~ e-ne-gen₇ - RS 23.34+ A, 12
- -ki-im ~ gen₇ - RS 79.25 29
- ki-i[n-na] ~ ġen-na - RS 23.34+ A, 15
- ki-iš ~ ġeš - RS 23.34+ B, 7
- na-aš-bi-<ša>-a ~ ġeš-peš-a - RS 17.10 Obv. 14
- na-i-zu ~ na-e-zu - AuOrS 23 21, 86
- -ni-in-ni ~ -(e)-ne-ne - RS 23.34+ B, 8
- nu-i₃-zu ~ nu-e-zu - AuOrS 23 25, 43-44
- za-e-me-in ~ za-e-me-en - RS 79.25, 31

Old Babylonian

- e-ni-im-ku-ku-ti-e ~ i₃-ni-ib₂-ku₄-ku₄-de₃-a - TIM 9 35, 10-11
- ga-ne-š*i* ~ gana₂-še₃ - VS 2 3, I, 2
- ħa-la-mi-it-te ~ ħa-lam-e-de₃ - TIM 9 1, 9
- i-ni-in-ki ~ en ^denki - H 103 II, 12
- i-ni-ir ~ e-ne-er - TCL 15 38 Obv. 4 (53)
- i-ni-ra ~ e-ne-ra - CNMA 10051 II, 13 (140)
- i-ri- ~ erim₂ - TCL 15 38 Obv. 10 (63)
- iš-gar₃ ~ ešgar^(munus)Aš₂.GAR₃) - H 103 I, 18
- -ki-in ~ -gen₇ - H 103 IV, 14, 21
- ki-š*i*-da ~ keše₂-da - H 97 III, 34¹⁰²²
- -in-si ~ -ensi₂ - PBS 10/2 13 Rev. 11
- sa-gi-`iš` ~ saġ-e-eš - TCL 15 38 Rev. 1 (69)
- ši-in-bar ~ šeg₉-bar - PBS 10/2 13 Rev. 12
- šu mu-un-gi-di ~ šu mu-un-gid₂-e - OECT 5 10 Obv. 2-6
- -š*i* ~ -še₃ - TCL 15 3 + BL VI, 17
- -š*i* ~ -še₃ - H 97 II, 6

1022 This entry can also be read ke-š*i*-da.

e > a

Hattuša

Hittite Script Tablets

- **na-aš-ke-ma-am-ma-an-ku** ~ *ĝešgem-ama-ĝu₁₀* - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 40, 47
- **š[a-aš[?]-gur]-ra** ~ *siškur-re* - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 41
- **ši-da-a** ~ *a-de₂-a* - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 36

Emar

- **an-na** ~ *an-e* - E 775, 8
- **[dir]i(g)-ia-na-an-ni** ~ *diri-ge-ne-ne (?)* - E 767, II, 5
- **e-da-ra-ga-an-ni** ~ *e₂-da-ri₂-ke₄-ne-(ne)* - E 767, II, 6
- **edin-na** ~ *edin-e* - E 775, 16
- **ḫa-a** ~ *ḫe₂-a* - E 729, 5
- **mu-un-niĝ[en]-na[?]-aš₂** ~ *mu-un-niĝen₍₂₎-niĝen₍₂₎-ne-eš* - E 729, 24
- **ti-el-la-ga-an-ni** ~ *til-la-ke₄-e-ne* - E 734, 2

Ugarit

Babylonian Tablets

- **ap-pap-ma-aš₂** ~ *pap-meš* - AuOrS 23 25, 14

Ugarit Script Tablets

- **a-te-na** ~ *edin-e* - RS 79.25, 28
- **e-ur-ra-ga-an-ni** ~ *e₂-ur₃-ra-ke₄-ne-ne* - RS 23.34+ B, 10
- **en-na** ~ *e-ne* - RS 23.34+ A, 14
- **gu-gu-ut-ta** ~ *ku₅-ku₅-de₃* - RS 86.2210, II, § 7
- **ḫa-a** ~ *ḫe₂-a* - RS 79.25 2, 3
- **ḫe-za-la-qa** ~ *ḫe-zalag₍₂₎-ge* - RS 79.25, 20
- **ka-la-qa-e-ni** ~ *kala-ge-de₃* - RS 79.25, 24
- **ku-ku-ut-ta** ~ *ku₅-ku₅-de₃* - RS 86.2210, I, § 7
- **-kur-ku-ra-ak-ka** ~ *-kur-kur-ra-ke₄* - RS 79.25, 19
- **mu-ut-ta-ša-a** ~ *mud-da-še₃* - AuOrS 23 21, 81
- **na-aš-bi-<ša>-a** ~ *ĝeš-peš-a* - RS 17.10 Obv. 14
- **na-aš-ki** ~ *ĝeš-gi* - RS 17.10 Obv. 14

Old Babylonian

- **-ka** ~ *ke₄* - TCL 15 38 Obv. 13, 15 (66, 68)
- **mu-un-na-a** ~ *mu-un-e₃-a* - H 97 VI, 20
- **nu-na-am-ni-ra** ~ *^dnu-nam-nir-re* - TCL 15 38 Obv. 4, 5 (54, 56)
- **ni₂-ta-a-ni** ~ *ni₂-te-a-ni* - TIM 9 1, 20, 65

e > u

Ugarit

Babylonian Tablets

- -**ku** ~ -ke₄ - AuOrS 23 25, 52
- gi-**ku**-du-[...] ~ ^{gi}ge₂-ma₂-šu₂-a (?) - RS 86.2210 II, § 3¹⁰²³

Ugarit Script Tablets

- i₃-[i]g-**gu** ~ e-ne-gen₇ - RS 23.34+ A, 12

4.3.2.4 Alterations of i

i > e

Hattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- **le-e**-la-a ~ lil₂-la₂ - KUB 30 1, I, 4
- lu-**le-e**-la ~ lu₂-lil₂-la₂ - KUB 30 2, II, 9

Hittite Script Tablets

- i-**te**-[en-na] ~ edin-na - CTH 314 - KUB 4 5, II, 18
- **e**-m[u x x] ~ im-a u₄ a₂-ba - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 33¹⁰²⁴
- **e**-ri-ib-ba ~ i-ri-pa₃ - KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 8, 10
- **e**ⁱ-ri-ba ~ i-ri-pa₃ - KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 6
- **te**-le ~ til-la - KUB 37 111 Obv. R. Col. 3
- ti-**en**-kar ~ diğir - KUB 4 26B, 10, 11

Emar

- **e**-ne-e-še-ta ~ i₃-ne-eš₂ - E 767, I, 17a
- **e**-ni-e-š[e]-ta ~ i₃-ne-eš₂ - E 767, I, 17a
- e-**re**-a ~ eri/iri-a - E 729, 11
- e-**re-e**-du-ga- ~ eridu-ga- - E 729, 12
- ḫe₂-**ne**-tar-re ~ ḫe₂-ni-tar-re - E 775, 3
- ib-**te**-[...] ~ ib₂-dib-ba - E 768A, II, 5
- **te**-em-ma ~ dima - E 767, II, 2
- u₂-**me-en** (2) ~ imin - Tsukimoto, 38

¹⁰²³ This entry is listed here with caution because the reading is uncertain, see § 4.4.

¹⁰²⁴ See § 5.3.2.

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- a-te-na ~ edin-e - RS 79.25, 28
- de-en-ni-ig ~ dinig - RS 17.10 Obv. 12
- te-[em ...] ~ dima - RS 23.34+ B, 3
- u₂-me-na-ḫe₂-ḫe₂ ~ u₃-me-ni-ḫi-ḫi - AuOrS 23 21, 92

Old Babylonian

- a-ia-an-ne ~ a-(i)a-ni - H 97 V, 14
- di-ḡe₃-er ~ diḡir - TCL 15 3 + BL VI, 4, 5
- di-te-ne ~ di-da-ni - H 97 VI, 10
- e-gi ~ igi - TIM 9 23 Obv. 3 (164)
- e-ni-im-ku-ku-ti-e ~ i₃-ni-ib₂-ku₄-ku₄-de₃-a - TIM 9 35, 10-11
- en-b[u-u]r-bu-re ~ im-bur₂-bur₂-re - VS 2 94, 49
- en-du-du-e ~ im-du₃-du₃-e - VS 2 94, 49
- en-nu²-uš ~ ^uin-nu-uš - H 77, 22
- ke₄ ~ ki - H 97 II, 8
- me-ni-ḫul-lu-uš₂ ~ mi-ni-ḫul-lu-uš₂ - H 97 I, 12
- ne-qa-al ~ ni₂-gal - TIM 9 24, 10 (161)
- niḡ₂-ḡa₂-ka-ne ~ niḡ₂-ak-a-ni - H 97 III, 39

i > a

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- uš-ra-a ~ uš₇-ri-a - KUB 30 1, I, 5
- uš-ra-a-bi ~ uš₇-ri-a-bi - KBo 36 13, R. Col. 4

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- ta-na-ta ~ da-ni-ta - KBo 36 11+ Rev. 32, 33

Hittite Script Tablets

- ad- ~ i₇-(d) - KUB 57 126 Obv. I, 8
- a-uš ~ i₃-(e)-zu - KUB 57 126 Obv. I, 3
- ša'-aš-gu[r] ~ siškur - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 42
- š[a-aš²-gur]-ra ~ siškur-re - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 41
- ti-en-kar ~ diḡir - KUB 4 26B, 10, 11

Emar

- e-da-ra-ga-^ran-ni' ~ e₂-da-ri₂-ke₄-ne-(ne) - E 767, II, 6
- me-d[a-ri] ~ me-diri - E 767, II, 19a

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- a-ia-an-ni-gi-re-a-ab-ba-sag₁₀-ga ~ aia-ni ^denki-ra e₂-a ba-ši-ku₄-a - AuOrS 23 21, 83¹⁰²⁵
- i-da-[na-mi-da?] ~ iti nam-iti - RS 79.25, 40
- ka-<aš>-al-ḫi-a ~ gi-šul-ḫi-a - RS 17.10 Obv. 12
- kar-kar ~ gir₅-gir₅ - RS 86.2210, II, § 5
- ni₂-te-na ~ ni₂-te-a-ni - RS 79.25, 28
- ti-ga-ar ~ diḡir - RS 79.25, 7
- u₂-me-na-ḫe₂-ḫe₂ ~ u₃-me-ni-ḫi-ḫi - AuOrS 23 21, 92
- u₂-me-na-si₁₂-si₁₂ ~ u₂-me-ni-si₁₂-si₁₂ - AuOrS 23 21, 91

Old Babylonian

- la-ba-na-na-aḡ₂ ~ la-ba-ni-naḡ - CT 44 14, 7
- la-l(a)- ~ lil₂ - TCL 15 38 Obv. 7, 9 (59, 61)
- ur-gar₃? ~ ur-gir₁₅ (?) - BM 79949, 2
- ḡeš ga-a ~ ḡeš gi₄-a - H 110 Obv. 9 (32)

i > *u*¹⁰²⁶

Emar

- u₂-min ~ imin - Tsukimoto, 38
- u₂-me-en (2) ~ imin - Tsukimoto, 38

Ugarit

Ugarit Script Tablets

- su-lu-um ~ su-lim - RS 79.25, 26
- su-pa- ~ sipa- - RS 79.25, 19
- -zu ~ -si - RS 79.25, 17

Old Babylonian

- šu ku-un-di-ip-pa ~ šu kiḡ₂-dab₅-ba - TIM 9 1, 67
- niḡ₂-ku ~ niḡ₂-ki - H 77, 6
- u₂-bi-zu ~ u₃-bi₂-zi₂ - H 139 Obv. 6 (8)

1025 The sign SIG₅ (IGI.ERIM) was perhaps read sig₅ instead of sag₁₀.

1026 im-g[u]-g[u-r]a (KUB 30 1, I, 19) is not listed here on the basis of the reading gigurum/gugurum suggested in § 5.1.1.

The alteration of vowels can be summarized as follows:

Corpus	a > e/i	a > u	u > a	u > e/i	e > i	e > a	e > u	i > e	i > a	i > u	Total	%
Ḫattuša: Babylonian Script	3	0	2	0	13	0	0	2	2	0	22	10,9
Ḫattuša: Ass-Mit Script	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	1,5
Ḫattuša: Hittite Script	7	3	6	3	7	3	0	6	5	0	40	19,9
Total Ḫattuša	11	3	8	3	21	3	0	8	8	0	65	32,3
Emar	1	5	5	0	23	7	0	8	2	2	53	26,4
Ugarit: Babylonian Script	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	5	2,5
Ugarit: Ugarit Script	9	6	11	4	19	12	2	4	8	3	78	38,8
Total Ugarit	10	8	11	4	19	13	3	4	8	3	83	41,3
Subtotal	22	16	24	7	63	23	3	20	18	5		
Total	38 = 18,9%		31 = 15,4%		89 = 44,3%			43 = 21,4%			201	

In the OB sources the most frequent alterations are the shifts $a > e/i$, $e > i$ and $i > e$. The same alterations are also very common in the Syro-Anatolian documentation, but here other shifts that are less well documented in the OB texts such as $a > u$, $u > a$, $e > a$ and $i > a$ occur with a comparable degree of frequency. As the table shows, the largest number of alterations concern the vowel e (44,3%), in particular the shift $e > i$, which is the most documented with 63 entries.

Alterations of a are documented in all three corpora under investigation, with the shift $a > e/i$ being more common than $a > u$. Regardless of the provenance of the manuscripts (i.e. Ḫattuša, Emar or Ugarit), the majority of the attestations derive from tablets written by local scribes. Therefore Babylonian script tablets present a minor degree of alteration of a . At Ḫattuša, $a > u$ is only known from local tablets, but this shift is attested in a Babylonian tablet discovered at Ugarit. In the majority of instances, alterations of a can be regarded as cases of assimilation, either progressive: i_7 -**ti** ~ i_7 -da, nu-ki-ki-it-**ti** ~ nu-gi₄-gi₄-da, te-**le** ~ til-la (Ḫattuša), i-gi-du-ud-**du**₅ ~ igi-du-ta, u-**du** ~ u₄-da (Emar), šu-**kur**₂ ~ šu-kar₂, u₂-**du**-ra-am-me ~ u₄-da-ra-am, u₂-**sun**₂-na-pi ~ usan-bi (Ugarit); or regressive: ti-in-qa-**ri**-ni ~ diğir-ra-ni (Ḫattuša), ka-du-**gi**-ni ~ ka-du₁₀-ga-ni, nam-dub-sar-**re-eš**-še ~ nam-dub-sar-ra-še₃, za-al-za-al-**li**-bi ~ zal-zal-a-bi, ḫa-an-**du**-bu-ra ~ ḫa-an-da-bur₂-ra (Ugarit).

The vowel u provides the smallest number of alterations. In all three corpora the shift $u > a$ is far more common than $u > e/i$. Most of the alterations of u occur in tablets drafted by local scribes, notably from Ugarit. It cannot be excluded that, in some instances, the shift $u > a$, when no assimilation occurs, implies a reading /o/ as suggested for some peripheral variants of Akkadian.¹⁰²⁷ This may explain why the shift $u > a$ occurs more frequently in the local tablets from the Western periphery than in the OB texts. Assimilation is attested in several instances such as [m]**a**-[š]a-ra ~ mu₂-šar-ra, n[u-u]n-**za**-a ~ nu-un-zu-a (Ḫattuša), -tu-**ka**-a ~ -tuku-a (Emar), igi-**za**-ta ~ igi-zu-ta, nu-uz-**za**-a ~ nu-zu-a (Ugarit).

Alterations affecting e mostly consist in the shift $e > i$. Because it is difficult for modern scholars to accurately distinguish between the phonemes /e/ and /i/ in Sumerian¹⁰²⁸ and because it is possible that a given sign may express both values, perhaps the shift $e > i$ was not perceived. This is particular evident for the sign NI which is frequently used for -ne in the pronominal conjugation and in the plural possessive pronoun in all three corpora. However, the reading ne₂ has not been adopted here because standard orthography Sumerian employs the sign ne in those cases. The fact that the majority of the $e > i$ shifts from Ḫattuša derive from Babylonian script tablets, which usually record few phonetic alterations, strongly supports the hypothesis that the difference between e and i was not perceived. Moreover, broken writings such as mi-en-na-a ~ me-en-am₃ (Emar), ḫe-in-du ~ ḫe₂-en-du, za-e-me-in ~ za-e-me-en (Ugarit) seem to indicate a reading e . Several occurrences of the $e > i$ shift in the Emar corpus, which usually provides few examples for the other alterations, may provide further evidence that e and i are allographs. Cases of assimilation are attested: e-**mi**-bi ~ eme-bi (Ḫattuša), **in**-ki ~ ^denki, **i**-ri-du-ka-ak-ke ~ eridu-ka-ke₄ (Ugarit). Several cases of assimilation, either progressive or regressive, are also attested for the shift $e > a$. The sequence (n)e-ne is

1027 See Seminara 1998, 141-142.

1028 Edzard 2003, 14.

particularly affected by this alteration resulting in (n)a-an-ni: [dir]i(g)-ia-na-an-ni ~ diri-ge-ne-ne-(a), ti-el-la-ga-an-ni ~ ti-la-ke₄-e-ne (Emar), e-ur-ra-ga-an-ni' ~ e₂-ur₃-ra-ke₄-ne-ne (Ugarit). The shift $e > u$ only occurs at Ugarit and I was not able to find any example from the OB documentation.

The vowel *i* provides a smaller number of alterations compared to *e*. They are mostly concentrated in tablets drafted by local scribes. Contrary to $e > i$ which is well documented in the Babylonian script tablets from Ḫattuša, the opposite shift, $i > e$, occurs only twice in this group of manuscripts. The shifts $i > e$ and $i > a$ are documented with approximately the same frequency, contrary to alterations of *e* in which the $e > i$ shift is far more common than $e > a$. The equal proportion between $i > e$ and $i > a$ seems not be reflected in the OB texts on the basis of the occurrences I was able to collect. The attestation of the shift $i > u$ in the OB corpus perhaps suggests that also $e > u$ was documented in the Old Babylonian period.

To sum up, the majority of the alterations of vowels are documented in tablets written by local scribes, notably from the Ugarit documentation which provides the largest number of entries. Texts from Emar are apparently affected by vowel alteration to a large extent because they unusually provide more entries than the local tablets from Ḫattuša. As expected, the Babylonian script tablets show a more conservative nature, containing a small number of alterations of vowels. Only the shift $e > i$ is well known from these tablets, probably because it was not perceived as an alteration. Supporting the connection between the Babylonian script tablets from the Western periphery and the OB unorthographic texts is the fact that attestations in the Syro-Anatolian documentation of those of the aforementioned alterations that are less common in the OB corpus, namely $a > u$, $u > a$, $e > a$ and $i > a$, mostly occur in tablets written by local scribes.

4.4 Other Alterations

This section lists those cases which cannot be classed with any of the former anomalies.¹⁰²⁹ For some of them explanations are given.

Ḫattuša

Babylonian Tablets

- i-ni-im-ġa₂-ar ~ eme-ġar - KUB 30 1, I, 13: see § 5.1.1
- i-UŠ(-)ta-aq-qa - KUB 30 1, I, 12: see § 5.1.1
- ki-is-ki-il ~ ki-sikil - KUB 30 2, II, 5: this writing is common in phonetic texts.¹⁰³⁰
- le ~ guruš - KUB 30 1, I, 5: the sign KAL is misread as E, then written as LE.¹⁰³¹

Assyro-Mitannian Tablets

- ^ddim₃-ma-me[?] ~ ^ddim₃-me-lagab - KUB 37 102, L. Col. 4
- ka-tar-zu ka-an-s[i-il] ~ ka-tar-zu ḫa/ga-an-si-il - KUB 37 100 Rev. 22: see § 5.2.1
- u-guġ₂ ~ udug - KBo 36 11+ Rev. 44-45
- za-lim ~ ulutim₂/uktim (SIG₇.ALAM) - KBo 36 11+ Rev. 41: this writing perhaps indicates that the sign was read as sa₇-alam.
- za-za ~ za₃ - KBo 36 11+ Obv. 28: this is a possible case of dittography of the phonetic writing za for za₃.
- zi-ki-[ġal₂] ~ zi-ša₃-ġal₂ - KBo 36 11+ Obv. 21: see § 5.2.1

Hittite Script Tablets

- a-ni ~ diġir-re-ne - CTH 314 - KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 4: it is a misreading of the sequence AN-e-ne, see § 5.3.1.

¹⁰²⁹ Note that some of the entries listed under 'Other Alterations' are listed in other sections when they provide evidence for specific alterations.

¹⁰³⁰ See Civil 2007, 26.

¹⁰³¹ Geller 1989, 201 n. 3.

- a-uš ~ i₃-(e)-zu - KUB 57 126 Obv. I, 3: this entry is also listed here¹⁰³² as it is a possible case of metathesis zu > uš with shift z > š.
- du-um-mi-me ~ dumu-munus - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 43: does this suggest a reading dumu-mi₂?¹⁰³³
- e-e-qa-ma ~ 5-kam-ma - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 47: e-e is a phonetic writing for ia₂ = 5.
- ḥa-la-ba-a-uš ~ ḥa-la-ba - KUB 57 126 Obv. I, 3
- im-u-a-ab-ba ~ im-a u₄ a₂-ba - CTH 315 - KUB 4 2, 3: positions of u ~ u₄ and a are inverted.¹⁰³⁴
- IZI ~ zi - KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 6: see § 5.3.10.
- ki-e-ne₂-en-ti ~ ešemen (KI.E.NE.DI) - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 44: this is a phonetic writing of the sequence KI.E.NE.DI that is usually rendered as ešemen,¹⁰³⁵ but there are indications that perhaps it was not a Diri compound;¹⁰³⁶ note the d > t shift in ti ~ DI; perhaps the presence of /n/ before -ti is a compensation for the shift voiced > voiceless.
- ki-en-te-me-en ~ ki-aĝ₂ ša₃ ki-aĝ₂ - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 45: Arnaud¹⁰³⁷ suggests that te-me-en corresponds to dimma; see § 5.3.2.
- -ku- ~ -mu- in ša-an-ku-uš-ši ~ saĝ-mu-še₃ - KUB 57 126 Obv. II, 5: MU is read as ĝu₁₀ and rendered phonetically as ku.
- mu-un-ta ~ gi-un-ta - KUB 57 126 Obv. I, 6; Obv. II, 6
- mu-ut-ḥu ~ niĝ₂-tu-ḥu-um - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 37: see § 5.3.2.
- nam-ba-še-šu-še-šu-de₃ ~ nam-ba-šu₂-šu₂-de₃-en - KUB 37 111 Rev. R. Col. 4
- NI-in-NI-bu ~ ? - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 43: see § 5.3.2.
- nu-kal ~ abgal - CTH 314 - KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 4: this spelling derives from the writing NUN.ME for abgal; see § 5.3.1.
- ri-ib-x-ba ~ kala-ga - CTH 314 - KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 5: the sign KAL was read rib in the standard orthography text and written ri-ib- in the phonetic version; see § 5.3.1.
- ša-a ~ diri (SI.A) - CTH 315 - KUB 4 2, 8
- ša-a ~ diri (SI.A) - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 35, 41 II
- še-ag-na ~ še-gu-nu - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 34
- ši-da-a ~ a-de₂-a - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 36: see § 5.3.2.
- ti²-a ~ tum₂-a - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 38
- za-an-ku ~ za₃-mu - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 37: MU is misread as ĝu₁₀ and rendered phonetically as ku;¹⁰³⁸ -(a)n- is perhaps an attempt to render the phoneme ĝ.
- za-ar-tap-pa ~ ḤE(sar₂)-NUN(daba_x) - CTH 315 - AuOrS 23 50, II, 34: see § 5.3.2.
- zar-tab-ba ~ ḤE(sar₂)-NUN(daba_x) - CTH 315 - KUB 4 2, 5: see § 5.3.2.

Emar

- a-na ~ a-an - E 775, 19: this is a case of metathesis.
- an-nu ~ an - Tsukimoto, 38: probably -nu is a phonetic complement from Akkadian *Anu*.
- -e-ni-e-ni ~ -e-ne - E 767, II, 17
- -du ~ -ĝu₁₀ in i-ki-du (2) ~ igi-ĝu₁₀ - Tsukimoto, 37
- ga-a-ni-šur-ra-ke₄ ~ ga-ni-šur-ra ak (?) - E 775, 19: see § 6.1.1.
- i₃-in-gen¹⁷ / i₃-in-ke ~ e-ne-gen₇ - E 767, I, II, 23: this writing is here regarded as a case of metathesis -ne- > -in- with shift e > i, but other interpretations are possible.

1032 Cf. § 4.3.1.4, z > š, § 4.3.2.4, i > a.

1033 U. Gabbay's suggestion.

1034 Cf. Nougayrol 1968, 317: 32.

1035 For this word see Gadotti 2010.

1036 Gabbay 2015, 219.

1037 Arnaud 2007, 185: 45.

1038 Arnaud 2007, 184.

- lu-ul-bi ~ ^{li-ib}LUL - E 767 I, II, 21, 22¹⁰³⁹
- me-na ~ na-me - E 767, I, 8: this is a case of metathesis: see § 6.2.1.
- me-te ~ me-še₃ (?) - Tsukimoto, 37
- mu-tal₂ ~ mu-zal - E 773, 3
- nu-gib ~ nu-geg / mu-gib₃ - E 740, 2¹⁰⁴⁰
- nu-un-ku-a-ni ~ numun-a-ni - TBR 101 Obv. 6¹⁰⁴¹
- u₃-ser₃-ser₃ ~ šar₂×u = 3600×10 - E 767, I, 22
- u₃-šar-šar ~ šar₂×u = 3600×10 - E 767, II, 22
- ub-be₂ ~ ul₄-le - E 771+, 28
- za-aš ~ za₃-še₃ - E 734, 3: two explanations can be advanced: (1) the writing results from metathesis with the shift $e > a$; (2) it is a short writing with loss of e . This spelling is influenced by the use of -aš in certain contexts after Ca.

Ugarit

Babylonian Tablets

- KAL-la ~ ġuruš - AuOrS 23 25, 37: see § 7.1.3.

Ugarit Script Tablets

- a-li-im ~ isiš₂ (A.IGI) - RS 23.34+ A, 6: see § 6.2.1.
- a-ra-me-ek-mu-aš-šu ~ a-ra₂-min-kam₂-aš - AuOrS 23 21, 84: this writing has been listed under the heading of short writings¹⁰⁴² but another explanation is possible: -k-m- would result from metathesis with consequent $n > m$ shift; -u- in -mu- would derive from $a > u$ shift; and -š- in -aš- would result from assimilation of -m- to -š- due to the metathesis -aš > -šu with $a > u$ shift. Therefore the unorthographic writing could be reconstructed as ****a-ra-me-em-ka-am-aš**.
- [a-sa-ki-i]k-ku ~ a₂-sag₃-ge - AuOrS 23 21 70: this entry is also listed here¹⁰⁴³ because it is a possible Akkadographically written Sumerogram from *Asakku*.
- -aš in kur-aš ~ kur-še₃ - AuOrS 23 21, 8: -aš, used to indicate the terminative in certain contexts after Ca, is incorrectly used here.
- he₂-RU ~ ħe₂-pa₃ - AuOrS 23 21, 70: the sign IGI of the sequence IGI.RU = pa₃ is omitted.
- gi-in-ni-in-mi-ni ~ ġe₆ ni₂ me-lim₄ - RS 79.25, 27: the sign -lim₄ (NE) is written as -ni.¹⁰⁴⁴
- gi-il-tun₃ ~ ġeštug_{2/3} (?) - RS 79.25, 15: this alteration perhaps reflects the MB Akkadian shift $\dot{s} > l$.
- gi-ku-du[...] ~ ġi^gge₂-ma₂-š_u₂-a (?) - RS 86.2210 II, § 3: ku-du perhaps renders the sign KID = ge₂; this entry is not listed under additional u or under $k > g$ because the reading is uncertain; see § 7.3.6.
- giz-za-na ~ i₃-ġeš-ta - AuOrS 23 21, 92¹⁰⁴⁵
- i₃-[i]g-gu ~ e-ne-gen₇ - RS 23.34+ B, 12: this writing is interpreted as resulting from metathesis ***-ni- > -in-** and consequent assimilation of /n/ to /g/.
- il-li-il ~ ^den-lil₂ - RS 79.25, 4: this writing is based on the Akkadian *Ellil*.
- ka-la-qa-e-ni ~ kala-ge-de₃ - RS 79.25, 24: the sign -de₃ is read NE and written as -ni.
- ku-ug-bi ~ gu₂-un-bi - RS 79.25, 36: the sign UN is misread as uġ₃ and rendered as -ug-.

1039 See Alster 1990, 25.

1040 See Arnaud 1985-1987, Vol. 4, 348.

1041 Cf. Civil 1996: 'One more indication of the intervocalic -n- in NUMUN'.

1042 See 4.2.10

1043 Cf. § 4.3.1.1.2, $g > k$.

1044 See Arnaud 2007, 23.

1045 See Arnaud 2007, 88: 92.

- lu-u₂- ~ nu- - AuOrS 23 21, 80
- ma-aš-rab-ba ~ maš-tab - RS 86.2210, II, § 5
- me-e-tum ~ me-na - RS 23.34+ B, 6
- mi-nim-ru[?] ~ mi-ni-diri - RS 23.34+ A, 11
- mu-li-li ~ ⁴mu-ul-lil₂ - RS 79.25, 6
- nam-u₁₈-lu[?]-lu[?] ~ nam-lu₂-u₁₈-lu - RS 23.34+ A, 14: this is a case of metathesis.
- (šu-)nam-tar-ta-re-e-ni ~ nam-tar-re-de₃ - RS 79.25, 5: the sign -de₃ is read NE and written as -ni.¹⁰⁴⁶
- u₂-mu ~ u₄- - RS 79.25, 2: this writing is clearly influenced by Akkadian *ūmu*.

4.5 Concluding Remarks

The analysis has shown that phonetic writings from the Syro-Anatolian texts present deviations from the standard Nippur orthography comparable to those found in the Old Babylonian unorthographic texts stemming from Northern Babylonia. Indeed the majority of the alterations attested in the Western periphery can be found in the Old Babylonian unorthographic texts. However, a distinction has to be drawn between Babylonian script tablets and manuscripts drafted by local (i.e. Syrian or Hittite) scribes.

Tablets from Ḫattuša provide the majority of entries for phonetic writings. Within this corpus more than half of the entries are documented in the unorthographic incantations written on Babylonian script tablets (CTH 800). Nevertheless, the tablets providing the largest number of entries as a single group are the manuscripts written by local scribes at Ugarit.

Corpus	Entries	Percentage within the corpus	Overall Percentage
Ḫattuša: Babylonian Script	176	53,3	24,2
Ḫattuša: Ass-Mit Script	26	7,9	3,6
Ḫattuša: Hittite Script	128	38,8	17,6
Total Ḫattuša	330		45,4
Emar	157		21,6
Ugarit: Babylonian Script	20	8,3	2,8
Ugarit: Ugarit Script	220	91,7	30,3
Total Ugarit	240		33,0
Total	727		

Taking a statistical approach one may observe that for syllabification of logograms, which is the most common way of spelling Sumerian words phonetically, the majority of entries derive from the Babylonian tablets from Ḫattuša:

Corpus	Syllabification	Percentage
Ḫattuša: Babylonian Script	72	53,3
Ḫattuša: Ass-Mit Script	0	0,0
Ḫattuša: Hittite Script	12	8,9
Total Ḫattuša	84	62,2
Emar	15	11,1
Ugarit: Babylonian Script	0	0,0
Ugarit: Ugarit Script	36	26,7
Total Ugarit	36	26,7

¹⁰⁴⁶ For the initial šu see § 6.1.1.

Conversely, the majority of entries for effective alterations¹⁰⁴⁷ occur in tablets written by local scribes.

Corpus	Entries	Percentage
Ḫattuša: Babylonian Script	80	13,3
Ḫattuša: Ass-Mit Script	19	3,2
Ḫattuša: Hittite Script	135	22,5
Total Ḫattuša	234	38,9
Emar	133	22,1
Ugarit: Babylonian Script	12	2,0
Ugarit: Ugarit Script	222	36,9
Total Ugarit	234	38,9
Total	601	

Entries of effective alterations occurring in the Babylonian tablets from Ḫattuša reach an overall percentage of only 13,5. Tablets from Emar, which provide fewer phonetic writings than the Babylonian tablets from Ḫattuša, contain more effective alterations. This clearly sets the Babylonian tablets from the Hittite capital apart from the rest of the documentation. The unorthographic incantations CTH 800 present a conservative character similar to the OB texts, showing a minor degree of alteration. As will be argued below,¹⁰⁴⁸ this group of incantations and the OB unorthographic texts are both likely products of Northern Babylonian scribal circles. Babylonian script tablets inscribed with Sumerian texts were found in a very limited number at Ugarit. Moreover, only the tablet AuOrS 23 25 contains incantations entirely written in phonetic orthography. Similarly, the very low degree of alterations shown by the Assyro-Mitannian tablets is due to the fact that these texts were written in standard orthography with only occasional phonetic writings. In contrast, local tablets present a higher degree of alterations. The number of alterations occurring in local tablets is due to the tendency, evidenced in the analysis of single alterations, to use phonetic writings to a larger extent compared to both OB texts and Babylonian script tablets from the Western periphery. The majority of alterations are concentrated in the local tablets from Ugarit (36,9%). This indicates that each word and word cluster from the Ugarit documentation presents more than one variation and consequently it is listed under several different alterations, increasing the number of entries. The reason is not immediately understandable, but the practice of copying from dictation at Ugarit cannot be ruled out. It seems evident that by drawing from the possibilities offered by the cuneiform system local scribes made extensive use of the phonetic orthography conventions. However, unorthographic writings in the Syro-Anatolian texts result from an acquired knowledge that was transmitted to the Western periphery. Indeed in Syria and Anatolia, an environment in which Sumerian was poorly known and utilized for scholarly materials only, the concept of phonetic orthography itself could not have been developed independently of the Babylonian tradition. According to the hypothesis presented here, scribes from Syria and Anatolia were educated in orthographic conventions relying on the Northern Babylonian tradition. This knowledge was likely transmitted to the western regions by means of lexical lists¹⁰⁴⁹ containing phonetic spellings of Sumerian logograms in addition to the standard orthography form and the Akkadian translation.¹⁰⁵⁰ Samples of such lexical lists were found in Syria and Anatolia, such as the

1047 Effective alterations include the following: additional vowels, additional consonants, *sandhi*, short writings and all the phonetic alterations. They do not include *scriptio plena* and bindings.

1048 See § 5.1.1.

1049 On the tradition of lexical lists see Civil 1975, 128, Civil 1989.

1050 RIA 6, 616.

Ḫattuša editions of *Urra*,¹⁰⁵¹ *Kagal*¹⁰⁵² and *Erim-ḫuš*¹⁰⁵³ and the Emar and Ugarit recensions of *Urra*.¹⁰⁵⁴ The alterations noted in the literary and magical texts find parallels in the lexical lists,¹⁰⁵⁵ as in the following examples:

Line	Standard Orthography	Phonetic Orthography	Akkadian
Ḫattuša – Erim-ḫuš - KBo 1 41			
a 5	gī	ki-i	ši-ip-ṭ[u ₄]
a 6	gī-šu ₂	ki-i-šu	pu-ru-u[s-su ₂ -u _{1/2}]
a 7	gī-gī	ki-i-ki	ma-ḫa-a-[ru _{1/3}]
Emar – Urra XIb (canonical XIX) - E 556D = Msk 74149			
Obv. 6	gada šu-šu-ub diḡir-ra	ka-ad šu-šu-ub ti-gi-ra	šu-šu-[up] i-li
Obv. 8	gada šu-šu-ub ereš diḡir-ra	ka-ad šu-šu-ub i-ri-iš ti-gi-[ra]	[šu-šu]-up i-ti

Perhaps the unorthographic incantations CTH 800 were also used by Hittite scribes as a tool for learning phonetic writings.

As explained in detail in the analysis of single alterations, some phonetic alterations that occur quite rarely in the Old Babylonian documentation are more frequent in the Syro-Anatolian texts. Moreover a few alterations are unattested in the Old Babylonian texts under examination:

Alteration	Tablets	Occurrences	Text Typology
Analytic Writings	Ḫattuša: Ass-Mit Script	3	Standard Sumerian Incantations
g > ḫ	Ḫattuša: Hittite Script	1	Standard Sumerian Incantation
	Ugarit: Ugarit Script	1	Phonetic version of PFK ¹
k > ḡ	Ḫattuša: Ass-Mit Script	1	Standard Sumerian Incantation
	Ugarit: Ugarit Script	1	Phonetic Sumerian Incantation
ḡ > nk/nq	Ḫattuša: Hittite Script	6	Phonetic version of MLM ² Phonetic Sumerian Incantation
š > z	Ugarit: Ugarit Script	1	Phonetic version of LI-LN ³
z > š	Ḫattuša Hittite Script	2	Phonetic version of MLM Standard Sumerian Edubba E
	Emar	1	Standard Sumerian Incantation

1 *A Prayer for a King*, § 6.1.1.

2 *The Message of Lu-diḡira to his Mother*, § 5.3.2.

3 *The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaḡ*, § 5.3.4.

Texts containing these alterations belong to different typologies and script groups. In the standard Sumerian texts, alterations are likely mistakes. In the case of sibilants these spellings are perhaps local developments. Analytic writings are to be attributed to the copyists as they are usually hyper-corrections due to a theoretical or imprecise knowledge of a language. Further alterations unknown from the OB corpus under examination are attested in Babylonian tablets from the Western periphery ($\hat{g} > k$, $\hat{g} > ng$, $\check{s} > \check{s}$, $z > \check{s}$, $e > u$) and should hence be considered developments internal to the Babylonian tradition.

1051 Scheucher 2012, 488-503.

1052 MSL 13, 148-153, von Weiher 1970, Moran 1974, Wilhelm 1989, Scheucher 2012, 548-567.

1053 Scheucher 2012, 610-655.

1054 For Emar see the list of manuscripts in Scheucher 2012, 449-455 and the edition in Gantzert 2011; for Ugarit see the list of manuscripts in Scheucher 2012, 395-448. An overview of lexical lists from the Western periphery is provided in Viano forthcoming.

1055 For phonetic Sumerian in lexical lists see Scheucher 2012, 214-215.

Consonants are affected by phonetic alterations to a greater extent than vowels. Phonetic alterations of stops are the most frequent within consonants.

Corpus	Consonants				Vowels
	Stops	Nasal	Trills	Sibilants	
Ḫattuša: Babylonian Script	14	25	0	8	22
Ḫattuša: Ass-Mit Script	7	2	2	2	3
Ḫattuša: Hittite Script	44	24	0	18	40
Total Ḫattuša	65	51	2	28	65
Emar	39	16	0	7	53
Ugarit: Babylonian Script	2	2	0	0	5
Ugarit: Ugarit Script	62	24	1	11	78
Total Ugarit	64	26	1	11	83
Subtotal	168	93	3	46	
Total		310			201

It is important to address the function of unorthographic writings in tablets of different text types. As stated above, phonetic orthography in incantations was likely adopted to help the performer. This function was associated with unorthographic Babylonian script incantations from Ḫattuša (CTH 800) and probably with some of the incantations contained in the Babylonian tablet from Ugarit AuOrS 23 25.¹⁰⁵⁶ With few exceptions,¹⁰⁵⁷ phonetic writings in incantations drafted by local scribes have no consistent nature. Incantations in local script tablets are written in standard orthography and only random phonetic writings appear. Therefore it is likely that phonetic writings in local script incantations are the result of copying. The same explanation applies to phonetic writings found in Assyro-Mitannian incantations and literary texts in standard orthography.

The majority of phonetic writings in local script tablets derive from a particular text type: the phonetic versions of standard orthography texts. As mentioned above these are only found in literary texts and are usually added to standard orthography versions on multicolumn tablets. Such a tablet format with, from left to right, standard Sumerian, phonetic Sumerian, Akkadian and, at Ḫattuša, Hittite, is typical of the Western periphery and must be considered a product of the local scribes. Indeed, to my knowledge, only three examples of tablets inscribed with standard and phonetic orthography versions of the same texts stem from Mesopotamia. These are exercise tablets. The OB Nippur manuscript UM 29-15-174 is a bilingual tablet in parallel column format containing the composition *Diatribes against Woman*. The left column is inscribed with the Sumerian version in standard orthography, and underneath each line the phonetic version in small script, while the right column contains the Akkadian translation.¹⁰⁵⁸ CBS 11319+¹⁰⁵⁹ is an OB three-column tablet from Nippur inscribed with phonetic Sumerian in the first column, standard Sumerian in the second and Akkadian in the third. This is apparently the closest parallel to the Western periphery tablets, but it recalls the format of lexical lists with phonetic Sumerian in the first column. Indeed, this tablet is closer to lexical lists than to literary texts because although it contains quotations from different literary texts, most of the entries are not literary. The last example is the MB pillow-shaped tablet MS 2065¹⁰⁶⁰ which contains phonetic Sumerian, standard Sumerian, and Akkadian arranged in three lines from top to bottom. In this case too the phonetic version precedes the standard Sumerian as in lexical lists. Hence, none of these tablets resembles the format of the manuscripts from the Western periphery. The practice of writing standard Sumerian and phonetic orthography versions on the same tablet was scarcely used in Mesopotamia;

1056 See § 7.1.3.

1057 KUB 4 26 (+) HT 13, E 734, *Tsukimoto Incantation*, AuOrS 23 21.

1058 Alster 1991-1992, copy in RA 60, 5-7.

1059 Sjöberg 1993.

1060 § 1.1.7.8.

thus, contrary to Klinger,¹⁰⁶¹ it is unlikely that literary compositions arrived already in this format in the Western periphery. The clearest example is *The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ*: it is preserved in bilingual format in standard orthography at Ḫattuša (KUB 4 39) but an unorthographic version is known from Ugarit (RS 17.10). It is evident that this text was transmitted to the Western periphery in standard orthography. However, it is possible that phonetic versions were created under the supervision of Mesopotamian teachers. Phonetic versions of standard orthography texts are therefore to be considered as the work of local scribes, produced as part of scribal training.

Phonetic versions of standard orthography literary texts are attested at Ḫattuša, Emar and Ugarit and represent our primary source for unorthographic writings from tablets drafted in local script, as the following table shows:

Source	Composition	Entries	Total	Entries Local Script	%
Ḫattuša					
CTH 314	The Hymn to Iškur Adad	29	95	128	74,2
CTH 315	The Message of Lu-diĝira to his Mother	54			
KUB 57 126	Edubba E	12			
Emar					
E 767	The Ballad of Early Rulers	51	75	157	47,8
E 768 - E 769 - E 770	The Fowler	12			
E 776	Unidentified	3			
TBR 101	The Letter of Sin-iddinam to Utu	9			
Ugarit					
RS 17.10	The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ	19	137	222	62,3
RS 23.34+	The Ballad of Early Rulers	26			
RS 79.25	A Prayer for a King	70			
RS 86.2210	The Fox and the Hyena	22			

At Ḫattuša these sources contain 74,2% of the entries from local script tablets; at Emar the percentage is 47,8 while at Ugarit is 62,3. These numbers further evidence the pedagogical nature of the phonetic versions. Moreover the table explains that the elevated number of effective alterations in local script tablets (as seen above) derives from local scribal practices associated with education.

To sum up, it has been argued that the knowledge of phonetic writing in the Western periphery derives from the Northern Babylonian scribal schools. Unorthographic writings display different features and a different degree of agreement with the Old Babylonian tradition depending on the script and provenance of the manuscripts. Babylonian tablets from Ḫattuša, as expected, fall in the Babylonian tradition, whereas the local tablets, notably those from Ugarit, exhibit the strong influence of local scribal practices. Indeed, Syrian and Anatolian scribes developed local scribal habits through an extensive use of conventions learned from the Babylonian tradition.

¹⁰⁶¹ Klinger 2010, 316, 324, cf. Klinger 2012, 90-91.

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

5 Sumerian Literary and Magical Texts from Ḫattuša

This chapter is dedicated to the discussion and analysis of each Sumerian literary and magical text discovered in the Hittite capital. Texts will be presented according to the script of manuscripts.

5.1 Babylonian Script Tablets

A group of tablets written in Babylonian script contains Sumerian incantations.

CTH	Publication	Composition	Find-spot Area	Script	Language
800.1	KUB 30 1	Incantation	Bk. A	LOB/MB	PhS
800.4	KUB 37 109	Incantation	Bk. A	LOB/MB	PhS
800.2	KUB 30 2	Incantation	Bk. A	LOB/MB	PhS
800.4	KUB 30 3	Incantation	Bk. A	LOB/MB	PhS
800.3	KUB 30 4	Incantation	Bk. A	LOB/MB	PhS
800	KBo 36 13	Incantation	Bk. K	LOB/MB	PhS
800	KBo 36 15	Incantation	Bk. M	LOB/MB	PhS
800	KBo 36 16	Incantation	Bk. D	LOB/MB	PhS
812	KBo 36 19	Incantation	Bk. M	LOB/MB	PhS
800	KBo 40 103	Incantation	Bk. A	LOB/MB	PhS
800.4	KUB 37 108 KUB 37 110	Incantation	Bk. A	LOB/MB	PhS
801	KBo 36 21	Incantation	Bk. D	LOB/MB(?)	Ph(?)S
813	KBo 14 51	Collection of Incantations	Bk.	MB	SA
813	KBo 13 37	Collection of Incantations	HaH	Bab	Ph(?)SA(?)

5.1.1 Monolingual Incantations – CTH 800

Under CTH 800 is listed a group of monolingual incantations written in phonetic writing sharing the same sign shapes.¹⁰⁶²

The best preserved manuscript is KUB 30 1 (A),¹⁰⁶³ a two-column tablet inscribed with two incantations. This source was part of a series of tablets as is clear from the subscript [dub]-x-kam₂-ma nu-til.¹⁰⁶⁴ The fragment KUB 37 109 probably belongs to the same manuscript.

¹⁰⁶² See <http://www.hethiter.net>, introduction to KBo 36 and Wilhelm 1992, 84.

¹⁰⁶³ Manuscripts and lineation according to Geller 1989.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Falkenstein 1939, 8, suggests that this was the fourth tablet of the series as he reads -x- as -4-.

The obverse contains a Marduk-Ea incantation¹⁰⁶⁵ against witchcraft,¹⁰⁶⁶ known from three OB tablets in standard orthography. CBS 332 = PBS 1/2 122 (B) is a partially bilingual¹⁰⁶⁷ single-column tablet in interlinear format belonging to the Khabaza collection, hence probably from Sippar.¹⁰⁶⁸ J. Rylands Library Box 24 P 28 (C)¹⁰⁶⁹ is a single-column tablet of unknown provenance but probably from Sippar too.¹⁰⁷⁰ CBS 11933 (D) is a two-column tablet from Nippur. PBS 1/2 122 is possibly later than the other OB manuscripts, not only because of the presence of the Akkadian translation but also because of some late grammatical features and errors in the Sumerian version.¹⁰⁷¹

The reverse of KUB 30 1 contains a poorly preserved Marduk-Ea incantation, but no duplicates are known so far.

All the manuscripts significantly diverge from one another and have different line orders. Moreover, J. Rylands Library Box 24 P 28 and CBS 11933 add sections not attested in the other tablets.¹⁰⁷² KUB 30 1 represents a different recension and not simply a phonetic version of one of the OB manuscripts, as shown in the following examples:

- In line 9 KUB 30 1 follows D in the verbal form against C; the verbal form is not preserved in B.

9	H	I 14	lu-ul-lu pa-ap-ḥa-al-la [kli- ¹ a ¹ n[u-u]n-za-a // ba-ni-ib-di-ib-be ₂
	B	19	[lu ₂ -ulu ₃] pap-ḥal-la ki-nu-zu ¹ -a ¹ ba ¹ -[...]
		20	[a-wi-lam m]u-ut-ta-al-li-kam i-na la ¹ i ¹ -du ¹ -u ₂ ¹ [...]
	C	10	lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu pap-ḥal-la ki ¹ -nu-zu-a-ni ¹ ba-an-ḡen ¹
	D	9	lu ₂ -ulu ₃ ¹ pap-ḥal ¹ -l[a] ¹ ki ¹ -nu-zu-a-ni // ba-ab-dib
			<i>She made the distraught man walk about disoriented.</i>

- In lines 10-11 KUB 30 1 diverges from all the OB manuscripts, notably from D:

10	A	I 16-18	lu-bi šu-si-iq-qa ba-an-še ¹⁰⁷³ // gi-ri-si-iq-qa ba-an-še // sa-ad-ni-im im-šu-ub
	B	21	¹ lu ₂ ¹ -ulu ₃ -bi a ₂ -šu-ḡiri ₃ -ni sa ¹ - ¹ ad ¹ -[nim]
		22	i-na ma-na-ni-šu [ša] ¹ -aš ₂ -ša-tu ₃ ¹ [id-di]
	C	11	lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu-bi a ₂ -šu-ḡiri ₃ -ni sa-ad-nim ¹⁰⁷⁴ im-šub
	D	10	¹ lu ₂ ¹ -ulu ₃ -bi a ₂ -šu-ḡiri ₃ -na // [...-a]d-ni ugu-na // i-im-šub
			<i>She caused paralysis in the victim's limbs.</i>
11	A	I 19	za- ¹ ag ¹ -še im-g[u]-g[u-r]a a-gi-ga i-i ¹⁰⁷⁵
	B	23	za ₃ -še im-gigurum ¹⁰⁷⁶ a-geg ¹ e ₃ ¹ [...]
		24	a-ḥa-a-šu <i-dat>uš-š[a- ...]

1065 For this typology see Falkenstein 1931, 44 ff.

1066 This incantation has similarities with the series *Maqlû*, cf. Thomsen 1987, 15; on the identification of the antagonist as a female see Geller 1989, 201. Mention of Gilgameš in KUB 37 109, 4 and in KBo 36 13 R. Col., 15, gi-il-ga-m[i-iš], is relevant as he is also attested in *Maqlû*, Geller 1989, 202-203: 31, 41.

1067 Lines 23-26 have no Akkadian translation.

1068 See § 1 and fn. 78.

1069 Hand-copy in AfO 24 Table II.

1070 See Wilcke 1973, 1-2.

1071 See verbal forms in Falkenstein 1939, 34: 2, 4; also note the phonetic writing u₃-ub-da for u₃-ub-du₁₁-ga, Geller 1989, 202: 15. An error is also attested in manuscript C where -de₂ is replaced by -du₁₁, Wilcke 1973, 13: 7.

1072 See ll. 33-40, 50-57, 67ff. in Geller 1989.

1073 On še as a phonetic writing for šer₃ see Geller 1989, 202: 10.

1074 sa-ad-nim = *samānu*, CAD S, 111; incantations against *samānu* are attested in the MA documentation (§ 2.1.6.6) and at Ugarit, see § 7.1.3 and fn. 1805, § 7.3.7 and fn. 1842.

1075 For a gi-ga i-i = 'to utter a cry of pain', see Attinger 1993, 416.

1076 For gigurum see Zgoll 1997, 324-325; on the basis of the reading gurum of the sign GAM and the phonetic writing in KUB 30 1, I would suggest a reading gugurum.

C	12	za ₃ -še im-gigurum
D	11	za ₃ -še im-gigurum // 'a ₂ -ni?' [mu]-'un'-ĝal ₂ (The victim) bends on his side and utters a cry of pain.

- According to Geller's edition lines 62-63, u₃-u[š]-'š'u' [...] // gi-iš-šu-ub-gi-im¹⁰⁷⁷ [.....] (KUB 30 1 II, 17-18) are only attested in the Ḫattuša manuscript. Probably also line KUB 30 1 II, 4, uš-[r]a-an-[ni ...], which Geller identifies with line 46, is not attested in the other manuscripts.¹⁰⁷⁸

46	B	11	sa-UD gazinbu-gen ₇ uš ₇ -zu-e-ne ħe ₂ -b[al]a ² -uš
		12	ši-ir-a-ni-ša ki-ma ga-ši-ši-im ka-ša-ap-tu ₂ šu-a-ti [l]i-iĥ-ru-u ₂
	D	46	sa-UD gazinbu-g[en ₇] ħe ₂ -b[ala- ...] May they dig as with a stake at that witch, at her flesh.

Furthermore, contrary to the other manuscripts, KUB 30 1 reports the abbreviated Marduk-Ea formula¹⁰⁷⁹ as is typical in late texts.

Errors and anomalies are often the product of phonetic writings:

- In line 3, ħa-ma-an-ze₂-er šu im-ma-[...] (KUB 30 1, I 6-7), the directive case -e documented in C is omitted. As a consequence the verbal form has two direct objects¹⁰⁸⁰ (note that no OO is written in the verbal form):

3	A	I 6-7	i-gi-in im-ma-ab-[zu] // ħa-ma-an-ze ₂ -er šu im-ma-[.....]
	B	7	i ₃ -ĝen im ¹ abzu ħabrud-da siki-ħamanzer [...]
		8	eġ-lam u ₃ wa-ar-da-tu' [...] il-li-ik-ma ti-ġa-am i-na ABZU i-na ħu-u[r-ri-im...]
	C	4	[ħabr]ud-da siki-ħamanzer-re [š]u i[m-.....]
	D	2	[.....ħabru]da-'da' ħamanzer
	D	3	[.....] 'šu im?'-ma-ab-ti She went; she took the Abzu-clay from a hole and loose hair.

- In line 4 the verbal form dim₂, which is attested in B, mu-un-dim₂, and corresponds to Akkadian *epēšu*, is incorrectly replaced by gim in KUB 30 1, I, 8, mu-un-gi-im.¹⁰⁸¹ Furthermore in šu ma-an-g[u-ur], the prefix BA is miswritten as MA.¹⁰⁸²

4	A	I 8	a-la-am mu-un-gi-im ħa-ma-a[n-ze ₂ -er] / šu ma-an-g[u-ur]
	B	9	alam mu-un-dim ₂ ħamanzer šu i[m ² -...] i-pu-uš-ma mu-ša-ġe ₄ [...]
	C	5	alam mu-un-dim ₂ 'ħamanzer-re' x[.....]x
	D	4	[alam] mu-un-dim ₂ ħamanzer-a / šu ba-an-gur She fashioned a figurine and wrapped it in the loose hair.

- In line 6 KUB 30 1 has sa instead of ki because the sign KI was misread as DI, then read as sa₂ and rendered phonetically as sa:¹⁰⁸³

1077 A similar writing is attested in KBo 36 15 Rev. 6: [g]i-iš-bu-šu.

1078 Geller transliterates KUB 30 1 II, 4, as 'sa-UD ma²-da²-[al...]' but Falkenstein's reading, uš-[r]a-an-[ni...], seems to be more correct.

1079 Note that C and D do not have the line ĝen-na dumu-ĝu₁₀ 'asal-lu₂-ĥi, cf. l. 20.

1080 Cf. Attinger 1993, 228-229.

1081 Geller 1989, 201: 4.

1082 The 1sg. IO makes no sense in the context.

1083 Geller 1989, 201: 6; note also the miswriting IR for ni due to graphic similarity, Falkenstein 1939, 28: 10.

6	A	I 10	uš i-ni'(IR)-di sa bi-in-[.....]
	B	13	uš ₇ i-ni-in-de ₂ ki-a [.....] <i>'ru-uh'tam id-di-ma i-na er-se-tim i[q-bir]</i>
	C	7	[u]š ₇ i-ni-in-du ₁₁ ki-a 'bi ₂ '-in-tum ₂ -m[a]
	D	6	[uš ₇] i-ni-in-de ₂ // [... k]i-a bi ₂ -in-tum ₂ <i>She spat on it, and buried it in the earth.</i>

- In line 8 the sign KA(eme) of eme-ĝar was misread as inim, resulting in the writing i-ni-im-ĝa₂-ar (KUB 30 1, I 13).¹⁰⁸⁴

The analysis has shown that KUB 30 1 cannot be directly traced back to any of the extant OB manuscripts and reflects a later textual tradition. As seen in Chapter 4, KUB 30 1 and the manuscripts listed under CTH 800 represent a group of texts written with orthographic conventions typical of Northern Babylonia. Both in terms of orthography and typology the closest parallel can be found in the corpus of magical texts from Meturan that were used as examples of Old Babylonian unorthographic texts in Chapter 4. Indeed, these are collections of Sumerian monolingual incantations in phonetic writing dated to the time of Ḫammu-rābi.¹⁰⁸⁵ Moreover, one of the incantations inscribed in the tablet from Meturan H 97 contains a passage (IV, 13-17) partially parallel to KUB 30 1 I, 12-18.¹⁰⁸⁶

A	uš kaš [...] i-ni-im-ĝa ₂ -ar ḫu-u[l ...] x x lu-ul-lu pa-ap-ḫa-al-la [k]i-'a' n[u-u]n-za-a ba-ni-ib-di-ib-bi lu-bi šu-si-iq-qa ba-an-še gi-ri-si-iq-qa ba-an-še sa-ad-ni-im im-šu-ub
H 97	ka-ša de ₂ -a e-me-ĝar ḫu-lu ta-qa lu ₂ -ulu ₃ ! <pap>-ḫal-la ki nu-za-a-ni ba-ab-dab ₅ ¹⁰⁸⁷ lu ₂ -lu-bi šu-si-qa ba-an-du ka-ku-ĝal ₂ -a-ni IGI ba-ba šu-ni šu ĝiri ₃ kuš ₃ -na sa-ad-ni-im ba-an-šu-ub

It is worth noting the similarity of the phonetic spellings šu-si-qa (H 97 IV, 15) and šu-si-iq-qa (KUB 30 1 I, 16). The Meturan text also helps to clarify KUB 30 1 I, 12:

8	A	I 12-13	i-UŠ-ta-aq-qa uš kaš [.....] // i-ni-im-ĝa ₂ -ar ḫu-u[l...] x x
	B	17	uš ₇ kaš-e de ₂ -a eme-ĝar ḫul [.....] <i>ru-uh-tim ši-ka-rum 'id'-di-ma lem-ni-iš [...]</i>
	C	9	[u]š ₇ kaš-a 'de ₂ -a' eme-ĝar ḫul 'ta' ¹⁰⁸⁸ ga
	D	8	[u]š ₇ kaš uš-ri-a // 'eme'-[ĝa]r 'ḫul' [...]-ga <i>She poured spittle into (his) beer, (putting him) in a hostile mood.</i>

1084 Geller 1989, 201: 8.

1085 Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993a, 91-92; note however that the Meturan texts have the complete Marduk-Ea formula, see Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993b, 179-180, Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995a, 23, Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995b, 170-171, 186, 196.

1086 Cf. Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995b, 175-176 and lines 9-10 above.

1087 According to Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993b, 186, in the Meturan texts, the association of KU and DIB with the meanings 'to pass' and 'to seize' is the reverse of the Nippur tradition, whereas in KUB 30 1 *dib has the correct meaning 'to pass'. In this case, however, it is difficult to state whether in KUB 30 1 the meaning 'to seize' was intended, as in the Nippur manuscript, where dab₅ is attested, although *dib was written according to the Meturan tradition, or whether 'to pass' was actually intended, written with the phonetic rendering of dib.

1088 For this reading see Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995b, 175.

Scholars have interpreted the sign UŠ differently. Falkenstein¹⁰⁸⁹ reads -nita- as a scribal mistake probably due to dictation from the verbal form i-nita-ta-aq-qa ~ i₃-ni-ta₃-ta₃-ga, which he refers to the preceding line. Geller,¹⁰⁹⁰ following Falkenstein in referring this verbal form to the preceding line, regards UŠ as a miswriting for -ta- and reads i-ta'-ta-aq-qa as equivalent to ĝa₂-ĝa₂ in C and D corresponding to Akkadian *nadû*. However, H 97 IV, 13-14 may provide a different explanation:¹⁰⁹¹

H 97	13	uš ta-ka ka-ša de ₂ -a
	14	e-me-ĝar ħul-lu ta-qa

The Boğazköy text may contain a traditional variant if we regard uš as a phonetic writing for uš₇, as in the Meturan tablet, and i- as either an additional vowel or a scribal mistake possibly copied from the following line. Therefore, ta-aq-qa and ta-ka would be phonetic writings for taka₄.

The other monolingual Sumerian incantations are preserved on fragments:

KUB 30 2 is a fragment from the lower edge of a two-column tablet preserving, on the obverse, thirteen lines on the left column and twelve on the right; the reverse is broken away. The incantation is similar to KUB 30 1 as shown by the word ħa-ab-ru-ud-da (KUB 30 2 I, 10).¹⁰⁹²

KUB 30 3 is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving eleven lines on one side only, probably the reverse. This fragment contains the beginning of a complete Marduk-Ea formula.

KUB 30 4 is a fragment from the central part of a two-column tablet. Only one side survived, preserving eleven lines on the left column and fourteen on the right. The right column contains a complete Marduk-Ea formula.

KBo 36 13 is a large fragment from a two-column tablet discovered in Building K in a secondary context on a Phrygian level. Only one side, probably the reverse, is preserved with circa eighteen lines per column. The left column quotes Asalluĥi (l. 3)¹⁰⁹³ whereas the right column contains an incantation against witchcraft, ni-ĝa₂-ak-ka (l. 5), and mentions Gilgameš, gi-il-ga-m[i-iš] (l. 15).¹⁰⁹⁴

KBo 36 15 is a fragment discovered in Building M in a secondary context on a Phrygian level; the right column is preserved on both sides. The reverse contains an abbreviated Marduk-Ea formula.

KBo 36 16 is a fragment from the central part of its tablet discovered in Building D in a secondary context on a Phrygian level. Only ten lines are preserved on one side; the other is broken away.

KUB 37 108 + KUB 37 110 is a fragment from the upper edge of a two-column tablet discovered in Building A. The evil eye is referred to in the left column: 'i-gi'-ĥu-la (l. 2).

KBo 40 103 is a fragment from the left edge of its tablet preserving an abbreviated Marduk-Ea formula on the reverse. The obverse is broken away.

CTH 800 comprises monolingual unorthographic incantations inscribed on multicolumn tablets that are probably all part of the same collection, as the common concern with witchcraft and the presence

¹⁰⁸⁹ Falkenstein 1939, 28.

¹⁰⁹⁰ Geller 1989, 201.

¹⁰⁹¹ Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995b translate as «La salive avec laquelle on est entré en contact (la salive qu'on a laissé tomber?), qui a été versée dans la bière».

¹⁰⁹² See above l. 3.

¹⁰⁹³ [a-sa-al-l]u-uĥ-ĥi.

¹⁰⁹⁴ On Gilgameš in the series *Maqlû* see fn. 1066.

of Gilgameš would suggest. Similar orthographic conventions and tablet formats¹⁰⁹⁵ are attested in the texts from Meturan, but the incantations discovered in the Hittite capital use phonetic writings more extensively. The Marduk-Ea formula is attested in CTH 800 in both the complete¹⁰⁹⁶ and the abbreviated¹⁰⁹⁷ form.

As illustrated in Chapter 4, orthographic conventions adopted in CTH 800 are here considered a valuable indication of a Northern Babylonian textual tradition that recalls the unorthographic incantations from Meturan. Sumerian incantations completely written in phonetic orthography are in fact unattested at Nippur either in the contemporaneous Middle Babylonian documentation¹⁰⁹⁸ or in the Old Babylonian period. The few examples of texts drafted in phonetic orthography that are known from the Middle Babylonian period stem from Northern Babylonia.¹⁰⁹⁹ As both groups of sources, CTH 800 and the Meturan texts, were written by Babylonian (or Babylonized) scribes and are practical texts to be performed by exorcists, phonetic orthography likely served as a pronunciation aid.

The paleography of CTH 800 is indicated as Middle Babylonian in S. Košak's Konkordanz. Under the Kassites some signs developed shapes only attested in tablets from this period. The only diagnostic sign for the Kassite period, KUR,¹¹⁰⁰ is unfortunately not attested in any of the CTH 800 fragments, and other distinctive signs¹¹⁰¹ do not provide conclusive evidence. The signs NE, only attested in KBo 36 19, 9, and RU¹¹⁰² show shapes different from the typical Kassite forms.¹¹⁰³ The sign LI,¹¹⁰⁴ with five *Winkelhaken* before the upright wedge, also differs from the MB shape as attested in Sumerian literary texts inscribed in Babylonian script tablets discovered at Ugarit.¹¹⁰⁵ Only the presence of such sign shapes could provide evidence for dating. On the contrary, their absence does not exclude that the manuscript in question dates to the Kassite period, as many MB tablets containing Sumerian literary texts do not show the typical Kassite sign shapes.¹¹⁰⁶ Falkenstein¹¹⁰⁷ had already noticed that KUB 30 1 shows later forms for AḤ and the OB shape for TE. It is well known that distinguishing between LOB and MB tablets is very complicated.¹¹⁰⁸ The manner of incision and spacing between signs is reminiscent of CBS 563, one of the copies of *Incantation to Utu* dated to the Late Old Babylonian period. Similarities with the incantations from Meturan and paleographical features that distinguish this group of tablets from typical MB manuscripts lead me to suggest that

1095 See the photographs in Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993b.

1096 KUB 30, 3, KUB 30 4.

1097 KUB 30 1; KBo 36 15 Rev. 3-4: [a-sa-a]l-lu-ḫi i-gi im-[ma-an-si] // [gi-in-na] du-mu-gu a-s[a-al-lu-ḫi]; KBo 40 103, 3-4: a-sa-al-lu-ḫi i-gi im-ma-[an-si] // gi-in-na dumu-mu a-s[a-al-lu-ḫi].

1098 See § 1.1.10.1.

1099 Cf. *Incantation to Utu*, § 1.1.10.2.

1100 Veldhuis 2000a, 70.

1101 See Rutz 2006, 72 and n. 49.

1102 KUB 30 1 I, 1, KBo 36 19, 5, KUB 37 108 + KUB 37 110, 1.

1103 For Kassite NE see for instance N 6286 (§ 1.1.1.6) and CBS 13509 (§ 1.1.3.1). It is worth noting that the Kassite shape of NE is attested at Ḫattuša in the small fragment KUB 4 36 (diḡir-gal-gal-e-ne), a copy of a royal inscription in monumental script. Further examples of a Kassite royal inscription of an unknown king attested at Ḫattuša are the fragments KUB 37 123-125; it is not excluded that KUB 4 36 belongs to the same tablet, cf. Sommerfeld 1985. For RU see BE 14, No. 196, first variant; cf. PBS 10/4 12 Rev. Col. I, 1, 2, 7.

1104 KUB 30 1 I, 5, KUB 30 2 II, 9, KBo 36 19, 7.

1105 Cf. manuscripts from Ugarit of *The Ballad of Early Rulers*, § 6.2.1 and fn. 1631. The shape of LI in CTH 800 is also attested in the possible MB tablet CBS 10457 Obv. II, 11, Rev. III, 19, see § 1.1.4.1.

1106 For the sign KUR in MB Sumerian literary texts see UM 29-15-393 (Rutz 2006) and CBS 10475; for the sign RU see for instance N 6286, Cooper 1978, ll. 137, 146.

1107 Falkenstein 1939, 9.

1108 In this regard the shape of RU with one *Winkelhaken* is different from that attested in the LOB tablets of *Atraḫasis* dated to Amišaduqa (Hunger 1968, 26-27), CT 46 1 Tab. IV, 40, 54; CT 46 3 ii, 54.55. Yet, it is similar to the shape attested in BM 78375 Obv. 3 (Geller 1985, Pl. 18), an incantation tablet probably from Sippar dated, according to Geller 2006, 51, to the 17th century.

the CTH 800 sources could be very Late Old Babylonian tablets.¹¹⁰⁹ I would speculate that these tablets arrived at the Hittite capital as a result of the military campaign of Muršili I in Babylonia; they would have been brought to Ḫattuša as booty, probably together with *āšipū* priests.¹¹¹⁰ As explained below, the archival storage of these tablets suggests an early reception.¹¹¹¹ Obviously, transmission of such material via the peaceful dispatch of Babylonian specialists to the Hittite court, as is well known from the 13th century documentation, is also possible.¹¹¹² In my opinion, this group of texts represents a very late product of the same scribal milieu that produced the Meturan incantations. However, on the basis of the presently available evidence, a later date is not precluded.

5.1.2 KBo 36 19 (CTH 812)

KBo 36 19 is a fragment from the central part of a two-column tablet discovered in Building M in a secondary context on a Phrygian level. This tablet originally contained several different incantations as is clear from the Akkadian subscript [*a-na*] *pa-ša-a-ri*, ‘in order to release’,¹¹¹³ inscribed between two horizontal rulings (l. 4). Unfortunately, lines 1-3 are too badly preserved to determine whether they contained either a Sumerian or an Akkadian text. The following lines are instead inscribed with a monolingual Sumerian incantation in phonetic writing similar to those listed under CTH 800. The evil eye is quoted in R. Col. 6, *i-gi-ḫu-ul*.¹¹¹⁴ On paleographical grounds KBo 36 19 probably has the same origin as CTH 800, for they share the same script and ductus. However, it could belong to a different collection of tablets as none of the incantations listed under CTH 800 preserve Akkadian subscripts.

5.1.3 KBo 36 21 (CTH 801)

KBo 36 21 (CTH 801) is a tiny fragment from the lower edge of its tablet discovered in Building D under the first Phrygian layer. Six lines are preserved on the obverse and only one is partially preserved on the reverse. According to Wilhelm,¹¹¹⁵ it contains a bilingual text, probably an incantation,¹¹¹⁶ in interlinear format but in my opinion there is no evidence for the presence of an Akkadian translation: possibly Obv. 4-5 have only a Sumerian text: [...]e-ne / [...]gal-gal.¹¹¹⁷ Hence this fragment may belong to the same group as CTH 800 but is too badly preserved to ascertain whether or not it shares the same script.

5.1.4 KBo 13 37 (CTH 813)

KBo 13 37 is a fragment from the central part of its tablet discovered in the Haus am Hang in a post-Hittite layer. The obverse[?] seems to be inscribed with an Akkadian magical-ritual text while the reverse[?] has a Sumerian incantation quoting Asalluḫi (Rev.[?] 12) with perhaps an Akkadian

¹¹⁰⁹ For some OB features see Klingler 2012, 81 n. 8, 82 n. 10.

¹¹¹⁰ This scenario recalls the later looting of Babylonian scholarly texts by the Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta I.

¹¹¹¹ See § 8.5.

¹¹¹² Cf. Heeßel 2009.

¹¹¹³ See CAD P, 238.

¹¹¹⁴ For this evil demon in Sumerian incantations see Cunningham 1997, 104-105.

¹¹¹⁵ KBo 36, iv.

¹¹¹⁶ Schwemer 1998, 6 n. 27.

¹¹¹⁷ Note also that Obv. 3, which should contain the Akkadian translation, has [x]-u₂(-)DU-zu mu-[]; mu- is perhaps the beginning of a Sumerian verbal form.

translation arranged in interlinear format.¹¹¹⁸ Due to the fragmentary nature of KBo 13 37 the orthography of the Sumerian text is not clear but it is possibly written in standard orthography with some phonetic writings. The name of Asalluḫi is written in standard orthography, [dasa]r-lu₂-ḫi, and clearly differs from the variants attested in the monolingual incantations CTH 800.¹¹¹⁹ KBo 13 37 also diverges from CTH 800 incantations in terms of paleography¹¹²⁰ and especially ductus.¹¹²¹ However, a paleographic categorization of this fragment is not possible, beyond a general Babylonian origin.

5.1.5 KBo 14 51 (CTH 813)

KBo 14 51 (A) is a ten-line fragment from the left edge of its tablet discovered at Büyükkale in a debris layer preserving two incantations separated by a single ruling. Paleographic analysis clearly points to a Babylonian origin on the basis of the signs RU (l. 7),¹¹²² UŠ (l. 3), SAĜ (l. 6) and ḪAR (l. 6).

The first incantation (ll. 1-4) preserves the injunction to the demon and the self-legitimation of the *āšipu* as Enki's priest. The second incantation turns out to be a forerunner of Tablet VI of the series *Saĝ-geg*¹¹²³ known from first-millennium sources from Nineveh, CT 17 23, 192ff. (N), and Uruk, SpTU II 2, 148ff. (U). It is relevant that this incantation is also preserved in a copy from Ugarit in phonetic writing, RS 17.155 = AuOrS 23 21 (Ug).¹¹²⁴

A	1	[x] ʾnuʾ-m[u-x]-ʾxʾ
A	2	[asi]l _x -la ₂ igi-mu-ta [...] <i>Stay away from my eyes(?)</i>
A	3	[asi]l _x -la ₂ an-ta UŠ [...] <i>stay away from the heaven</i>
A	4	[ĝ]a ₂ -e lu ₂ -mu ₇ -mu ₇ saĝ[ĝa ₂ -maḫ d ^{en} -ki-ga-me-en] ¹¹²⁵ <i>I am the exorcist and the Sanga-priest of Enki.</i>
A	5	en ₂ -e ₂ -[nu-ru]
A	6	saĝ-ki-dib ḫur-saĝ-ĝa ₂ [.....]
N	192	en ₂ saĝ-ki-dib-ba ḫur-saĝ-ĝa ₂ lu ₂ nu-ub-da nu-ub-zu
U	148	en ₂ saĝ-ki-dim ₂ ¹ ḫur-saĝ-gen ₇ lu ₂ -nu-ub-da nu-ub-zu
Ug	79a	saĝ-ki-dib ḫur-saĝ-ĝa ₂ <gu>-u ₂ -ru-ud-ta ne-zu ¹¹²⁶ <i>Incantation. The headache, like a mountain, no man can approach and know.</i>
A	7	aš-ĝar aš-ru u ₁₈ -lu-bi [.....]
N	193	aš-ĝar aš-ru lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu-gen ₇ ba-an-dul-dul
U	149a	aš-ĝar aš-ru u ₁₈ -lu-gen ₇ ba-an-dul-la
Ug	79b+80a	aš-gar ₃ aš-[ru] // lu-<ul-lu>-ug-gen ₇ mu-un-du-du <i>The Ašgar disease and the tremble cover (the victim) like an Alu-demon,</i>
A	8	lu ₂ diĝir nu-tuku-ra lu ₂ -bi [.....]

¹¹¹⁸ It is unclear whether the text was fully bilingual, note Rev. 4, *e-pu-uš*.

¹¹¹⁹ Cf. KUB 30 1, I, 20, a-sa-a[l-lu-ḫi]; KUB 30 4, R. Col. 4, [a-sa-a]l-lu-ḫi; KBo 36 13, L. Col. 3, [a-sa-al-l]u-uḫ-ḫi.

¹¹²⁰ 'Sumerisch-akkadischer Text in nicht Boğazköy-Duktus', KBo 13, v. Middle Assyrian script is not excluded.

¹¹²¹ The space between signs is smaller than in CTH 800 incantations.

¹¹²² See BE 14, No. 196.

¹¹²³ For the tablets of this series see Falkenstein 1931, 13-14, Finkel 1991, 94.

¹¹²⁴ AuOrS 23 21, 79ff., see § 7.3.7. The series *Saĝ-geg* is also preserved in a fragment from Emar, E 732, see § 6.2.9.

¹¹²⁵ Cf. UH III: 100, VI: 28.

¹¹²⁶ Cf. CT 17 14, 1, en₂ saĝ-geg mul-an-gen, an-edin-na gurud-da nu-ub-zu.

N	194	lu ₂ diġir nu-tuku-ra sila-a gub si-sa ₂ -e
U	149b	lu ₂ diġir nu-tuku-ra sila-a-še ₃ ? si-sa ₂ -e
Ug	80b+81a	lu-u ₂ ti-kar lu-u ₂ -tu-ku-ra // ku ¹ -u ₂ -ba-ni mu-ud-ta-ša-a (they) stand(?) on the street in front of the man who has no personal god
A	9	[.....](-)a DU:DU DU:DU [.....]
N	195	alam sila-a šu-du ₇ keše ₂ -da nu-keše ₂ -da
U	150	alam nu alam? du?? x-da nu-keše ₂ -da
Ug	81b	a-lim si-la-si-si an-nu-k[e-še-(da)] making perfect(?) a statue (of him?) on the street; nobody can bind him(?) ¹¹²⁷
A	10	[.....] x tab ¹¹²⁸ [.....]

The relation of KBo 14 51 to the first-millennium recension is unclear because the tablet is too badly preserved and all sources present several variants.¹¹²⁹ However, one may note that KBo 14 51 is the only source preserving the complete rubric en₂-e₂-nu-ru instead of the abbreviated en₂ typical of the canonical recension. It is unknown whether the tablet contained an Akkadian translation. The Sumerian text is fairly good and no phonetic writings are attested.¹¹³⁰ This source, the duplicate from Ugarit and a fragment from Emar (E 732) represent the oldest attestations of the series *Saġ-geg*.

5.2 Assyro-Mitannian Script Tablets

All the Assyrio-Mitannian Sumerian texts were found in the citadel of Büyükkale chiefly within Building A and only include bilingual incantations.

CTH	Publication	Composition	Find-spot Area	Language
805.1	KBo 36 11 (KUB 37 100a + 103 + 106 L. col. + 144) + KUB 37 100a Rev. + KUB 37 106 R. col. + ABOT 2 255	Collection of Incantations	Bk. A	SA
805.2	KUB 37 143	Incantation	Bk. C	S (A)
805.2	KUB 37 101	Incantation	Bk. D	SA
805.2	KUB 37 102	Incantation	Bk. D	SA
805.3	KUB 37 107	Incantation	Bk. A	(S) A
812	KUB 4 16	Incantation	?	(S) A
794	KBo 7 1 + KUB 37 115 (+) KBo 7 2	Collection of Incantations	Bk. D	SA
813	KUB 34 3	Incantation	Bk. A	SA
819	KUB 37 127	Incantation	Bk. A	SA
806.3	KUB 37 95	Incantation	Bk. A	S (A?)

¹¹²⁷ The line is unclear.

¹¹²⁸ U 151 has lu₂ niġ-tab-ba-bi, see comment to SpTU II 2, 151.

¹¹²⁹ Cf. CT 17 14, 1ff. and CT 17 20, 52ff., Campbell Thomson 1903, Vol. II, 52-53, 68, 80-83.

¹¹³⁰ Note the good Sumerian DU:DU DU:DU.

5.2.1 Collection of Udug-ḥul Incantations – CTH 805.1

KBo 36 11+ is a bilingual tablet in parallel column format discovered in Building A. Both columns are preserved on the obverse, whereas the Akkadian column is lost on the reverse. Four incantations are inscribed on the tablet, one on the obverse and three on the reverse.¹¹³¹

a) The first text, **KBo 36 11+ Obv. 1-42 (F)**,¹¹³² is an uncommon Marduk-Ea incantation¹¹³³ belonging to the corpus of texts labeled as *nam-erim₂-bur₂-ru-da*¹¹³⁴ that were not collected in a canonical series. Duplicates are known from the Old Babylonian until the Neo Babylonian period. In the first millennium this incantation became Tablet VI of the series *Muššu'u*, a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian incantations that also includes texts already attested in other series.¹¹³⁵ In the intercolumn space on the obverse KBo 36 11+ bears the additional subscript *[ini]m-inim-ma udug-ḥul-a-kam*¹¹³⁶ that identifies the incantation as *Udug-ḥul*, although it did not enter into the canonical series.

The incantation comprises two parts: the first (ll. 1-34) is a long catalogue of the patient's afflictions whereas the second (ll. 35-71) includes a description of Enki's mighty powers, and ends, *ex abrupto*, with the formula *^dasar-lu₁₀-ḥi nam-šub ba-an-šum₂*, 'Marduk has cast the spell'. The first part of the incantation is missing in KBo 36 11+ but it cannot be excluded that it was inscribed on another tablet. According to Falkenstein,¹¹³⁷ the text preserved in the OB and first-millennium manuscripts is an abbreviated form. Indeed, the dialogue between Enki and Asalluḥi, typical of Marduk-Ea incantations, is not attested. An unorthodox Marduk-Ea formula is only preserved in the first lines of KBo 36 11+,¹¹³⁸ which therefore represents the full-length version of the incantation. This clearly indicates that KBo 36 11+ reflects a different textual tradition from the other manuscripts.

The section of the incantation preserved on KBo 36 11+ is known from four duplicates.¹¹³⁹ Bu 88-5-12, 6 = CT 4 3 (D) is an OB tablet of unknown provenance probably from Sippar.¹¹⁴⁰ This tablet is characterized by confusion between human and non-human possessive pronouns¹¹⁴¹ and by rare words.¹¹⁴² K 5111 + Sm 28+83+1298+1580¹¹⁴³ (A) and BM 128027 = CT 51 182 (C) are two NA bilingual tablets from Nineveh. UET 6 393, 9-11 (G) is a NB tablet from Ur containing extracts from different incantations.

The Sumerian text shows fairly good stability from the Old Babylonian period until the first millennium. Indeed most of the variants are purely orthographic:

1131 The second incantation begins on the obverse and ends on the reverse.

1132 Lineation and manuscripts according to Böck 2007.

1133 Falkenstein 1931 classified this text as 'Nebenbildung der Marduk-Ea Typ.'

1134 See the subscript of the manuscripts in Böck 2007, 233, cf. 237.

1135 Böck 2007, 23. Forerunners of this series are also attested at Emar and Ugarit, Böck 2007, 42-43; see §§ 6.2.8, 6.2.9, 7.3.7.

1136 KUB 37 106.

1137 Falkenstein 1939, 73.

1138 Cooper 1971, 18, Böck 2007, 227.

1139 For the full list of manuscripts see Böck 2007, 221.

1140 See entry P355751 in CDLI.

1141 Cooper 1971, 19; -bi- is written instead of -ani-, see ll. 18, 19, 21, 24, 33, 35, 37.

1142 See l. 19, Cooper 1971, 20; l. 28, Cooper 1971, 21.

1143 For the handcopy see Böck 2007, Pl. XXVIII-XXIX.

Line	KBo 36 11+ (F)	CT 4 3 (D)	K 5111+ (A)
36	nam-še ¹	nam-igi	x
38	libiš-a	libiš	x
40	[š]a ₃	ša ₃ -ga	x
42	diġir-e ² -ne	diġir-re-e-ne	niġ ₂ -nam- ^ˆ diġir- ^ˆ [re-e-ne-ke ₄] niġ ₂ -nam-diġir-re-e-ne-ke ₄ (G)
44	an-na	an-na-a	an-na an-na (G)
45	ki-a	ki-a-a	ki-a
45	k[...]	ka-a	ki-...]
46	igi-b[i-š]e ₃	igi-e-še ₃	igi-bi-še ₃
46	x-luḥ ¹ -e-de ₃	ḥu-luḥ-e-da	x
47	igi-[du ₈ -d]u ₈ -bi-še ₃	igi-du ₈ -du ₈ -bi-še ₃	igi-du ₈ -du ₈ -bi-e-ne
48	[...]-e-ne	diġir-re-ne-ke ₄	x
49	kiġ ₂ -b[ur ₂]-ru ¹ -t[a]	kiġ ₂ -bur ₂ -ru-da	kiġ ₂ -bur ₂ - ^ˆ ru ^ˆ -[...]
50	nam-til ₃	nam-til ₃	nam-til ₃ -la
50	zi-ki-[ġal ₂] ²	zi-ša ₃ -ġal ₂	x
51	ša ₃ a[rḥ]uṣ ₂	arḥuṣ ₂	arḥuṣ ₂
52	s[a]g ₁₀ -ga-g[en ₇]	sa ₆ -ga-gen ₇	sa ₆ -ga
54	nam-r[i]-ma ³	nam-erim ₂ -e	nam-erim ₂ -ma
56	in-tub ₂ -tub ₂ -be ₂	mu-un-ta ₃ -ta ₃ -[ga]	x
57	niġ ₂ -geg niġ ₂ -geg-ga-a	niġ ₂ im-geg-ga	^ˆ niġ ₂ im ^ˆ -g[eg-ga]
58	dadag	da-da	<i>Omitted</i>
58	za-za	za ₃ -ki-a	^ˆ za ₃ -ki ^ˆ -[a]
59	nam-ri-m[a]	nam-erim ₂ -e	x
59	[...]- ^ˆ x ^ˆ -ta-[b]e ₂	lu ₂ -ku ₅ -ru-da-be ₂	x
60	in-...]	im-ġen-ġen-e	x
60	in-dal-...]	im-[dal]-e	x
64	ba-an-ši-in- ^ˆ gi ^ˆ -[gi]	in-ši-in-g[i ₄ -gi ₄]	mu-un-ši-in-gi ₄ -gi ₄
65	sa-a	sa	sa
65	ba-an-ši-in-dub-...]	in-ši-in-...]	mu-un-ši-dub ₂ -dub ₂ -bu
66	saġ-še	za ₃ -še ₃	du ₁₀ -du ₁₀
67	šu im-...]	šu in-ši-ri-e	mu-un-ši-ib-ġar-ra
68	ka-a-ni	ka-ka-ni	ka-ka-na
68	[...-i]n-taka ₄ -...]	in-ši-in-tuku ₄ -tuku ₄	ši-en-taka ₄

1 For this variant see below.

2 For this variant see below.

3 This writing is already attested in the Ur III texts from Nippur, see Cooper 1971, 21.

As is clear from the list of variants the text of KBo 36 11+ does not fully correspond to any of the other manuscripts: several variants are shared by the OB text while others are found in the first-millennium recension. Variants in lines 51¹¹⁴⁴ 56¹¹⁴⁵ and probably 57 are possibly scribal mistakes. Line 52 has instead a lexical variant different from both OB and first-millennium manuscripts. In lines 66 and 67 the NA tablet presents recensional variants against the Ḥattuša and OB sources. Phonetic writings are limited and likely they mostly depend on copying. Only a few phonetic alterations are documented.

1144 This is a case of dittography from arḥuṣ₂ ša₃-la attested in manuscripts A and D.

1145 For this variant see below.

Further recensional variants are attested in KBo 36 11+:

- In line 62 KBo 36 11+ seems closer to the Nineveh manuscript than to the OB recension:

62 F Obv. 33 su-gu₂ [.....] ba-an-ši-in-[.....]
*ri-šu-tum*¹¹⁴⁶ ša zu-[um-ri-šu]
 D Rev. 25 du₁₀-ge-eš su-bi-a im-ši-sa₆-[ge]
 A iv 1 [.....]-in-sag₃-sag₃-[ge]
r[i-.....] zu-um-ra u₂-pa-aš₂-[šaḥ]
 F: *The Rišutu-illness (covering) his body [...]*
 D: *He will make this body feel better*

- In line 63 KBo 36 11+ has the verbal form šu im-[...] instead of si-sa₂ attested in both OB and NA manuscripts:

63 F Obv. 34 ulutim₂[!] x[.....] šu im-[.....]
bu-un-na-ni-[šu₂]
 D Rev. 26 ulutim₂-ulutim₂-bi si in-sa₂-sa₂
 A iv 4 ulutim₂-bi ḥe₂-ni-ib-si-sa₂-e-[de₃]
bu-un-na-ni-šu uš-te-šir
He restored his appearance to normal

- Line KBo 36 11+ Obv. 38 is not attested in the other manuscripts.

F Obv. 38 a-ga-bi-[še₃[?]]
a-na ar-[ka-ti-šu]
to his back [.....]

- In line 67 (KBo 36 11+ Obv. 39) a₂ šu-šu may represent a variant to a₂-bi-še₃ a₂ su₃-su₃ (CT 4 3) as the Akkadian translation of the Ḫattuša manuscript diverges from the first-millennium recension. However, an error of homeoteleuton cannot be excluded.

F Obv. 39 a₂ šu-šu [.....] šu im-[.....]
*mi-n[a-ti-šu₂.....]*¹¹⁴⁷
 D Rev. 30 a₂-bi-še₃ a₂ su₃-su₃ šu in-ši-ri-e
 A a₂-bi-še₃ su₃-ge[˘]-eš mu-un-ši-ib-ḡar-ra
a-na i-di-šu ša₂-da-ḥa i-šak-kan

The Akkadian version often diverges from the Sumerian.¹¹⁴⁸ Case endings are normally correct with only a few exceptions¹¹⁴⁹ and no Assyrianisms are attested,¹¹⁵⁰ whereas Babylonian forms are common: *el-le-ti* (l. 49) VS Ass *ellāti*; *re-me-nu-u₂* (l. 51) VS Ass *rēmānu*.¹¹⁵¹ The Akkadian translation was composed in Babylonia¹¹⁵² and later a bilingual version was transmitted to the

1146 *rišūtu* is a type of skin illness (CAD R, 381-382) and translates su-gu₂ which is a phonetic writing for su-gu₂.

1147 *mināti* in KBo 36 11+, 35, translates ḡeš-gi-en-gi.

1148 See ll. 51, 52, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 67. Cooper 1971, 20, suggested that the Akkadian version was composed by a Hittite scribe on the basis of the lack of a distinction between voiced and voiceless consonants in Sumerian, but this view is clearly outdated, see § 4.3.1.

1149 AN-u₂ (l. 44) for the genitive; for further observations on the Akkadian version see Klinger 2010, 335-336.

1150 Assyrianisms are rare in other Assyro-Mitannian tablets, see Schwemer 1998, 49-50.

1151 Late (l. 31 [š]u-ti₄-ni) and peripheral forms are attested, see Cooper 1971, 19, cf. Jucquois 1966, 60-71.

1152 Klinger 2010, 335, also regards the Akkadian version as a Babylonian work.

Assyro-Mitannian scribal schools, regardless of where they were located. The Akkadian version also significantly differs from the first-millennium recension.¹¹⁵³

The Ḫattuša recension represents an intermediate stage between the OB and first-millennium recensions, but as the variants show, it reflects a different textual tradition from the extant earlier and later manuscripts. It is impossible to identify when and where this recension was created, but taking into consideration that Assyro-Mitannian texts are the product of Northern Mesopotamian/Babylonian scribal circles,¹¹⁵⁴ KBo 36 11+ likely reflects a local/independent(?) variant.

b) The second text, **KBo 36 11+ Obv. 43 - Rev. 24**, is a Marduk-Ea incantation with an abbreviated formula. The text is badly preserved and no duplicates are known so far. I attempt here to provide an edition:

KBo 36 11+ Obv.

- 43 udug-ḫul lu₂ 'x'-a(-)an-na 'diġir'(-)[...]
The evil Udug, the man [...] in the(?)sky, the god(?) [...]
- 44 a-la₂-ḫul diġir im-gen₇ u[gu' nam-lu₂-u₁₈-lu]
the evil Alla and the god like a storm over(?) [mankind]
- 45 ḫuš-a(-)aš KA m[u-u]n-na-an-[...]
terribly(?) [...]
- 46 gidim-ḫul lu₂ im-g[e]n₇ ġiri₃-saġ-ġa₂ [...]
The evil Ghost, the man like a storm over (his) feet and head [...]
- 47 ugu nam-lu₂-[u₁₈]-lu-ta [...]
over mankind [...]
- 48 gal₅-la₂-ḫul lu₂-uš₂-gen₇ sul-'nin²-bi²'-[da ...]¹¹⁵⁵
The evil Galla like a dead man, the young man together with the lady (?) [...]
- 49 nam-lu₂-u₁₈-lu [...]
mankind [...]
- 50 diġir-ḫul siškur₂ nu-m[u]-un-zu-a arina_x (RI₈) nam-lu₂-[u₁₈-lu ...]
the evil God who does not know the prayer, the Arina-plant, mankind [...]
- 51 [(x)](-)ġeš-gen₇ x bi₂-ib₂-[...]
[...] like wood(?) [...]

KBo 36 11+ Rev.

- 1 [.....iz]i-gen₇ [...] (x) nam-lu₂-u₁₈-lu-ke₄
[x]-ib₂-gu₇-gu₇
[...] like fire [...] of mankind [...] / [...] eats
- 2 'diġir-x-x' izi-gen₇ u[g]u nam-lu₂-u₁₈-lu ri x (x)
the god [...] like fire(?) spread(?) over mankind

1153 See Böck 2007, 223-233 ll. 42, 43, 48, 50-56, 66, 67; variants are orthographic, lexical, syntactic and morphological.

1154 Schwemer 1998, 50.

1155 This line may also be read as šul 'dam-nu'-[tuku-a].

3	su-ni-še <i>to his body the (evil) Alla</i>	a ₂ -la ₂ -[(hul)]
4	imin-bi-e-ne gal ₅ -la ₂ -hul siškur ₂ nu-mu-un-zu-a <i>the Seven ones and the evil Ghost who do not know prayers,</i>	
5	ka-ba-a-ni <i>his mouth is not healthy.</i>	nu-silim-ma
6	^d en-lil ₂ -la ₂ usu-e-ne <i>May Enlil make their power run away(?)</i>	ʿšuʿ (x)-[(x)-d]ag ¹¹⁵⁶
7	^d en-ki ḡalga-maḥ e ₂ -engur-ta ḥ[a-.....]amʿ <i>May Enki the mighty instruction from the Engur [...]</i>	
8	diḡir-ḥuš us ₂ -sa-ne-ne [(...)]	
9	ḥa-ba-ni-in-gaz <i>may (he) kill the furious god and his followers(?)</i>	
10	igi-a-ni-še ₃ [...] <i>to his face,</i>	
11	sul diḡir nu-tuku ḥa-ba-an-teḡ ₃ -[ḡe ₂₆ -de ₃] <i>(He) approached the young man who has no personal god,</i>	
12	ki-kur ₂ -še ₃ [ḥa-ba-ra-ab-...] <i>to a hostile place, may [...]</i>	
13	^d asar-lu ₂ -ḥi [igi im-ma-an-šum ₂] <i>Asalluḥi saw it.</i>	
14	ḡen-na dumu-mu <i>Go my son!</i>	
15	a-pe-el-l[a ...] <i>dirty water (?) [...]</i>	
16	lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu x-a-ni x[...] <i>the man, his [...]</i>	
17	a-ga-n[a g]i-izi-la ₂ x [...] <i>at his back, the torch [...]</i>	
18	tu ₆ -d[u ₁₁ -ga] DI-ga ¹¹⁵⁷ [...] <i>the incantation formula [...]</i>	
19	du ₁₁ -ga ^d en-ki ^d en-lil ₂ -le [...] <i>by order of Enki and Enlil [...]</i>	

1156 For šu--dag see Karahashi 2000, 152-154; an alternative reading may be ʿḡa₂-laʿ[(x) d]ag, cf. UH I: 141, XII: 63, 105.

1157 This is perhaps a non-finite form from du₁₁.

20	šu-nam-tar [?] <ra>-ga-a-ni ħe ₂ -am ¹¹⁵⁸ [...] <i>may (he) be the 'his hand of Namtar' [...]</i>
21	en-na u ₄ til ₃ -la ša ₃ -zu tab nu-ši-bi[l [?] ...] <i>Until you will live, the fever will not burn your heart.</i>
22	lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu-bi ka-tar-zu ka-an-s[i-il] <i>May that patient recite your praises.</i>
23	ĝa ₂ lu ₂ -mu ₇ -mu ₇ [arad-zu] <i>I, the āšipu, your servant,</i>
24	ka-tar-zu [ga-an-si-il] <i>may I recite your praises.</i>

22. On the basis of UH III: 196-197 ka-an-s[i-il] is here regarded as a 3sg. precativ form:

UH ^{III} 196	lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu-bi ka-tar-zu ħe ₂ -en-si-il-e LÜ ₂ šu-u ₂ da-li-li-ka lid-lul
197	u ₃ ĝe ₂₆ -e lu ₂ -mu ₇ -mu ₇ arad-zu ka-tar-zu ga-an-si-il u ₃ a-na-ku a-ši-pu a-rad-ka da-li-li-ka lud-lul

As noted above¹¹⁵⁹ the same form is attested in a MB Emesal text from Sippar; on the basis of the explanations given above it seems that ka- was likely a common writing for the precativ in Northern Babylonian scribal practice. This is a further piece of evidence for placing this text within the Northern Babylonian textual tradition.

The final prayer containing the thanksgiving formula (Rev. 22-24) is known from *Incantation to Utu* (ll. 244-249),¹¹⁶⁰ the series *Udug-ĥul*¹¹⁶¹ and *Kiutu* incantations of the series *Bīt rimki*.¹¹⁶² Unorthographic writings are limited to a few cases.

c) The second incantation on the reverse, **KBo 36 11+ Rev. 26-38**, has no preserved duplicate. I present here an attempt at an interpretation:

26	lu ₂ -ĥul lu ₂ -bi KA [?] [...]
27	lu ₂ -ĥul lu ₂ -bi si [?] -a [...]
28	si-taraĥ-maš dur ₁₁ -ra-a-ni-ta te-ge-ta-'a x'
29	šu-bil'-[bil] (x) šu-na ba-an-ĝar-re
30	ĝiri ₃ -bil-[bi]l ĝiri ₃ -na ba-an-ĝar-re
31	ki-si ₃ -g[a (x)]-ni-na-(a) ki-še ĥa-ba-an-ku ₄ -ru
32	saĝ-ki-[(x)-r]a ta-na-ta
33	e ₂ en-[x]-ta ta-na-ta (x)
34	igi maš-š[a] igi-gul-gul-la-ta
35	DU-[...] MA.RA ħe ₂
36	sul-[x]-bi-še ₃ GABA-ta-bi-še ₃

1158 Cf. UHF 714: lu₂-ulu₃-be₂ šu nam-tar-ra-ka-na ĥul-lu-be₂ mu-un-kuš₂-u₂, 'That man suffers horribly from fate (lit. the hand of 'Namtar')'.

1159 § 1.1.9.1.

1160 Geller 1995, 102 n. 6.

1161 UH II: 60, III: 196-197, X: 78.

1162 Laessøe 1955, Pl. III n. IX: 6'; this is also similar to Pl. II no. V Rev: 5'; see also Kunstmann 1932, 52.

37	na a[dʔ] [...] x-bi-še ₃ GABA-ta-bi-še
38	na a[dʔ] ġa ₂ -a-b[i-(še ₃)] zi-ga

26-27. These lines describe an evil man, lu₂-ḫul, assaulting the patient, lu₂-bi.

28. si-taraḫ-maš, 'gazelle's horn', is attested in UH IX: 46.

29-30. Cf. UHF 537-538; these two lines may be translated as 'the burning hands touched his hand / the burning foot touched his foot.'

31. ki-si₃-ga are funerary offerings, see UHF 63'; the line can be translated as 'May the funerary offerings return to their place(?).'

32. On the basis of UHF 540, the first word is perhaps saġ-ki-sumur-ra, 'hot-headedness', but there seems to be no room for sumur. ta in ta-na-ta may be a phonetic writing for da 'side'; lines 32-33 may be rendered as 'forehead (...) from/at his side (?) // from the temple of (?) from/at his side.'

35. MA.RA is unclear; may one read ma-ra-saga₇, 'to scatter'?

37-38. na is perhaps 'incense'; cf. UH VII: 111, IX: 44.

d) The last incantation on the reverse, **KUB 37 100a 39-46**, is a forerunner of *Udug-ḫul* Tablet V.¹¹⁶³ The only OB source preserving lines inscribed on the Assyro-Mitannian manuscript is a tablet from Nippur, Ni 631 (B). This incantation remains quite unvaried from the Old Babylonian period up to the first millennium, even though a few variants are documented in the manuscripts:

Line	KUB 37 100a, 39-46	Ni 631	Line	UH V
377	niġ ₂ -nam-mu	niġ ₂ -nam	142	niġ ₂ -nam-ma
377	us ₂ -bi	uš ₂ -bi	142	us ₂ -su ₁₃
378	'dim ₂ '-bi	[...-b]i	143	dim ₂ -ma-bi
378	e ₂	a ¹	143	a
379	za-lim ²	[ulutim ₂ (SIG ₇ ,ALAN)-bi] ³	144	ulutim ₂ -bi
380	gul-gul-[e]	gul-gul	145	gul-gul
380	zi-'ir-zi'-ir ⁴	'zi ₂ '-ir-zi ₂ -re-da	146	zi-ir-zi-re-da
381	u-gug ₂ ⁵	udug	147	udug

1 Contrary to Geller, I read e₂ instead of u₂.

2 See § 4.4.

3 Restored on the basis of CT 16 Pl. 15, iv 42 and BAM V 508, IV, 20, ulutim₂-bi niġ₂ an-gen₇ šu nu-teġ₃-ġe₂₆.

4 Note that this writing is shared by the first-millennium recension, see UH V: 145.

5 Contrary to Geller, I read u-gug₂(LU₃) instead of udug¹.

Variants are mostly purely orthographic or consist of phonetic writings. The only attested recensional variant is us₂-bi (M), uš₂-bi (B) and us₂-su₁₃ in the canonical recension.

To sum up, this tablet contains a collection of different *Udug-ḫul* incantations that with only one exception were not incorporated in the canonical recension. Nevertheless, the first incantation became part of the *Muššu'u* series.

5.2.2 CTH 805.2-3

The entry CTH 805.2 includes three fragments that probably belong to the same tablet even though they do not physically join.

KUB 37 143 is a tiny fragment from the central part of its tablet discovered in Building C under the Phrygian level. Only four lines are preserved on one side, whereas the other side is broken

¹¹⁶³ Geller 1985 source M = UHF 377-382; UH V: 142ff. (CT 16 Pl. 15 iv 40ff.; cf. BAM V 508, IV, 18-25).

away. The text is a forerunner of *Udug-ḫul* Tablet VII¹¹⁶⁴ (UHF 674-682) corresponding to canonical UH VII: 14ff.¹¹⁶⁵ Only the Sumerian text is preserved, but an Akkadian translation was arranged in a parallel column. Three OB tablets preserve this passage: Ni 631 (B) from Nippur, CBS 591 (E) likely from Sippar¹¹⁶⁶ and BM 78375 = CT 44 29 (J) also perhaps from Sippar.¹¹⁶⁷ Another duplicate of Tablet VII is the possibly MB tablet Ni 2676 + Ni 2997 + Ni 4017 + Ni 4018 (C) in which these lines are almost completely broken away.¹¹⁶⁸ As see above, the Old Babylonian manuscripts, regardless of their provenance, are close to one another. An exhaustive comparison with older and late duplicates is precluded as only a few signs are preserved on KUB 37 143 but one may note that the Assyro-Mitannian tablet omits line UHF 677 = UH VII: 17.

KUB 37 101 is a tiny fragment of a two-column tablet discovered in Building D above the Hittite level. The fragment contains a bilingual incantation in parallel column format. Only a few signs to the left and right of the intercolumn space are preserved.¹¹⁶⁹

KUB 37 102 is a fragment from the central part of a two-column tablet discovered in Building D above the Hittite stratum, inscribed with a bilingual text in parallel column format that is a forerunner of the series *Udug-ḫul*. The text, enumerating a list of demons, duplicates UH III: 138ff. and UH VI: 58ff. and it is also attested in *Bīt rimki* III: 49ff.¹¹⁷⁰ Unfortunately, the first two lines which provide the context of the incantation only preserve the end of verbal forms that are unparalleled in the canonical series. The OB forerunner of *Bīt rimki* III, CBS 1529, a single-column tablet likely from Sippar,¹¹⁷¹ does not preserve any lines of KUB 37 102.¹¹⁷² Compared to the first-millennium recension, KUB 37 102 is characterized by the writings ^ddim₃-ma-me[?] instead of ^ddim₃-me-lagab (l. 4) and -ḡar-ra for -kar-ra (l. 5). The OB recension does not preserve this section in either Tablet III or VI, but considering that the gap in Tablet III is only four lines, whereas in Tablet VI it is longer,¹¹⁷³ the text of KUB 37 102 probably belongs to the latter. The Hattuša manuscript shows close similarity to the canonical recension.

1	[.....](-)il ₂ -la ₂
2	[.....](-)il ₂ -la ₂
3	[(udug-ḫul a-la ₂ -ḫul gidim-ḫul gal ₅ -la ₂ -ḫul diḡir)] ḫul maškim-ḫul u ₂ -tuk-[...]
4	[(^d dim ₃ -me dim ₃ -me-a)] ^d dim ₃ -ma-me [?] la-maš-[tu ...]
5	[(lu ₂ -lil-la ₂ ki-sikil-lil ₂ -la ₂ ki-sikil-u ₄ -da)]-ḡar-ra uz-[...]
6	[(nam-tar-ḫul-ḡal ₂ a ₂ -saḡ ₃ niḡ-geg-ga niḡ-dur ₁₁)-r]u nu-du ₁₀ -ga na[m-tar ...]
7	[(niḡ-geg niḡ-ak-a niḡ ₂)-ḫu]l-dim ₂ -ma
8	[(aš-ḡar aš-ru a-ḫa-an-tum ₃ u ₄)]-š _{u2} -uš-ru
9	[(diḫ dim ₂ -ma bar)]-ḡeš-ra
10	[(lu ₂ -ḫul igi-ḫul ka-ḫul eme)]-ḫul

1164 Manuscript N in Geller 1985.

1165 Cf. Cooper 1978, 150-154.

1166 It belongs to the Khabaza collection. For Ni 631 and CBS 591 see § 1.1.10.1.

1167 See fn. 1108.

1168 See § 1.1.10.1.

1169 Cooper 1971 suggests that KUB 37 101-102 belong to the first two incantations of KBo 36 11+, but no line can be restored on the basis of the signs inscribed on these two fragments.

1170 Borger 1967.

1171 For this tablet see § 1.1.10.3.

1172 Geller 1995, 117-118.

1173 Geller 1985, 93; for Tablet VI see Geller 1995, 121-122.

11	[(uš-ḫul uš-zu)] uš-ra
12	[(niĝ ₂ -ak-a niĝ ₂ -ḫul-dim ₂)-m]a-ta
13	[.....keš ₂ (?)]-ta ¹¹⁷⁴
14	[.....] x

KUB 37 107 (CTH 805.3), discovered in Building A, is a fragment from the intercolumn space of a two-column tablet. Only the left edge of the Akkadian column is preserved. The incantation is probably of the *Udug-ḫul* type.¹¹⁷⁵

5.2.3 KUB 4 16

KUB 4 16 is a fragment from the lower right corner of a two-column tablet which has been recently published by Fincke (2009a) as a forerunner of *Udug-ḫul* Tablet VI. The fragment, originally part of a bilingual tablet in parallel column format, preserves only the Akkadian version on both obverse and reverse.¹¹⁷⁶ Text lines are set off by horizontal rulings. The obverse¹ contains the end of an incantation with the *zi-pa₃* formula¹¹⁷⁷ (l. 1-4) followed by a prophylactic incantation¹¹⁷⁸ which continues on the reverse. This fragment is identified as Assyro-Mitannian¹¹⁷⁹ but its paleographic categorization is not beyond doubt¹¹⁸⁰ and it is not excluded that it represents an example of a Hittite copy of an Assyro-Mitannian manuscript.¹¹⁸¹ The only OB manuscript preserving the segment of Tablet VI inscribed on KUB 4 16 is CBS 1532 (F), a tablet belonging to the Khabaza collection, hence probably from Sippar.

Fincke demonstrated the closeness of this fragment to the canonical recension, but some remarks are required. Although the line order is closer to the canonical recension than to the OB it is not identical:

KUB 4 16	UH VI	UHF VI
[Obv. ¹ 1]	104	582
Obv. ¹ 2	105	583
Obv. ¹ 3-4	106	584
Obv. ¹ 5	114	x
Obv. ¹ 6	115	x
Obv. ¹ 7	116	x
Obv. ¹ 8	118	x
Rev. ¹ 1	119	x
Rev. ¹ 2	120/133a	515a
Rev. ¹ 3	121/133b	515b
Rev. ¹ 4	134	516
Rev. ¹ 5	135	517
Rev. ¹ 6-7	136	518
Rev. ¹ 8-10	-	-
Rev. ¹ 11	139	521

¹¹⁷⁴ For this restoration see K 3462 Rev. 14, Borger 1967, 6 (C).

¹¹⁷⁵ Schwemer 2013, 154.

¹¹⁷⁶ Obverse and reverse are to be exchanged, see Fincke 2009a.

¹¹⁷⁷ UH VI: 105-106; see l. 4 *ni-iš₃ AN-e* [...]. At Ḫattuša this formula is also attested in KUB 37 111 (§ 5.3.10) and in the Akkadian incantation KUB 37 85, *ni-iš DINGIR-lim-ia lu-u₂* [...] (Rev. 5), whose script is not clearly identified, see Schwemer 1998, 5 n. 21.

¹¹⁷⁸ For this typology see Falkenstein 1931, 35-44.

¹¹⁷⁹ Schwemer 2013, 154.

¹¹⁸⁰ Cf. Weeden 2012, 230 and n. 13.

¹¹⁸¹ Cf. KUB 37 111, § 5.3.10.

KUB 4 16 shows omissions (107-113,¹¹⁸² 117, 122-133,¹¹⁸³ 137-138), additions (Rev.¹ 8-10) and variants¹¹⁸⁴ to the canonical recension. The passage in KUB 4 16 Rev.¹ 8-10, which is an elaboration on the schema of Rev.¹ 6-7, replaces lines 519-520 of the OB recension and 137-138 of the first-millennium recension:

Rev. ¹	8	GID[IM] <i>lem-nu a-na</i> [...]
Rev. ¹	9	[<i>gallû l[e[m]-'nu' a-na</i> [...]
Rev. ¹	10	[<i>īlu lem-nu' a'-na</i> [...]
UHF	519	udug-<ḥul> e ₂ -a til ₃ -la šu [nu-ĝar-ra-zu-še ₃]
	520	diĝir lu ₂ -ulu ₃ -[ke ₄]
UH ^{VI}	137	udug-ḥul e ₂ -a ti-la šu nu-ĝar-ra-zu-še ₃ diĝir-ḥul lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu-ke ₄ u ₂ -tuk-ku <i>lem-nu ša₂ ina E₂ tuš-b[u-u] DIĜIR u LU₂ ana la ga-ma-li-ka</i>
UH ^{VI}	138	udug-ḥul a-la ₂ -ḥul gedim-[ḥul] gal ₅ -la ₂ -ḥul diĝir-ḥul maškim-ḥul [u ₂ -tuk-ku <i>lem-nu a-lu-u lem-nu e-ṭim-mu lem-nu gal-lu-u lem-nu i-lu lem-mu ra-bi-šu lem-nu</i>]

KUB 4 16 deviates from the other manuscripts, reflecting an intermediate stage between the OB and the canonical recensions. It represents a product of the Middle Babylonian scribal schools and in light of the variants it likely relies on a different textual tradition from the extant sources.

5.2.4 CTH 794

Fragments listed under CTH 794, **KBo 7 1 + KUB 37 115 (+) KBo 7 2**, were found in Building D and are part of a bilingual tablet in interlinear format written in Assyro-Mittanian script.¹¹⁸⁵ Three columns are ruled on the manuscript but text lines oddly run continuously from left to right. Perhaps this layout was originally inscribed on the tablet with a different text in mind. The obverse¹¹⁸⁶ contains a Marduk-Ea incantation, whereas the reverse has a *Kiutu* prayer.

Only a few unorthographic writings are documented:

ab-ba-si-il-le ~ a-ba-si-il-le - Obv. 1, 2, 4
-dal ~ -dar - Obv. 3
inim¹-gal ~ inim-ĝar - Obv. 20
mu-un-ni ~ mu-un-ne - Rev. 3
nam-me-en ~ nam-en - Rev. 8

a) The Marduk-Ea incantation which reports the abbreviated form of the dialogue between Asalluḫi and Enki, as is typical in late texts, is poorly preserved and no duplicates are known. The Sumerian text shows some errors:

¹¹⁸² Note that these lines are fragmentary even in the first-millennium manuscripts.

¹¹⁸³ In KUB 4 16 lines 120-121 are immediately followed by 134 as they are identical to line 133.

¹¹⁸⁴ Text in Rev.¹ 4 is different from UH VI: 134.

¹¹⁸⁵ Assyro-Mitannian signs are: LA with one horizontal: KUB 37 115 Rev. 4, KBo 7 2 10; NAM: KUB 37 115 Obv. 7, KBo 7 2, 20; EN: KUB 37 115 Obv. 7; IG: KBo 7 2, 17; AK: KBo 7 2, 17; GI: KBo 7 2 15.

¹¹⁸⁶ Lineation according to Cooper 1972. Obverse and reverse of KBo 7 1 are to be exchanged, see Cooper 1971, 9; for the disposition of fragments see Cooper 1972, 62 n. 2, 69 n. 24; the web site <http://www.hetither.net> provides a drawing of the joins.

- The Akkadian translation of *si-il*, ‘to split apart’, with *i-sa₃-al-la-lu* in *su ab-ba-si-il-le* (CTH 794 Obv. 1, 3, 5),¹¹⁸⁷ is probably an error for *isallatū*.¹¹⁸⁸
- In *ninda du₁₀-ga nu-mu-ra-an-gu₇-e // a-du₁₀-ga nu-mu-ra-an-naĝ-ab*, ‘He cannot eat good food, he cannot drink good water’ (CTH 794 Obv. 5-6), *-ab* at the end of the verbal form makes no sense and is probably a copying mistake.¹¹⁸⁹ The infix *-ra-* (ablative?) is also unclear.
- The Sumerian verbal form in [.....] ĝešŠU₂.[A ĝeš]šeneg // [.....] *ina l[i¹-ti bi-ni] tu-še-ši-ib* (CTH 794 Obv. 17) seems to be omitted.

b) The *Kiutu* incantation¹¹⁹⁰ on the reverse is known from two first-millennium recensions: one preserved on three manuscripts from Nineveh (N)¹¹⁹¹ belonging to the ‘second house’ of the series *Bīt rimki*, and the other inscribed on a bilingual tablet from Sultan-Tepe, STT 197 (St), containing the text in phonetic orthography.

The Ḫattuša manuscript has a different line order from the Nineveh and Sultan-Tepe sources, which are very close to each other.¹¹⁹² The Sumerian version in CTH 794 shows several anomalies:

- In [...] *ama⁴ nin-gal* (CTH 794 Rev. 6), the genitive is omitted: cf. *dumu u₃-du₂-ud-da ama⁴ nin-gal-la-ke₄*, ‘Born son of mother Ningal’ (N).¹¹⁹³ This omission is possibly due to the copyist.
- In [ħa]r-ra-an *kaskal si [...]x sa₂*, (CTH 794 Rev. 7), the directive required by the compound verb is omitted; the Nineveh and Sultan-Tepe sources also omit the directive, *igi zalag₂-ga kaskal ħar-ra-an si ba-ni-ib₂-si-sa₂-e*,¹¹⁹⁴ ‘Bright eye that maintains the roads and highways’ (N). Omission of the directive with a compound verb resulting in two direct objects, not admitted in standard Sumerian, is a trait of late texts.
- The genitive is written with *-e* in [...] *en dili-[im₂]-babbar₂-re* (CTH 794 Rev. 5), cf. *a-ri-a ku₃-ga-ta en dili-im₂-babbar-ra*, ‘Pure offspring of lord Dilimbabbar’ (N); switching between *e* and *a* occurs since the Old Babylonian period.¹¹⁹⁵
- The sequence UD.UD is read as *babbar₂*, ‘white’, in *tug₂-maḥ gada babbar₂-re a-ra-an-ĝar-ra // tu-maḥ-ħa-a ki-te¹-i el-la u₂-ma-aš-š²-ka*, ‘I have spread before you an ‘exalted garment’, a garment of white linen’ (CTH 794 Rev. 14), but it is translated as *ellu*, ‘pure’, in Akkadian;¹¹⁹⁶ also the first-millennium manuscripts have *dadag = ellu*, *tu₉-maḥ* [tu₉ gada dadag]-g[a...] (N). The lack of agreement between Sumerian and Akkadian in the Ḫattuša manuscript cannot be attributed to the Assyro-Mitannian scribe, but it must be considered as a variant already attested in the model: there is in fact no reason to assume that the scribe miscopied *-ga* as *-re*.

1187 The extra *-b-* is a binding from *a-ba-si-il-le*.

1188 Cooper 1972, 63-64: 1.

1189 *-ab* possibly refers to the absolutive incorrectly written after the verbal base. The verb *naĝ* ‘to drink’ usually has the reduplicated *marû* form, but it is frequently written *-naĝ-e* in the canonical *Udug-ħul*, possibly under the influence of *gu*, ‘to eat’ (*marû = -gu₇-e*), cf. UH VI: 169, 181.

1190 For this genre see § 1.1.10.3.

1191 For the Nineveh manuscripts see Cooper 1972, 69.

1192 Cooper 1972, 67.

1193 The ergative is incorrect in a list of epithets as in this case, cf. Jagersma 2010, 160.

1194 The verbal form in the late sources is incorrect because it has the 3sg. human OO *-ni-* instead of the non-human (*-bi-*); also note the late form *si--si-sa₂* instead of standard Sumerian *si-sa₂*.

1195 Black, Zólyomi 2007, 18.

1196 Cooper 1972, 78: 14.

- The verbal form bi_2 -in-zu in ${}^dutu \hat{g}e\hat{s}gu$ -za ku_3 -ga tuš-a-zu bi_2 -in-zu // ${}^dUTU ina \hat{g}e\hat{s}'GU.ZA el-le-ti ti-ša-am-ma$, 'Šamaš, sit on your holy throne!' (CTH 794 Rev. 26), is only attested in the Ḫattuša manuscript. It is very unlikely that this form was added by the copyist of CTH 794; it was probably attested in some variant version unknown to us. Since the Akkadian translation is substantially the same in all the manuscripts, one can speculate that the Sumerian of the Ḫattuša manuscript is the oldest version and later the verbal form bi_2 -in-zu was left out because it was no longer understood. Indeed, it seems that the Akkadian version misunderstands the Sumerian by translating tuš-a-zu (tuš-zu in St), which was probably a pronominal form, 'when you sit', with an imperative.¹¹⁹⁷ At a certain point in time the Sumerian version was perhaps rephrased on the basis of the Akkadian translation by skipping the Sumerian finite form.

With a few exceptions, most of the anomalies and variants cannot be attributed to the Assyro-Mitannian copyist but derive from the textual history of the composition and the Babylonian model(s). *Kiutu* incantations are typical of the post-Old Babylonian period, but it is not precluded that a (monolingual?) version of this text existed in earlier times as perhaps line CTH 794 Rev. 26 might suggest. Nevertheless the Ḫattuša manuscript represents the oldest surviving source for the bilingual version. After the Middle Babylonian period, this text was transmitted to first-millennium libraries and underwent further modifications. The Kassite tablet HS 1512¹¹⁹⁸ is partially parallel to our *Kiutu* incantation¹¹⁹⁹ but unfortunately the Assyro-Mitannian source is too badly preserved for comparison. One may only observe that HS 1512, as with late duplicates, has anše-kur-ra-ke₄¹²⁰⁰ while CTH 794 Rev. 11, has anše-kur-ra-zu. Šamaš prayers are mostly known from Northern Babylonia,¹²⁰¹ hence the same provenance may be surmised for the *Kiutu* incantation inscribed on CTH 794.

The Akkadian version is usually correct,¹²⁰² but a few mistakes are documented: *i-gar₃-ra-šu* for *egirrašu* (CTH 794 Obv. 20) is a *hapax* in which the switch *e/i > a* is a trait of peripheral Akkadian;¹²⁰³ *i-da₂-aš-ši-ku₈*¹² is an incorrect form for *udakkīšu* (CTH 794 Rev. 19).¹²⁰⁴ The Akkadian and Sumerian versions differ in some verbal forms: Rev. 17: mu-un-ġar (3sg.) VS *aš-tak₂-ka-an'* (1sg.); Rev. 20: ġar-ra (non-finite form) VS *aš-ku-un-ku* (1sg. preterite).

The relation between the two compositions inscribed on CTH 794 is unclear. In particular, it is unknown whether the incantations were already inscribed on the same Babylonian model, or rather if the *Sammeltafel* was compiled by the Assyro-Mitannian scribes.

5.2.5 KUB 34 3

KUB 34 3 is a seven-line bilingual fragment discovered in Building A containing the main theme of a prophylactic incantation. Only one side is preserved while the other is broken away. Sumerian and Akkadian versions are set off by *Glossenkeile* and lines are marked by rulings.

1	[.....] x [...]
2	[... nam-ba-t]eġ ₃ -ġe ₂₆ -de ₃ : 'a-na mi-x [...] <i>May you not approach his</i> [...].
3	[... x]-ni-še ₃ nam-ba-teġ ₃ -ġe ₂₆ -de ₃ : a-na mi- x[...]

¹¹⁹⁷ For *tišab* see GAG § 103 h.

¹¹⁹⁸ See § 1.1.10.3.

¹¹⁹⁹ H 1512, 7-9 is parallel to CTH 794 Rev. 11, 12, 16.

¹²⁰⁰ Note that the Akkadian version of St 177 has ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ-ka.

¹²⁰¹ On this point see § 1.1.10.3 and fn. 422.

¹²⁰² Cooper 1972, 68.

¹²⁰³ Cooper 1972, 64: 20.

¹²⁰⁴ Cooper 1972, 68 n. 21.

4	<i>May you not approach his [...].</i> [... n]am-ba-teĝ ₃ -ĝe ₂₆ -de ₃ : a-na ra-pa ₂ -a[š [?] -ti [?] -šu e ta-aṭ- hi]
5	<i>May you not approach his loins.</i> [... n]am-ba-teĝ ₃ -ĝe ₂₆ -de ₃ : a-na GUBU ₃ -li-š[u [?] e ta-aṭ- hi]
6	<i>May you not approach his left.</i> [... na]m-ba-teĝ ₃ -ĝe ₂₆ -de ₃ : a-na kiš-ši _x (IGI)-šu ₂ [...]
7	<i>May you not approach his shins.</i> [.....] 'a-na' ĠIRI ₃ -šu ₂ x [...] <i>[May you not approach] his feet.</i>

This incantation did not enter the canonical *Udug-ḫul* series and no duplicates are known. As pointed out by Cooper,¹²⁰⁵ this text shows a late tradition for, as in first-millennium sources, the expected 2sg. suffix -en is omitted at the end of the verbal form.¹²⁰⁶

The attribution of this fragment to the Assyro-Mitannian school is questionable as it is based on the shape of the sign NAM (ll. 3, 4, 5) only.¹²⁰⁷

5.2.6 KUB 37 127

KUB 37 127, discovered in Building A, is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving eleven lines on one side, whereas the other side is broken away. The text is probably a prophylactic incantation (see l. 5 [...] *lu-u₂ ša*-[...]) in interlinear bilingual format. The attribution to the Assyro-Mitannian school is based on the shapes of the signs LU and ŠA.¹²⁰⁸

5.2.7 KUB 37 95

KUB 37 95, discovered in Building A, is a fragment possibly from an Assyro-Mitannian tablet.¹²⁰⁹ The text, of which nine broken lines are preserved on one side only, is an incantation quoting Asalluḫi (l. 7). The preserved portion of the tablet seems to contain a monolingual Sumerian text but it is not excluded that an Akkadian translation was inscribed on a parallel column.

5.3 Hittite Script Tablets

This group includes tablets drafted by Hittite scribes mostly dated to the Late Hittite period.

CTH	Publication	Composition	Find-spot Area	Script	Language
314.1A	KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	?	NS	S PhS A H
314.2.B	KBo 12 72	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	HaH	NS	(S) (PhS) A H
314.2.C	KUB 4 4	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	(?)	NS	(S) (PhS) A H
314.2.A	KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	HaH	NS	(S) PhS H
315	KUB 4 2	The Message of Lu-diğira to his Mother	?	NS	(S) PhS (A) (H)

¹²⁰⁵ Cooper 1971, 10.

¹²⁰⁶ In the OB incantations of this type demons are addressed in the second person singular. It is worth noting the use of the correct form -ĝe₂₆-.

¹²⁰⁷ Note the two vertical wedges that intersect the first horizontal, cf. Schwemer 1998, 21. The sign LI (KUB 34 3, 5) may also be attributed to the Assyro-Mitannian school, but it is to be recalled that the same form was used in the Late Empire period.

¹²⁰⁸ ŠA has four horizontal wedges (l. 5), cf. KUB 37 106, 20 (it joins KBo 36 11+).

¹²⁰⁹ The signs LU₂ (l. 7) and KI (l. 8) seem to be Assyro-Mitannian, cf. Schwemer 1998, 30, 35.

CTH	Publication	Composition	Find-spot Area	Script	Language
315	KUB 4 97	The Message of Lu-diĝira to his Mother	?	NS	(S) (PhS) A H
315	RS 25.421 = AuOrS 23 50	The Message of Lu-diĝira to his Mother	Ugarit: Lamaštu Archive	NS	S PhS A H
807	KUB 57 126	Edubba E	?	NS	S PhS (A) (H?)
807	KUB 4 39 (RS 17.10; RS 17.80)	The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ	?	NS	S (A)
801.3	KUB 4 7	Nergal D	?	NS	S
819	KUB 4 41	Hymn to Nergal (?)	?	NS	SA
801	KUB 4 26 (+) HT 13 (+) KUB 37 112	a) <i>šuilla</i> to Adad (Akk.) b) Hymn (?)	?	NS	PhS A
793	KUB 4 11	Incantation to Utu	?	NS	SA
806.2	KUB 4 24	Collection of Incantations	?	NS	S
801.4	KUB 37 111	Collection of Incantations	Bk. D	NS	SA
806.1	KBo 1 18	Collection of Incantations	?	NS	S
819	KUB 4 23	Collection of Incantations	?	MS/NS	SA
813	KUB 34 4	Incantation	Bk. A	NS	SA
806	KBo 36 20	Incantation	HaH	NS	S
806.4	ABoT 1 43	Incantation	?	NS	S (A?)
801	KBo 36 17	Incantation	T. I	NS	SA
819	KBo 19 98	Unidentified Text	T. I	MS	SA
819	KBo 36 24	Unidentified Text	? (Lower City)	NS	S (A)
819	KUB 4 10	Unidentified Text	?	NS(?)	SA(?)

5.3.1 The Hymn to Iškur-Adad – CTH 314

Under CTH 314 are listed six fragments containing a Sumerian hymn to Iškur-Adad: KUB 4 6 (A) (+) KUB 4 8 (B), KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73 (C), KBo 12 72 (D) and KUB 4 4 (E).¹²¹⁰ Fragments C and D were discovered in the Haus am Hang. Also manuscripts A, B and E, whose find-spots were not recorded,¹²¹¹ probably stem from the same building.¹²¹²

KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8 (A(+))B) were possibly part of the same multicolumn tablet¹²¹³ containing standard Sumerian, phonetic Sumerian, Akkadian and Hittite versions. Sections of all the versions are preserved on the obverse even though they do not overlap as the fragments do not physically join. The whole composition was divided into two tablets of which KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8 represents the first one as indicated in the colophon: DUB 1-kam *u₂-ul qa-t[i]* ‘first tablet – not finished.’ The second tablet of the series is probably **KBo 12 72 (D)**,¹²¹⁴ a fragment from the central part of its tablet that preserves only the Akkadian column on the obverse, while the reverse is broken away. For the sake of simplicity, this edition will be called quadrilingual (Edition A), even though phonetic Sumerian is not a different language. The fact that KBo 12 72, discovered in the Haus am Hang, belongs to the same edition as KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8 is evidence that all the fragments come from the same building.

Fragments **KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73 (C)** belong to a different edition (Edition B), here called trilingual, as they are part of a three-column tablet containing versions in standard orthography, phonetic

¹²¹⁰ Manuscripts according to Schwemer 2001, 191-196.

¹²¹¹ On the provenance of fragments with unrecorded find-spots see § 8.5.

¹²¹² See Klingler 2010, 313.

¹²¹³ It is unclear if fragments A and B belong to the same manuscript, as they do not physically join and do not contain any parallel passages, see remarks in Klingler 2010, 314.

¹²¹⁴ Attribution of KBo 12 72 to the same edition as fragments A and B is uncertain because the sign LU in KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 6, has one initial upright wedge while in KBo 12 72 it is consistently written with three initial horizontal wedges.

orthography and Hittite, while the Akkadian column is lacking. It is worth noting that the Akkadian text of KBo 12 72 corresponds to the lines preserved in manuscript C. KUB 4 5+ represents the second tablet of the series, as is clear from the catch-line that reports the last two lines of the first tablet contained in KUB 4 8. These lines have only the Hittite text, but no variants are attested for the quadrilingual edition.

On paleographical grounds the manuscripts of Editions A and B date to the second half of the 13th century.¹²¹⁵

KUB 4 4 is a fragment from the central part of its tablet containing Tablet II of an additional quadrilingual edition, but only the Akkadian and Hittite columns are preserved on both sides. This fragment differs from the other manuscripts on paleographical grounds as the signs LI, IK and TA¹²¹⁶ seem to show old shapes.¹²¹⁷ The presence of the late form of ḪA throughout the tablet would suggest that KUB 4 4 is a late copy of an older tablet. However, van den Hout's remarks on the development of Hittite cuneiform¹²¹⁸ may allow us to date it to a period earlier than the other fragments, possibly the early empire – or even earlier. In both cases KUB 4 4 clearly represents a further, older, edition. This suggests that the composition was received by Hittite scribes earlier than the late 13th century.

Three different editions of *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* are therefore attested at Ḫattuša and can be summarized as follows:

Edition A (Quadrilingual)	
Tablet I:	
KUB 4 6 (A)	SS-PhS-(A)-(H)
(+)	
KUB 4 8 (B)	(SS)-(PhS)-A-H
Tablet II:	
KBo 12 72 (D)	(SS)-(PhS)-A-(H)
Edition B (Trilingual)	
Tablet II:	
KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73 (C)	(SS)-PhS-H
Edition C (Quadrilingual)	
Tablet II:	
KUB 4 4 (E)	(SS)-(PhS)-A-H

The fragments from the Hittite capital are the only sources of this composition that have come down to us.¹²¹⁹ Unfortunately, the standard orthography is only preserved for a few lines in KUB 4 6. Although no OB duplicates are known, some errors may shed light on when the recension of the text transmitted to the Hittite capital was composed:

- In *i₇-da-gal-gal*, 'in the big rivers' (CTH 314 – KUB 4 6 Obv. I, 7), *-(d)a*, whatever function it had (probably locative),¹²²⁰ is misplaced because it is not at the end of the noun phrase. I tend to regard it as an error produced when the text was composed, the result of an inadequate

1215 According to S. Košak's Konkordanz fragments of the quadrilingual edition, A+B and D, are 'junghethitisch' while the trilingual edition, manuscript C, is 'spätjunghethitisch', but note remarks in Klinger 2010, 313, where all fragments are dated to the same period. Furthermore, according to Klinger, manuscript D may be a late copy of an older tablet.

1216 Old and late sign shapes are here referred to the Hittite script, cf. de Martino 1992, 84.

1217 Even though the tablet surface is eroded the photograph seems to agree with the hand-copy.

1218 van den Hout 2012b, 166-167. Klinger 2010, 313, also identifies late EN, AL and RA, but see again van den Hout's remarks on EN and AL.

1219 A Hittite translation of an Akkadian hymn to Adad is preserved on a MS tablet (KUB 3 21), Archi 1983; even this composition is unknown in Mesopotamian originals.

1220 The function of *-a* cannot be ascertained because the rest of the line is not preserved.

knowledge of Sumerian grammar. It seems improbable that the Hittite copyist autonomously inserted the sign DA.

- The expression $\text{šu-du}_7 \text{ni}_2\text{-<gal>-a-ni}$ (CTH 314 - KUB 4 6 Obv. I, 3) is problematic because the verb is not placed at the end of the sentence. Two explanations can be advanced:
 1. As $*\text{ni}_2\text{-<gal>-a-ni} \text{šu-du}_7$, 'his awe-inspiring radiance is perfect',¹²²¹ would be expected, the actual form is possibly influenced by an Akkadian expression with a participle in *status constructus* like *mušaklil namrirrišu*, 'it makes perfect his awe-inspiring radiance.'
 2. The expression may be a faulty representation of a genitive compound: $*\text{šu-du}_7 \text{ni}_2\text{-<gal>-a-na}$.¹²²²

As in the preceding case this mistake was likely produced when the text was composed.

These errors can hardly be attributed to the Hittite scribes because they imply an active role in producing the text and a level of knowledge of Sumerian that, although still insufficient, the Hittites were unlikely to possess. It seems that these mistakes could have not been introduced by someone copying the tablet. As a hypothesis I would tend to regard them as hints of a late date for the composition or reworking of the text. A further hint that this was a late composition is the fact that Iškur, with the exception of the Emesal liturgies and the Larsa literature,¹²²³ had a marginal role in Sumerian literary texts.¹²²⁴ Schwemer¹²²⁵ pointed out that some themes incorporated in this composition are known from Mesopotamian literature, while other passages have no parallels. No phonetic writings seem to be attested in the standard orthography version contrary to other texts from Ḫattuša.¹²²⁶

The phonetic Sumerian version, only preserved in KUB 4 6 and KUB 4 5+ - with no parallel lines between the two manuscripts - was composed at Ḫattuša by local scribes.¹²²⁷ Likely it served as a school exercise¹²²⁸ for advanced students. It is not excluded that the tablets were copied under the supervision of a Babylonian teacher. Signs that rarely occur in the Hittite syllabary are used, as for instance the sign GUR that was adopted by Hittites only as a logogram for the word 'other'.¹²²⁹ The presence of this sign is evidence that this composition was probably copied for educational purposes in the Hittite scribal school. It is worth noting that the phonetic writing a-ia renders the correct pronunciation of the Sumerian word for 'father', aia (A.A),¹²³⁰ and is traditionally attested in OB unorthographic texts.¹²³¹ This knowledge was transmitted by means of lexical lists and by Babylonian teachers working in the Hittite capital. A further indication that this text was adopted in the Hittite scribal school is the writing $\text{šu-}^{\text{du}}\text{du}_7$, because glosses are rarely attested in Sumerian

1221 See the translation in Schwemer 2001, 192: «vollkommen ist sein Schreckensglanz».

1222 Cf. Thomsen 1984, 262.

1223 Brisch 2007, 44-48.

1224 Schwemer 2001, 175. There are only three compositions addressed to Iškur, *Iškur A* (ETCSL 4.9.1, STVC 57, Schwemer 2001, 190), *Ur-Ninurta F* (ETCSL 2.5.6.6) and *Sîn-iddinam E* (ETCSL 2.6.6.5), to which a temple hymn is to be added (TCS III No. 27).

1225 Schwemer 2001, 195-196.

1226 Cf. § 5.3.3.

1227 Cf. § 4.5.

1228 'Exercise' here must not be equated with daily assignments in the OB Edubba.

1229 The sign gur with value kur₃ (CTH 314 - KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 1) is used instead of the plain kur, Klinger 2010, 316. The sign GUR is used in the Hittite texts with the meaning 'other', instead of the Mesopotamian KUR₂, see Weeden 2011b, 239-240. The Hittite word for 'other' *tamai-* was regularly written syllabically up to the 13th century when the logogram GUR, which in Mesopotamia did not have any association with the meaning 'other', was adopted by means of lexical lists, Weeden 2011a, 609.

1230 *pace* Klinger 2010, 316; cf. aBZL No. 470.

1231 H 97 I, 33-34; III, 24-25; IV, 19-20; V, 14-15, Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993b, 179, Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995a, 23, Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995b, 170, 186, see § 4.2.8.

texts from Ḫattuša. As pointed out by Klinger,¹²³² the preserved unorthographic versions were not created anew on the basis of the standard orthography written on the same tablet because it is unlikely that a scribe would have restored gal in ni-gal-a-ni (KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 4) which is omitted in the standard orthography version, ni₂-<gal>-a-ni.¹²³³ This implies that phonetic versions of the preserved manuscripts depend on an older, relatively standardized model¹²³⁴ created by Hittite scribes and containing all the versions. Several errors are documented in the phonetic Sumerian version:

- nu-kal, a-ni and ri-ib-ba (KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 4-5) are errors respectively for abgal = NUN.ME, diġir-re-ne = AN-re-ne and kala read as rib.¹²³⁵
- In ki-bi lu-na-me in-pa-a-da (KUB 4 5+, II, 9-10) a negative verbal form is expected¹²³⁶ on the basis of the Akkadian version, [a]-ša-ar-šu ma-am-ma-an u₂-ul u₂-wa-ad-da₂, ‘his place that nobody knows’ (KBo 12 72).¹²³⁷ The Hittite version, U₂-UL ku-iš-ki, adheres to the Akkadian text.¹²³⁸ Unfortunately, the standard orthography version is not preserved and it is therefore not possible to ascertain whether it was different from the phonetic version. However, since a negative verbal form would imply a totally different sequence of signs, it is reasonable to assume that the phonetic version does not substantially differ from the standard Sumerian. This has several implications:
 1. The Akkadian version differs from the Sumerian text.
 2. Since, on the basis of the context, the expected meaning is that expressed by the Akkadian version, the latter would be the primary version and the Sumerian text a mistranslation from Akkadian. This further supports the hypothesis that this text was composed or reworked in the post-Old Babylonian period.
 3. The Hittite version is based on the Akkadian text.

However, in the absence of the standard orthography version the question must remain open.

- In en(-)na du-uš-ka-ra / giri₁₇-za-al iškur // be-lu ša i-na ħe-gal-li / aš-bu mu-te₉-el-lu ⁴10, ‘The lord who seats (Akk: in plenty), the noble Iškur’ (CTH 314 – KUB 4 5+, II, 11-12; KBo 12 72, 11-12), one may observe the following errors:
 1. The scribe reads the sign KU as tuš instead of dur₂¹²³⁹ but **tuš--ġar is an unattested form in Sumerian, whereas dur₂--ġar corresponds to Akkadian *wašābu*.
 2. The Sumerian for *ina ħegalli* is apparently omitted¹²⁴⁰ but a possible explanation is that the scribe only omitted the sign ħe₂ from the word nam-ħe₂, ‘abundance’, a synonym of ħe₂-ġal₂¹²⁴¹ and wrote nam as na. nam-ħe₂ is associated with Iškur in the following instances: en nam-ħe₂ giri₁₇-zal lu-lu-lu, ‘Lord of prosperity who makes glory abundant’;¹²⁴² ⁴iškur en-nam-ħe₂ kalam-e/ma zi šum₂-mu, ‘Iškur the lord of prosperity who gives life to the land’;¹²⁴³ a similar passage is also ⁴iškur en dim-gal / nita²-saġ dumu-an-na / e₂-ħe₂-ġal₂-la tuš, ‘Iškur, lord of the stack, the foremost

1232 Klinger 2010, 316.

1233 A similar phenomenon is attested at Emar for *The Ballad of Early Rulers*, see § 6.2.1.

1234 Perhaps KUB 4 4?

1235 Schwemer 2001, 192 n. 1318.

1236 Laroche 1964, 77: 9-10.

1237 For pa₃ = *wadû* see AhW 1455: ki-pa₃-da-na-me-en = *a-šar la ud-di-i*.

1238 Even though the pronoun is correct, the Hittite version misunderstands the text, see Klinger 2010, 321 n. 42.

1239 The readings tuš and dur₂, originally belonging to different signs, were merged in KU during the second millennium.

1240 For a different explanation see Laroche 1964, 70: 11-12, cf. also Seminara 2001, 434.

1241 Cf. Wagensooner 2011a, 26.

1242 *Sîn-iddinam E*, 25 (RIME 4.2.9.15 – ETCSL 2.6.6.5).

1243 Schwemer 2001, 386.

one, son of An, the one dwelling in the temple of abundance'.¹²⁴⁴ Perhaps, then, this passage can be restored as en na-<ḫe> du-uš-ka-ra / giri₁₇-za-al iškur, with correspondence between the Sumerian and Akkadian.

The difference between the use of giri₁₇-zal in *Sîn-iddinam E* where it has the meaning of 'splendor, glory', and in KUB 4 5+ where it is translated with *muttallu/muttellu*, 'noble',¹²⁴⁵ is a possible further hint that this hymn was composed or reworked in the post-Old Babylonian period. Middle Babylonian scribes probably drew passages from OB Sumerian sources where giri₁₇-zal is associated with Iškur and used them with a different nuance¹²⁴⁶ probably taken from lexical lists where both meanings are attested. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that *muttallu* referring to Adad is only known from a royal inscription of the first millennium.¹²⁴⁷

These observations strengthen the hypothesis that *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* was composed or reworked in the Middle Babylonian period likely on the basis of Old Babylonian texts.¹²⁴⁸ It is also possible that lexical lists were used as references.

Moving to the Akkadian version, KUB 4 4 shows some peculiarities: the Assyrian obl. pl. [a]ḫ-ḫe-e-šu (Obv. II, 15);¹²⁴⁹ the form *ta-ki-il* (Obv. II, 14) from *kullu* which is a mistake for *tukil*¹²⁵⁰ due to a non-Akkadian speaker; *ša-ma-a-mi* (Rev. II, 4), a poetic form for the genitive of *šamû*. Assyrianisms are attested at Ḫattuša to a limited extent¹²⁵¹ and they are unknown in forms in *status constructus* such as *aḫḫēšu*.¹²⁵² A single Assyrian form cannot be taken as evidence for Assyrian mediation in the process of transmission of this text, as Assyrianisms are common in peripheral Akkadian.¹²⁵³ The Akkadian of the other fragments does not show any peculiarities; case endings are usually correct with a few exceptions.¹²⁵⁴

No parallel line of the Hittite translation is preserved across the manuscripts. It is therefore unclear whether a common translation was shared by the three editions. Tablet I in both Edition A and B ends at the same point and no variants are attested between the catch-line of Edition B and the end of Tablet I in Edition A. Moreover, the Akkadian text of the quadrilingual Edition A, preserved in source D, has the same lineation of the trilingual Edition B (manuscript C). These elements speak for a common model for the Hittite translation. Conversely, according to Klinger¹²⁵⁵ some hints suggest that the Hittite version of Edition B was prepared directly from the Sumerian as for instance in C-D 11-12 (KUB 4 5+, II, III, 11-12; KBo 12 72, 11-12).¹²⁵⁶

C	en(-)na du-uš-ka-ra giri ₁₇ -za-al iš-kur
D	be-lu ša i-na ḫe-gal-li aš-bu mu-te ₉ -el-lu ^a 10

1244 Seal LSC 8 7, 1-3, Schwemer 2001, 440; note that this is a Kassite seal.

1245 Both meanings are known, Sjöberg 1962.

1246 The only possible attestation of giri₁₇-zal with the meaning of 'noble' is in *Ur-Ninurta F*, 1 (ETCSL 2.5.6.6): ur-saḡ nam-ḫe₂-a gu₃-ru-ru-gu₂ giri₁₇-zal, 'Hero of abundance, the one who rumbles, noble(?)', but Schwemer 2001, 190, reads gu₃-ni and translates «Held, der im Überfluß seine Stimme brüllen läßt!».

1247 RIMB 2 S.0.1002.11, 2.

1248 See for instance an-ta ḫe-in-gal me-ta-a-ši-im-ši-im (KUB 4 5+, II, 13-14) which is attested in *Enlil A* (ETCSL 4.5.1), Falkenstein 1959, 18: 145.

1249 See Mayer 1971, 48-49.

1250 See Schwemer 2001, 195 n. 1328.

1251 Durham 1976, 502-503.

1252 Durham 1976, 514-515.

1253 For Assyrianisms in peripheral Akkadian see von Soden 1979 and van Huyssteen 1991. Note the Babylonian form *ajaru* 'rosette, flower' (KUB 4 4 Obv. II, 8) VS Assyrian *jaru*, AhW A, 24.

1254 KUB 4 8 Obv. 4: *ša-m`u-u* for genitive; KBo 12 72 Obv. 15: *ḫe-gal-li* for accusative. In KUB 4 4 Obv. 13-14, LUGAL *ga-aš-ru e[n-b]u // ḫe-en-gal-li `ta`-k[i]-`il*, 'Powerful king, you held fruit and abundance', *e[n-b]u* and *ḫe-en-gal-li* should be accusative.

1255 Klinger 2010, 321.

1256 The Hittite version is from Edition B, the Akkadian from Edition A.

C *The lord who sits in plenty, the noble Iškur.*
 EN-aš li-li-wa-an-za d[am-me-da ku-iš(?)] me-ek-ki me-mi-iš-kat-t[a?]¹²⁵⁷
The lord who fast moves promised (repeatedly) a lot of plenty.

Klinger argues that the form *liliwant-* translates the value $\hat{g}en$ = ‘to go’ of the sign DU which is part of the form *du-uš-ġar-ra*. The same would have occurred with the verb *mema-* (iter. *memisk-*) which translates the meaning ‘to speak’ (du_{11}) of the sign KA instead of $giri_{17}$. Unfortunately, the lack of the Hittite version in Edition A prevents comparison. A further example of mistranslation of the Sumerian might be *LU₂-tar-ši-i[t]*, ‘his mankind’ (KUB 4 5+, III, 9), translating *lu-na-me* ~ *lu₂-na-me*, ‘someone, anyone’: here the Hittite scribe was probably misled by the logogram *LU₂*.¹²⁵⁸ Hence, according to Klinger,¹²⁵⁹ there was no formalized Hittite translation. Many variants between the Akkadian and Hittite versions are also attested in KUB 4 4 (Edition C)¹²⁶⁰ and some of them may depend on a mistranslation of the unpreserved Sumerian version, as with Edition B.¹²⁶¹ Because the various manuscripts do not preserve parallel passages of the Hittite version we cannot be certain that a common Hittite text did not exist. Nevertheless, it is clear from these examples that the Hittite version diverges from the Sumerian-Akkadian text and can be considered as a sort of free translation.¹²⁶²

No performative rubric like those found in hymnic liturgies is associated with this text. But if the composition already existed in the Old Babylonian period it surely had a low degree of duplication and, therefore, it can be defined as a non-curricular text.¹²⁶³ Nevertheless, this composition was unlikely to have been connected with practical worship during the post-Old Babylonian period, especially if, as here suggested, it was composed in the Kassite period. It is even more improbable that this text was associated with liturgical contexts at *Ḫattuša*. It appears that a text perhaps originally composed with a liturgical purpose turned out to be used in the education of scribes at least in the Western periphery. This is suggested by several factors: multiple copies; the addition of phonetic orthography and Hittite versions; its discovery in the Haus am Hang, the venue of a scribal school. As a unique composition, this hymn could be the product of any local scribal circle and its tradition cannot be clearly identified on the basis of the present evidence. The manuscripts of Sumerian texts on *Iškur*¹²⁶⁴ are from Nippur (CBS 7055 = STVC 57) or of unknown provenance (VS 17, 40; YBC 4624). It appears, however, that as a unique composition and a possible product of the post-Old Babylonian period the text cannot be assigned to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition in the terms in which it has been defined here. To conclude, one or more bilingual manuscripts reached *Ḫattuša* from some Babylonian center and were copied there with the addition of the phonetic Sumerian and the Hittite versions. The existence of a probably earlier manuscript (KUB 4 4) suggests that this text was transmitted to the Hittite capital before the 13th century.

5.3.2 The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother – CTH 315

The composition titled *The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother (MLM)*¹²⁶⁵ is preserved on OB monolingual Sumerian manuscripts as well as on tablets from *Ḫattuša* (KUB 4 2 and KUB 4 97) and Ugarit (RS 25.421 = AuOrS 23 50). Tablets from the Western periphery contain the text in standard orthography, phonetic orthography, Akkadian and Hittite arranged in parallel columns.

1257 See Schwemer 2001, 194 n. 1324.

1258 For a slightly different explanation see Laroche 1964, 77: 9-10.

1259 Klinger 2010, 323.

1260 See Klinger 2010, 321-323.

1261 According to Laroche 1964, 78: 2-9, the Akkadian and Hittite versions independently translate the Sumerian text.

1262 For a mistake in the Hittite version see Klinger 2010, 318.

1263 Cf. Tinney 2011, 585-586.

1264 See fn. 1224.

1265 ETCSL 5.5.1.

KUB 4 2 (H₁) is a fragment from the second column of its tablet preserving, on the reverse, lines 32-36 of the phonetic Sumerian version whereas the obverse is broken away. **KUB 4 97 (H₂)** is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving lines 34-40 of the Akkadian and Hittite columns on the reverse, whereas the obverse is broken away. These fragments probably belong to two different tablets because at the point where they would physically join (l. 36) both preserve the intercolumn space: to the right of the second column in KUB 4 2 and to the left of the third column in KUB 4 97. If they were part of the same tablet this space would be much wider than that preserved in KUB 4 97 between the third and fourth columns.¹²⁶⁶ The find-spots are unrecorded but the use of the same tablet format chosen for *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* perhaps suggests that these fragments stem from the Haus am Hang where it is likely that *MLM* also served in the education of scribes.¹²⁶⁷

RS 25.421¹²⁶⁸ = Ugaritica V 169; AuOrS 23 50 (Ug) is a large fragment of a four-column tablet preserving extensive portions of the text on both obverse and reverse. This tablet was found in the Lamaštu archive,¹²⁶⁹ but as already noticed by Nougayrol¹²⁷⁰ the sign shapes and the presence of the Hittite translation itself leave no doubt that this tablet was written by a Hittite scribe likely at Ḫattuša and then imported to Ugarit. This tablet shows the same paleography, ductus and *mise en tablette* – the text is case-ruled with two lines for each case – as the fragments from Ḫattuša. RS 25.421 probably served as a model for local copies like the one identified by Arnaud¹²⁷¹ in the small fragment **RS 25?.135A** which preserves a few signs of lines 38-39 in bilingual interlinear format. On paleographical grounds the Ḫattuša and Ugarit manuscripts can be dated to the 13th century.¹²⁷²

Five OB monolingual manuscripts are known: AO 6330 = TCL 15 39 (A), LB 2112 = TLB 2 5 (B), BM 17117 = CT 42 41 (C), CBS 1554 = JNES 23, 6¹²⁷³ (D), Ni 2759 = Belleten 40, 417-418 (E).¹²⁷⁴ Additionally, a lenticular tablet (Type IV) from Susa, MDP 27 107, contains a few line extract of MLM. Additionally, a lenticular tablet (Type IV) from Susa, MDP 27 107, contains a few line extract of MLM. This composition belongs to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition, mainly known from Nippur, as is clear from the fact that the city of the god Enlil is indicated as the residence of Lu-diġira's mother Šāt-Ištar. However, this composition was well known outside Nippur. Indeed, only manuscript E stems from Nippur while the other tablets are of unknown provenance. Manuscript D is probably from Sippar as it belongs to the Khabaza collection and according to Civil¹²⁷⁵ it joins C. The OB manuscripts show a high degree of variation. It appears that this composition existed in different textual variants in the the Old Babylonian period.

The relation among the three Hittite tablets is not clear as only a few lines overlap:

32	OB	ġešġem ama-ġu ₁₀	3-kam-ma ga-mu-ra-ab-šum ₂
			<i>Let me give you a third sign about my mother:</i>
	H ₁	PhS	[..... ga(?)]-mu-ra-an-šu
	Ug	PhS	[.....]
		A	[ĜEŠ]GEM AMA-mi-ia ša-lu-ul-ta lu-ud-din-ku

1266 Klinger 2010, 324 also believes that these fragments do not belong to the same tablet.

1267 Cf. § 8.1.

1268 According to RSO 5, 324, the unpublished fragments RS 25.527 A+B belong to the same tablet.

1269 For this archive see van Soldt 1995, 178-180 and § 9.5.2.

1270 Nougayrol 1968, 310.

1271 Arnaud 2007, 184.

1272 See Klinger 2010, 325.

1273 Civil 1964.

1274 Çiġ, Kramer 1976.

1275 Civil 1964, 1 n. 4.

- 33 OB ama-ĝu₁₀ šeĝ₁₄-an-na (var. B-E: im-a u₄ a₂-ba) a-numun-saĝ-ĝa₂-ke₄
My mother is like the heavenly rain, water for the choicest seeds.
- H₁ PhS [.....] im-u-a-ab-ba // [.....š]a-ag-ga-ak-ke
 Ug PhS [am-m]a-an-ku e-m[u (?) x x] // a-ni-ma-za-an-qa-ak-ke
 A AMA-mi ša-mu-ut ši-ma-an me-e NUMUN maḥ-ru-u
- 34 OB A buru₁₄ ħe-nun še guru₅-g[u₂ x] x an-na
 B [bur]u₁₄ ħe₂-nun buluĝ₃¹ ba-til-la gu-nu diri
 D buru₁₄ ħe₂-nun še gu-nu mu₂-a
 E buru₁₄ ħe₂-nun bu-lu-ug ba-til gu₂-[guru₅]
(She is) a bountiful harvest which grows fine barley.
- H₁ PhS [..... z]ar-tab-ba // [.....] us₂-sa-a
 H₂ A [.....] x x [.....]-tum [.....]
 Ug PhS e-bu-ur za-ar-tap-pa // še a-ag-na us₂-sa-a
 A BURU₁₄ nu-uḥ-šu ḥu-un-tu // šal-tu₃
 H BURU₁₄-an-za-ma-aš dam-me-tar-wa-a[n-za] //
 še-ep-pi₂-it-ta-aš-ma-aš mar-ra- [...]
- 35 OB A ĝeš₆kiri₆ me-a i-si-iš la₂-la₂-e
 B [(ĝeš)ki]ri₆ me-a i-si-iš la₂-la₂-e
 D ĝeš₆kiri₆ la-la asila^{la2} diri
 E kiri₆ 'me-a' [i-si-iš] 'la₂-la₂'
(She is) a garden of delight, overflowing with joy.
- H₁ PhS [..... la]-la-me-en //[...] ša-a
 H₂ A [ki-ra]-a la-a-le-e // [š]a¹ a-[ši-la-l]i⁷ ša-ši ma-[lu-u₂]¹²⁷⁶
 Ug PhS ki-ri la-li-me-a a-ši-la [š]a-a
 A KIRI₆ la-le-e ša r[i]-ša-ti ma-lu-u
 H KIRI₆-aš-ma-aš GEN₇-an // še-eš-šu-ra-aš na-aš a-aš-šu-i-it //
 šu-u-wa-an-za
- 36 OB ĝeš₃u₃-suḥ₅ a-de₂-a ĝeš₃še u₃-suḥ₅ (var. A-B : (ĝeš)li) šu ta₃-ga
(She is) a well-irrigated pine tree, (var: an adorned juniper) adorned with pine-cones.
- H₁ PhS [..... d]a²-a¹²⁷⁷ // [.....]-x-ku
 H₂ A ĝeš₃U₃^{1?}.SUḥ₅ še-eq-qa₂-tum // ša te-ri-in-na-ta zu-[u-na-at]
 Ug PhS a-šu-uḥ ši-da-a še-nu // a-šu-uḥ ši-da-qa
 A ĝeš₃U₃^{1?}.SUḥ₅ ši-iq-qa-ti // ša te-re-en-na-ti zu-'na-at
 H ĝeš₃šu-i-ni-la-aš-ma-aš GEN₇-an // še-eš-šu-ra-aš na-aš a-aš-šu-i-it //
 šu-u-wa-an-za
- 37 OB A gurun za₃-mu-a ĜEŠ.U₂-SAR(=u₂-ĝeš₆kiri₆) nisaĝ-ĝa₂
 B gurun za₃-mu-am₃ niĝ₂-tu-ḥu-um nisaĝ-ĝa₂
 D gurun za₃-mu u₂-ĝeš₆kiri₆ nisaĝ-ĝa₂

1276 This is a hypothetical restoration based on the photograph.

1277 For this reading see Klinger 2010, 327.

- E [gurun]-za₃-[m]u-a niĝ₂-tuĥ-mu-um nisaĝ-ĝa₂
(She is) a new-year flower, a fruit of the first-month.
- H₂ A *in-bu pa-an ša-at-ti mu-ut-ĥu-mu ni-is-sa₃-a-[ni]*
 H x-[.....] // ar.¹²⁷⁸[.....]
 Ug SS [gurun-za₃]-mu ʾgurun^ʾ-ĝeš¹kiri₆¹²⁷⁹ // [iti] para₁₀-za₃-ĝar
 PhS ku-ru-um-za-an-ku mu-ut-ĥu // pa-ra-za-an-kar
 A *in-bu ša pa-na MU.KAM-ti // mu-ut-ĥu-mi ni-is-sa₃-ni*
 H MU.KAM-ti-ia-aš ĥa-an-te-ez-z[i-iš] // še-ša-aš IGI-zi-ia-aš-ma
 IT[I].KAM-a[š] // ĝeš¹la-aĥ-ĥur-nu-uz-zi
- 38 OB pa₅-šitan mu₂-sar-re a ĥi-li-a de₆-a
(She is) an irrigation ditch carrying water to the garden plot.
- H₂ A *ra-a-tum ša a-na m[u-u]š-ša-a-ri // me-e ku-uz-ba₂ ub-b[a₂-lu]*
 H PA₅-aš-ma-aš ʾGEN₇-a[n...] // dam-me-tar-wa-an-ti [...]
 Ug SS [pa]₅ mu₂-sar-ra a ĥi-li de₆-(x)-a
 PhS pa-a [m]a-[š]a-ra a ĥi-li ʾti^ʾ-a
 A *ra-a-tum ša a-na mu-ša-ri // me-e ku-uz-ba₂ ub¹-ba₂-lu*
 H PA₅-aš-ma-aš GEN₇-an [...] // na-aš-kan₂ ta²-lu-up-pi₂-ia-aš
 dam-me-tar-wa-an-t[i-i]t // A.MEŠ-ar an-da pid₂-da-an-zi
- 39 OB zu₂-lum delmun-na ku₇-ku₇ zu₂-lum saĝ kiĝ₂-kiĝ₂-e
(She is) a very sweet date from Dilmun, the choicest date sought after.
- H₂ A *as-sa₃-an-nu-u₂ du-[uš-šu-pu] ša i-[n]a Z[U₂-LUM x x]x še-ti-e-u₂*
 H DELMUN(SAL.ĤUB₂^{NU^N}).N[A...] // na-aš-kan₂ [...]
 Ug SS [zu₂-l]um-delmun(SAL.ĤUB₂^{nun})-na¹²⁸⁰ ku₇-ku₇ // [zu₂-lu]m šen kiĝ₂-kiĝ₂-e
 PhS zu-lum te-el-mu-na-ku-[u]k-ku // [z]u-lum za-an ki-ki-ne
 A *a-sa₃-an-nu du-uš-šu-pu // ša i-[n]a ZU₂-[LU]M ʾsa₃-an-qe₂-e // ša-ki-in¹²⁸¹*
 H ^{uru}tal-mu-na-aš-ma-aš mi-li-it¹²⁸² // ZU₂.LUM-PI₂ na-aš-kan₂ «ĝeš» gur^ʾ-ša-
 wa-[na-ti] // an-da a-ri
- 40 OB ĝešgem ama-ĝu₁₀ 4-kam-ma ga-mu-ra-ab-šum₂
Let me give you a fourth sign about my mother.
- H₂ A *it-tum AMA-i[a] // ku-x [.....]*
 Ug PhS n[a-aš-ki-m]a-am-ma-an-ku // lam-ma-q[a-m]a [g]a-m[u-ra]-an-šum₂
 A ĜEŠGEM AMA-mi-ia ru-bu-ta // lu-ud-din-ku
 H 4-an-na-za nam-ma am-me-el // AMA-an ĜEŠGEM me-ma-aĥ-ĥi

1278 For *arma* = ITI see Kümmel 1969, 163.1279 Arnaud 2007, 184: 37: gurun-kiri₆.

1280 For this spelling of Dilmun see RGTC 1, 157-158, Wiggermann 1988, 233 n. 33; the same writing is attested in KUB 37 138, 2, 8.

1281 Cf. CAD S, 148.

1282 For *milit* = KU₇ see CHD L-N, 251-252.

The phonetic Sumerian version seems to be common to all the LBA manuscripts:

- L. 34. The writing [z]ar-tab-ba/ za-ar-tap-pa is common to H₁ and Ug. According to Nougayrol,¹²⁸³ 𒀠E-NUN, which is attested in TCL 15 39 (A) in place of the 𒀠₂-nun of the other OB manuscripts, was misread as sar₂-daba_x.
- L. 34. us₂-sa-a is attested in both H₁ and Ug but is unknown in the OB manuscripts.¹²⁸⁴
- L. 35. -me-en/-me-a in [la]la-me-en/la-li-me-a are not documented in the OB manuscripts, but they cannot be an interpolation of the Hittite scribe. They may be forms from the enclitic copula,¹²⁸⁵ but another hypothesis can be advanced on the basis of the OB variants. Both variants me(-a) (A and B) and la-la (D) correspond to Akkadian *lalû*. Hence, it is not precluded that the LBA manuscripts rely on a model where both variants were attested with a pleonastic nuance or that the Hittite scribes had different models.

Nevertheless, differences between the phonetic versions in the two LBA manuscripts are attested, notably in the choice of signs:

- L. 33. im-u-a-ab-ba (H₁) VS e-m[u (?) x x] (Ug); according to Arnaud¹²⁸⁶ e-m[u (?) x x] could be a term for 'water' not translated into Akkadian where we have *šamûtu*, 'rain', which goes back to the OB manuscripts. However, it seems more probable that e-m[u (?) x x] is a different rendering of im-u-a-ab-ba documented in H₁: these two phonetic writings render im-a u₄ a₂-ba in manuscript B which corresponds to the Akkadian translation *ša-mu-ut ši-ma-an*.¹²⁸⁷ This is further evidence that the phonetic version in both tablets is based on the same standard orthography text.
- L. 33. [...-š]a-ag-ga-ak-ke (H₁) VS a-ni-ma-za-an-qa-ak-ke (Ug)
- L. 36. [.....]-x-ku (H₁) VS ši-da-q-qa (Ug)

The closeness between phonetic versions suggests that manuscripts Ug and H₁ are closely related. Possibly they rely on the same model, likely a tablet drafted at 𒀠attuša on the basis of a Mesopotamian *Vorlage* to which a Hittite scribe added the unorthographic version. This version was then copied with slight differences in the surviving manuscripts.

The standard orthography version is only partially preserved in manuscript Ug for lines 37-39. Nevertheless, one may notice that the text of the Hittite recension diverges from the known OB manuscripts, as for instance in the above quoted line 37.¹²⁸⁸ The phonetic version provides further evidence that the LBA recension diverges from the OB manuscripts.¹²⁸⁹

- L. 36. According to Arnaud,¹²⁹⁰ ši in ši-da-a (Ug) VS a-de₂-a (OB), 'watered', is a reading for šeĝ₃ 'rain'; if this holds true the Hittite source diverges from the preserved OB manuscripts.
- L. 36. še-nu (Ug) VS 𒀠ešli (A) / 𒀠ešše (D); all three variants refer to plants.¹²⁹¹

1283 Nougayrol 1968, 317: 34.

1284 See Arnaud 2007, 184: 34, Gadotti 2010, 124.

1285 Klinger 2010, 326.

1286 Arnaud 2007, 183-184: 33.

1287 Per *š/simānu* = u₄-a₂-bi see CAD S, 269.

1288 Note that in line 39 the word saĝ is phonetically written as šen, see Arnaud 2007, 185: 39 and § 4.1.1.3.1.

1289 See also the examples quoted above, ll. 33, 34, 35.

1290 Arnaud 2007, 184: 36.

1291 See Klinger 2010, 326.

- L. 43. ni-in-ni-bu (Ug) VS lu-li-gu₂-na (A), lu-lu-gu-na (B), lu-l[u-b]u-na (E); ša-ḫu-la (Ug) VS i-lu (OB).

43	OB	A	lu-li-gu ₂ -na dumu-munus-lugal i-lu ḫe ₂ -ḡal ₂ -la-kam
		B	lu-lu-gu-na dumu-lugal-la i-lu ḫe ₂ -ḡal ₂ -la
		E	lu-l[u-b]u-na dumu-lugal-la i-lu ḫe ₂ -ḡal ₂ -la-kam

The offspring, royal progeny, a song of abundance.

Ug	PhS	ni-in-ni-bu [d]u-um-im-[me]-lu-gal ša-ḫu-la ḫe ₂ -in-[gal-la]
	A	na-[na-a]b DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL ḫu-ud lib ₃ -bi ša ḫe ₂ -en-gal-li

The offspring, royal progeny, joy of abundance.

For the writing ni-in-ni-bu two explanations can be advanced: (1) if NI was read as li₂ the sequence li₂-in-li₂-bu would be a phonetic writing for li-li-a, another synonym of ‘offspring’ in addition to those attested in the OB manuscripts;¹²⁹² (2) the scribe wrote ni-in-ni-bu on the basis of the Akkadian *nannābu* ‘offspring.’ In the first hypothesis, manuscript Ug would depend on a variant attested in an unpreserved tablet, while in the second the writing is due to the Hittite scribe.

- L. 45 ki-en-te-me-en VS ki-aḡ₂ ša₃-ki-aḡ₂:

45	OB	ki-aḡ ₂ ša ₃ -ki-aḡ ₂ la-la nu-gi ₄ -gi ₄ -da
----	----	--

A lover, a loving heart whose delight never changes.

Ug	PhS	ki-en-te-me-en la-la-bi nu-ki-ki-it-ti
	A	ra-a-am mu-ur-ta ₂ -mi-tu ₃ ša la-a-lu-šu la i-ša-bu-u

It is difficult to ascertain whether the phonetic writing misreads the standard Sumerian or whether the archetype contained a variant. It is to be noted that Akkadian *ra-a-am mu-ur-ta₂-mi-tu₃*, ‘love of the lovers’, only partially translates the Sumerian text of the preserved OB manuscripts. Perhaps ki-en is a writing for ki-eḡ₃(Aḡ₂), TE is a paleographic confusion for ša₃ and the final -en is a further writing for -eḡ₃(Aḡ₂);¹²⁹³ however -me- remains difficult.

Arnaud¹²⁹⁴ suggested that the Hittite scribes copied from several Mesopotamian models on the basis of the variations occurring among the versions (i.e. Sumerian, Akkadian and Hittite) in line 37 of manuscript Ug.¹²⁹⁵ The standard Sumerian gurun-ḡes³kiri₆, which is not documented in any of the OB manuscripts, is rendered in the unorthographic version as mu-ut-ḫu and translated into Akkadian as *mutḫummu* in both H₂ and Ug.¹²⁹⁶ An alternative to Arnaud’s hypothesis assumes that in order to write the phonetic version the Hittite scribe, dealing with an unfamiliar Sumerogram, referred to the Akkadian text and by means of lexical lists he found equivalences to *mutḫummu* similar to those quoted here:¹²⁹⁷

Urra XVII 120: [u₂] ‘mut-ḫu’-um ḡEŠ.SAR = *mut-ḫu-mu*
 LTBA II 1 v. 35: *mit-ḫu-mu* (var. *mut-ḫu-mu*) = GURUN.ḡEŠ.SAR
malku-šarru (K 4375 = CT 18 2): [*mut*]-ḫu-um-mu = *in-bu* ḡes³KIRI₆

¹²⁹² Arnaud 2007, 185: 43, suggests that li₂-li₂-a was attested in the orthographic version but this seems improbable.

¹²⁹³ Uri Gabbay’s suggestion.

¹²⁹⁴ Arnaud 2007, 184: 37.

¹²⁹⁵ See above for this line.

¹²⁹⁶ The Hittite version is based on the Akkadian translation.

¹²⁹⁷ CAD M/2, 298.

The Sumerian word for the Akkadian *muthummu*, ‘fruit’, is attested in several forms including those documented in the OB manuscripts. According to Civil¹²⁹⁸ both the Sumerian and the Akkadian are loan-words from a third language. Hence, the Hittite scribe went back to the sequence mud-ḥum/mud-ḥu-um, equivalent to *muthummu*,¹²⁹⁹ and wrote it phonetically as mu-ut-ḥu.

As noted above, the OB manuscripts do not present a uniform text and are characterized by many variants. The lack of uniformity in the OB manuscripts is clear in line 29:

29	OB	A	ġeš ¹ PU ₂ ʿEʿ NI niġ ₂ -zi pa-an ^{aġ2} -pa-an ^{aġ2}
		B	[niġ ₂]-zi-ġal ₂ niġ ₂ -zi pa-e ₃ zi bur ₂ ḪAR-ḪAR
		E	[..... N]Ē ki [.....]
		A who breaths (?)
		B	a breathing living creature, who emits breath...
	Ug	A	šur-ḥu-ul-lu ši ₂ -ip-pa-tu ₄ // ša i-na nap-ša-ti i-ḥal-lu-lu
		H	GI ¹ .DURU ₅ -aš-ma-aš ḥu-uḥ-ḥur-ta-al-la-a[š] // u ^{zu} GU ₂ .ḪAL-iš-ša-an ku-i-e-eš kal-[ka]l-l[i-i]š-[...]
			<i>A šippatu necklace worn around the neck</i>

The Akkadian translation in the Ugarit manuscript seems preferable¹³⁰⁰ as it better fits the context of the passage, in which Lu-diġira’s mother is compared to jewels. The OB manuscripts are problematic because they contain words out of context: ġeš¹PU₂ with the reading ġeš¹gigir₂ means ‘chariot’, while [niġ₂]-zi-ġal₂ signifies ‘living creature.’¹³⁰¹ A possible explanation involves the term *šurḥulu*, a type of metal necklace or bracelet which is attested in lexical lists as Akkadian for urudu¹³⁰²niġ₂-gul-(šu)-ma.¹³⁰² The sequence ĠEŠ PU₂ in A, following Van Dijk’s collation,¹³⁰³ may be read urudu,¹³⁰⁴ ‘bronze’, which partially corresponds to the Akkadian version.¹³⁰⁵ Even though Sumerian and Akkadian versions cannot be harmonized a sort of correlation probably existed. The Hittite version is based on the Akkadian text. The rare term *šippatu* was probably unknown to the Hittite scribe, who translated it with GI¹.DURU₅-aš which does not correspond to any metal object but to a homonymous word *šippatu* meaning a type of reed.¹³⁰⁶

1298 Civil 1964, 8-9.

1299 Cf. Arnaud 2007, 184: 37.

1300 The Sumerian version is not preserved in manuscript Ug. Gadotti 2010, 123, also regards the Akkadian version as the correct one.

1301 The rest of the Sumerian sentence is possibly connected to *napšatu*, ‘life, throat, neck’, CAD N/1, 296; for zi-pa-aġ₂/an = ‘throat’ see CAD N/1, 303, *Inana and Ebiḥ* 55 (Attinger 1998, 170).

1302 *Urra* XI 358, Hunger, von Weiher 1976/1988 No. 123 Rev. 6, cf. CAD Š/2, 315.

1303 TLB 2, Pl. XI.

1304 urudu with inscribed *Winkelhaken* is normally used from the Middle Babylonian period and is also attested in the Old Babylonian period, see Labat No. 132; this may indicate a late date for A.

1305 The sign NI is probably to be read zal: urudu¹³⁰²niġ₂-zal-la₂-da is attested in *Urra* XI (ll. 354, 356) as Sumerian for *puḥru*, a type of metal object, CAD P, 493.

1306 *šippatu* D, CAD Š, 203; in *Urra* VIII 12 a-b *šippatu* translates gi-duru₅.

Further evidence for the divergence of the LBA recension from the surviving OB manuscripts is provided by line 26 where the Akkadian and Hittite versions (the only ones preserved) differ from the OB tablets which, however, present several variants as well:¹³⁰⁷

26	OB	A	gil ^{na4} gug-am ₃ bibra ħe ₂ -du ₇ -ġu ₁₀ <i>A carnelian treasure, my ornamental vessel</i>
		B	^{na4} [g]il ^{na4} gug ^{na4} za-gin ₂ ħe ₂ -du ₇ -a ¹³⁰⁸ <i>A stone treasure, a carnelian, an ornamental lapis lazuli</i>
		D	^{na4} kišib-nir ₂ -a ^{du} tu-gen ₇ ħe ₂ -du ₇ -a <i>A seal made of Nir-stone, an ornament like the sun</i>
		E	gil-gil-s[a ^{na4} gug-a]m ₃ bibra si ₁₂ -ga-a <i>A carnelian treasure, a pale green vessel</i>
	Ug	A	<i>ki-ši₂-ir¹³⁰⁹ ħu-la-li // bi-ib-ru ħu-uš-šu-u</i>
		H	NA ₄ .NIR ₂ -aš-ma-aš ħa-am-m[i-...] // ħa-li-wa-ni-iš-ma-aš SA[GA ₁₀ [?] -an-za]
		A	<i>A piece of ħulālu-stone, a reddish rhyton</i>
		H	<i>A ħulālu-stone (...) a great (?) rhyton</i>

It is clear that the LBA manuscripts do not directly depend on any of the preserved OB tablets. The closeness between the manuscripts from ̒attuša and Ugarit shows that they represent a common recension that was likely created in the Middle Babylonian period when *MLM* was modified with the addition of the Akkadian translation and transmitted to the Western periphery. Some grammatical features and mistakes in comparison with the OB tablets could be further hints of the late re-working of the LBA manuscripts. The directive, attested in the OB manuscripts, is replaced by the locative: mu₂-sar-re VS mu₂-sar-ra (l.38). The 3sg. human pronominal prefix -n- is used as an object in cohortative forms instead of the expected non-human -b- attested in the OB manuscripts: 32, [ga]-mu-ra-an-šu (H₁);¹³¹⁰ 39, [g]a-m[u-ra]-an-šum₂ (Ug); 47, qa-mu-ra-an-šum₂ (Ug). The use of different models, as suggested by Arnaud, can perhaps be attributed to Middle Babylonian scribes who had different tablets at their disposal containing several variants, as shown by the preserved OB manuscripts.

The Akkadian versions preserved in H₂ and Ug only show purely orthographic variants:

Lines	H ₂	Ug
35	[ki-ra]-a	KIRI ₆
35	la-a-le-e	la-le-e
36	še-eq-qa ₂ -tum	ši-iq-qa-ti
36	te-ri-in-na-ta	te-re-en-na-ti
37	pa-an	ša pa-na
37	ša-at-ti	MU.KAM-ti
37	mu-ut-ħu-mu	mu-ut-ħu-mi
38	ra-a-tum	ra-a-tum
38	m[u-u]š-ša-a-ri	mu-ša-ri
39	as-sa ₃ -an-nu-u ₂	a-sa ₃ -an-nu
39	še-ti-e-u ₂	ša-ki-in
40	it-tum	ĜEŠGEM

1307 The Hittite version seems to diverge from Akkadian but the restoration of SAGA₁₀ is hypothetical, cf. Laroche 1968, 776: 19-20.

1308 For this line see Gadotti 2010, 123.

1309 *kišru* has different meanings and here it may be translated as either 'piece' or 'stone', see CAD K, 437, 441.

1310 KUB 4 2, 2.

Even though only a few examples are available, source H₂ shows the tendency to replace Sumerograms attested in manuscript Ug with syllabic writings (ll. 35, 37, 40). The only textual variant occurs on line 39 where H₂ correctly translates the Sumerian verb *kiĝ₂*, ‘to seek’, with *šite’u* whereas Ug has *šākin*.¹³¹¹

The Akkadian mostly agrees with the Sumerian text.¹³¹² The omission of *kigallu* ‘pedestal’ in Ug, 30 must be regarded as a copying mistake of the Hittite scribe because the term occurs in the Hittite translation (*palzaska-*) and in the OB manuscripts (*ki-gal*):

30 OB ^dlamma ^{na4}ĝeš-nu₁₁-gal ki-gal ^{na4}za-gin₃-na gub-ba-am₃

An alabaster statuette, set on a lapis-lazuli pedestal

Ug A ^dLAMMA ^{NA4}AŠ.NU₁₁.GAL // [š]a ina uq-ni-i i-za-az
 H ħu-bi-iš-na-aš-ma-aš ^{NA4}aš še-e-na-aš // na-aš-kan₂ ^{NA4}ZA.GIN₃-aš pal-
 za-aš-ħi DU-ri

It is worth noting that the term ‘alabaster’ in the Akkadian version is written with ^{NA4}AŠ.NU₁₁.GAL, which is a variant attested exclusively at Ḫattuša of the Babylonian ^{NA4}ĜEŠ.NU₁₁.GAL = *ĝešnugallu*.¹³¹³

The language is Babylonian but in manuscript Ug the Assyrian form *iħallulū* (l. 29) occurs for the Babylonian *iħallalū*.¹³¹⁴ As noted in regard to other compositions an isolated Assyrianism is not evidence of Assyrian mediation, but must be regarded as a feature of peripheral Akkadian.¹³¹⁵

At some points the Hittite translation diverges from the Sumero-Akkadian text:¹³¹⁶

- L. 24. Hittite ^{na4}ZA.GIN₃-aš-ma-aš [...] ^{uru}KA₂.DIĜIR.RA-aš-m[a-aš ...], ‘She is lapis lazuli [...], of Babylon’, seems to differ from Akkadian [^{na4}GU]G a-qar₂-tu₃ [^{na4}DU₈].ŠI.A ba₂-ra-[aħ-šū], ‘She is precious cornelian, *dušū*-stone from Baraħsu’, which adheres to the Sumerian version.
- L. 36. The second part of the Hittite line has *na-aš a-aš-šu-i-it šu-u-wa-an-za*, ‘full of goods’; the term *aššu*, ‘good, treasure’, does not occur in the Sumerian and Akkadian versions.¹³¹⁷
- L. 39. The Hittite version, ‘She is the honey and the date of Dilmun; she comes from the island’,¹³¹⁸ differs from the Akkadian, ‘(she is) a very sweet date from Dilmun that is taken among the choicest¹³¹⁹ dates.’ Moreover ‘honey’ is added in the Hittite version. It is also worth noting that Dilmun is written phonetically as ^{uru}tal-mu-na-aš-ma-aš in manuscript Ug and with the logogram in source H₂.
- L. 46. The term *u₂-um-ma-aš* of unknown meaning has no parallel in the Sumerian and Akkadian versions.¹³²⁰ The Hittite version translates the second part of the line differently:

46 Ug PhS i-ni-im-‘mu’ lu-na-‘am’-ra // am-ma-an-ni-[š]e ku-u-[r]a

¹³¹¹ See Arnaud 2007, 184-185: 39.

¹³¹² See for instance Arnaud 2007, 183: 23, 24, 25.

¹³¹³ CAD G, 104; see Weeden 2011b, 161-162.

¹³¹⁴ (*ħ*)*alālu* II, AhW I, 34.

¹³¹⁵ A different explanation assumes that the spelling *i-ħal-lu-lu* is a case of dittography because the scribe repeated the sign LU under the influence of the last sign of the sequence.

¹³¹⁶ For lines 36 and 39 see transliteration above.

¹³¹⁷ Laroche 1968, 778: 38-40.

¹³¹⁸ Starke 1990, 535-536.

¹³¹⁹ *sanqū*, CAD S, 148, note that this word is a *hapax* and its meaning is based on the Sumerian manuscripts.

¹³²⁰ Laroche 1968, 779: 64-66.

A	<i>bu-us-su₂-ra-at šal-li [š]a <a-na> AMA-šu₂ i-ta¹-a-ra</i>
H	<i>aš-šu-la-aš me-mi-ia-na-aš-ma-aš [...] GEN₇-[an] // u₂-um-ma-aš NAM.RA-az DUMU-aš // AMA-ši EGIR-pa u₂-iz-zi</i>
A	<i>(She is like) tidings of a captive who returns to his mother</i>
H	<i>(She is) like a good word ... when a son comes back to his mother from the prison</i>

To sum up, it seems that there are sufficient grounds to consider the Hittite manuscripts of *MLM* as based on a bilingual model, probably created during the Middle Babylonian period with adaptation and modification of the OB text. This source was later transmitted to Ḫattuša where local scribes added the phonetic Sumerian version and the Hittite translation. Thereafter, a copy was imported to Ugarit where a local copy was drafted. This composition reflects the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition, but it is unknown where the MB bilingual text was created and from where it was transmitted to the Western periphery. As with *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* this text likely served in scribal education at Ḫattuša, as suggested by the tablet format. On the basis of the present evidence it is unknown whether the Hittite translations depend on a common model or were composed independently.

5.3.3 Edubba E – KUB 57 126

KUB 57 126 is a fragment from a multicolumn tablet preserving on both obverse and reverse standard Sumerian and phonetic orthography versions of the text. The tablet originally contained an Akkadian translation and possibly a Hittite version. The find-spot is unknown but the fact that it shares the same tablet format as CTH 314 and CTH 315 suggests that it may come from the Haus am Hang. The *mise en tablette*, with the case-ruled text, recalls that of *MLM*. Despite Civil's remark¹³²¹ that the sign TU has a MB shape, the tablet is written in 13th century Hittite script.¹³²²

This fragment contains the *Edubba*-text *Edubba E*,¹³²³ which consists mostly of extracts from other compositions. The text is known from three OB tablets. UET 6 165 (A) is a single-column tablet from Ur containing the whole composition; UET 6 166 (B) is a pillow-shaped extract tablet from Ur containing the first nineteen lines; LB 2125 = TLB 2 7 (C) is a four-sided prism possibly from Nippur,¹³²⁴ containing *Edubba A* on the first two sides and *Edubba E* on sides iii-iv. The reverse of KUB 57 126 includes a riddle known from SP 25¹³²⁵ and several other compositions,¹³²⁶ among them *The Instructions of Šuruppak*.¹³²⁷

As pointed out by Civil,¹³²⁸ KUB 57 126 (H) shows several variants to the OB text, in particular the addition of passages copied from *Dialogue III*.¹³²⁹

1321 Civil 1987, 25.

1322 The obverse and reverse of the hand-copy are to be exchanged; see LUGAL (Rev.¹ I, 4), ŠA (Rev.¹ II, 7), TA (*passim*), TAR (Obv.¹ I, 2), KI with only one initial *Winkelhaken* (Obv.¹ I, 2; II, 2). Note, however, that the tablet is badly preserved.

1323 ETCSL 5.1.5.

1324 See entry P345846 in CDLI.

1325 ETCSL 6.1.25.12:

31. an-ku₄-ku₄ nu-si-si

32. ib₂-ta-e₃ nu-silig-ge

33. niĝ₂-gur₁₁ lugal-la-ke₄

34. igi-zu na-an-il₂-en

See Alster 1997, Vol. I, 277, Vol. II, 452-453.

1326 See Alster 1991b, 152-153, Alster 1997, Vol. II, 453.

1327 Civil 1984b, 287, 293.

1328 Civil 1987, 26.

1329 *Dialogue between Enki-manšum and Ĝirini-isag* (ETCSL 5.4.3); note that this composition has the same incipit as *Edubba E*.

KUB 57 126 Obverse

	H	Obv. ¹ 2	[gan ₂ -n]a u ₄ -šakar uš saĝ kut-ta ga-na uš-kar [...]
	A	26	gana ₂ u ₄ -šakar saĝ-ki-gud-da-gen ₇
	C	III 23a	[x x] saĝ-ki-gud-da-gen ₇
	H	Obv. ¹ 3	[saĝ]-ki-kut-ta ħa-la-ba a-uš ša-an-ki-ku-ut-[ta ...]
	A	27	us ₂ teš ₂ i ₃ -gu ₇ -e-en ħa-la-bi i ₃ -zu
	C	III 23b	i ₃ -gu ₇ !(KA) ħa-la-ba i ₃ -e-zu
	H	Obv. ¹ 4	[ga]n ₂ -na pana du-uš-te-li ga-na pa-a-na d[u-...]
	H	Obv. ¹ 5	[sa]ĝ-mu-še ₃ a-ša ₃ a-gar ₃ na ² -[...] ša-an-ku-uš-ši [...]
	H	Obv. ¹ 6	ˊ2ˊ [m]u ² -un-ta-ˊak-ke ₄ ˊ [...] ˊ1ˊ mu-un-t[a- ...]
Cf.	A	28	ĝeš ² dim-zu-uš dili a-ša ₃ -kiri ₆ eš ₂ -gana ₂ gi-ninda-1 u ₄ a-ša ₃ -ga BU
	C	III 24	[ĝeš ² dim-zu]-uš dili a-ša ₃ eš ₂ -gana ₂ gi 2 ² ninda ¹ (ĜAR) a-ša ₃ -ga-ni BU.BU
	H	Obv. ¹ 7	im-ˊdu ₃ ˊ-a uš kar ₂ -kar ₂ [...]
	A	32	m-du ₃ -a guru ₃ -guru ₃ ^{ru} agar ₄ kar ₂ za ₃ niĝ ₂ -du ₃ -a
	H	Obv. ¹ 8	e ₂ du ₃ -ˊra ² ˊ šeg ₁₂ -gur ad-gen ₇ e-du[r ...]
	A	35	e ₂ -du ₃ -a e ₂ -UŠ ¹ .GID ₂ .DA šeg ₁₂ anše
		36	i ₇ ba-al eš ₂ gu ₂ ĝar-ra

KUB 57 126 Reverse

	H	Rev. ¹ 2	niĝ ₂ gur ₁₁ ku ₄ -ku ₄ [nu-si-sa ₂] [...]
	A	58a	[...] nu-x
	C	IV 11a	[a]n ² -ku ₄ -ku ₄ nu-si-si-[x (...)]
	H	Rev. ¹ 3	ib ₂ -ta-e ₃ nu-si[lig-ge] [...]
	A	58b	ni ₂ -a ₂ ^{!?} nu-silig-ge ₄
	C	IV 11b	[...]
	H	Rev. ¹ 4	niĝ ₂ -gur ₁₁ lugal-ak-ke ₄ [...]
	A	59	[.....] lugal-la-kam
	C	IV 12a	niĝ ₂ -gur ₁₁ lugal-<la>-kam
	H	Rev. ¹ 5	niĝ ₂ ħul dim ₂ -ma [...]
	A		<i>Omitted (?)</i>
	C	IV 12b	[...]

H	Rev. ¹ 6	KA-zu ḫul dim ₂ -ma [...]
A	60a	[..... du ₁₁]-du ₁₁ ka-ḫul dim ₂ -ma ka-ḫul il ₂ -en?
C	IV 13a	KA-zu du ₃ -du ₃ ¹³³⁰ ka-ḫul dim ₂ -ma ka ḫu[- ...]
H	Rev. ¹ 7	ˁsaĝˁ ze ₂ ˁx xˁ ka-a-ni ša-an [...]
H	Rev. ¹ 8	keš ₂ -da [...]

It appears that KUB 57 126 does not duplicate any of the OB manuscripts, but was probably reworked by the Middle Babylonian scribal schools. The most likely scenario is that in the Kassite period *Edubba E* was modified and an Akkadian translation was added. At Ḫattuša a phonetic Sumerian version, and possibly a Hittite translation, were created by local scribes upon a Babylonian bilingual model. This composition belongs to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition as its presence on the same source (TLB 2 7) as *Edubba A*, a text included in the House F Fourteen, indicates. It is to be recalled that TLB 2 7 is possibly from Nippur. Moreover, the incipit of *Edubba E* is quoted in literary catalogues, but it is not certain that the entries refer to this composition.¹³³¹ *Edubba E*, as was typical for *Edubba*-texts, served in scribal education. This is confirmed by its association with *Edubba A* and by its presence on a prism, a tablet format that was often associated with schooling.¹³³²

The replacement of S-signs with the Š series in the unorthographic version was perhaps influenced by Hittite scribal practices:¹³³³

ša-an-ki-ku-ut-ta ~ saĝ-ki-gud-da (Obv.¹ II, 3)
ša-an-ku-uš-ši ~ saĝ-mu-še₃ (Obv.¹ II, 5)
ša-an ~ saĝ (Rev.¹ II, 7)

Several phonetic writings are also documented in the standard orthography version:

uš saĝ kut-ta ~ uš saĝ gu₇-da (Obv.¹ I, 2)
[saĝ]-ki-kut-ta ~ saĝ-ki-gud-da (Obv.¹ I, 3)
a-uš ~ i₃-(e)-zu (Obv.¹ I, 3)
ad- ~ i₇.(d) (Obv.¹ I, 8)

In the case of Obv.¹ 3, the standard orthography version, [saĝ]-ki-kut-ta, is very close to the phonetic spelling ša-an-ki-ku-ut-[ta]. These writings are likely to be attributed to the Hittite scribe. However, it is worth noting that the OB manuscripts also contain unorthographic writings.¹³³⁴

5.3.4 The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ

*The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ (LI-LN)*¹³³⁵ is a rephrased version of the *The Letter of Inim-Inana to Lugal-ibila* that belongs to the Sumerian Epistolary Miscellany (=SEpM 22).¹³³⁶ According

1330 Is du₃-du₃ a phonetic writing for du₁₁-du₁₁?

1331 See § 8.1.

1332 On prisms used in the OB scribal schools see Tinney 1999, 160; further prisms discovered at Ḫattuša containing Sumerian texts are KBo 1 18 (§ 5.3.10), KBo 19 98 (§ 5.3.17), KUB 4 41 (§ 5.3.6).

1333 On this point see § 4.3.1.4.

1334 See UET 6 165, 32: im-du₃-a ~ im-du₈-a; UET 6 165, 58: ni₂-a₂ ~ niĝ₂-e₃.

1335 ETCSL 3.3.17.

1336 ETCSL 3.3.12. For this letter see Civil 2000a, 107-109, Kleinerman 2011, 181-182.

to Civil,¹³³⁷ this composition, which is only known from post-Old Babylonian sources, was drafted in the Late Old Babylonian period, after the reign of Samsu-iluna, perhaps already in bilingual format.¹³³⁸ An OB catalogue of literary letters from Uruk¹³³⁹ quotes *lugal nesaĝ²-ĝ[e₂₆? ...]* (Rev. 30) which may correspond to the incipit of either *LI-LN* or of *Dedication of a Dog to Nintinuga* (SEpM 20).¹³⁴⁰ Because the Uruk tablet is broken this title cannot be assigned with full confidence to either composition. However, if it referred to *LI-LN* Civil's statement would have to be dismissed because the Uruk tablet dates to Rīm-Sîn's rule over the city (1792-1781).¹³⁴¹

The oldest manuscripts so far known are a tablet from Ḫattuša (KUB 4 39) and two fragments from Ugarit (RS 17.10, RS 17.80). *LI-LN* is also preserved in first-millennium duplicates, on two NA tablets from Assur, VAT 10365 (= LKA 65) + VAT 11777 (Ass₁) and CBS 1642¹³⁴² (Ass₂), and two NB manuscripts from Babylon, BM 32330 (Bab) and from Ur, BM 130460 (Ur). Contrary to *LI-LN* which was transmitted to the first-millennium library, its model, *The Letter of Inim-Inana to Lugal-ibila*, was no longer copied.

KUB 4 39 (H)¹³⁴³ is a fragment from the upper left corner of a four-sided prism with two columns on each side containing a bilingual version of the text in parallel column format. The fragment only preserves the beginning of the first column, inscribed with the Sumerian version. The find-spot is unknown but the tablet format suggests that this manuscript was possibly associated with a scribal school.

RS 17.10 (UgA) and **RS 17.80** (UgB) (= Ugaritica V 15; AuOrS 23 54-55) are two fragments discovered in the *Bibliothèque du Lettré*¹³⁴⁴ at Ugarit. The first one contains the phonetic Sumerian version and the second the Akkadian translation. According to Nougayrol, they belong to different tablets even though they were probably written by the same scribe.¹³⁴⁵ However, the fact that these fragments report the same segment of the text might suggest that they were part of a single two-column tablet inscribed with the phonetic Sumerian version in the left column and the Akkadian translation in the right. Moreover, both fragments present the same *mise en tablette* with paragraphs of one to four lines set off by horizontal rulings. A standard orthography version has not been recovered at Ugarit but it was probably inscribed on a different tablet.

Several features reveal the late stage of the Ḫattuša-Ugarit manuscripts in the standardization process. Because these traits are shared by later manuscripts, the LBA and first-millennium recensions likely reflect closely related stages in the transmission process of the composition.

- L. 3. In the Ḫattuša, Ugarit, Babylon and possibly Assur manuscripts the pronominal suffix appended to the verbal form indicates the dative.

H	inim-mu-un-še ₃ ¹³⁴⁶ gi-na-zu // gal-eš gu ₂ -zu na-an-šub-[...]
UgA	[.....]-an-zu // [.....na-a]n ² -šub-ba
UgB	[a-na a-mat] aš ₂ -pu-ra-ku ra-biš aḫ-ka // [la-a ta]-na-an-di ₃
Ass ₁	[.....] kin-n[a.....]
	[a-na a]-mat aš-pu-ra[k-ka.....]
Bab	inim-mu-še ₃ ^{še} kiĝ ₂ -gi ₄ -a-zu gal-le-eš [.....]

1337 Civil 2000a, 113.

1338 See Kleinerman 2011, 99.

1339 W 17259an, 30, Cavigneaux 1996a, 57-59, cf. van Dijk 1989.

1340 Kleinerman 2011, 174-177.

1341 See Cavigneaux 1996a, 3, Robson 2002, 329.

1342 The provenience of this fragment from Assur is hypothetical; only Face B duplicates *LI-LN* whereas Face A has a different text, see Cavigneaux 1996b, 11-13.

1343 Lineation follows Civil 2000a and Arnaud 2007, 189 ff.

1344 Nougayrol 1968, 23 ff.

1345 Nougayrol 1968, 24.

1346 The insertion of -un- is incorrect and likely due to a copying mistake.

a-na a-mat aš₂-pu-rak-ka ra-biš [.....]
Do not neglect so much my message sent to you!

-zu at the end of the verbal form gi-na/kiĝ₂-gi₄-a expresses the 2sg. dative; this form is incorrect in Sumerian and is likely based on the Akkadian *-ku(m)*¹³⁴⁷ of *aš₂-pu-ra-ku*. *gu₂-zu na-an-šub-[...]* and [... na-a]n²-šub-ba are incorrect forms of *na-ab-šub-be₂-en*:¹³⁴⁸ the 3sg. non-human pronominal prefix -b- is replaced by the human -n-.¹³⁴⁹ This is evident by comparison with SEpM 22, 3:

SePM 22 eme-gir₁₅-še₃ gu₂-zu na-ab-šub-be-en
Do not neglect Sumerian

It is worth noting that the word *ašpura(k)ku* is written with the sign AŠ₂ in the Ugarit manuscript and in the Assur and Babylon duplicates, even though the value aš₂ rarely occurs at Ugarit.¹³⁵⁰

- L. 5. In the manuscripts from Ḫattuša, Assur and Babylon¹³⁵¹ the Sumerian text is corrupt as ki has been added before niĝ-galam-galam-ma-bi on analogy with ki-bur₂-bur₂ and ki-dul-dul in lines 6-7.¹³⁵²

H	nam-dub-sar ¹³⁵³ ki niĝ ₂ -galam-galam-[(ma)-bi] // mu-un-na-pa ₃ -pa ₃
Ass ₁	[nam-dub-sa]r-ra ki-niĝ ₂ galam-bi <i>ṭup-šar-ru-t[u ...]</i>
Ass ₂	nam-d[ub-sar ...] <i>ṭup-[šar-ru-tu ...]</i>
Bab	[na]m-dub-sar ki niĝ ₂ -galam-galam-ma ¹ -bi // mu-ri-i[n ...] <i>[ṭu]p-šar-u₂-tu e-ma 'nik'-la-ti-šu [...]</i>

These three lines are attested in *Edubba A* 60-62:

Ed A 60	nam-dub-sar-ra niĝ ₂ -galam-galam-ma-bi mu-ni-in-pa ₃ -pa ₃ -de ₃ -en
61	ša ₃ -dub-ba šid niĝ ₂ -kas ₇ ki-bur ₂ -bur ₂ -ra-bi igi mu-un-na-si-ga-aš
62	gu-šum ₂ -ma ki-dul-dul-a-bi dal mu-na-an-e ₃

*I kept explaining to him all the fine points of the scribal art.
 To show him the solutions of the tablets with calculations and accounts,
 I clarified for him all the secrets of the cuneiform signs.*

In some cases, manuscripts from Ḫattuša and Ugarit agree against the first-millennium duplicates:¹³⁵⁴

- L. 4. al-tuš (H), al-du-uš-ša₂-a (UgA) VS na-an-tuš-en; in this case the Ḫattuša and Ugarit manuscripts adhere to the text of SEpM 22, 5:

¹³⁴⁷ Krecher 1969, 153, assumes that -zu is an unorthographic writing for še₃, but this is to be rejected in light of the NB duplicate.

¹³⁴⁸ Krecher 1969, 153.

¹³⁴⁹ Civil 2000a, 114: 3-4.

¹³⁵⁰ Arnaud 2007, 191: "La 'valoeur' aš₂ de AŠ₂ n'est pas 'occidental'"; see Huehnergard 1989, 385.

¹³⁵¹ The Ugarit manuscript is broken at this point.

¹³⁵² Civil 2000a, 114.

¹³⁵³ Note the omission of the genitive -ra in the manuscripts from Ḫattuša and Babylon, as often occurs in late texts.

¹³⁵⁴ For further variants see Civil 2000a, 114: 10-11.

SEpM 22	lu ₂ tur igi-zu-še ₃ al-durun ^{un} -na <i>The child(ren) who sit(s) before you</i>
H	lu ₂ -tur-ra igi-zu-še ₃ al-tuš // gu ₂ -zu na-an-šub
UgA	[.....]-uš-še al-du-uš-ša ₂ -a // [...n]a-an-šub-ba
UgB	[.....i]-na ¹ IGI-ka a-ši-ib [aḥ-k]a la-a ta-na-an-di ₃
Ass ₁	[x lu ₂]-tur igi-zu-še ₃ n[a...] ʿu ₃ a-na ši-iḥ-ri ša ₂ ina ʿx [...]
Bab	u ₃ lu ₂ -tur igi-zu-še ₃ na-an tuš-en ʿgu ₂ [...] u ₃ a-na ša-aḥ-ri ša ₂ i-na maḥ-ri-ka aš ₂ -bu a[ḥ-...]

The phonetic Sumerian version is only attested in RS 17.10 which was probably written as an exercise by a local scribe.¹³⁵⁵

RS 17.80 and the first-millennium duplicates usually agree in the Akkadian version and only orthographic variants are documented:¹³⁵⁶

Line	RS 17.80	NA – NB Manuscripts
1	<i>n-pu-ri-ia</i>	<i>ni-ip-pu-ri-i</i> (Bab)
2	<i>[i-b]i-i-la</i>	MIN (Bab)
2	^{uru} <i>u-ru-ma-ak-ku</i>	<i>u₂-ru-</i> (Bab)
3	<i>aš₂-pu-ra-ku</i>	<i>aš₂-pu-rak-k[a]</i> (Bab)
4	IGI-ka	<i>maḥ-ri-ka</i> (Bab)
4	<i>a-ši-ib</i>	<i>aš₂-bu</i> (Bab)
5	^e <i>e²-ia-am</i>	<i>e-ma</i> (Bab)
5	<i>ki-it-me₂-ti-šu</i>	^{nik} <i>nik⁻-la-ti-šu</i> (Bab)
6	NIG ₂ ŠID ^{me}	<i>nik-ka₃[s-si]</i> (Ass ₁)
8	<i>[di]-i-ku</i>	<i>de-e-ku</i> (Ass ₁) ¹
8	KUŠ	<i>maš-ku</i> (Ass ₁ – Ur)
9	<i>še₂₀-eb-<ru>²</i>	<i>šeb-ru</i> (Ass ₁) <i>še-eb-ru</i> (Ur)
9	<i>ma¹-aš-lum</i>	-
9	<i>šu-ul-^rlu⁻-š[u</i>	<i>šu-l[u-]</i> (Ur)

1 Cf. E: *di-i-ku*.
2 See Krecher 1969, 154.

The only recensional variants are *kitimtu*¹³⁵⁷ VS *nikiltu* (l. 5) and *ma¹-aš-lum*¹³⁵⁸ (l. 9), which is not documented in the other manuscripts. The language is Babylonian with haphazard local coloring.¹³⁵⁹ One may notice a tendency towards ideograms in RS 17.80 as opposed to their first-millennium duplicates.

Closeness between manuscripts suggests that they directly or indirectly rely on a common model, likely a MB recension that was transmitted on the one hand to the Syro-Anatolian scribal centers

1355 Note that the use of a Sumerogram for another partial homophone, kalam for galam, is uncommon in the unorthographic writings from Ugarit and requires a good level of proficiency in Sumerian, cf. Nougayrol 1968, 27-28. A phonetic writing is also attested in KUB 4 39, 11: ša₃-dub-pa ~ ša₃-dub-ba.

1356 See also Civil 2000a for lines 5, 8, and Arnaud 2007, 191-192, for lines 5, 8, 9.

1357 For this unique form see Nougayrol 1968, 28: 7; Huehnergard 1989, 107, cf. CAD K, 465.

1358 For this word see Krecher 1969, 154, Arnaud 2007, 192: 9.

1359 Incorrect doubling in *šu-up-pi₂-šu* (Huehnergard 1989, 49); nasalization *dd > nd* in *la ta-na-an-di₃*, (Huehnergard 1989, 114); for the form *ti-i-de₄-e* (l. 10) see Huehnergard 1989, 50-54.

and on the other hand to the first-millennium libraries. *LI-LN*, like the entire Sumerian Epistolary Miscellany (SEpM), is a product of the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition, notably of the Nippur scribal milieu. Indeed the majority of the tablets containing literary letters stem from Nippur.¹³⁶⁰ Additionally, manuscripts of SEpM 22 were only found in Nippur with the exception of an unprovenanced prism containing *The Letter of Sîn-iddinam to Utu*, which is attested at Emar and, as shown below,¹³⁶¹ is a Nippur composition. Moreover, connections to Nippur are also evident in the protagonist of the letter: the rare name Lugal-ibila is mostly attested in Nippur, and Lugal-nesaĝ, who appears in several other letters, is specifically identified as a citizen of Nippur.¹³⁶² However, this does not imply that a MB *Vorlage* was transmitted to the Western periphery direct from Nippur. As with CTH 315 the Ugarit recension is probably based on a Hittite source. As explained in detail below,¹³⁶³ literary letters were used in the Intermediary Phase of the OB curriculum,¹³⁶⁴ thus *LI-LN* likely served the same function in the Western periphery. An association with schooling is also clear for the phonetic version, which was composed with an educational purpose.

5.3.5 Nergal D – KUB 4 7

KUB 4 7 is a fragment from the upper left corner of a two-column tablet containing a bilingual version of the hymn *Nergal D*.¹³⁶⁵ The fragment only preserves the first lines of the Sumerian column on the obverse whereas the reverse is broken away. This composition is known from an OB tablet probably from Sippar, CT 58 46, and from a first-millennium bilingual duplicate from Nineveh, K 4809 + K 4925.¹³⁶⁶ KUB 4 7 was drafted by a Hittite¹³⁶⁷ scribe and can be dated to the imperial age, but several paleographic oddities can be found. The sign AN has the OB shape in lines 5 and 11 whereas it shows the late form with only two horizontal wedges in the rest of the tablet; the sign tarah₃ (DAR₃) (l. 10) has a very archaic shape similar to the third-millennium form,¹³⁶⁸ but unknown to the Hittite scribal school.¹³⁶⁹ Likely, the Hittite scribe who copied the tablet was influenced by sign shapes of the Babylonian model.¹³⁷⁰ The odd mixture of older and later signs, however, could have been a trait of the model, as similar mixing is attested in other Kassite tablets.¹³⁷¹

The text inscribed in KUB 4 7 shows several peculiarities and anomalies that go back to the Babylonian *Vorlage* and reflect a late stage in the standardization process:

- L. 6. The verbal form at the end of the line is abbreviated as u₃-; this writing is mostly documented in late texts and is typical of the Emesal liturgies.¹³⁷²

1360 See Kleinerman 2011, 22-23, 84; note that only a very limited number of tablets stem from the North, either Kiš or Mari.

1361 See § 6.2.4.

1362 Kleinerman 2011, 43-45, 47-48.

1363 §§ 8.1, 9.1.

1364 Cf. Kleinerman 2011, 75-94.

1365 I refer here to my edition in Viano 2012b.

1366 Böllenrücher 1904, 24-30, Borger 1973, 47-50.

1367 Klinger 2010, 337; see the shapes of the signs LA (l. 3), NAM (l. 4) and TA (l. 4).

1368 See Fossey, 240-242.

1369 HZL No. 71.

1370 The OB shape of AN is documented at Ḫattuša in KUB 37 124, a copy of a Kassite royal inscription, see fn. 1103.

1371 See N 2431, § 1.1.1.2 and fn. 108.

1372 Examples in main dialect compositions are provided by the MB and MA recensions of Angim (ll. 130-146), Cooper 1978, Viano 2012a, see §§ 1.1.1.6, 2.1.1.2. Possibly also KUB 4 7, 3 contains an abbreviation, Viano 2012b, 233-234.

- L. 11. The value me_5 of A in me_5 - lim_4 - $maḥ$ is not Hittite¹³⁷³ and is a late and rare value which was likely attested in the Babylonian model.¹³⁷⁴
- L. 14. As is typical in late texts the compound verb gu_2 - e_3 has the nominal element placed before the verbal base: mu - ra - gu_2 - e_3 .

Other features are instead probably due to the Hittite copyist:

- Ll. 1, 3. The phonetic writing ni_3 - $ḥuṣ$ for ni_2 - $ḥuṣ$
- L. 4. The phonetic writing $-da_2$ in u_3 - du_2 - ud - da_2
- L. 5. The dittography AN AN in $dumu$ - $maḥ$ «AN» $ḏkur$ - gal - la .
- L. 8. The omission of ki in $ḏen$ - $\langle ki \rangle$ - ke_4 .
- L. 9. The writing $ḏnun$ - dim_2 - mud for $ḏnu$ - dim_2 - mud ¹³⁷⁵ that is attested in the NA manuscript.¹³⁷⁶

Besides the presence of archaic non-Hittite sign forms, some signs were miswritten by the copyist.¹³⁷⁷

Nergal is mentioned in another bilingual composition from the Hittite capital, but the tablet, KUB 4 41, is too badly preserved to ascertain whether the text was dedicated to the same deity.¹³⁷⁸

Comparison with the OB and first-millennium recensions shows that KUB 4 7 is closer to the NA duplicate, not only because of its bilingual format, but also because of the line order. The LBA and first-millennium recensions strongly differ from the OB manuscript as they contain passages not attested in CT 58 46 whereas others are omitted. Notably, only the first four lines of the OB recension are duplicated in the other two tablets.¹³⁷⁹ The LBA and first-millennium recensions clearly result from the reworking of the OB text by Middle Babylonian scribes who also added the Akkadian translation.

The function of *Nergal D* in the Old Babylonian period is unclear. The reverse of CT 58 46 ends with the za_3 - mi_2 doxology which is curiously addressed to Enlil, $[k]ur$ - gal aia en - lil_2 za_3 - mi_2 - zu $maḥ$ - $a[m_3]$ (CT 58 46 Rev. 11). However, the text on the reverse appears to belong to the same composition because Nergal is mentioned (Rev. 4) and seems to be the addressee of the hymn. Therefore the za_3 - mi_2 doxology that is typical of mythological texts is to be referred to the whole tablet. Given that it is known from only a single OB manuscript, this composition is perhaps to be regarded as an isolated hymn that was not used in the curriculum. On the account of this and the Sippar provenance of the OB tablet, one may argue that this hymn did not belong to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition although it cannot be assigned to any specific tradition.

This text is included in the NA 'Catalogue of Texts and Authors',¹³⁸⁰ which lists some of the most popular compositions of Mesopotamian scholarship including *Lugal-e*, *Angim*, the Babylonian epic of Gilgameš and the astrological series *Enūma Anu Enlil*. Therefore it is reasonably certain that *Nergal D* did not survive by chance but was selected as worthy of preservation and of receiving a standardized form. The closeness of the LBA and first-millennium recensions can be understood within the context of the process of the canonization of this composition, which was already in an advanced phase in the Kassite period. The catalogue attributes the authorship of *Nergal D* to a certain Pappa-

1373 See HZL No. 364, Durham 1976, 117.

1374 This value is attested in Old Akkadian texts as well as in the post-Old Babylonian period, see Labat No. 579 and MesZL No. 839. In lexical lists me_5 is attested in *Aa* I/1 115 (MSL 14, 205).

1375 For this name see RIA 9, 607; in line 7 $ḏnu$ - nam - nir is correct, cf. RIA 9, 614.

1376 Borger 1973, 48: 1.

1377 See the shapes of $-ke_4$ (l. 8), $engur$ (l. 10; see comment in Viano 2012b), mul (l. 11).

1378 See § 5.3.6.

1379 On this point see Viano 2012b, 231-232.

1380 Lambert 1962, 64: IV 3-4.

tum (IV 5) who is otherwise unknown. Through the catalogue the hymn *Nergal D* can be connected with other compositions found in the Western periphery, because of the mention of Sidu, the compiler of a series that includes *The Ballad of Early Rulers* and *The Fowler*.¹³⁸¹ This is important evidence that the presence of these compositions in the Western periphery results from a conscious process of selection, adaptation and transmission that occurred in the Kassite scribal schools.

5.3.6 KUB 4 41

KUB 4 41 is a fragment of unknown find-spot written in NS, from a four-sided prism that only partially preserves two columns with paragraphs set off by double rulings. The composition, a bilingual text in interlinear format,¹³⁸² seems to be a hymn to Nergal who is quoted in Col. II, 5, [dⁿ]e₃-eri₁₁-gal. The name of Enlil is also mentioned in Col. I, 8 as well as his byname [d^{nu}]-nam-nir in Col. II, 8.

5.3.7 KUB 4 26 (+) HT 13 (+) KUB 37 112

Under **KUB 4 26** are published two fragments, A and B, which do not physically join. Fragment A contains an Akkadian šu-il₂-la₂ to the god Adad known from first-millennium duplicates from Assur, LKA 53, and Nineveh, BMS 20 (+) BMS 49.¹³⁸³ Klinger¹³⁸⁴ has recently demonstrated that the fragment **HT 13** joins KUB 4 26A and contains the end of the incantation-prayer. After double rulings, HT 13 continues with an unorthographic Sumerian text to which the fragment **KUB 4 26B** belongs even though the two pieces do not physically join. HT 13 seems to be the left part of the tablet while KUB 4 26B is probably the right side, but text lines cannot be harmonized between the two fragments. The text seems to be a hymn or a prayer to an unknown deity addressed in the second person (za-e, *passim*). Some words seem to refer to Enki such as lu-u-gal ab-zu-ta, 'king of Abzu' (HT 13, 5), and ki-iš-tu-ud-ku, ki-iš-tu-ug (KUB 4 26B, 3, 13), which are perhaps phonetic writings for ġeštug, 'wise', a typical epithet of Enki. Interesting are the writings ti-en-kar ~ diġir (KUB 4 26B, 10-11) and ti-in-qa-ri-ni probably for diġir-ra-ni.

KUB 37 112,¹³⁸⁵ a tiny fragment of six lines from the left edge of its tablet, perhaps belongs to the same tablet.¹³⁸⁶ This piece has a Sumerian monolingual text in phonetic orthography with some elements similar to KUB 4 26+, such as the use of the second person za-e-me-en to address the deity (KUB 37 112, 1), and the words lugal, written lu-gal and lu-u-gal (KUB 37 112, 3),¹³⁸⁷ and nam-til₃-(la).¹³⁸⁸ This fragment also preserves the divine name dⁿⁱⁿ-ZU (KUB 37 112, 3-4), which may be a writing for Ninanzu or Ninzu'anna.¹³⁸⁹

All these fragments were written by Hittite scribes and can be dated to the 13th century.¹³⁹⁰ Unfortunately, the composition is too fragmentary to be understood, but it is worth noting that this is the only monolingual Sumerian text in phonetic writing copied by a Hittite scribe. Its relation to the Akkadian *Šuilla* cannot be explained. The origin of the text is unknown and it is not precluded that

1381 See §§ 6.2.1, 6.2.3.

1382 See *an-nu-ti[m]*, Col. II, 3.

1383 Schwemer 2001, 671-674.

1384 Klinger 2010, 336.

1385 Cooper 1971, 4 n. 20.

1386 Perhaps KUB 37 112 is to be placed under the fragment HT 13 or was part of the reverse.

1387 The word lugal is spelled as lu-u-gal in KUB 4 26B, 4, 8, 9; HT 13, 4, 5, 9, 14.

1388 KUB 4 26B 4, 5; KUB 37 112, 1.

1389 RIA 9, 489-490.

1390 Klinger 2010, 337; see the shape of LA.

the Hittite fragments depend on a Mesopotamian manuscript already written in phonetic Sumerian.¹³⁹¹ This would possibly suggest a Northern Babylonian tradition for the *Vorlage*, but no conclusive evidence can be drawn.

5.3.8 Incantation to Utu – KUB 4 11

KUB 4 11¹³⁹² is a fragment from the central part of its tablet containing a bilingual version¹³⁹³ in interlinear format of *Incantation to Utu*, which as seen above is a composition preserved in copies from the Old Babylonian period up to the first millennium.¹³⁹⁴ The tablet originally had several columns, as the remainder of a vertical ruling at the left-hand edge of the reverse¹ indicates. The obverse¹ contains a series of epithets addressed to Šamaš in the second person, whereas the reverse lists the viziers of the god.

KUB 4 11 is a further example of a tablet written in Hittite NS that displays the influence of a Babylonian model because the sign ŠA shows both the Hittite and the Babylonian shape. Additionally, the sign LI is written with both the old and the late Hittite variants.¹³⁹⁵

KUB 4 11 is the sole preserved bilingual source of *Incantation to Utu* which in Mesopotamia is known from monolingual manuscripts only. The Ḫattuša tablet presents many variants compared to the other sources. However, a high degree of variation is also attested among the Mesopotamian manuscripts.¹³⁹⁶ None of the lines on the obverse¹ exactly duplicates the text preserved in the other tablets whereas the reverse¹ reports lines 79-86 even though a few variants are documented.¹³⁹⁷ The text inscribed on KUB 4 11 reflects therefore a MB recension composed by the Kassite scribes who also added the Akkadian translation. The Sumerian version does not contain phonetic writings, a fact that locates KUB 4 11 closer to the textual tradition represented by the OB manuscript CBS 563 (A) and the possible MB tablet CBS 1686 + CBS 1533 (F). The Akkadian version shows Babylonian forms.¹³⁹⁸ The list of the viziers of Šamaš is also quoted in the MB tablet HS 1512.¹³⁹⁹

As already noted for several texts and in particular for *Incantation to Utu*, compositions centered on the Sun-god originate in Northern Babylonia and are usually unknown in the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. The mix of older and later sign forms and the possible influence of *Incantation to Utu* on the *Prayers to the Sun-God* (CTH 372-374),¹⁴⁰⁰ which are preserved on MS tablets,¹⁴⁰¹ suggest that this composition was received by Hittites before the 13th century, perhaps during the Middle Hittite period.¹⁴⁰²

1391 Phonetic Sumerian texts written by Hittite scribes are usually limited to the unorthographic versions of standard orthography compositions.

1392 Against the copy, obverse and reverse must be exchanged.

1393 Schwemer 2007: 'bilingual abgefaßten Variantenduplikat'.

1394 For this composition see § 1.1.10.2.

1395 Schwemer 2007, Klinger 2010, 329, cf. § 5.3.5.

1396 Some manuscripts contain a shorter version whereas others are written in phonetic writing.

1397 Klinger 2010, 330.

1398 Note the Babylonian form *te-ne₂-še-ti*, 'people' (Obv¹ 3).

1399 See § 1.1.10.3.

1400 Alaura, Bonechi 2012, 54-55.

1401 See Schwemer *forthcoming*.

1402 Klinger 2010, 329.

5.3.9 KUB 4 24

KUB 4 24 is a fragment from the lower left corner of its tablet preserving fifteen lines on the obverse and twelve on the reverse; it contains a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian incantations. The only preserved Sumerian incantation, Rev. 8-12, turned out to be a forerunner of *Udug-ḫul* Tablet II (UH II: 24-30). The text is in monolingual Sumerian:

8	en ₂ -e ₂ ¹ -nu-ru maš-maš nu-u[n-gal-e-ne a ₂ -ḡal ₂ a-nu-un-na-ke ₄ -e-ne] <i>Incantation. The exorcist of the Igigi, the support of the Anunna (is he).</i>
9	^d asar-lu ₂ -ḫi ušum-gal an-k[i-bi-da-ke ₄] <i>Asalluḫi, dragon of heaven and earth,</i>
10	[tu ₆]-a-ga-a-ni li-u[ḫ ² -a ti-la] <i>through whose spoken incantation a dead man can turn back to life.</i>
11	[^d asar(?)-nu]n-na dumu-saḡ [ab-zu-ki ...] <i>Asalluḫi, foremost son of the Abzu ...</i>
12	[.....] x nu x[.....]

This manuscript is relevant because Tablet II of the series *Udug-ḫul* is poorly known before the first millennium.¹⁴⁰³ It is worth noting that KUB 4 24 together with KBo 14 51 are the only monolingual texts from the Hittite capital containing identified forerunners of first-millennium incantation series.¹⁴⁰⁴ The others are bilingual.

KUB 4 24 shows several differences from the canonical recension. It presents the full rubric en₂-e₂¹-nu-ru contrary to the abbreviated form of late duplicates. The beginning of the incantation in the canonical recension, which contains a three-line introduction in Akkadian followed by two Sumerian lines, is omitted in KUB 4 24. Further omission in KUB 4 24 are lines UH II: 26, 28-29. KUB 4 24 contains a substantially abbreviated text. A few phonetic writings are attested: nu-u[n] ~ nun, [tu₆]-a-ga-a-ni ~ tu₆-du₁₁-ga-a-ni, li-u[ḫ²-a] ~ lu₂-ug₇-a. A further peculiarity is the rarely attested writing ušum-gal (BUR₂.GAL) for ušumgal (GAL.BUR₂).¹⁴⁰⁵

Sign shapes suggest that KUB 4 24 is a late copy of an older manuscript: the tablet presents the old form¹⁴⁰⁶ of LI¹⁴⁰⁷ and the late shape of AG¹⁴⁰⁸ and IG.¹⁴⁰⁹

5.3.10 KUB 37 111

KUB 37 111 is a large fragment from a two-column tablet discovered in Building D. The obverse preserves part of the right column and a few signs on the left column. Only the right column is preserved on the reverse. The tablet contains Sumerian incantations of the *Udug-ḫul* type in interlinear bilingual format.¹⁴¹⁰ The obverse comprises the introductory theme of a prophylactic incantation¹⁴¹¹

1403 Geller 1985, 3.

1404 See § 8.2.

1405 MesZL, 362 No. 553.

1406 Old and late sign shapes are here referred to the Hittite script.

1407 Obv. 9, Rev. 10.

1408 Rev. 4.

1409 Rev. 9.

1410 Occasionally Sumerian and Akkadian are written on the same line set off by a *Glossenkeil*.

1411 For this typology see fn. 1178.

while the reverse preserves the end of the main theme of another prophylactic incantation with an elaborated *zi-pa₃* formula.¹⁴¹² The text of KUB 37 111 is not duplicated in either the OB or the canonical recension of the series *Udug-ḥul* but it presents some similarities with Tablet IV.¹⁴¹³

Obv. Right Col.¹⁴¹⁴

1	[.....] x ṣa' x (x) [.....]
2	[.....]-ta
3	[lu ₂] 'zi te-le' ḥe ₂ -me-en
4	[lu-u ₂] 'ZI-šú' i _q -tu ₃ -ma ¹⁴¹⁵ i-na šu-u-mi i-mu-[tu ₃ at-ta] <i>Whether you are a man who perished and died in thirst,</i>
5	[lu ₂ zi-i]g-'pa' pa _x (GAM)-ta izi [š]ub-ba ḥe ₂ -me-en
6	lu-u ₂ ta ₂ -mu-u ša i-na i-ša-ti na-ad-u at-[ta] <i>or whether you are an accursed man who is thrown into the fire,</i>
7	lu ₂ zi-ig-pa pa _x (GAM)-ta ḥu-u-la-a ¹⁴¹⁶ ḥe ₂ -me-en
8	lu-u ₂ ša ma-mi ₃ -ti iṭ-bu-ma i-mu-tu at-ta <i>or whether you are a man who drowned because of a broken oath¹⁴¹⁷ and died,</i>
9	lu ₂ i ₇ -ti bi-id-ta ḥe ₂ -me-en : lu-u ₂ ša ID ₂ iṭ-bu-u [at-ta] <i>or whether you are a man who drowned in the river,</i>
10	lu ₂ ma ₂ -a ba-su ₂ -šú-ud-ta ba-uš ₂ ḥe ₂ -me-en
11	lu-u ₂ ša i-na Ĝ[IS.MA ₂] iṭ-bu-u i-mu-tu at-ta <i>or whether you are a man who drowned with his boat and died,</i>
UHF 325	'lu ₂ ḡeš ₂ ma ₂ -ni i ₃ -su ₃ '-a ḥe-me-en <i>whether you are the one whose ship sank</i>
UH IV 144	lu ₂ ḡeš ₂ ma ₂ a-su ₃ -ga ḥe-me-en <i>lu-u₂ ša₂ ina e-lip-pi ina me-e iṭ-bu-u at-ta.</i>
12	lu ₂ ma ₂ -a ab-ba-ke ₄ ' ab'-ba'-a ¹⁴¹⁸ u ₂ -za-ag-ga ḥe ₂ -me-en
13	lu-u ₂ ša i-na ĜEŠ.MA ₂ qe-reb A.AB.BA iṭ-bu-u [at-ta] <i>or whether you are a man who drowned in a boat in the midst of the sea and died,</i>
14	lu ₂ ad-da nu-tuku-'a' ḥe ₂ -me-en : lu-u ₂ ša a-ba la'-a i-šu[-u at-ta] <i>or whether you are a man with no father,</i>

1412 Cooper 1971, 11, for this formula see Falkenstein 1931, 34-35.

1413 See UH IV: 118 ff. = UHF 298 ff.

1414 The left column only preserves five broken lines ending with *at-ta*; this indicates that the left column contained the same theme as the right column.

1415 Y. Cohen's insight.

1416 ḥu-u-la-a seems to be a phonetic writing for ḥul, but its relationship with the Akkadian *mātu* is unclear.

1417 For saḡ-ba = *māmītu* see Schramm 1997, 3-8.

1418 Cf. CAD T, 153: lu₂ ma₂-a ab-ba ša₃(?) ab-ba-a.

- 15 lu₂ ama nu-tuku-a ħe₂-me-en : lu-u₂ ša AMA NU.TUKU *at-ta*
or *whether you are a man with no mother,*
- 16 [l]u₂ dam nu-tuku-a ħe₂-me-en : lu-u₂ ša DAM-ti NU.TUKU *at-[ta]*
or *whether you are a man with no wife,*
- 17 [lu₂ dumu dumu nu-tuk]u ħe^ˈ-m[e-en :] ħe^ˈ-m[e-en :] lu-u₂ ša DUMU-tu₃? NU.TUK[U *at-ta]*
or *whether you are a man with no children,*

Rev. Right Col.

- 1 [...] ħx^ˈ [.....] ħx^ˈ [.....]
- 2 [l]u₂-še₃ nam-ba-teġ₃-ġe₂₆-de₃ : a-na [.....]
Do not approach the man,
- 3 [na]-an-gub-ba na-an-tu-uš-[t]a-a : la-a [ta-za-az la-a tu-ša-ab]
do not stand, do not sit,
- 4 nam-ba-ku₄-ku₄-NE na[m]-ba^ˈ-ki-ki-ti [...]
5 la-a ta-tu₂-ra la-a [t]a-sa₃-ħu-ra
do not cover (?) him, do not go around

UH VI 74

- na-an-gub-ba na-an-dur₂-r[u] nam-ba-ġi₄-ġi₄-e-de₃ nam-ba-niġen-n[a]
la ta-za-az la tu-š[ab] la t[a-ta]-nu-ra la ta-sa-na-ħur
- 6 IZI diġir-gal-gal-e-ne-ke₄ e^ˈ-ri-pa₂ ħa-[ba-ra-du-un]
7 ni-iš₃ DIĠIR.MEŠ.GAL.ĤI.A ta₂-ma-ta lu-u₂ DU-a[k]
You are adjured by the life of the great gods, so you may go off!

UH IV 116

- zi diġir-gal-la-e-ne-ke₄ i-ri-pa₃ ħa-ba-ra-du-un
niš DIĠIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ u₂-tam-me-ka lu-u ta-at-tal-lak
- 8 zi an^ˈ-na e-ri-ip-pa₂ ħa-ba-ra-an-[du-un]
9 ni-iš₃ ša-me-e ta₂-ma-ta lu-u₂ DU-[ak]
You are adjured by the life of the heavens, so you may go off!
- 10 zi ki-a e-ri-ip-pa₂ ħa-ba-ra-an-[du-un]
11 ni-iš₃ er-še-ta ta₂-ma-ta lu-u₂ DU-[ak]
You are adjured by the life of the earth, so you may go off!
- 12 zi an-na an-ki-a A.NA ME BI KI NUN[?] x [.....]
13 ni-iš₃ DIĠIR-lim ša₂ AN.KI ta₂-ma-ta [x ...]
You are adjured by the life of the heavens and the earth [...]
- 14 [...] ħx (x) x^ˈ za-ag-pa ħe^ˈ-m[e-en :] diġir^ˈ?-diġir-gal-gal-[e-ne (ħe-pa₃)]¹⁴¹⁹
15 [.....] ħx^ˈ ma-mi-ti ša₂ DIĠIR.MEŠ [GAL.MEŠ ta₂-ma-ta]
[.....] *the curse of the gods* [.....]
- 16 [.....] ħx x x^ˈ [.....]

1419 Cf. UH VII: 54.

The OB text of Tablet IV of the series *Udug-ḫul*, which is known from a single manuscript, BM 78185 (H), a tablet probably from Sippar, is very close to the first-millennium recension. KUB 37 111 reflects therefore a different textual tradition that did not become part of the canonical recension.

The Sumerian version has several unorthographic writings that present phonetic alterations,¹⁴²⁰ some of which clearly resulted from copying:

- pa_x(GAM)-ta (Obv. R. Col. 5, 7) is probably a writing for pa₃-da.¹⁴²¹
- bi-id-ta (Obv. R. Col. 9) is unclear but on the basis of the Akkadian *ṭebû* it was probably intended to represent bi-<su₍₃₎-su₍₃₎>id-ta.¹⁴²²
- IZI (Rev. R. Col. 6) instead of zi is probably a mistake due to phonetic similarities between the two signs.
- The Sumerian in Rev. R. Col. 12 is corrupt; even this case is to be regarded as a copying mistake.

Unorthographic writings in KUB 37 111 have no consistent nature and can be mostly attributed to scribal mistakes. Such odd writings are unlikely to have appeared in the Mesopotamian model unless it was corrupt. Mistakes are limited to the Sumerian version whereas the Akkadian translation is correct. This is a further piece of evidence that the errors result from the inadequate understanding of Sumerian by the Hittite scribe. On paleographical grounds this tablet can be defined as an example of mixed ductus because it shows both Hittite and Assyro-Mitannian sign shapes:¹⁴²³ the sign LA occurs both with one initial horizontal wedge¹⁴²⁴ (Rev. 5) and with two (the common NS form); ŠA¹⁴²⁵ is written with the typical Assyro-Mitannian shape¹⁴²⁶ throughout the text.¹⁴²⁷ At the present state of research it is unclear whether the mixed ductus results from Hittite copies of Assyro-Mitannian manuscripts¹⁴²⁸ or from the work of Hittite scribes who mastered different scripts¹⁴²⁹ or whether it is a script developed within the Hittite scribal tradition comprising earlier and later forms.¹⁴³⁰ Taking into consideration that texts from the Mesopotamian tradition, unlike diplomatic texts, were not produced by the Hittite chancellery but were likely copies of foreign tablets, it seems to me more probable that the Hittite scribes were influenced by the script of the models. Moreover, the parallel examples of NS tablets offering Babylonian paleographic features (KUB 4 7 and KUB 4 11) further strengthen this hypothesis.

1420 For a complete list of phonetic writings and alterations see § 4.1.1.1.1.

1421 Cf. CAD M, 190.

1422 The verb su₍₃₎ is written phonetically in the following line.

1423 For an overview of the mixed ductus see Devecchi 2012.

1424 LA/2 in Devecchi's list.

1425 ŠA/3 in Devecchi's list.

1426 See Schwemer 1998, 31, 36.

1427 For these signs see Devecchi 2012, 51-52.

1428 The hypothesis that the mixed ductus resulted from Hittite scribes copying tablets in foreign script was argued by Klinger 2003.

1429 Schwemer 2013, 12. With Klinger 2012, 80 n. 4, I find it unlikely that scribes were able to manage different scripts.

1430 Devecchi 2012.

5.3.11 KBo 1 18

KBo 1 18 is a four-sided prism with a central longitudinal hole.¹⁴³¹ Only the left side of Column I, the right side of Column III and a great part of Column IV are preserved. This prism contains a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian magical texts¹⁴³² including incantations against snakes, *ši-pa-at ša MUŠ* [...] (Col. I, 21), and scorpions (Col. IV, 14-20).¹⁴³³ According to the Akkadian subscript, *šipat zubbi*,¹⁴³⁴ Col. IV, 9-13 might be a rare example of a Sumerian incantation¹⁴³⁵ against flies which, to my knowledge, are known from Akkadian sources only.¹⁴³⁶ This incantation quotes Asalluḫi and Ea, ⁴BAḪAR'₂ (Col. IV, 12), who is also attested in the two following incantations (Col. IV, 19, 22).

The catch-line reads LUGAL ŠU₂ = *šar kiššati*,¹⁴³⁷ 'king of the universe', which may refer to the legends of the kings of Akkad which are known at Ḫattuša in Akkadian and Hittite versions.¹⁴³⁸ Unfortunately, the relation between this collection of incantations and the Sargonic tales is unclear. The colophon reports the date ITI *ša re-ši*.¹⁴³⁹

The tablet is written in NS¹⁴⁴⁰ but with a mixture of old and late sign shapes.¹⁴⁴¹ The sign LI is consistently written with the old form;¹⁴⁴² IG and GI also have archaic shapes but they are only attested once.¹⁴⁴³ Conversely, AG and ḪA show late forms¹⁴⁴⁴ typical of the second half of the 13th century. These features suggest that KBo 1 18 is a late copy of an older manuscript. Based on the tablet format, KBo 1.18 was perhaps used in schooling like the other prisms containing Sumerian texts.¹⁴⁴⁵

5.3.12 KUB 4 23

KUB 4 23 is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving ten lines on one side whereas the other side is broken away. The tablet originally contained a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian incantations¹⁴⁴⁶ set off by rulings. Lines 7-10 include the remainder of a bilingual incantation in interlinear format: niĝ₂-ḫul-ak-ka₃-zu nu-me-a, 'your evil witchcraft will disappear' (l. 7).

Signs LI (l. 3) and AK (ll. 6, 7) show old shapes that may date to the 14th century.

1431 Schwemer 2013, 154.

1432 Some are possibly Sumerian-Akkadian mixed texts. The Sumerian incantations seem to be Col. I, 11-18 (note the Akkadian subscript *ši-pa-at u₂-ul-i-ia-a*, l. 16), Col. I, 19-21, Col. I, 22-24, Col. I, 25-28, the entire Col. III, Col. IV, 9-13.

1433 Cf. CAD Q, 137.

1434 CAD Z, 154-155.

1435 For the Sumerian nature of this text see the verbal form im-ma-ta-e₃.

1436 YOS 11 5-6, see Cunningham 1997, 105-106 cf. 154. YBC 4616 = YOS 11 5 is an example of *Sammel tafeln* from the OB period containing Sumerian and Akkadian incantations against scorpions and flies.

1437 Schwemer 2013, 154.

1438 Westenholz 1997, 280-293.

1439 Schwemer 2013, 154. I thank Prof. Daniel Schwemer for drawing my attention to this point.

1440 See Schwemer 2013, 154.

1441 Old and late sign shapes are here referred to the Hittite script.

1442 KBo 1 18 I, 5, 7, 8, 9, IV, 3, 7.

1443 IG: KBo 1 18 Col. IV, 16; GI: KBo 1 18 Col. IV, 14.

1444 AG: KBo 1 18 Col. III, 23; ḪA: KBo 1 18 Col. IV, 24.

1445 See § 5.3.4 and fn. 1332.

1446 Cooper 1971, 4 n. 16, 11.

5.3.13 KUB 34 4

KUB 34 4 is a fragment from the central part of its tablet discovered in Building A preserving ten broken lines on the obverse, whereas the reverse is broken away. The fragment probably contains the ritual theme of a bilingual Marduk-Ea incantation:¹⁴⁴⁷ [ḏasa]l-lu₂-ḫi u-mi-ni-in-šu₂: x [...] // ša ḏmarduk (ll. 6-7). The Akkadian translation is set off from the Sumerian text by *Glossenkeile*. This recension displays the coexistence of late and conservative tendencies as shown by the presence of both u- and u₃- as prefixes of preformative forms.¹⁴⁴⁸ The shapes of the signs LU₂ (ll. 2, 6) and ŠA (ll. 1, 7) indicate that the tablet was written by a Hittite scribe during the 13th century.

5.3.14 KBo 36 20

KBo 36 20 is a tiny fragment preserving six broken lines from a possible Sumerian incantation:¹⁴⁴⁹ in line 3 Asalluḫi, [ḏasa]r-lu₂-ḫi, is quoted. The script of the fragment cannot be classified with certainty as too few signs are preserved, but its discovery in the Haus am Hang makes it probable that this fragment was written by a Hittite scribe.¹⁴⁵⁰ This is the only Sumerian incantation found in an archaeological layer surely associated with the Haus am Hang;¹⁴⁵¹ thus its presence there indicates that this text type was copied within the building.

5.3.15 ABoT 1 43

Two fragments, A and B, originally part of a multicolumn tablet, are published as **ABoT 1 43**. Only traces of the Sumerian text are preserved but an Akkadian translation was possibly arranged in a parallel column. The fragment B quotes ḏnin-maḫ (B, 1) and Asalluḫi, [ḏas]ar-¹lu₂-ḫi zi nam-ti₃-la (B, 4). The shapes of the signs TI and LA (B, 4) suggest that the tablet was written by a Hittite scribe.

5.3.16 KBo 36 17

KBo 36 17 is a tiny fragment from the central part of its tablet discovered in Temple I which preserves seven lines of a bilingual text in interlinear format on one side whereas the other side is broken away. The text seems to be an incantation.¹⁴⁵²

5.3.17 KBo 19 98

KBo 19 98 is a six-sided prism discovered in Temple I and inscribed with the *Cuthean Legend of Naram-Sîn*.¹⁴⁵³ The tablet is written in MS and was possibly drafted by Ḫanikkuili,¹⁴⁵⁴ the scribe of the prism KBo 19 99,¹⁴⁵⁵ which probably contains a further Naram-Sîn text.¹⁴⁵⁶ Ḫanikkuili the son

¹⁴⁴⁷ For the ritual section of Marduk-Ea incantations see Falkenstein 1931, 58-62.

¹⁴⁴⁸ L. 3: u-me-ni-in-e; l. 4: u-me-ni-in-e; l. 5: u₃-me-ni-in-e.

¹⁴⁴⁹ Probably there is no room for an Akkadian column because this fragment seems to be from the right edge of the tablet.

¹⁴⁵⁰ On the tablets stemming from the Haus am Hang, see. § 8.5.

¹⁴⁵¹ Note that KBo 13 37 comes from a post-Hittite layer, see § 5.1.4.

¹⁴⁵² Schwemer 1998, 6 n. 27.

¹⁴⁵³ Westenholz 1997, 280-293.

¹⁴⁵⁴ For this scribe see Gordin 2013, 67-69.

¹⁴⁵⁵ For the identification of the scribe see Rüster, Wilhelm 2012, 70.

¹⁴⁵⁶ See the remarks in Beckman 1983, 102 n. 26.

of Anu-šar-ilāni, a Mesopotamian scribe working at the Hittite court, is also the author of several *Landschenkungsurkunden* dated to the time of the king Ḫantili II. Hence, the Naram-Sîn prisms can be dated to the middle of the 15th century.¹⁴⁵⁷ Side A of KBo 19 98 preserves eleven fragmentary lines inscribed with a bilingual text in interlinear format,¹⁴⁵⁸ but its relationship to the Naram-Sîn legend inscribed on the rest of the prism is unclear. As the *Cuthean Legend of Naram-Sîn* is only known from Akkadian sources, it is not excluded that Side A contained a different text, but too little is preserved for this composition to be identified. The most interesting aspect of this tablet is the attestation of a bilingual text in the Middle Hittite period. The Akkadian text on the rest of the prism presents orthographic conventions common in Northern Babylonia.¹⁴⁵⁹

5.3.18 KBo 36 24

KBo 36 24 is a fragment of unclear provenance¹⁴⁶⁰ preserving six lines of a Sumerian text. A parallel column, possibly containing an Akkadian translation, was arranged to the right of the preserved lines as is clear from the traces of a vertical ruling. The script seems to be Hittite on the basis of the sign IL.¹⁴⁶¹

5.3.19 KUB 4 10

KUB 4 10 is a tiny fragment of unknown find-spot preserving a few signs on one side; the other side is broken away. The tablet originally contained a bilingual text in parallel column format.¹⁴⁶² Based on the manner of incision and the sign shapes, I would tend to regard the script as NS, with the caveat only a few signs are preserved.

5.4 Unplaceable Fragments

The following fragments cannot be attributed on paleographical grounds to any of the aforementioned scripts.

CTH	Publication	Composition	Find-spot	Script	Language
795	KUB 37 41	Dumuzi Composition (?)	Bk. A	(?)	SA
813	KUB 37 92	Collection of Incantations	Bk. A	(?)	S
819	KBo 36 14	Incantation	Bk. D	(?)	S
819	KBo 36 18	Unidentified Text	Bk. A	(?)	SA

5.4.1 KUB 37 41

KUB 37 41 is a fragment from a multicolumn tablet discovered in Building A. The signs exhibit non-Hittite shapes, but they cannot be confidently assigned to a specific script. The tablet preserves ten lines on one side whereas the other side is broken away. It may be suggested that the text, which is arranged in an interlinear bilingual format, is a Dumuzi composition. No Sumerian word can be read with certainty, but phonetic writings seem to be attested and it is not precluded that the text was entirely written in phonetic orthography.

¹⁴⁵⁷ van den Hout 2009, 82, see also Beckman 1983, 102-106, Westenholz 1997, 281.

¹⁴⁵⁸ Westenholz 1997, 284-285.

¹⁴⁵⁹ Westenholz 1997, 282.

¹⁴⁶⁰ According to S. Košak's Konkordanz the fragment was found in the lower city.

¹⁴⁶¹ See HZL No. 117.

¹⁴⁶² See [...]a-ni-ta (Col. I, 2) and i-n[a] (Col. II, 3-4).

1	[.....] x me-na [...]
2	[.....] x <i>hal-pa(-)at</i> -[...]
3	[.....] x(-)ub(-)nu-u ₂ x [...]
4	[.....] x a-ma-TU/še-ku [...]
5	[.....] x mu-un-na-[...]
6	[i-n]a su-pu-ri x [...]
7	i-na <i>te-eh-ḫi-šu</i> [...]
8	a-ma-ze ₂ -er-ra e ² -[...]
9	su ₂ -pur ^d dumu-zi
10	x x ḫe ₂ -en-s[i ² ...]

A possible parallel to the lines above can be found in the closing lines of the love song *Dumuzi-Inana R (D-I R)*. The composition is known from three OB tablets from Nippur, UM 55-21-309 (A), CBS 6898 = STVC 134 (B) and CBS 8534 Rev. (C):¹⁴⁶³

A	26	^{u2} rib-ba ki-ḫalba ₂ -še ₃ ga-ḡu ₁₀ <ga-ga-mu> di-di du ₅ -mu-u ₅ -zu
C	13	^{u2} rib-ba ki-ḫal-bi-še ₃ ga-ḡu ₁₀ un-di-di-x <i>Oh that I might know the way to the meadow, the freezing place, (to) my milk <my cream>!</i>
A	27	amaš-ku ₃ -ga amaš-mu-ti-in-na-ma ₃ -še ₃ di-di du ₅ -mu-u ₅ -zu
C	15	amaš-ku ₃ -ge amaš-mu-ud-na-ma ₃ -[...] <i>Oh that I might know the way to the pure sheepfold, my bridegroom's sheepfold!</i>
A	28	amaš-ku ₃ -ge amaš- ^d dumu- ^r zi-ma ₃ -še ₃ di-di du ₅ -mu ^r -u ₅ -zu
C	16	amaš-ku ₃ -ge amaš- ^d du[mu-zi] / di-[...] <i>Oh that I might know the way to the pure sheepfold, my Dumuzi's sheepfold!</i>

2. *ḫal-pa* from *ḫalpû*, ‘frost, freezing’, translates the Sumerian ki-ḫalba₂/ḫal-bi of line 26; *-at*-[...] perhaps belongs to the same word in the form *ḫalpātānû*, probably related to *ḫalpû*, otherwise known only from Ḫattuša in the medical text KUB 37 2.¹⁴⁶⁴

4-7. The sign after *-ma-* in line 4 is clearly TU but if one may read *-še(!)-ku-* this could be a phonetic writing for amaš-ku₃. However, this reading is problematic because we have to assume that the Ḫattuša fragment adds a segment before a-ma-še-ku-[...] unattested in the OB text. On the other hand, the presence of amaš in line 4 is assured by the Akkadian translation *ina supûri*. In line 5, mu-un-na-[...] is either a verbal form (not attested in the OB manuscripts) or a phonetic writing for mu-ud-na (cf. C 15). In line 7 *ina teḫḫišu* can be translated as ‘in its proximity’, likely referring to the sheepfold in the preceding line.

8-9. a-ma-ze₂-er-ra could be a phonetic writing for amaš ‘sheepfold’.¹⁴⁶⁵ It seems that the beginning of line A 28 is omitted in the Ḫattuša manuscript.

10. This line has no parallel in the OB recension.

¹⁴⁶³ ETCSL 4.8.18; for this composition see Sefati 1998, 236-246.

¹⁴⁶⁴ See AhW, 313.

¹⁴⁶⁵ Cf. CAD S, 397.

Unfortunately, because KUB 37 41 is too badly preserved one cannot conclusively state whether this fragment contains a bilingual version of *D-I R*. Moreover, it is not fully clear whether the text was entirely written in unorthographic Sumerian, or whether phonetic writings are an idiosyncrasy perhaps due to the scribe. No unorthographic versions of *D-I R* are known but other Dumuzi texts written in phonetic orthography are attested in the Old Babylonian period.

It is worth noting that this is one of the merely two Sumerian literary texts in interlinear bilingual format from the Hittite capital.¹⁴⁶⁶ Moreover KUB 37 41 can be identified as the only source of a composition partially written in Emesal dialect¹⁴⁶⁷ that appears in the Syro-Anatolian documentation.

As demonstrated, there are sufficient grounds to consider KUB 37 41 as belonging to the Dumuzi-Inana corpus. However, presently, due to the fragmentary nature of the text, it cannot be assigned with all confidence to *D-I R*. This fragment is even more important because, with the exception of an unpublished MB extract tablet,¹⁴⁶⁸ it is the only attestation of a Dumuzi text in the Late Bronze Age. In addition, no composition related to Dumuzi has been found in a first-millennium library so far. The corpus of Dumuzi-Inana texts belongs to the body of hymnic liturgies that served cultic functions and were not part of the curriculum.¹⁴⁶⁹ The vast majority of sources for Dumuzi-Inana hymns stem from Nippur, and it is likely that they were associated with the Nippur tradition; however, the fragment KUB 37 41 cannot be confidently assigned to a specific tradition.

5.4.2 KUB 37 92

KUB 37 92 is a fragment from the central part of its tablet discovered in Building A which preserves a few lines on one side only. The tablet contained a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian incantations. Lines 4-7 are inscribed with an Akkadian incantation¹⁴⁷⁰ but the preceding lines probably contained a Sumerian text: $\text{he}_2\text{-si}[\text{kil}^?]$ (l. 2).¹⁴⁷¹ Because there seems to be no place for an Akkadian translation the text was probably monolingual. According to S. Kořak's Konkordanz this fragment does not show a Hittite ductus.

5.4.3 KBo 36 14

The fragment **KBo 36 14** only preserves four signs on two lines, [...]-e₃-de₃ // [...]-e₃-de₃, which may refer to an incantation.

5.4.4 KBo 36 18

KBo 36 18 is a fragment discovered in Building A preserving five lines of a bilingual text in interlinear format on one side; the other side is broken away. On line 5 the Akkadian text is set off from the Sumerian version by a *Glossenkeil*. The surface of the fragment is badly preserved, but the sign shapes show quite clearly that the tablet was not written in Hittite ductus even though there is no clear clue leading to an attribution. However, the sign forms and the manner of incision remind me of the Assyro-Mitannian tablets.

¹⁴⁶⁶ The only other literary text in bilingual format is the unidentified composition inscribed on KBo 19 98 (§ 5.3.17).

¹⁴⁶⁷ On the Emesal of the Dumuzi texts see Sefati 1998, 53-55.

¹⁴⁶⁸ See § 1.1.8.18.

¹⁴⁶⁹ Tinney 2011, 585.

¹⁴⁷⁰ Note the full rubric [en₂-e]₂-nu-ru.

¹⁴⁷¹ See l. 3 [...]-gi-NE x[...].

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

6 Sumerian Literary and Magical Texts from Emar

Texts from Emar will be presented according to their scribal tradition, Syrian and Syro-Hittite. Texts with duplicates from Emar and Ugarit will be treated in the present chapter as the Emar sources are usually better preserved.

6.1 Syrian School Texts

The only known Sumerian literary text written in Syrian school style is E 775, *A Prayer for a King*. The rest of the Syrian school documentation consists of lexical lists, omnia and incantations.¹⁴⁷²

6.1.1 A Prayer for a King – E 775 - RS 79.25

The composition *A Prayer for a King* (*PfK*) is a prayer to the god Enlil on behalf of an unnamed king. This text is unknown from the Old Babylonian literature and is only attested in a bilingual recension preserved on two tablets from Emar and Ugarit.

E 775 is a single-column tablet from Emar containing a bilingual version of the text in interlinear format. **RS 79.25** is the left edge of a tablet discovered at Ugarit in Maison A containing the phonetic Sumerian version of the text.¹⁴⁷³ A parallel column likely containing the Akkadian translation was arranged to the right of the Sumerian version as shown by double vertical rulings on line 11 of the obverse.¹⁴⁷⁴ An additional Akkadian version is attested at Ugarit on a small fragment, **RS 79.25C**,¹⁴⁷⁵ which, according to Arnaud,¹⁴⁷⁶ does not belong to the same tablet as RS 79.25 on the basis of clay and sign shapes. According to the hand-copy, which shows the margin of the tablet to the left of the phonetic Sumerian column, RS 79.25 did not contain a version in standard orthography; such a version was probably inscribed on a different tablet as attested for other Sumerian texts from Ugarit.

The Emar manuscript is a beautiful tablet entirely preserved¹⁴⁷⁷ and drafted, according to the colophon, by the scribe Tuku-^dE₂-ḫur-saĝ, priest of the god Dagan.¹⁴⁷⁸ This name is otherwise unknown at Emar and in the Mesopotamian onomasticon. Recently Rutz proposed the reading Raši-ili, <title of> Eḫursaĝ, shrine of Dagan.¹⁴⁷⁹ Whatever the correct reading is, the association with Dagan, the principal deity of the Middle Euphrates region, makes it clear that the scribe was Syrian.

The tablet is dated to the month of *Urda*.¹⁴⁸⁰ This is possible evidence for an early date because at Emar only the oldest texts contain a dating formula. Indeed, most of the dated ephemeral documents go back to the first dynasty while only seven dated tablets date to the second dynasty and

1472 Lexical lists: *Urra* I, *Urra* III-V_a, SAG-tablet; omnia: sipa compendium, KAK.TI compendium; *manna lušpur* incantation. Note that the Syrian recension of *Urra* is in monolingual Sumerian, Cohen 2009, 132-135.

1473 This tablet was drafted by a local scribe as shown by the shape of TI and LI (*passim*).

1474 Dietrich 1998, 156.

1475 Arnaud 1982a, 213.

1476 Arnaud 1982a, 209.

1477 Photo available in Arnaud 1985-1987.

1478 Cohen 2009, 135-136.

1479 Rutz 2013, 296-298.

1480 For this god see Fleming 2000, 28-29.

mostly to the first kings.¹⁴⁸¹ Consequently, this tablet may be dated to a period between the second half of the 14th century and the first half of the 13th. The tablet was probably a library copy, as no other duplicates are known from Emar.

Most of the Ugarit scholarly texts date to the last fifty years before the destruction of the city (second half of the 13th century),¹⁴⁸² but some tablets may be earlier and have been preserved as library copies. Tablets discovered in Maison A are from a secondary context going back to a phase earlier than the building itself. If this group of tablets is actually older than the rest of the scholarly texts discovered at Ugarit, the Emar and Ugarit sources of *PfK* might be contemporary.¹⁴⁸³

PfK is a royal hymn containing a prayer asking the gods to bestow blessings and gifts on the king, who is addressed in the second person as is typical in the Sumerian royal hymns. M. Dietrich's study¹⁴⁸⁴ dedicated to this composition will be the starting point for the present analysis. According to Dietrich,¹⁴⁸⁵ the Ugarit text is based on the Emar model, and some passages were expanded as a result of adaptation to the local cultural and theological milieu. Dietrich evidenced the text's reliance on the Mesopotamian tradition but also suggested connections with Ugaritic and biblical literature. In addition to the Sumero-Akkadian bilingual format,¹⁴⁸⁶ links to Mesopotamian literature include the deities mentioned in the text, the list of divine gifts and the role of the king as conqueror of his enemies and as defender of his land. These elements can be found in the royal inscriptions and royal hymns of the second and first millennium.¹⁴⁸⁷ Dietrich pointed out that contrary to the Mesopotamian tradition, where kings are blessed with both material (weapons, scepter, throne etc.) and immaterial gifts, only abstract gifts are attested in *PfK*. The single material gift is a weapon given by Nergal in a line that is only preserved in the Emar text (*PfK* 13). Western Semitic elements in *PfK* include the encomiastic incipit wishing life upon the king, expressed by the formula *ti-la lugal-mu / buluṭ bēlī*, 'Live!, my king',¹⁴⁸⁸ and the divine granting of life to the king, which follows a *topos* known from the Ugaritic epic texts.¹⁴⁸⁹ The list of divine gifts is unknown in the Ugaritic literature, but some biblical passages on the enthronement of kings describe abstract gifts similar to those attested in *PfK*,¹⁴⁹⁰ such as wisdom, integrity and a long-lasting and prosperous reign.¹⁴⁹¹

Dietrich regards *PfK* as a *Krönungshymnus* that may have been sung during the enthronement of the king at Emar and Ugarit.¹⁴⁹² This hypothesis is based on the connection between the Sumerian royal praise poems and enthronement.¹⁴⁹³ According to Dietrich *PfK* is thus a literary work that originated in Mesopotamia but was adapted to Syrian culture.¹⁴⁹⁴ On the assumption that the diffusion of the Mesopotamian texts followed an east-west route, Dietrich also states that the Ugarit text depends on an Emar source and identifies that city as the place where the composition was reworked.¹⁴⁹⁵

1481 Fleming 2000, 198-204.

1482 van Soldt 1995, 174.

1483 For the chronology of the Ugarit tablets see § 9.4.

1484 Dietrich 1998; lineation follows Dietrich's edition.

1485 Dietrich 1998, 170, 195.

1486 Dietrich 1998., 171.

1487 Dietrich 1998, 171-181.

1488 Dietrich 1998, 181-184.

1489 Dietrich 1998, 185-189.

1490 Dietrich 1998, 195.

1491 Dietrich 1998, 190-194.

1492 Dietrich 1998, 196.

1493 Dietrich 1998, 174, 179.

1494 Dietrich 1998, 197.

1495 Dietrich 1998, 195.

The textual analysis presented here will show that *PfK* relies entirely on the Mesopotamian tradition.

The postulated function of *PfK* as an enthronement hymn is in contrast with its presumed reworking at Emar. The social and political structures of Emar and Ugarit were so far removed from one another that it is inconceivable that the same literary composition was used in the enthronement of the king in both cities. The Emarite kingship was defined by Fleming¹⁴⁹⁶ as a *Limited Kingship* as its authority was restricted by collective powers, such as the Elders, typical of the entire Middle Euphrates region. These features render Emar's society and political framework completely different, even from an economic point of view, from the palatial and centralized structures of Ugarit.¹⁴⁹⁷

The local religious and cultic traditions of Emar are encoded in several Akkadian rituals that display, on the one hand, the importance of the god Dagan, and on the other hand the limited role of the king in religious ceremonies.¹⁴⁹⁸ The creation of a royal hymn with a cultic function similar to the Sumerian praise poems¹⁴⁹⁹ seems unlikely in a society in which the king had a limited religious role. Moreover, Dietrich has only evidenced connections between *PfK* and Ugaritic and biblical literature but not with the local cultural setting of Emar that is expressed in the ritual texts, even on the linguistic level.¹⁵⁰⁰ The social and cultural milieu that yielded this composition is therefore removed from that of the city of Emar. Even though an effective use of *PfK* during enthronement ceremonies at Ugarit is to be dismissed, the ideology behind this composition would better fits the Ugaritic court.¹⁵⁰¹

Contrary to Dietrich's claim, the elements assumed to be typical of Western Semitic culture can be traced in the Mesopotamian literature, remarkably the introductory petition for the life of the king:¹⁵⁰²

PfK	1	E	til ₃ -la lugal-ĝu ₁₀ u ₄ -gid ₂ -da ħe ₂ -am
		U	bu-luṭ be-li U ₄ .MEŠ-ka ₃ li-ri-ku
			ti-il-la lu-ga-la-g[u]

This incipit appears in NBC 5452, an unpublished tablet containing the hymn *Sîn-iddinam D*,¹⁵⁰³ which consists of four prayers beginning with til₃¹-la lugal-ĝu₁₀.¹⁵⁰⁴ Three of these prayers end with the formula ^d*sin-i-din-nam* lugal-ĝu₁₀.¹⁵⁰⁵ The rubric RN lugal-ĝu₁₀ is documented in the royal hymns of Rīm-Sîn, Ḫammu-rābi and Samsu-ilūna¹⁵⁰⁶ and according to van Dijk¹⁵⁰⁷ it might indicate a distinctive literary genre tied to the cult. It is worth noting that only a single manuscript containing this rubric is known from Nippur.¹⁵⁰⁸ As NBC 5452 is unpublished, the relation, if any, between *Sîn-iddinam D* and *PfK* cannot be ascertained.

1496 Fleming 1992.

1497 For an overview on the social and economic structures at Emar and on the Middle Euphrates as opposed to those from the Levant, see Viano 2010; on Ugarit see Liverani 1974.

1498 See Fleming 1996, Beckman 2008, 13.

1499 RIA 4, 543.

1500 Seminara 1998, 24-25.

1501 The Ugaritic kingship was related to the epic and ritual texts in Ugaritic, Liverani 1974, 338-341, Del Olmo Lete 2008; for the divinization of the king see 121-132; the local gods who appear in these texts were the only ones to be worshipped at Ugarit, Kämmerer 1998, 64-66; for the religious role of the king at Ugarit see Wyatt 2007.

1502 Cf. Hallo 1992, 86.

1503 Hallo 1967, 96 (*Sîn-iddinam C!*), cf. Brisch 2007, 47, 265.

1504 This incipit is possibly attested in N 1316 (ETCSL 2.99a), a tablet containing a hymn to an anonymous king which on the basis of the expression nam-lugal-u₄-sud-ra₂ bala ħe₂-ĝal₂-la zi¹] x x x seems to contain a petition for a long-lasting reign (Sjöberg 1982, 75-76); the first line could be restored as [til₃]-la lugal-ĝu₁₀ ĝeš-gu-za [...], see Sjöberg 1982, 75 n. 8.

1505 One prayer ends ^d*sin-i-din-nam* lugal nam-nam-ma [an]¹-ra <diri-ga>, Hallo 1967, 96.

1506 ETCSL 2.6.9.3, 2.6.9.4, 2.6.9.5, 2.6.9.6, 2.6.9.7, 2.8.2.2, 2.8.3.2, 2.8.3.3, 2.8.3.5.

1507 van Dijk 1966, 63.

1508 3N-T 230 + 3N-T 236 = *Samsu-ilūna E* (ETCSL 2.8.3.5), see Brisch 2007, 47.

The expression *ti-la lugal-ĝu₁₀* is not limited to this text but is also attested in *Hymn to Marduk for a King* (HM),¹⁵⁰⁹ a praise poem on behalf of an anonymous king¹⁵¹⁰ inscribed on OB *Sammeltafel* from Sippar, which, as we will see below, also contain the monolingual recension of *The Ballad of Early Rulers*. Even though in the *Hymn to Marduk for a King* this expression does not occur as the incipit, it is placed at the beginning of the second section of the composition after a dividing ruling found in both manuscripts that preserve the text:¹⁵¹¹

HM 14 *til₃-la lugal-ĝu₁₀ igi an-ne₂ aia-diĝir-re-e-ne-ke₄ sa₆-ga¹⁵¹²*
May the life of my king be pleasant in the eyes of An, father of the gods!

The *Hymn to Marduk for a King* also represents a close parallel to *PfK* even though it does not duplicate any line. Both texts contain the theme of a long life granted to the king:

PfK 1 E *til₃-la lugal-ĝu₁₀ u₄-gid₂-da ħe₂-am*
bu-luṭ be-li UD.MEŠ-ka₃ li-ri-ku
 U *ti-il-la lu-ga-la-g[u]*

2 E *mu-mu-zu ħe₂-mu₂-me-en-na-an-da ħe₂-am₃*
MU.MEŠ-ka li-te-ed-di-ša
 U *u₂-mi-za-aḥ-bi-lu ḥa-a*

*Life, my king! May your days be long,
 may your days be renewed*

HM 4 *nam-til₃-la-zu ħe₂-ri-ib-su₃-dam*
 5 *[ud d]u-ru-še₃ ħe₂-ri-ib-tuku-a*
 6 *ħe₂-til₃-la*

*May he (Marduk) prolong your life,
 may he let you keep it for everlasting days!
 May you live!*

The *Hymn to Marduk for a King* only mentions abstract gifts, which were considered by Dietrich one of the principal connections to biblical literature.¹⁵¹³

HM 3 *nam-til₃-zu ^dmarduk ħe₂-eb₂-be₂*
May Marduk decree life for you!

7 *ħe₂-silim-ma*
 8 *gi₁₆-sa-aš ħe₂-a*
 9 *ĝeš-šub-ba-zu nam-til₃-la ħe₂-a*
 10 *nam-til₃ ša₃ du₁₀-ga ḥa-la-zu ħe₂-a*
May you have peace!

1509 ETCSL 2.8.5.b, Alster, Jeyes 1986, Alster 1990.

1510 It is not precluded that the unnamed king is Abī-ešuh who is the addressee of another hymn inscribed on the same *Sammeltafel*; this praise poem follows the *Hymn to Marduk for a King*, Alster 1990, 1-2.

1511 BM 80091, CBS 1208.

1512 Note that the incipit of the first prayer of *Sîn-iddinam D*, *til₃-la lugal-ĝu₁₀ igi x [...]*, recalls this line of the *Hymn to Marduk for a King*.

1513 An expression similar to the *PfK* incipit is known from the Ur III version of the Sumerian King list: *^dšul-gi lugal-ĝu₁₀ u₄-sud-še₃ ḥa'-ti-il*, 'May Šulgi, my king live a life of long days', Steinkeller 2003, 284.

*May it last forever!
May life be your lot.
May a life of a good heart be your share.*

If the *Hymn to Marduk for a King* was not composed on behalf of a specific king, the absence of the king's name is perhaps a further connection with *PfK*. The theme of bestowing a long life on the king is also contained in *The Letter of Šin-iddinam to Utu* of which a duplicate is attested at Emar:¹⁵¹⁴

SI-Utu	45	u ₃ ĝa ₂ -e ni ₂ -teĝ ₃ -ĝa ₂ -mu-uš nam-ti šum ₂ -mu-na-ab <i>And to me give life because of my reverence!</i>
	46	zi su ₃ -ud ĝal ₂ niĝ ₂ -ba-e-eš ₂ ba-mu-na-ab <i>A long-lasting life bestow upon me as a present.</i> ¹⁵¹⁵

The portrayal of An bestowing life and plenty (*PfK* 17-18), which according to Dietrich reflects the nature of the Ugaritic god El,¹⁵¹⁶ is already known in Mesopotamian literature. In the hymn *Lipit-Ištar C* the god An is addressed as numun i-i, 'the one who makes the seeds sprout'.¹⁵¹⁷ Moreover in the praise poem *Ur-Ninurta E* (*UrN E*) the god An grants the king 'years of plenty':¹⁵¹⁸

UrN E	24	mu ħe ₂ -ĝal ₂ bala u ₄ sud-da
	25	^d ur-< ^d nin-urta>-ra mu-na-an-šum ₂ <i>(An) gave to Ur-Ninurta years of plenty, and a reign of long days</i>

The life-giving power of the water connected to the god An, which according to Dietrich¹⁵¹⁹ reflects the role of El in the Ugaritic theology, is attested in *Rim-Šin C* (*RS C*).¹⁵²⁰ It is worth noting that this composition is one of the RN lugal-ĝu₁₀ hymns. Here An grants rain bringing life and plenty:

PfK 18	U 32	a-ia-i- ^r gu-la-gin ₃
	U 33	du-ga a[n-nu za-e-me-in] <i>Like the water of great rivers may you be in accordance with the orders of An</i>
PfK 19	E	a-na ħe ₂ -ĝal ₂ -la an-ta-ĝal ₂ ga-a-ni-šur-ra-ke ₄ <i>ša-mu-ut ħe₂-gal-li iš-tu ša-me-e li-iz-nu-<un>-ka</i> <i>May a rain of plenty rain over you from the sky.</i>
RS C	23	ubur an sud-aĝ ₂ ĝal ₂ ħu-mu-ra-ab-taka ₄ im-a an-na ħu-mu-ra-ab-šeĝ ₃
	24	mu ma-da u ₄ nam-ħe ₂ an-ša ₃ -ta za ₃ ħu-mu-ra-ab-keše ₂
	25	iti ₆ niĝ ₂ giri ₁₇ -zal ša ₃ ħul ₂ -la u ₄ -zu-še ₃ ħu-mu-ra-ab-ĝar
	26	bala niĝ ₂ du ₁₀ niĝ ₂ -si-su si-a šu-zu-še ₃ ħu-mu-ra-ab-ĝar

1514 § 6.2.4.

1515 Brisch 2007, 45-46.

1516 Dietrich 1998, 159 n. 24, 169, 180-181. Marduk playing the role of Enki as lord of the underground water (*PfK* 7), cited by Dietrich (Dietrich 1998, 159 n. 21) as a further example of the difference between this text and the Mesopotamian tradition, is probably part of the process of Marduk's rising to the head of the pantheon and of the syncretism between Babylon and Eridu accomplished in *Enūma-eliš*.

1517 Römer 1965, 10; for the role of An as creator see Tallqvist 1938, 254.

1518 ETCSL 2.5.6.5.

1519 Dietrich 1998, 169.

1520 ETCSL 2.6.9.3; Brisch 2007, 61-64, 200-202.

- 23 *May he open for you the breasts of the shining heavens,
so that the rain of heaven rains for you.*
- 24 *Years of prosperity and days of plenty
may he assemble for you from the heart of heaven.*
- 25 *Months of splendor and a joyful heart may he establish for your lifetime.*
- 26 *A reign filled with excellence and justice may he give to you.*

The same portrayal of An is found in *Ur-Namma C*:¹⁵²¹

- 20 an-e ka ku₃-ga-ni mu-un-ba im-a ma-u₃-du₂
An opens his holy mouth, and for me rain is produced.

As pointed out by Dietrich *PfK* is not only connected to the Sumerian literary texts but also to the Akkadian literature. Arnaud¹⁵²² noticed the close relationship of the Akkadian version to the inscription of the Kassite king Agum-kakrime, although the latter is only preserved in first-millennium sources.¹⁵²³

I was able to identify a further parallel to *PfK* in a composition titled *Bénédictio sur le roi à son entrée dans le nouveau palais* published in Arnaud's volume on the literary texts from Ugarit (RS 25.431A = AuOrS 23 37). A line of this text strongly resembles the second part of the *PfK* incipit:

- | | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| AuOrS 23 37 | 2 | U ₄ .MEŠ-ka li-ri-ku ba-la-ṭa liš-r[ik ₂]
<i>May your days be long, may (the god) grant life to you.</i> |
| PfK | 2 | bu-luṭ be-li U ₄ .MEŠ-ka ₃ li-ri-ku |

Arnaud regards this tablet as imported from Assyria on the basis of the ductus and the presence of a few Assyrianisms and dates it to Tukulti-Ninurta's reign. A paleographic analysis, however, shows that this tablet was not drafted in 13th century Assyria.

- The sign ŠA with two inscribed *Winkelhaken* (l. 6) , has a Middle Babylonian shape;¹⁵²⁴ the same form is attested in the 14th century MA texts,¹⁵²⁵ but it is different from that known from the texts of Tukulti-Ninurta's period, , as shown for instance in KAR 128 (*Prayer to Assur for Tukulti-Ninurta*)¹⁵²⁶ and KAJ 310.
- The shape of the sign LI (ll. 1, 2)¹⁵²⁷ is typically Middle Babylonian;¹⁵²⁸ it diverges from both the 14th century Assyrian variant,¹⁵²⁹ and from the ŠE+ŠA variant (with four horizontal wedges) of the 13th century.¹⁵³⁰ This variant is also different from the late Ugarit script form¹⁵³¹ attested in other literary texts.¹⁵³²

1521 ETCSL 2.4.1.3.

1522 Arnaud 1982a, 216.

1523 See for instance K 4149+ = 5R 33, VII, 11-12, ša LUGAL a-gu-um // U₄.MEŠ-šu₂ lu-u'ar-ku'.

1524 BA 14, No. 167.

1525 See Weeden 2012, 237 and n. 48.

1526 See § 2.1.5.1.

1527 In line 5 the sign transliterated as LI looks like TE.

1528 BE 14, No. 211; the Syrian school shape attested at Emar derives from the MB variant, Wilcke 1992, 128-131.

1529 Weeden 2012, 239-240.

1530 See Weidner 1952-53, 201, van Soldt 2001.

1531 van Soldt 2001; this variant corresponds to that attested at Emar in the Syro-Hittite scholarly texts.

1532 Cf. RS 79.25 (Arnaud 1982a, 210-212), RS 17.80 (Nougayrol 1968, 376).

- The sign KA shows a MB shape,¹⁵³³ , which is different from the 13th century MA variant¹⁵³⁴ attested for instance in KAR 128 ; this form is also different from the 14th century MA variant.¹⁵³⁵

Paleographic analysis thus invalidates the hypothesis that AuOrS 23 37 is a 13th MA tablet. Linguistic traits taken by Arnaud as clues to an Assyrian origin are limited to the adverb [*ha-ra-a*]*m-ma* (l. 10) and to the 3sg. precativative [*l*]*u-ka-an-ni-ka* (l. 11).¹⁵³⁶ Arnaud himself admits that the only certain Assyrianism is the precativative form since the adverb is in a broken context and its restoration is speculative. Even the precativative might be a Babylonian form¹⁵³⁷ if it were a 1sg. form. Notwithstanding Arnaud's claim that the context requires a 3sg. form,¹⁵³⁸ the use of the second person to address the king does not exclude that the precativative could be a 1sg. form.

A further hint toward the origin of the tablet is provided by its find-spot. AuOrS 23 37 was found in the Lamaštu archive where several Babylonian tablets were unearthed.¹⁵³⁹ Therefore, by regarding the precativative as a 1sg. form¹⁵⁴⁰ the script of the tablet can be classified as Babylonian.¹⁵⁴¹

The influence of Akkadian literature is further suggested by the epithet of Iškur, *lu[-ga]l ḫi-gal* 'king of plenty'.¹⁵⁴² *PfK* is the only Sumerian text where such an epithet is attested, but it is known from several Akkadian compositions and the list *An=Anum*.¹⁵⁴³

It is clear that *PfK* was not reworked in Syria¹⁵⁴⁴ but rather originated in the Mesopotamian stream of tradition. All the elements supposed by Dietrich to be influenced by West Semitic culture are already attested in the Sumero-Akkadian documentation. In this context, these traits, which later appear in biblical literature, must be considered as dependent on the Mesopotamian tradition.

Compared to the text of the Emar tablet the Ugarit manuscript expands some sections: Enki and Asalluḫi are added to the list of invoked gods (*PfK*, 7);¹⁵⁴⁵ Anu/El is mentioned in a passage equating the king to the power of the waters (*PfK*, 17-18). On the contrary RS 79.25 makes no mention of Nergal providing the king with a mighty weapon (*PfK* 13). Furthermore, the Ugarit manuscript ends with a four-line reference to Iškur's gifts, which is lacking in the Emar tablet. Some textual variants are also attested:¹⁵⁴⁶

1533 BE 14, No. 84.

1534 For the 13th century MA shape see van Soldt 2001.

1535 Weeden 2012, 238-239, 247.

1536 Arnaud 2007, 15, 123-124.

1537 For the Babylonian and Assyrian variants in the D stem see GAG § 81c.

1538 The line is broken and this is the only word preserved.

1539 For this archive see § 9.5.2.

1540 Is it possible reading [*u*]₂ instead of [*l*]*u*? By reading [*u*]₂-*ka-an-ni-ka* the presence of Assyrianisms would be excluded.

1541 Note also the use of the value /aš/ of the sign AŠ₂ that, as seen in RS 17.80 (see § 5.3.4), is rare at Ugarit (Huehnergard 1989, 385), and the value pi which is only known from texts of Mesopotamian origin, Huehnergard 1989, 23. On the other hand, if any Assyrianism is attested, this manuscript might be a Syrian copy of either a MB tablet or a 14th century MA tablet. In the first case the Assyrianisms are due to the Syrian scribe, for at Ugarit and Karkemiš the precativative presents both Babylonian and Assyrian forms, Huehnergard 1979, 232-233.

1542 RS 79.25, 44.

1543 Schwemer 2001, 65.

1544 Kämmerer 1998, 118-119, supporting the Syrian reworking of *PfK*, defines the process as *Induktion*.

1545 Dietrich 1998, 168.

1546 Orthographic variants due to phonetic writings in the Ugarit recension are not listed here.

Line	E 775	RS 79.25
2	mu-mu-zu $\text{h}_2\text{-mu}_2\text{-me-en-na-an-da}$	$\text{u}_2\text{-mi-za-a}\text{ḫ-bi-lu}$
3	nu-bala-ta	ṣu-nam-ba-le-e
3	nam-tar-zu $\text{h}_2\text{-ne-tar-re}$	$\text{ṣu-nam-tar-ta-re-e-ni}$
5	diġir-meš	ti-ga-ar^1
6	ereš gal	$\text{e-re-eš ma-a}\text{ḫ}$
6	še-er-ga-an-zu $\text{h}_2\text{-li h}_2\text{-am}_3$	$\text{h}_2\text{-li-du-u}\text{ṭ-ṭu}$
8	ši-meš	la-le-e
8	an-na	an-nu-ga-al
8	$\text{h}_2\text{-ri-ib}_2\text{-si}$	in-na-zu
9	ši-meš	la-li-a-ni
9	nam-til ₃ -la	ta-a-bi
10	giz-zu ne-ne	$\text{h}_2\text{-za-la-qa}$
11	$\text{u}_4\text{-gid}_2\text{-zu h}_2\text{-ne-ib}_2\text{-tar-re}$	$\text{nam-tar-gi-da ta-r}[\text{i ...}]$
14	$\text{d}^{\text{nin}} \text{d}^{\text{inana}}$	$[\text{in-n}] \text{a-na e-re-eš m}[\text{a-a}\text{ḫ}]$
16	$\text{h}_2\text{-en-na-an-šum}_2$	$\text{i}[\text{n- ...}]\text{-gal}^?$
17	$\text{i}_7\text{-da-gen}_7$	a-ia-i-du-ki-im
18	a	a-ia-i-du-ki-im
18	$\text{h}_2\text{-me-en-gen}_7$	za-e-me-in
22	$\text{mu-un-ra}_2\text{-a-de}_6$	in-na-an-ba

1 Singular instead of plural.

Now that the dependence of *PfK* on the Mesopotamian tradition has been substantiated, it is time to determine how the text received the form in which it came down to us.

The Sumerian text shows many errors and is often obscure and artificial. In the following section, I try to distinguish errors typologically, in order to identify their origin.

Traditional-Type Errors

Here are listed errors documented in any segment of the Sumerian literary tradition:

- Ergative indicated with -a; this writing is known from the Old Babylonian period:¹⁵⁴⁷
 - ši-meš nam-til₃-la an-na $\text{h}_2\text{-ri-ib}_2\text{-si}$, ‘Let An fill you with the plenty of life’ (E 775, 8).
 - $\text{d}^{\text{ak}} \text{lugal gi-dub-ba-a u}_4\text{-gid}_2\text{-zu h}_2\text{-ne-ib}_2\text{-tar-re}$, ‘Let Nabu the king of the stylus decree long days for you’ (E 775, 11); the expected form would be: * $\text{d}^{\text{ak}} \text{lugal gi-dub-ba-ke}_4$.
 - According to the Akkadian translation, *še-e-ru pu-luḫ-ta-šu li-din-<ku>*, ‘Let the steppe provide you with its awesomeness’, the ergative is perhaps indicated by -a in $\text{edin-na ni}_2\text{-bi h}_2\text{-en-na-an-šum}_2$ (E 775, 16). The same use of -a seems to be attested at Ugarit: *a-te-na* (RS 79.25, 28). However, $\text{edin-na ni}_2\text{-bi}$ can also be an anticipatory genitive, ‘The awesomeness of the steppe’.

¹⁵⁴⁷ For attestations and bibliography see Attinger 1993, 214; although it rarely occurs, the writing of the ergative with -a is also documented in the Decad, see Delnero 2006, 412. This phenomenon derives from the confusion between -a and -e in the dative and directive which extended to other cases, see Black, Zólyomi 2007, 18. An example in a MB tablet is attested in N 3455, § 1.1.1.1.

- u_2 -du su-pa-kur-ku-ra-ak-ka [u]₄-za-la-qa-ka ḫe_2 -za-la-qa, 'Let Utu, shepherd of the lands, light you up like a bright day' (RS 79.25, 19-20); in this case the use of -a is probably to be considered a result of the assimilation $e > a$ in the phonetic writing.
- Genitive indicated by /ke/:¹⁵⁴⁸
 - In u_2 -ša₃-ḫul-ke gu-la-kam₂, 'The plant of heart-joy is big' (E 775, 20), the presence of the ergative is incorrect because it is a nominal sentence with copula.
- A further error typical of late texts is the transfer of the nominal element of a compound verb directly before the verbal base; this error is attested in both manuscripts for the verb ḡal_2 --taka₄:

Pfk 7	E	^d asal umun-ḫal ḫal-bi mu-un- ḡal_2 -taka ₄ -a
		^d AMAR.UTU <i>be-el na-ag-bi na-ga₁₄-ab-šu lip-te-ku</i>
	U	a-ša-a-li-ni ₂ -te ni ₂ -te ma-an-a-gal-ta-qa-a
	E	<i>Marduk the lord of the underground water opened his underground water.</i>
	U	<i>Asalluḫi (lord) of fear, opened the fear.</i>

- An error going back to the post-Old Babylonian tradition¹⁵⁴⁹ is the use of -meš as a plural marker under the influence of Akkadian: diḡir-meš (E 775, 5), ši-meš (E 775, 8) i₇-da-meš (E 775, 22); note the same use in the MA tablet BM 98496.¹⁵⁵⁰
- The precativ of the verb šum_2 is formed with the *ḫamṭu* stem in two-participant clauses. Such constructions are sporadically known from the Old Babylonian period.¹⁵⁵¹

E 9	ši-meš nam-til ₃ -la ḡeš-nu ₁₁ šu ḫe_2 -en-na-an-šum ₂ ¹⁵⁵²
E 13	^d i-šum nir- ḡal_2 diḡir-gal-gal-e-ne ^{ḡeš} tukul kala-ga-me ₈ -en ḫe_2 -en-ti-an-šum ₂ ¹⁵⁵³
E 15	ḡe_6 me-lim ₄ ḫe_2 -en-na-an-šum ₂
E 16	edin-na ni ₂ -bi ḫe_2 -en-na-an-šum ₂ ¹⁵⁵⁴

- Some substantives that are usually nominal elements of compound verbs are used as independent verbs in non-finite forms where the Akkadian has finite verbal forms. Such forms are usually found in late texts:
 - šudu_3 is rarely attested as a verbal form after the post-Old Babylonian period.¹⁵⁵⁵

E 4	^d nin-lil ₂ -la ₂ inim-du ₁₀ -ga-ni šudu_3 - šudu_3 -a-zu
	^d NIN.LIL ₂ <i>i-na pi₂-ša ṭa₃-a-bi li-ik-ru-bu-ka</i>
	<i>(May) Ninlil bless you with her good words.</i>

1548 See Attinger 1993, 259, Edzard 2000, 64, Huber Vulliet 2001, 176-177.

1549 A similar use is already attested in the royal inscriptions of Rim-Sîn but limited to person class nouns, see Kärki 1967, 41.

1550 § 2.1.5.2; see also § 6.2.2.

1551 Black, Zólyomi 2007, 21-22.

1552 The 3sg. IO (-na-) occurs instead of the Akkadian 2msg. dative (-ku).

1553 -en-ti- is unclear and *ḫa-ra-ab-šum₂-mu would be expected.

1554 This sentence is two-participant only if edin-na is the subject, see above.

1555 Attinger 1993, 727 § 864.

E 5 diġir-meš kalam-ma šudu₃-šudu₃-a-zu
 DIĠIR.MEŠ KALAM.MA *ša ma-ti li-ik-ru-ba-ak-ku*¹⁵⁵⁶
May the gods of the land bless you.

- In [a-š]a-lu-uḫ-ḫe₂ e-kur nam-til₃-[la] // [še-er-k]a-an-zu, '(May) Asalluḫi from the Ekur adorn you with life' (RS 79.25, 10-11), še-er-ka-an, 'ornament', which is usually part of the verb še-er-ka-an-du₁₁, is used as a verbal form (= *za'ānu*).¹⁵⁵⁷

In both cases the possessive -zu with an apparent object function is appended to a non-finite verbal form. Even though the possessive can assume the function of objective genitive,¹⁵⁵⁸ in these cases -zu seems to be the direct object, probably under the influence of Akkadian,¹⁵⁵⁹ a similar form is found at Meturan, mu-ši-bar-ra-zu.¹⁵⁶⁰ Note that the Akkadian accusative pronominal suffix is attested in the Emar version.

Copying Mistakes

The following mistakes are likely to be attributed to Syrian copyists:

- The insertion of šu in šu-nam-tar-ta-re-e-ni (RS 79.25, 5) is probably the result of miscopying from the preceding line: il-li-il šu-nam-ba-le-e, 'Enlil the one who does not change'¹⁵⁶¹ (RS 79.25, 4).
- The morpheme -ke₄, which is attested in the phonetic version from Ugarit as -ka, is omitted and the verbal form is miscopied in the following lines:

E 10 ^dutu sipa-kur-kur-ra u₄-zalag₂-giz-zu ne-ne
^dutu *re-i ma-ta-ti ki-ma u₄-mi ša nam-ri / li-na-me-er-ka*
 U 19-20 u₂-du su-pa-kur-ku-ra-ak-ka // [u]₄-za-la-qa-ka ḫe₂-za-la-qa
Let Utu, shepherd of the lands, light you up like a bright day.

- In i₇-da-meš-tum (E 775, 22), -tum is miscopied from the Akkadian version, I₇.MEŠ-tum.

Other Errors

This section groups errors that cannot be clearly explained:

- -me₈-en is unclear in ^di-šum nir-ġal₂ diġir-gal-gal-e-ne ^ġes^{es}tukul kala-ga-me₈-en ḫe₂-en-ti-an-šum₂ // ^dNE₃.ERI₁₁.GAL *e-tel* DIĠIR^{mes} *ra-bu-ti ka-ak-ka₃ dan₅-na li-din-ku*, 'May Nergal prince of the great gods give a mighty weapon to you' (E 775, 13).
- In a-na-ḫe₂-ġal-la an-ta-ġal₂ ga-a-ni-šur-ra-ke₄ // *ša-mu-ut ḫe₂-gal-li iš-tu ša-me-e li-iz-nu-<un>-ka*, 'May a plenty rain¹⁵⁶² fall over him from the sky' (E 775, 19), an-ta-ġal₂ 'exalted' (see ePSD) is a mistake for an-ta = *iš-tu ša-me-e*. The verbal form is perhaps a writing for ga-ni-šur-ra ak: as seen above, the cohortative form ga- for the expected precativ is attested elsewhere

1556 Note that in line 4 the verb is plural but the singular form is expected whereas in line 5 it is singular but the subject is plural; the scribe probably reversed the position of the signs BA (l. 5) and BU (l. 5).

1557 As a verbal form šerkan is only attested in lexical lists, see Attinger 1993, 684 § 777, 685 § 781.

1558 In this case -zu would refer to the whole sentence.

1559 Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993b, 201.

1560 Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993b, 198.

1561 The translation is based upon the Akkadian *lā mušpelû*.

1562 a-na is a writing for šeġ₃ (A.AN).

in the LBA documentation but how it developed remains unclear;¹⁵⁶³ -ke₄ is perhaps a form from the verb AK used as a verbalizer.¹⁵⁶⁴

- The expression nam-tar-tar in ^den-lil₂-e nu-bala-ta¹⁵⁶⁵ nam-tar-zu ħe₂-ne-tar-re, 'May Enlil, the one who does not change, decree your fate' (E 775, 3), is not attested elsewhere and is probably a calque on the Akkadian *ši-im-ka li-ši-im* in which nam-tar corresponds to *ši-im-ka*.
- In ħur-saġ gu₂-un-bi gur₃ zi-ga-zu // *ša-du-u₂ bi-la-as-su liš-ši-ku*, 'May the mountain bring its tribute to you' (E 775, 21), it is unclear why two synonymous verbal forms guru₃ and zi are used for the Akkadian verb *našû*, 'to bring, to lift.'¹⁵⁶⁶
- The morphemes following -mu₂¹⁵⁶⁷ are unclear; perhaps they result from copying:

E 2 mu-mu-zu ħe₂-mu₂(-)me-en-na-an-da ħe₂-am
 MU.MEŠ-ka *li-te-ed-di-ša*
May your years renew.

A sequence of two precatives¹⁵⁶⁸ is perhaps attested also in the Ugarit manuscript according to Arnaud's interpretation of u₂-mi-za-aĥ-bi-lu ħa-a (RS 79.25, 2) as *mu-mu-za ħe₂-gibil ħa-a.¹⁵⁶⁹ A similar series of precatives is attested, once again, in a passage of the *Hymn to Marduk for a King*:

HM 23 ħe₂-til₃-la ħe₂-silim-ma gi₁₆-sa-aš ħe₂-a
May you live! May you have peace! May it last forever!

It appears that the majority of mistakes are not unknown in Sumerian literature, especially in late sources. This perhaps indicates that *PfK* was composed or deeply reworked during the Middle Babylonian period.

As already noticed, the Sumerian and Akkadian diverge in several passages. Here follows the list of variants:

2 E ħe₂-mu₂-me-en-na-an-da ħe₂-am VS *li-te-ed-di-ša*
 U -aĥ-bi-lu ħe-a

3 E ħe₂-ne-tar-re VS *li-ši-im*
 U šu-nam-tar-ta-re-e-ni

4 E šudu₃-šudu₃-a-zu VS *li-ik-ru-bu-ka*
 U šu-da-ia-ku

5 E šudu₃-šudu₃-a-zu VS *li-ik-ru-ba-ak-ku₈*
 U šu-da-ia-ak-...]

¹⁵⁶³ See §§ 1.1.9.1, 5.2.1.

¹⁵⁶⁴ Cf. § 2.1.5.1.

¹⁵⁶⁵ This form probably derives from *nu-bala-e-da.

¹⁵⁶⁶ CAD N/2, 80-81.

¹⁵⁶⁷ For mu₂ = *edēšu* see CT 51 168 ii 43.

¹⁵⁶⁸ Two precatives are usually documented with the same verb with an emphatic function. A series of epistemic ħe₂-clauses are found to indicate disjunction, see Civil 2000b, 34-35.

¹⁵⁶⁹ Arnaud 1982a, 213; according to Arnaud the phonetic writing aĥ-bi-lu renders gibil with the shift *g > ĥ*, see § 4.3.1.1.2.

6 E	še-er-ga-an-zu ɥi-li ɥe ₂ -am ₃ VS <i>li-ze-en-ka</i> ₃
U	ɥi-li du-uṭ-ṭu
7 E	mu-un-ḡal ₂ -taka ₄ -a VS <i>lip-te-ku</i>
8 E	ɥe ₂ -ri-ib ₂ -si VS <i>li-še-eb-be</i> ₂ -ka
U	in-na-zu
10 E	NE.NE VS <i>li-na-me-er-ka</i>
U	ɥe ₂ -za-la-qa
11 E	ɥe ₂ -ne-ib ₂ -tar-re VS <i>liš-ṭur</i>
U	ta-r[i...]
12 E	kala-ga-me-en VS <i>lid-din-nin</i>
U	[ka-l]a-qa-e-ni
14 E	(a-)ri-a VS <i>li-ir-mi-ku</i>
19 E	ga-a-ni-šur-ra-ke ₄ VS <i>li-iz-nu-<un>-ka</i>
20 E	gu-la-kam ₂ VS <i>li-ir-bi-ku</i>
21 E	guru ₃ zi-ga-zu VS <i>liš-ši-ku</i>
22 E	mu-un-DU-a-DU VS <i>lu-ub-la-ku</i>
U	in-na-an-ba
23 E	ḡa ₂ -ra VS <i>li-ip-qi</i> ₂ -id-ka

These occurrences may be grouped according to the following typologies:¹⁵⁷⁰

- Akkadian precativè VS Sumerian non-finite form (Emar: ll. 4-5, 10(?), 12, 14, 20, 21, 23; Ugarit: ll. 3, 4-5, 6, 11, 12)
- Sumerian precativès formed with an additional form of the verb 'to be' (Emar: ll. 2, 6; Ugarit: l. 2)
- Akkadian precativè VS Sumerian non-precativè verbal forms beginning with the prefix mu- or in- (Emar: ll. 7, 22; Ugarit: ll. 8, 22)
- Sumerian cohortative VS Akkadian precativè (Emar: l. 19)¹⁵⁷¹

A few lines (ll. 3, 8, 10)¹⁵⁷² offer examples of precativès in both Akkadian and Sumerian. Another attestation is the above-quoted ɥe-en-na-an-šum₂ in E 775, 9, 15, 16 that corresponds to the Akkadian precativè *li-din-ku*.¹⁵⁷³ In E 775, 11, the opposition between the Sumerian tar 'to decree' in ɥe₂-ne-ib₂-tar-re and the Akkadian *šaṭāru* 'to write' is semantic. None of the verbal forms in the Sumerian

¹⁵⁷⁰ For the precativè in the Ugarit version see Arnaud 2007, 22.

¹⁵⁷¹ For this line see above.

¹⁵⁷² Note that ɥe₂-za-la-qa (l. 10) in the Ugarit text is more correct than the Emar text.

¹⁵⁷³ Cf. fn. 1552.

version correctly correspond to the Akkadian precatives that are the expected forms on the basis of both the context and the parallels cited by Dietrich.

The Akkadian version, fully preserved only in the Emar tablet, shows a higher degree of accuracy compared to the Emar documentation. The Gtn conjugation, which is rare and usually incorrect at Emar,¹⁵⁷⁴ appears in the morphologically correct form *li-te-ed-di-ša* (E 775, 2).¹⁵⁷⁵ The Akkadian version presents old and late forms.¹⁵⁷⁶ Archaic forms typical of the Syrian school tradition are the sign su_2 (ZU) in *bi-la-as-su_2* (E 775, 21)¹⁵⁷⁷ and the preservation of š before a dental in *na-pu-uš-ti* (E 775, 18) and *liš-ṭur* (E 775, 11). Later traits emerge in the shift $w > m$ in *li-na-me-er-ka* and *nam-ri* (E 775, 10).¹⁵⁷⁸ Moreover CvC signs are frequently used and voiced and emphatic consonants are incorrectly distinguished as is common in peripheral Akkadian.¹⁵⁷⁹ Such late features are not unusual in the Emar Syrian school texts.¹⁵⁸⁰ Isolated Assyrianisms are the form *lu-ub-la-ku*¹⁵⁸¹ and the value ṭi_2 of the sign 𐎢 (E 775, 23).¹⁵⁸² As with other texts such forms are to be considered common features of peripheral Akkadian. The few traces of the Akkadian version in the Ugarit manuscript seem to agree with the text of the Emar source.

According to Arnaud,¹⁵⁸³ the Sumerian text is not the primary version, but a translation from Akkadian prepared 'à coup de listes lexicographiques'. The dependence of *PfK* on Sumerian literature indicates that the whole Sumerian text cannot be considered as a translation from Akkadian. A further example of such a connection is the expression $\text{ḫi-li-du-ud-du}_5 \sim \text{ḫi-li du}_8 \text{-du}_8$ (RS 79.25, 9)¹⁵⁸⁴ which is known in the Sumerian literature and especially in praise poems.¹⁵⁸⁵ Nevertheless the relevant influence of Akkadian makes it possible that lexical lists were used as a reference for composing the text. Lexical material was also employed by Syrian scribes to create the phonetic version, as pointed out by Arnaud.¹⁵⁸⁶

Three features of the text have emerged so far: (1) the high number of mistakes in the Sumerian version; (2) the difference between the Sumerian and Akkadian versions; (3) the accuracy of the Akkadian translation. The primary result of this analysis is that there is no evidence supporting a Syrian adaptation of *PfK*. Indeed, the majority of mistakes are common to the diachronic development of Sumerian grammar whereas only copying mistakes may be attributed to local scribes. The Sumerian appears to be artificial and strongly influenced by Akkadian and shows many late traits. Such features along with the lack of any Old Babylonian duplicates suggest that this text was composed or reworked in the Middle Babylonian period, perhaps on the basis of older texts such as the *Hymn to Marduk for a King*. The presence of Emesal forms – *mu-li-li* \sim ${}^a\text{mu-lil}_2$ (l. 4), *umun*, *e-re-eš* \sim *ereš* (l. 6) – in a main dialect text is further evidence for a late date of composition.

Lacking any OB exemplar the setting of this royal hymn cannot be understood. It is unknown whether it was composed with a cultic intent and was actually performed in ceremonies praising the

1574 Seminara 1998, 412-413 and n. 141.

1575 Note that the use of the feminine is normally correct in the scholarly texts, Seminara 1998, 358 n. 62.

1576 Note the gloss in DIGIR.MEŠ KALAM.MA *ša ma-ti* (E 775, 5) which represents one of the rare cases in the Emar documentation, Seminara 1998, 70.

1577 See Seminara 1998, 72-76 and n. 62.

1578 Seminara 1998, 164-165.

1579 See ku_8 (E 775, 5); ga_{14} (E 775, 7); Seminara 1998, 176-177; see also the use of the signs tu_3 (E 775, 6) and $-ka_4$ (QA) in U_4 .MEŠ- ka_4 , Seminara 1998, 256.

1580 Seminara 1998, 216-217.

1581 See Seminara 1998, 403.

1582 Seminara 1998, 212.

1583 Arnaud 1982a, 209.

1584 Arnaud 1982, 214: 8-9.

1585 Sjöberg 1966, 292.

1586 Arnaud 1982a, 213: 1-2: the writing u_2 -*mu* for u_4 -*d* (RS 79.25, 2) is attested in an Ugarit recension of *Urra*; here it is clearly due to the influence of Akkadian.

king.¹⁵⁸⁷ If *PfK* already existed in the Old Babylonian period it was most likely a non-curricular text. On the contrary if this composition was composed during the post-Old Babylonian period a cultic setting is unlikely. Whatever its original function, it seems that *PfK* was copied in a scholastic context during the LBA at least in the Western periphery. On the basis of the present evidence the tradition of *PfK* cannot be ascertained. However, one may note that RN *lugal-ĝu₁₀* hymns are rare in Nippur. Moreover, connections with the *Hymn to Marduk for a King*, a composition that lies outside of the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition, likely originating in Northern Babylonia,¹⁵⁸⁸ perhaps suggest that *PfK* derives from the same scribal milieu. Differences between the Emar and Ugarit manuscripts suggest that different *Vorlagen* circulated in Syria.

6.2 Syro-Hittite School Texts

Syro-Hittite school texts include wisdom compositions, a literary letter and incantations.

6.2.1 The Ballad of Early Rulers

*The Ballad of Early Rulers (BeR)*¹⁵⁸⁹ is preserved on three Old Babylonian tablets as well as in copies from Emar and Ugarit. This composition features the so-called vanity theme that reflects upon the shortness and futility of human life. The Emar fragments, **E 767+**, belong to a three-column tablet containing versions in standard Sumerian, phonetic Sumerian and Akkadian. A second manuscript is the tiny fragment Msk 74159j (E 767B) which contains lines 6-8 of the phonetic Sumerian version. On the basis of the fragment Msk 74153, which preserves a cryptographic colophon, the scribe of this tablet has been identified as Šaggar-abu¹⁵⁹⁰ the eldest son of Ba'al-qarrād, diviner of Zu-Ba'la's family. Šaggar-abu is also known as the author of letters¹⁵⁹¹ and scholarly texts:¹⁵⁹² two manuscripts of the *Paleographic Syllabary A*, the *S^a Vocabulary*, *Urra Tablets V_p-VII* and *XIII*, the lexical list *Lu*, one omen probably belonging to the series *iqqur-īpuš*, one astronomic omen concerning a lunar eclipse and the Sumerian wisdom text *The Fowler*.¹⁵⁹³

Three bilingual fragments of *BeR*, published by Nougayrol in *Ugaritica V* 164-166, have come down to us from the Ugarit documentation. **RS 25.130 = Ugaritica V 164** (Ua), discovered in the Lamaštu archive, is a single-column tablet containing the standard orthography version with inter-linear Akkadian translation. The tablet has a circular disposition of text lines: the beginning of the composition is duplicated in lines 18-23 on the obverse and on lines 40-44 on the reverse.¹⁵⁹⁴ The text continues on the obverse (ll. 1-17) with a line order different from the Emar manuscript.¹⁵⁹⁵ The remainder of the reverse (ll. 24-39) contains a collection of sayings called *Proverbs from Ugarit*.¹⁵⁹⁶ Fragments **RS 23.34 (+) 23.484 + 23.363 = Ugaritica V 165** (Ub), found in the proximity of the *Maison-aux-tablettes*,¹⁵⁹⁷ belong to a two-column tablet containing the phonetic Sumerian version

¹⁵⁸⁷ For the context of the royal hymns see Ludwig 1990, 41-65.

¹⁵⁸⁸ The text is unknown in Nippur and was likely composed under Abī-ešuḫ when most of the Nippur scholars left the city; in addition all the manuscripts stem from Sippar.

¹⁵⁸⁹ ETCSL 5.2.5; the unilingual Old Babylonian recension is indicated as OB, and the Syrian as Syr. A new hand-copy of the Emar tablet is provided by George apud Cohen 2012c, 148-149.

¹⁵⁹⁰ Cohen 2006.

¹⁵⁹¹ Cohen 2009, 165.

¹⁵⁹² Cohen 2009, 166-170.

¹⁵⁹³ § 6.2.3.

¹⁵⁹⁴ These lines are separated from the preceding lines by a double ruling containing the sign BAD.

¹⁵⁹⁵ For the reconstruction of line order see Dietrich 1992, 13.

¹⁵⁹⁶ For this composition see § 7.1.1.

¹⁵⁹⁷ van Soldt 1991, 187.

on the left and the Akkadian translation on the right.¹⁵⁹⁸ No standard Sumerian was inscribed on this tablet. At the end of 'Face A' a portion of the colophon is preserved identifying the scribe as an apprentice.¹⁵⁹⁹ This clearly indicates that this tablet is the product of schooling activities. The third manuscript **RS 25.424 = Ugaritica V 166** (Uc) discovered, like Ua, in the Lamaštu archive only preserves a few lines of the Akkadian version and traces of the Sumerian text. On the basis of Obv. 7 (Syr. 6) which preserves [... -g]a-an-ni, it seems that the Sumerian version was probably written in phonetic orthography and was separated from the Akkadian translation by *Glossenkeile*.

The Old Babylonian recension is inscribed on three *Sammel tafeln* probably stemming from Sippar, BM 80091 (A), BM 80184 = CT 44 18 (B) and CBS 1208 (D). In addition to *BeR* these tablets contain three other monolingual compositions¹⁶⁰⁰ that are thematically related.¹⁶⁰¹ No sources so far stem from Nippur even though it is not precluded that *BeR* was known in the city of the god Enlil.¹⁶⁰² The Nippur OB tablet CBS 13777, which preserves two literary texts that feature the vanity theme,¹⁶⁰³ the OB recension of *Proverbs from Ugarit* and niĝ₂-nam nu-kal, *Nothing is of Value* (NV),¹⁶⁰⁴ perhaps also contained *BeR*.¹⁶⁰⁵ The Sippar tablets reflect a late textual tradition as shown by the use of the person class interrogative pronoun a-ba-am₃ in reference to a non-person class noun.¹⁶⁰⁶

BeR is also known from the NA bilingual fragments K 6917 + K 13679 discovered in the library of Aššurbanipal at Nineveh. These fragments only preserve the beginning of the composition in a format similar to Ua: a proverb collection reminiscent of *Proverbs from Ugarit* is inscribed between the three-line introductory prologue repeated twice. *BeR* is also quoted in the NA catalogue of the series of Sidu.¹⁶⁰⁷

A number of studies¹⁶⁰⁸ have been dedicated to this composition and often very diverse interpretations have been advanced.¹⁶⁰⁹ For the present study it will suffice to recall the different hypotheses on *BeR*'s textual history and the relation between the Old Babylonian and Syrian recensions.

The Syrian recension diverges from the monolingual version as it presents a different line order and some additional passages.¹⁶¹⁰ Lines 16-18 of the monolingual recension correspond to lines 7-9 of the Syrian text, which follow a six-line introductory theme unpreserved in the OB manuscripts. The Syrian recension ends differently with a *carpe diem* theme: lines 21-22 are replaced with a passage dedicated to the beer goddess Siraš (Syr. 23) and a couplet (Syr. 20-21) is added. Finally, in the Syrian recension the names of Bazi and Zizi are added to the list of ancient rulers (Syr. 16).

Two different hypotheses on the origin of the Syrian recension have been put forward: some scholars (Dietrich, Klein, Kämmerer) assume that the Emar-Ugarit text results from reworking by local scribes; on the other hand, some (Lambert, Alster, Y. Cohen) consider the Syrian recension to be dependent on Mesopotamian models.

1598 Against the hand-copy (Nougayrol 1968, 438) obverse and reverse are to be exchanged as the text begins on 'Face B' and continues on 'Face A'.

1599 For a translation see Dietrich 1992, 20; at the bottom of the tablet a ruling separates the colophon from some badly preserved signs which may be part of either the same colophon or of another composition.

1600 1. *Hymn to Marduk for a King* (ETCSL 2.8.5.b); 2. *Abī-ešuh B* (ETCSL 2.8.5.a); 3. *Nothing is of Value*; 4. *The Ballad of Early Rulers* (ETCSL 5.2.5).

1601 See Alster 1990, 8-9, Alster 2005, 297.

1602 See §§ 9.1, 9.4.

1603 CBS 13777 probably contained extracts from vanity theme compositions.

1604 Alster 2005, 282.

1605 Alster 1999, 89.

1606 Cf. Syr 19 below. For the differences among the manuscripts see Alster 2005, 318-319.

1607 ki^aen-ki ĝeš-ḫur-ḫur-ra, Finkel 1986. The same catalogue lists *The Song of the Plowing Oxen* (§ 1.1.5.1) and possibly *The Fowler* (§ 6.2.3).

1608 Nougayrol 1968, 291-300, Civil 1969, Arnaud 1982b, 51, Alster, Jeyes 1986, Arnaud 1985-1987, Vol. 4 359-365, Wilcke 1988, Alster 1990, Dietrich 1992, Lambert 1995, Kämmerer 1998, 103-104, Klein 2000, Alster 2005, 288-322, Arnaud 2007, 142-148, Cohen 2012c.

1609 For an overview on the different interpretations see Alster 2005, 290-292.

1610 See Alster 2005, 292-293 for more details on the differences between the two recensions.

Dietrich regards the Emar text as an independent composition resulting from adaptation to the local environment. He also underlines differences between the Syrian manuscripts and describes the Emar text of *BeR* as «eine in sich geschlossene Komposition mit sechs Abschnitten» but «Das ist aber bei den Ugarit-Texten nicht der Fall» since only Ub and Uc reflect the Emar text, whereas Ua has a different structure.¹⁶¹¹ According to Dietrich the Syrian recension of *BeR* was composed at Emar on the basis of Mesopotamian models and then was transmitted to Ugarit where it was further modified.¹⁶¹² It became a very popular composition in the Syrian scribal schools as «Lernstoff Sumerisch und Babylonisch». According to Dietrich, the Mesopotamian tradition can be seen in the themes of ancient rulers and the *carpe diem* motif that he related to the Siduri episode of the Old Babylonian Gilgameš epic. The idea of adaptation is followed by Kämmerer who defined the Syrian recension as an example of «Reception mit Adaption».¹⁶¹³

A totally different view was proposed by Lambert who found no evidence that the Emar and Ugarit recensions reflected a text independent from the Mesopotamian tradition because «The differences ... are less than recensional differences between variant editions of Akkadian texts from southern Mesopotamia in the Old Babylonian Period, e.g. the Gilgameš Epic, and there is of course no proof that the Ugarit and Emar copies of the texts under discussion offer editions created in the west».¹⁶¹⁴ He also presented evidence supporting a connection between *BeR* and the book of *Qoheleth*,¹⁶¹⁵ which, according to him, was therefore inspired by the Mesopotamian tradition.¹⁶¹⁶ On the addition of the Siraš theme, he states that «The Emar recension and the Ugarit copies ... obviously are based on something very like the unilingual Sumerian version and have inserted into it a second, more specific, idea of how to find happiness».

In a later study Klein (2000), following Dietrich, emphasized the independent character of the Syrian recension, listing additional parallels with *Qoheleth*. According to him the monolingual recension could have ended with a pessimistic tone as opposed to the *carpe diem* theme of the Syrian recension.¹⁶¹⁷

More recently Alster argued in favor of the dependence of the Syrian manuscripts upon Mesopotamian models, as «whenever the Syro-Mesopotamian versions differ from their presumed genuine Babylonian forerunners, there may have been Babylonian models for specific additions in the Syro-Mesopotamian texts, whether 'genuine' Babylonian models are presently known or not».¹⁶¹⁸ By restoring the conclusion of the monolingual text,¹⁶¹⁹ he was able to demonstrate that the Old Babylonian and Syrian recensions do not offer a thematically different ending. The *gaudeamus igitur* theme was attested in the monolingual version too:¹⁶²⁰

OB 21 niĝ₂-sa₆-ga diĝir-re-ene bi₂-in-šum₂-ma-am₃ u₂-gu₇-gu₇ nam-til₃ i₃-kiĝ₂-kiĝ₂
For him who gives the good things of the gods, the food provider, life is found.

According to Alster the Syrian manuscripts depend on an unpreserved MB model which modified the monolingual text: 'the structure of the OB version had become somewhat weakened, and some of its well-intentioned additions result in confusion rather than clarity.'¹⁶²¹ The differences of the Syr-

1611 Dietrich 1992, 26.

1612 Dietrich 1992, 27.

1613 Kämmerer 1998, 103-104.

1614 Lambert 1995, 42.

1615 *Qoheleth* 9, 7-9.

1616 *Qoheleth* was thought to be inspired by Greek culture, cf. Lambert 1995, 42.

1617 Klein 2000, 213.

1618 Alster 2005, 299.

1619 Alster 2005, 311.

1620 Alster 2005, 290, 296.

1621 Alster 2005, 292.

ian recension reflect therefore «a rephrasing or ‘update’ – perhaps but not necessarily, to suit local circumstances – of the underlying intent of the OB version».

Even the mention of Bazi and Zizi belongs to a Mesopotamian tradition, as these two rulers appear as kings of Mari in the Tell-Leilan recension of the Sumerian King List.¹⁶²² Y. Cohen¹⁶²³ has shown that the inclusion of the section dedicated to the kings of Mari mentioning Bazi and Zizi was not limited to the Tell-Leilan recension of the SKL but was part of a widespread Mesopotamian heritage.

In the following pages I will try to substantiate the dependence of the Syrian recension on Babylonian models with further evidence.

According to Alster the Emar and Ugarit sources belong to two different textual traditions: on the one hand the Ugarit manuscripts are closer to the Old Babylonian recension, and on the other hand the Emar tablet reflects a later tradition.¹⁶²⁴ Differently, Arnaud (2007) believes that the Ugarit manuscripts do not reflect one homogenous tradition: according to him manuscripts Ub and Uc were transmitted to Ugarit through Assyrian and Anatolia as they exhibit Hittite sign values and Assyrianisms in addition to some possible local features. Conversely, Ua does not show any Assyrianisms but has several Hittite traits which would indicate that this manuscript reached Ugarit from Babylonia via Anatolia.¹⁶²⁵

The analysis of the Ugarit manuscripts reveals that they cannot belong to a single textual tradition: Ua is closer to the Old Babylonian monolingual recension than the other manuscripts.¹⁶²⁶ A peculiarity of manuscript Ua that has so far escaped the attention of scholars is the sequence of lines: the line order of Ua on the obverse (ll. 1-16) follows the OB recension, not the Emar text:

	Ua	OB	E
Obv.	1-2	13	15
	3-4	14	17
	5-6	15	18
	7-8	16	7
	9-10	17	8
	11-12	18	9
	13-14	19	19
	15-17	20	22
	18-19	x	1
	20-21	x	2
	22-23	x	3
Rev.	24-39 = <i>Proverbs from Ugarit</i>		
	40-41	x	1
	42-43	x	2
	44-(45)	x	3

One of the major differences between the Syrian and OB sources, namely the line order, does not occur in manuscript Ua. Conversely, manuscripts Ub and Uc follow the line order of the Emar tablet. This strengthens Alster's criticism¹⁶²⁷ of Dietrich's hypothesis that *BeR* was transmitted along the East-West route and consequently the Emar text would have been the model of the Ugaritic manuscripts.

¹⁶²² See Alster 2005, 318: 16 with bibliography.

¹⁶²³ Cohen 2012c.

¹⁶²⁴ Alster 2005, 293.

¹⁶²⁵ Arnaud 2007, 12.

¹⁶²⁶ Partially this emerges from Alster 2005, 293, 318.

¹⁶²⁷ Alster 2005, 293.

Dietrich's suggestion that the list of ancient rulers and in particular line 16 mentioning Bazi and Zizi¹⁶²⁸ is missing in Ua because of the theological conception of the king in Ugarit as mortal in life but deified after death¹⁶²⁹ is also to be dismissed. As Arnaud's restoration of Ua 1-2, [me-e ^den-k] i-d[u₃] // [a-li] ^dEn-ki-du₃ š[a ...],¹⁶³⁰ shows, the mention of Enkidu indicates that this section was attested in this manuscript too, but it is not fully preserved. The list of ancient rulers is also inscribed in Ub as demonstrated by Cohen (2012c):

Ub B ¹ 16	[me-e ^m a-lu]-lu mu šar ₂ -[10-am ₃ in-ak]
17	[me-e ^m en-ta-na lugal-e lu ₂] an-[š ₃ bi ₂ -in-e ₃ -de ₃]

The omission of Bazi and Zizi in Ua recalls the absence of this line in the monolingual version. Unfortunately, the other Ugarit manuscripts are too badly preserved to ascertain if they originally contained this line.

Ua further differs from the other Ugarit manuscripts in its origin. Paleographic analysis of the tablet clearly indicates that signs present MB shapes¹⁶³¹ and the syllabary is Babylonian.¹⁶³² The value mam₂ of the sign SAL,¹⁶³³ indicated by van Soldt¹⁶³⁴ as Ugaritic, is Babylonian¹⁶³⁵ and it is attested in colophons from the library of Aššurbanipal¹⁶³⁶ in the word *mam₂-ma*. Consequently a first-millennium Assyrian scribe could not have learned this value from the peripheral regions. At Ugarit *mam₂* occurs elsewhere only in Ugaritica V 4, 3, a legal text from the Rašap-abu archive;¹⁶³⁷ the context is, however, unclear and Berger¹⁶³⁸ reads *mim-ma* instead of *mam₂-ma*. The value *mam₂* cannot therefore be considered as typical of Ugarit. Indeed Uc, which was drafted by a local scribe,¹⁶³⁹ has *ma-am-ma* (Obv. 9 = Syr. 7). To sum up, Ua is a Babylonian tablet¹⁶⁴⁰ containing a recension of *BeR* very close to the OB manuscripts, but apparently lacking the final lines of the monolingual recension.¹⁶⁴¹ Nevertheless, Ua seems to offer a different ending from the other Syrian manuscripts, E, Ub and Uc (Syr. 23-24), as it ends with line 20 which is the last line shared by all manuscripts (i.e. OB and Syrian). Unlike Ub, which has a parallel column format, the Akkadian translation in Ua is arranged in interlinear format. All these differences exclude that Ua is the model of Ub and Uc.

Even though Ua is very close to the monolingual recension, its text reflects the modifications and adaptations occurring in the Middle Babylonian period as is evident from the presence of the Akkadian translation. Indeed, Ua does not entirely adhere to the monolingual recension as lines 15-16 (= Sir. 22) make clear:

1628 This line should have been placed between lines 1-2 and 3-4.

1629 Dietrich 1992, 26.

1630 Arnaud 2007, 142: 4, see also Cohen 2012c, 140.

1631 See the shapes of the signs TI (ll. 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 27, 29, 31, 41), LI (ll. 4, 16, 17), RU (l. 8) and TAR (l. 37).

1632 See the use of the signs qum/qu (ll. 8, 16), qa (ll. 21, 37), su (l. 37) and the sign KI with the value qe₂, see Aro 1955, 19-20. Also note the lack of Assyrianisms, Arnaud 2007, 12.

1633 Ua, 10 (Syr. 8), 31 (*Proverbs from Ugarit*); in both cases the sign is used in the word *mam₂-ma*; however Alster 2005, 314, reads *mim-ma* in line 10.

1634 van Soldt 2012, 176.

1635 Jucquois 1966, 71.

1636 MesZL, 450; AkkS no. 298.

1637 Huehnergard 1989, 407.

1638 Berger 1969, 121.

1639 Ub and Uc present Ugarit sign shapes, see TI (Ub A¹, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15; Ub B¹, 11, copy in Arnaud 2007, 256; Uc Rev. 2, 6), LI (Ub A¹, 6, 13), RU (Ub A¹, 11; Uc Obv. 8).

1640 Based on the present evidence it is not possible to state with all confidence whether Ua was an imported tablet or whether it was written by a Babylonian scribe working at Ugarit; only a physical analysis of the clay would allow us to understand its origin.

1641 OB 21-22 in Alster 2005, 305.

OB	20	niĝ ₂ -saĝ-il ₂ -la u ₄ ša ₃ -ĥul ₂ -la ₂ 1-am ₃ niĝ ₂ -me-ĝar mu 36000x10-am ₃ in-ak <i>Instead of one day of joy, 36000 years of silence.</i>
E	22	za-[...]´il ₂ u ₄ ´ ša ₃ -ĥul ₂ -la ₂ // [lu-u]-bi u ₃ -ser ₃ -ser ₃ ĥe ₂ -en-du za-an-ki-el-la u ₂ ša-ĥu-la-al // lu-ul-bi u ₃ -šar-šar ĥe ₂ -en-du <i>di-na-nu [ša ĥu-u]d lib₃-b[i] // 1-en u₄-m[u...]</i> ¹⁶⁴²
Ua	15 16	niĝ ₂ -saĝ-il ₂ -la ša ₃ -ĥul ₂ -la // ´u ₄ 1´-kam u ₄ -im-ba-kam mu-10-šar ₂ ĥul in-na-ak <i>a-na di-na-an ĥu-ud lib₃-bi u₄-um-ak-kal u₄-um qu-li // 10 ŠAR₂.[MEŠ]</i> MU.MEŠ lil-li-ka
Ub A ¹	8 9	saĝ-ki-il-la [...] ĥu-ul-la // u ₂ -l[u]-ul-bi [...] ĥi-in-du <i>a-[n]a ´di₃´-na-ni u₄-mi ĥu-ud [.....] // 1 U₄ qu₂¹⁷-[i] ´e´-še-re-et ša-a-r[u...]</i>

E S: *Instead of a single day of joy, let there come silence for 36000 (years).*

E A: *Instead of [one day] of joy, one day of [silence (?)] for 36000 (years).*

Ua: *Instead of the joy of the heart for one day, let one day of silence for 36000 years come.*

Ub: *Instead of a day of joy, let a day of 36000 years of silence come.*

This line shows some degree of variation among the Syrian manuscripts¹⁶⁴³ and the Sumerian of Ua differs from all the sources. As pointed out by Alster,¹⁶⁴⁴ there are two Sumerian variants, ´u₄ 1´-kam and u₄-im-ba-kam, for the Akkadian u₄-um-ak-kal, ‘for the length of one day’; thus he states: ‘the text seems to have expanded by the inclusion of both variants, instead of the plain OB u₄ ša₃-ĥul₂-la diš-am₃’. Sumerian and Akkadian diverge from one another in Ua: *qulu*, ‘silence’, seems to translate ĥul, ‘bad’; Sumerian in-na-ak adheres to the OB recension whereas the Akkadian *lillika* translates the Sumerian of E and Ub.¹⁶⁴⁵

Syrian manuscripts offer different texts also in Syr. 19: the Emar text is closer to the monolingual version rather than to Ua which includes a variant:

OB	19	A [nam-til ₃ n]u-zalag-ga [ugu nam-uš ₂ -a-kam] // [a]-ba-am ₃ bi ₂ -[in-diri-ga] B [nam-til ₃ nu-zalag-ga] ugu nam-uš ₂ -a-kam // [a]-ba-am ₃ bi ₂ -in-diri-ga D [...] x ĜEŠ.KA-am ₃
E	19	[na]m-ti[l ₃ nu-zal]ag-ga // [ugu]-nam-u[š ₂ t]a-am ₃ me-diri nam-til ₃ nu-za-la-aq-qa // u-ga-na-ma-uš-ša ta-am ₃ me-d[a-ri] [ba-la]-ṭu ša la-a na-ma-ri // [a-na-m]u-ti mi ₃ -na-a ut-ti-i[r]
Ua	13 14	nam-til ₃ -la niĝ ₂ -zalag-ga nu-me-a ugu-[n]a nam-uš ₂ -a a-na-am ₃ mi-ni-diri <i>ba-la-ṭa ša la na-ma-ri a-na mi-ti mi-na-a ut-ter</i>
Ub A ¹	10 11	na[m]-til ₃ nu-za[lag-.....] na[m-u]š ¹ ta-a // mi-x-ru? [.....] x x x <i>: ba-la-ṭu₃ ša la-a na-ma-[ri] // UGU ´mu´-ti mi-na [ut-ter]</i>
Uc Rev.	1-2	[...] [.....š]a la-a na-´ma´-[ri] // [.....]-ti mi-na-am ut-´ter´

Life on which no light is shed, how can it be more valuable than death?

¹⁶⁴² Reading based on George’s copy *apud* Cohen 2012c. Scholars have read this line differently: Arnaud 1985-1987: *di-na-nu [ĥ]u-ud lib₃-b[i] 1-en U₄ n[a-am-ri] 10 ša-r[i ni-is-sa-ti]*; Wilcke 1988 and Alster 2005: *di-na-nu [ša ĥ]u-ud lib₃-b[i] // 1-en u₄-m[u] 10 ša-r[u...]*; Dietrich 1992: *di-na-nu [ĥ]u-ud lib₃-b[i] u₄-mu-[ak-kal] 10 ša-r[u...]*.

¹⁶⁴³ See Alster 2005, 311.

¹⁶⁴⁴ Alster 2005, 319.

¹⁶⁴⁵ Cf. the OB manuscripts: BM 80091: [niĝ₂-saĝ-i]l₂-la u₄ ša₃-ĥul₂-la ‘x’ // niĝ₂-me-ĝar mu 3600 x 10-am₃ in-ak; BM 80184: [...]a u₄ ša₃-ĥul₂-la 1-am₃ // [ni]ĝ₂-me-ĝar mu 3600 x 10-am₃ in-ak; CBS 1208: [...] 3600 x 10-am₃ in²-ak.

Ua has niĝ₂-zalag-ga nu-me-a, 'without light',¹⁶⁴⁶ instead of nu-zalag-ga attested in the OB manuscripts, E and Ub. Moreover, Ua is the only manuscript to report the correct non-human interrogative pronoun a-na-am₃ instead of the incorrect a-ba-am₃ attested in the OB recension. It is worth noting that the Akkadian versions of all the Syrian manuscripts are nearly identical.

The extant sources seem to diverge from one another in line 3 and thus some remarks are required:

E	3	[u ₄ -da(?) igi-da-ta inim] ni ĝal ₂ -la u-du i-gi-du-ud-du ₅ i-nim ni-ig-gal-[a] [i]š-tu u ₄ -mi pa-na-a 'ib'-[.....]
Ua	22	[u ₄]-da-ta im al-ĝal ₂ -la
	23	[.....] x x i-ba-a[š ₂]-ša-a an-ni-[a-t]u ¹⁶⁴⁷
Ua	44	'u ₄ -da-ta' im [.....]
	45	[...]
Ub B'	5	u ₂ -tu 'i ² -ki'-[tu?.....] [...]
Uc Obv.	2	[...] [.....] u ₄ -mi pa-na-nu ib-ba ₂ -a[š ₂]

The text of E, Ub and Uc also agrees with the NA recension against Ua:

NA [x] igi-du-ta ne-e al-ĝal₂-[la(?)]

According to Alster¹⁶⁴⁸ i-gi-du-ud-du₅ in E, which renders the reading igi-du of IGI.DU, replaces the expected palil because the scribe mistakenly copied from the following line. However, the restoration proposed here in Ub B' 5, u₂-tu 'i²-ki'-[tu?...], allows harmonizing the text of Ub with manuscript E and with [x] igi-du-ta¹⁶⁴⁹ in the NA fragment. This suggests that the Emar variant is not due to a scribal mistake but that E, Ub, Uc and NA rely on the same textual tradition that ensued from adaptation and modification that occurred in the Middle Babylonian period. Alster restored im al-ĝal₂-la, 'there has been wind', in the OB recension¹⁶⁵⁰ on the basis of Ua and regarded the Emar manuscript as corrupted.¹⁶⁵¹ Assuming agreement between the Mesopotamian sources (OB and NA), Alster states: 'these lines¹⁶⁵² do not confirm the expected reading im al-ĝal₂-la = [ša]-ru found in Ua 22-23, but have NE instead of im.'¹⁶⁵³ As far as the relationship among the Syrian manuscripts is concerned, two possible explanations may be advanced:

1646 This expression is grammatically incorrect as -da is omitted; for the expression -da nu-me-a 'without' see Jagersma 2010, 711.

1647 Different readings of Ua have been suggested by scholars: Dietrich 1992, 14, reads [.....p]a²-na² i-ba-a[š₂]-ša-a an-n[i]-i'-[t]um; Arnaud 2007, 144, reads [i]š-tu U₄ pa-na a-w]a-a-tu₃ i-ba-a[š₂]-ša an-ni-[a]-tu₃, considering IM as a *lapsus* for i-ni-im ~ inim, but this seems improbable as im also appears in line 44; Wilcke 1988 followed by Alster 2005 reads [...] x x i-ba-a[š₂]-ša-a-an-n[i] (x) ša]-ru. According to the hand-copy the last sign can be neither -tum nor -tu₃, but -ru (Alster) or -tu as here suggested.

1648 Alster 2005, 306: SS 3.

1649 For IGI.DU = *panû* see CAD P, 96.

1650 Syr. 1-6 are not preserved in the OB manuscripts.

1651 Alster 2005, 306-307: SS 3

1652 He refers to the NA text; this line is repeated in NA 2, 10.

1653 Alster 2005, 321: NA 2 and 10.

1. ne-e (NA) could be the demonstrative pronoun ne(n)¹⁶⁵⁴ written phonetically in E as ni; consequently one may regard IM in Ua with the reading ni₂ as a phonetic writing for ne-e that would fit Akkadian *anniātu*.¹⁶⁵⁵
2. ni (E) and ne-e (NA) could be phonetic writings for ni₂ which would be a misreading of IM. Consequently, the reading of the line Ua proposed by Wilcke and Alster is required. This would lead to two hypotheses: (a) the copying mistake was produced independently in Syria and at Nineveh; (b) the two recensions depend on the same corrupted MB source which instead of IM had a different sign, for instance NI.

Because the tablets are badly preserved a conclusive explanation cannot be arrived at; perhaps slightly different texts existed.

The phonetic Sumerian version occasionally differs from the standard orthography version:

- In line 8 the standard orthography version of the Emar text has me-na instead of the expected na-me attested in the phonetic version and in Ua.

E	8	[(ki) buru ₃ -da]-bi me-na 'nu'-u[n-zu-a] [..... n]a-me nu-un-zu-wa-a ¹⁶⁵⁶
Ua	9-10	ki buru ₃ -da-gen ₇ na-me nu-zu-[...] <i>A place which like the depth of the underworld nobody knows.</i>

- In E 21 the first column has mu-un-na-dim₂¹⁶⁵⁷ whereas the second has mu-un-na-ak-ki. This difference depends on the equivalence of dim₂, 'to create', and AK, 'to do', with the Akkadian *epēšu*.¹⁶⁵⁸ It is not precluded that the same holds true in line 11 in which the standard orthography version reports [...]-e-dim₂, whereas the OB recension has in-ak.¹⁶⁵⁹ Unfortunately, the second column of the Emar tablet is broken.

These examples may suggest that the phonetic Sumerian version of the Emar source is independent from the standard orthography version written on the same tablet. However, as this involves the way in which texts were copied it goes beyond the limits of the present work; the question remains open to further study.

The standard orthography Sumerian text usually agrees with the OB version, but variants are attested both between the Syrian and the monolingual sources, and between the Syrian manuscripts. The majority of variants are orthographic, but as pointed out above several textual variants are attested. Additionally, Syr. 20-22 is omitted in the manuscript Uc. This is further evidence that the final part of the composition was transmitted with several variants.

Line ¹	Standard Orthography		
	OB	E	Ua
2	x	ki 'nam'-sur-'sur-re'	ki-gal nam'-sur-sur-re
3	x	[inim] ni ĝal ₂ -la	im al-'ĝal ₂ '-la
7	šu-ĝu ₁₀	šu ti	šu-t[i?]

¹⁶⁵⁴ Edzard 2003, 49-50, Jagersma 2010, 225-227.

¹⁶⁵⁵ Cohen 2013, 140-143: 3, also suggests the presence of a demonstrative pronoun, but he refers it to I.NIM, read as i-ni, in the phonetic version of E, while ni-ig would be a writing for niĝ₂. However, in the first column NI is clearly written before ĝal₂-la, hence if one takes I.NIM as a writing for the ne(n), the reading i₃-ĝal₂-la / i₃-ig-gal-l[a] is required. Consequently, ni-ig cannot be a writing for niĝ₂, unless one considers that /i/ is omitted after ni-ig, but taking into consideration that in Ua and NA the prefix is al-, I would tend to regard ĝal₂-la as a non-finite form.

¹⁶⁵⁶ Msk 74159j, 3 has the variant nu-mu-un-zu-wa-a.

¹⁶⁵⁷ Alster 2005 reads mu-un-na-ka but the sign seems to be gen₇ in E 767, I, 7 = Msk 74153 Obv. 10; for KA see E 767, III, 7, II, 15, III, 20, III, 23; Arnaud 1985-1987 and Dietrich 1992 transliterate -gim.

¹⁶⁵⁸ CAD E, 192.

¹⁶⁵⁹ See below for the list of variants.

Standard Orthography			
7	sa ₂ bi ₂ -in-du ₁₁ -ga	na[m-bi-in-zu]	[x]-zu AN
8	ki buru ₃ -da-gen ₇	[ki buru ₃ -da]-bi	ki buru ₃ -da-gen ₇
8	na-me	me-na	na-me
8	nu-mu-un-zu-a	nu-u[n-zu-a]	nu-zu-[...]
11	in-ak	[...]-e-dim ₂	x
12	bi ₂ -in-e ₃ -de ₃	[x-(x)-d]a -e-de ₃	x
13	nam-til ₃	nam-til ₃ -la	x
13	i ₃ -kiĝ ₂ -kiĝ ₂	kiĝ ₂ -[...]	x
14	[me-a]	[me]-e	m[e-e]n
17	∅	∅	i ₃ -ti ₂ -eš ²
17	dub-saĝ	∅	?
17	u ₄ -ul-li ₂ -a-ke ₄ -ne	[u ₄ -saĝ-ĝa ₂]-ta	x
17	∅	e-ne-e-še-ta	?
18	[(nu-un-peš ₄ -peš ₄)]-´a´	[nu-peš ₄ -men ₅]	nu-peš ₄ -peš ₄ -e-ne
18	nu-un-du ₂ -ud-da	nu-du ₂ -du ₂ -men ₅	nu-du ₂ -d[u ₂ -...]
19	nu-zalag-ga	[nu-zal]ag-ga	niĝ ₂ -zalag-ga
19	∅	∅	nu-me-a
19	ugu nam-uš ₂ -a-kam	[ugu]-nam-u[š ₂]	ugu nam-uš ₂ -a
19	a-ba-am ₃	[t]a-am ₃	a-na-am ₃
19	bi ₂ -in-điri-ga	me-điri	mi-ni-điri
22	niĝ ₂ -saĝ-il ₂ -la	za-[...]-´il ₂ ´	niĝ ₂ -saĝ-il ₂ -la
22	u ₄ ša ₃ -ĥul ₂ -la ₂	´u ₄ ´ ša ₃ -ĥul ₂ -la ₂	ša ₃ -ĥul ₂ -la ³
22	1-am ₃	∅	´u ₄ 1´-kam u ₄ -im-ba-kam
22	niĝ ₂ -me-ĝar	∅	∅
22	∅	[lu-u]l-bi	∅
22	mu 3600 x 10-am ₃	u ₃ -ser ₃ -ser ₃	mu-10-šar ₂ ĥul
22	in-ak	ĥe ₂ -en-du	in-na-ak

1 Lineation according to the Syrian recension.

2 This is an unorthographic writing for i₃-til₃-eš, cf. OBGT I, 655.

3 Note that u₄ = ūmu is also omitted in the Akkadian translation.

The phonetic Sumerian version is known from manuscripts E and Ub¹⁶⁶⁰ but only some lines are preserved. From the several variants attested it is clear that phonetic versions of these manuscripts are not derived from the same source; likely they were created independently at Emar and Ugarit as exercises.

Phonetic Orthography		
Line	E	Ub
3	u-du	u ₂ -tu
3	i-gi-du-ud-du ₅	´i ² -ki´-[tu...]
4	me-na-a	me-e-tum ¹
4	la-ba-an-tu-ka-a	lah ₃ -ba-an-[...]
5	[dir]i-ia-na-an-ni	điri-ni-in-ni
6	[an-ta e ₂ /e ² -u]r-ra-k[i]-´e´-en ²	[a]n-ta-e-ur-ra-ga-´an-ni´
7	an ša-ud-ta-ki-im	[a]n-šu ₂ ¹ -ud-ta-´ki´-im

1660 A few unorthographic writings are also attested in Ua.

Phonetic Orthography		
8	na-me	nam-e-e
10	nam-lu-x [...]	[na-a]m ² -lu-lu
10	ud-da-ri-iš	ud-da
10	nu-ni-x[...]	ni ₂ -ig-[...]
19	nu-za-la-aq-qa	nu-za[lag-...]
19	u-ga-na-ma-uš-ša	[...]-na[m-u]š ¹
19	ta-am ₃	ta-a
19	me-d[a-ri]	mi-x-ru ²
20	ku-ru-uš	gu- [˘] ru-uš [˘]
20	ti-kar-zu	di[ġir-...]
20	ga-r[a-zu]	ga-la-[...]
21	isiš ₂	a-li-im
22	za-an-ki-el-la	saġ-ki-il-la
22	u ₂ ša-ḥu-la-al	[...]-ḥu-ul-la
22	lu-ul-bi	u ₂ -l[u]-ul-bi
22	ḥe ₂ -en-du	ḥi-in-du
23	ni-in-ki	ni-[i]g-gu
24	˘e [˘] -[e]n-ni	˘en-na [˘]
24	ki-iš-ḥu-ur	˘gi-eš [˘] -[...]
24	[nam]-˘lu-ul-lu [˘]	nam-u ₁₈ -lu-˘lu [˘]
24	gi-na	ki-i[n-na]

1 Cf. *Erimḥuš* Bogh A r' 12: me-ta [...] = *im-ma-ti-ma* = *nu ku-uš-ša-an* (Hitt.); OBG I 722: me-da-kam = *ma-ti-ma*.

2 ˘e[˘]-en is in Msk 74159j.

The Akkadian translation presents a few variants between manuscripts:

Line	E	Ua	Ub	Uc
1	<i>u[š-...]</i>	<i>[u]š-šu-ra-tu₄</i>	<i>[... š]u²-re-[tu]</i>	x
2	<i>ṭe₄-em¹</i>	<i>ṭe₃-em / ṭe-em</i>	<i>ṭe₄-e-i-ī[m</i>	x
2	DIĠIR- <i>'lim-ma²</i>	DIĠIR- <i>ma</i>	DIĠIR- <i>ma</i>	x
2	x	<i>us-qe₂-tu</i>	x	<i>us-qe₃-[...]</i>
3	<i>pa-na-a</i>	x	x	<i>pa-na-nu</i>
3	<i>'ib²-[...]</i>	<i>i-ba-a[š₂]-ša²-a²</i>	x	<i>ib-ba₂-a[š₂...]</i>
4	<i>[te]š₂²-mi</i>	x	x	<i>[t]e-iš-mi</i>
5	<i>[elī]-ši-na ši-na-m[a]</i>	x	x	<i>[e-ī]i-šu-nu šu-nu-ma⁴</i>
5	<i>ša-an-nu-t[u₄-ma]</i>	x	x	<i>ša-nu-tu-ma</i>
7	<i>[ī]-ka-aš-šu-ud</i>	x	x	<i>i-kaš-ša[d]</i>
7	x	AN- <i>u₂</i>	x	<i>[š]a-mu-u₂</i>
7	x	ŠU	x	<i>qa-ta²</i>
15	<i>^mEn-ki-du</i>	<i>^dEn-ki-^rdu₃²</i>	x	x
17	<i>a-le-e šar-ra-nu</i>	<i>a-le šu-nu-ti LUGAL.MEŠ</i>	x	x
18	<i>[u]l</i>	<i>ul</i>	<i>[u₂-u]l</i>	x
18	<i>in-ne₂-ru-ma</i>	<i>in-ne₂-ru-u₂</i>	x	x
19	<i>[ba-la]-ṭu</i>	<i>ba-la-ṭa</i>	<i>ba-la-ṭu₃ ba-la-aṭ²</i>	x
19	<i>la-a</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>la-a</i>	<i>la-a</i>
19	x	<i>a-na</i>	UGU	x
19	<i>[m]u-ti</i>	<i>mi-ti</i>	<i>'mu²-ti</i>	x
19	<i>mi₃-na-a</i>	<i>mi-na-a</i>	<i>mi-na</i>	<i>mi-na-am</i>
19	<i>ut-ti-ī[r]</i>	<i>ut-ter</i>	x	<i>ut²-ter²</i>
21	<i>si₂-ki[p²]</i>	x	<i>si₂-[k]i-īp</i>	-
21	<i>qu-ī-[a-ti]</i>	x	<i>qu₂-ī-[a-t]i</i>	-
22	<i>di-na-nu</i>	<i>a-na di-na-an</i>	<i>a-[n]a² di₃-na-ni²</i>	x
22	<i>[ḥu-u]d lib₃-b[ī]</i>	<i>ḥu-ud lib₃-bi</i>	<i>u₄-mi ḥu-ud [...]</i>	x
22	<i>1-en u₄-m[u]</i>	<i>u₄-um-ak-kal u₄-um</i>	<i>1 U₄</i>	x
22	<i>10 ša-[ru ...]</i>	<i>qu-li // 10 ŠAR₂.[MEŠ] MU.MEŠ</i>	<i>qu₂¹²-l[ī] 'e²-še-re-et ša- a-r[u ...]</i>	x
23	<i>ki-i-ma ma-ri² [d²zi-ra-aš]</i>	x	<i>'zi-ra²-[aš] ki-[...]</i>	<i>[...] ki-a[m]-ma ma-a-ri</i>
24	<i>an-nu-um</i>	x	<i>[an]-nu-um-ma</i>	<i>[an-nu-u]m</i>
24	<i>u₂-š[u-ur-tum]</i>	x	<i>i-š[u-ur-tum]</i>	<i>i-šu-ur-tum</i>

¹ Alster 2005, 307, regards the feminine form in E as a mistake, but see the reconstruction in Cohen 2013, 132, in which *elišina* refers to *anniātu* in l. 3. Dietrich 1992, 15, regards *-šina* as referring to an implied substantive *nišū*. For the use of 3fpl. possessive pronouns see Seminara 1998, 262-263.

² This line is duplicated in Ub A 10-11 and 3.

The majority of variants are purely orthographic and as expected the most significant ones are attested in Ua¹⁶⁶¹ which relies on a different textual tradition.¹⁶⁶²

¹⁶⁶¹ See Syr. 3, 5, 17, 22.

¹⁶⁶² Note the tendency towards the use of logograms for syllabic writings in the other manuscripts in ll. 7, 17, 22 and the writing *la* in line 19 as opposed to *la-a*.

As noted above the Akkadian diverges from the Sumerian text in Syr. 3, 22; a further instance is E 767, 17 which presents e-ne-e-še-ta, a phonetic writing for $i_3/i/e$ -ne-še₃-ta 'henceforth', instead of the expected $i_3/i/e$ -ne-še₃ = *inanna*,¹⁶⁶³ 'now, so far',¹⁶⁶⁴ as shown by the Akkadian *adi inanna*.

The Sumerian text presents errors of minor importance. Aberrations such as those observed in *PfK* are not attested in *BeR*.

- The genitive is omitted in the following passages of the Emar text:
 - In [ka lu₂]-igi-du-a-ni (E 767, I, 4) -k- is omitted: *ka lu₂-igi-du-ka-ne₂.
 - [ugu]-nam-u[š₂] (E 767, I, 19), cf. ugu-nam-uš₂-a-kam in BM 80184 (B); on the basis of the hand-copy there is no room for the -a attested in the phonetic version u-ga-na-ma-uš-ša.

Both cases may be due to the Emar copyist.

- The use of -bi with human class nouns is known since the Old Babylonian period:¹⁶⁶⁵ in lu-u₂ tur-ra-bi, 'her little child' (E 767, I-II, 23), -bi refers to a goddess.¹⁶⁶⁶
- In e₂-ur₃-ra-ke₄-e-n[e] (E 767, I, 6) -e-ne is a short-writing from -a-ne-ne = *e₂-ur₃-ra-ke₄-n[e].¹⁶⁶⁷
- E 767, 18 has the 1/2sg. copula instead of the expected 3pl. -me-eš; the copula is not present in the OB manuscripts:¹⁶⁶⁸

B [nu-un-peš₄-peš₄]-^ˈa^ˈ nu-un-du₂-ud-da

E 18 [nu-peš₄-men₅] nu-du₂-du₂-men₅
nu-peš-ša-me-en nu-da-da-am-m[e-en]

They are no longer engendered, they are not born.

- In Ub A¹ 6 (= Syr. 21) the scribe writes the sequence A.IGI for isiš₂ as a-li-im.¹⁶⁶⁹

As noticed above, the OB manuscripts also exhibit some errors that suggest a late textual tradition. A further example is til₃-a e₂ guruš-ke₄, '(men who) live in the house of the young man' (OB 22): according to Alster¹⁶⁷⁰ the syntactic order with the verb placed at the beginning of the sentence is influenced by Akkadian. However, a different explanation may apply: the sentence could be a genitive compound, in which case the error is not in the position of til₃-a,¹⁶⁷¹ but in the use of -ke₄ as a genitive case marker, a common practice since the Old Babylonian period,¹⁶⁷² instead of the expected -a-ka.

¹⁶⁶³ Cf. CAD I, 142.

¹⁶⁶⁴ Cf. OBGT Ia rev. i 5': i_3 -ne-še-ta = *iš-tu i-na-a[n-na]*; *Inana and An* (ETCSL 1.3.5) Segment D 43, i_3 -ne-eš₂-ta u₄-da šid-bi ba-da-tur u₄ ġe₆-bi-a ba-da-bur₂, 'From today, when the day's watch is three units long, daylight is equal to night-time.'

¹⁶⁶⁵ Black, Zólyomi 2007, 13-15.

¹⁶⁶⁶ Alster 2005, 319.

¹⁶⁶⁷ See Alster 2005, 308.

¹⁶⁶⁸ See Alster 2005, 309-310.

¹⁶⁶⁹ See Alster 2005, 318.

¹⁶⁷⁰ Alster 2005, 311.

¹⁶⁷¹ til₃-a is a writing for til₃-la.

¹⁶⁷² Edzard 2000, 64.

Arnaud suggested that the text of Ub and Uc was received through Assyrian mediation on the basis of the form *išurtu* for the Babylonian *ušurtu* (Syr. 24).¹⁶⁷³ A further Assyrianism in the same line is *amiluttu*, documented in Ub, Uc and E. These Assyrian forms, however, must be considered common features of peripheral Akkadian. The use of the Assyrian suffix *-uttu* is typical of the Akkadian of Emar for abstract substantives.¹⁶⁷⁴ Peripheral forms are the adverb *panānu* in Uc Obv. 2 (Syr. 3), which in the second half of the second millennium is only attested in the Western periphery and earlier in the Old Babylonian and Old Akkadian dialects;¹⁶⁷⁵ the word *immatimē* in E (Syr. 4), which belongs to the peripheral lexicon;¹⁶⁷⁶ the form *ša-an-nu-t[u₄-ma]* in E (Syr. 5).

To sum up, two different textual traditions of *BeR* are reflected in the Syrian manuscripts, one represented by the Babylonian script tablet Ua, and the other by the manuscripts E, Ub and Uc which share the same line order¹⁶⁷⁷ and the mention of Siraš (Syr. 23-24). Whether the circulation of the Ua text in Syria was limited to Ugarit cannot be determined on the basis of the present evidence. Babylonian schools developed and transmitted two versions of *BeR*, one closer to the OB recension¹⁶⁷⁸ and another characterized by several variants. These two textual traditions probably took different paths of transmission: the text of Ua reached the Western periphery directly, whereas the Emar-Ugarit manuscripts (E, Ub, Uc) seem not to depend on the same Mesopotamian model. Different versions of the same composition are known at Ugarit for the Gilgameš epic as pointed out by Arnaud¹⁶⁷⁹ and George.¹⁶⁸⁰

Variants of the Emar-Ugarit manuscripts rely on the Mesopotamian tradition and do not result from reworking by local scribes but rather by the Middle Babylonian scribal schools. However, the distinction between variants due to Middle Babylonian scribes and those already attested in some unpreserved OB sources is unclear. The alteration of line order and the addition of Bazi and Zizi to the list of ancient rulers were likely accomplished in the Middle Babylonian period,¹⁶⁸¹ whereas the mention of Siraš might have been contained in an OB manuscript.¹⁶⁸²

BeR was used in the Syrian scribal schools as a tool for learning Sumerian and Akkadian as evidenced by the creation of the phonetic Sumerian version and by the recovery of manuscripts in two different scribal centers at Ugarit, the Maison-aux-tablettes (Ub) and the Lamaštu archive (Ua, Uc). Moreover the scribe of Ub is identified as an apprentice.

As better explained below,¹⁶⁸³ the relation of *BeR* to the vanity theme which was well known at Nippur suggests that it reflects the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition.

6.2.2 Enlil and Namzitarra

*Enlil and Namzitarra (EaN)*¹⁶⁸⁴ is another wisdom composition expounding the vanity theme discovered in the Syrian libraries.¹⁶⁸⁵ It is preserved in two manuscripts from Emar and Ugarit.

¹⁶⁷³ Arnaud 2007, 12, see also Arnaud 1977-78, 185-186.

¹⁶⁷⁴ Seminara 1998, 104; this form is also attested in *Enlil and Namzitarra*.

¹⁶⁷⁵ See Seminara 1998, 515 and AHw, 818.

¹⁶⁷⁶ Seminara 1998, 567-568.

¹⁶⁷⁷ Ub A' 3 = A' 10-11 (= Syr. 19); Uc omits Syr. 20-21.

¹⁶⁷⁸ Note also in Ua the preservation of *-ak*, Syr. 22 (= OB 20), as in the OB manuscripts, whereas the other Syrian manuscripts have *-du*, Alster 2005, 293.

¹⁶⁷⁹ Arnaud 2007, 36.

¹⁶⁸⁰ George 2007b.

¹⁶⁸¹ Indeed Ua does not report this line.

¹⁶⁸² See Alster 2005, 290.

¹⁶⁸³ See § 9.4.

¹⁶⁸⁴ ETCSL 5.7.1.

¹⁶⁸⁵ For the interpretation of the composition see Alster 2005, 327-334, Cohen 2010 with previous bibliography.

Fragments **E 771 (+) E 772 (+) E 773 (+) E 774 (+) E 592** are part of a two-column tablet containing the Sumerian version on the left and the Akkadian translation on the right. The Emar recension is expanded with an Akkadian wisdom text inscribed on the same tablet containing the speech of a father to his sons. This composition begins on line 29 without any dividing ruling from *EaN* and it is inscribed on both columns.

RS 22.341 + RS 28.053A = AuOrS 23 47 is a fragment from the right edge of its tablet discovered in the Maison-aux-tablettes preserving a few lines on the reverse whereas the obverse is broken away. Only the Akkadian version is preserved but the Sumerian text was probably arranged in a parallel column. The tablet format with lines enclosed in paragraphs set off by horizontal rulings is reminiscent of the Emar tablet. This manuscript is the work of a local scribe as is evident from the shapes of TI (§§ 2, 3, 4, 5) and LI (§ 5).

EaN is known from seven OB tablets from Nippur and was used in the education of scribes during the Intermediary Phase, as the tablet formats clearly indicate.¹⁶⁸⁶ As pointed out by Y. Cohen,¹⁶⁸⁷ the Ugarit recension duplicates the Emar text. This composition is quoted in a catalogue from the library of Aššurbanipal,¹⁶⁸⁸ but no first-millennium sources are so far known. This quotation, however, confirms that *EaN* was transmitted to the first-millennium libraries.

Compared to the OB monolingual text, the bilingual Syrian recension differs in line order and the addition of new sections.¹⁶⁸⁹ Indeed the three-line speech in the OB version (19-21) featuring the vanity theme is expanded into a larger section in the Emar text (E 771+, 13-26):

OB	19	ku ₃ ħe ₂ -tuku za ħe ₂ -tuku gud ħe ₂ -tuku udu ħe ₂ -tuku
	20	u ₄ nam-lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu al-ku-nu
	21	niġ ₂ -tuku-zu me-še ₃ e-tum ₃ -ma
	19	<i>You will have silver, you will have precious stones, you will have cattle, you will have sheep.</i>
	20	<i>The day of mankind is approaching (death),</i>
	21	<i>So where does your wealth lead?</i> ¹⁶⁹⁰
E	13	ʿen-na ku ₃ -babbar ħe ₂ -tuku [.....]
	14	^{na4} za-gin ₃ ħe ₂ -tuku [.....]
	15	gud ħe ₂ -tuku [.....]
	16	[u]du ħe ₂ -tuku
	17	ku ₃ -babbar-zu ^{na4} za-gin ₃ -zu gud-zu udu-zu ʿKU ₃ .BABBAR-ka ^{na4} ZA.GIN ₃ -ka [GUD-ka UDU-ka]
	18	me-še ₃ al-tum ₃ ¹⁶⁹¹
	19	u ₄ -nam-lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu al-gurun-na U ₄ .MEŠ a-mi-lu-ut-ʿti lu qe ₃ -er-bu ¹⁶⁹²
	20	u ₄ -an-na ħa-ba-lal u ₄ -mi a-na u ₄ -mi li-im-ṭ[i]
	21	iti-an-na ħa-ba-lal ITI a-na ITI li-im-ṭi

1686 The OB sources of *EaN* are inscribed on either *Sammeltafeln* or exercise tablets, see Civil 1974-77, 67, and Vanstiphout 1980, 67 and n. 1. Type I: 3N-T 326 (IM 58427) + 3N-T 360 (A 30218), N 3097, UM 29-16-79A; Type III: CBS 4605 = PBS 12/1 31; Type II: N 5149, N 5909, CBS 7917 + N 4784, see also Kleinerman 2011, 65, Rutz 2013, 271 n. 235-236.

1687 Cohen 2010, 91-92.

1688 Lambert 1989.

1689 See Cohen 2010.

1690 Translation according to Cohen 2010, 92-93.

1691 The presence of al- is possibly due to an analogy with line 20 of the OB recension where this prefix was used.

1692 For this restoration see Cohen 2013, 159: 19; Arnaud 2007, 140 § 4 reads *ik-pu-pu*.

22	mu-mu-an-na ḥa-ba-lal ¹⁶⁹³ MU <i>a-na</i> MU <i>li-mi-ṭi</i>
23/24	mu ₂ šu-ši mu-meš nam-lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu niĝ ₂ -geg-bi ḥe-a 2 šu-ši MU.MEŠ-u lu-u ₂ ik-ki- [˘] ib <i>a-mi-lu-[˘]ut-ti ba-la-x</i>
25	ki-u ₄ -ta-ta nam-lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu <i>iš-tu</i> U ₄ . [˘] DA [˘] <i>a-di[˘] i-na-an-na</i>
26	e [˘] -na i ₃ -in-eš ₂ til ₃ -la-e-ni <i>a-mi-lu-ut-tu₃ bal-ṭu</i>
13	<i>You will have silver,</i>
14	<i>You will have lapis lazuli gems,</i>
15	<i>You will have cattle,</i>
16	<i>You will have sheep.</i>
18	<i>[Whe]re will I have taken</i>
17	<i>Your silver, your lapis lazuli, your sheep?</i>
19	<i>The days of mankind are declining.</i>
20	<i>Day after day they are diminishing.</i>
21	<i>Month after month they are diminishing.</i>
22	<i>Year after year they are diminishing.</i>
	<i>[The days of mankind] – they are diminishing (Ugarit only),</i>
23/24	<i>120 years – that is the limit of mankind's life, its term,</i>
25	<i>from that day till now,</i>
26	<i>as long as mankind has existed.</i> ¹⁶⁹⁴

As with the other compositions found in the Western libraries, our main concern lies in the origin of the differences between the OB recension and the LBA manuscripts. Klein¹⁶⁹⁵ claimed a connection with the Western-Semitic tradition and in particular with Genesis 6:3 in which the limit of 120 years is imposed on mankind (E 771+, 23-24). Indeed, even though the divine imposition of a limit on human life is known from Atrahasis and the Gilgameš epic, the number of 120 years is nowhere else attested in Mesopotamian literature. On the contrary Alster¹⁶⁹⁶ emphasized the relation with the Mesopotamian tradition, advancing the hypothesis, here followed, that the Syrian recension stems from a MB model that was created on the basis of the tale of *EaN*. Moreover, according to Alster the Akkadian is the primary version while the Sumerian was added as a secondary translation.

The figure of 120 years which seems to be the principal connection with the Western-Semitic tradition is based on a sexagesimal system, which is common in Mesopotamia but unknown in the biblical literature as pointed out by Klein himself.¹⁶⁹⁷ Also the meaning 'bane' (as the consequence of a punishment) implied in the term niĝ₂-geg (l. 24), which is only attested in the Emar manuscript, is known from *The Death of Gilgameš* as illustrated by Klein.¹⁶⁹⁸ The dependence of the Syrian manuscripts of *BeR*, which is thematically related to *EaN*, on the Mesopotamian tradition further supports Alster's hypothesis.

The Akkadian wisdom text inscribed on the same tablet as E 771+ was appended to *EaN* because it concerns the shortness of human life expressed in the vanity theme. Even though no Mesopotamian duplicates of this text are known, its thematic relation with *EaN*, and more generally with the vanity

¹⁶⁹³ Sumerian u₄/iti/mu -an-na is not equivalent to u₄-mi a-na u₄-mi, ITI a-na ITI, MU a-na MU, see Klein 1990, 63 n. 12, 14. For a similar expression see E 775, 24.

¹⁶⁹⁴ Translation according to Cohen 2010, 94.

¹⁶⁹⁵ Klein 1990, 60-62.

¹⁶⁹⁶ Alster 2005, 330-332; Alster's hypothesis that the Emar scribe copied from a damaged tablet on line 23 may be dismissed in light of Klein's reading *pa₂-la[˘]-ša[˘]* at the end of the Akkadian line, *apud* Cohen 2010, 94 n. 13. I consider ḥe-a here as a phonetic writing for ḥe₂-a.

¹⁶⁹⁷ Klein 1990, 69 n. 47.

¹⁶⁹⁸ Klein 1990, 64 n. 15.

theme, indicates that it relies on the Mesopotamian tradition.¹⁶⁹⁹ This composition is reminiscent of *Šimâ Milka*,¹⁷⁰⁰ attested at Emar, Ugarit and Ḫattuša. Although no OB or MB sources from Mesopotamia have yet been recovered its quotation in an OB catalogue¹⁷⁰¹ and the recent identification of a first-millennium manuscript from Nimrud¹⁷⁰² clearly evidence that *Šimâ Milka* is a Mesopotamian composition. The close relation between Sumerian and Akkadian wisdom texts is not surprising, given the aforementioned OB catalogue quoting *Šimâ Milka*¹⁷⁰³ which lists Akkadian texts in addition to Sumerian compositions. Moreover an OB Type II tablet is inscribed with an Akkadian Sargon letter and an extract from Proto-Lu₂.¹⁷⁰⁴ Therefore it is not precluded that *EaN* and the Akkadian wisdom text were already written together on the same Mesopotamian tablet that was transmitted to the Western periphery. The format of E 771+ recalls OB Type III tablets inscribed with different compositions on each side.¹⁷⁰⁵

That *EaN* is a composition belonging to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition¹⁷⁰⁶ is clear from its curricular setting and the provenance from Nippur of all the OB manuscripts. During the Middle Babylonian period *EaN* was rephrased and updated with the addition of the Akkadian translation.¹⁷⁰⁷ This bilingual version was then transmitted to the Western periphery.

6.2.3 The Fowler – E 768 - E 769 - E 770

A literary composition concerned with a fowler is preserved in several fragments at Emar. Two fragments are published under **E 768**. E 768A = Msk 7498b (+) Msk 7478b + Msk 74228b is a fragment from the upper left corner of its tablet preserving standard orthography and phonetic Sumerian versions arranged in parallel columns. E 768B = Msk 74137b is a fragment from the right edge of its tablet that only preserves the Akkadian version. According to Arnaud these two fragments were not part of the same tablet, but restoration of the colophon¹⁷⁰⁸ may suggest otherwise. According to the colophon the scribe is the same as that of *BeR*, Šaggar-abu son of Ba'al-qarrād. **E 769** is a fragment from the lower left corner preserving six lines on the obverse and five lines on the reverse in standard Sumerian. **E 770** is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving, on the obverse, unorthographic Sumerian and Akkadian versions in parallel column format, whereas the reverse is broken away. It is clear that these fragments belong to several three-column tablets, the same format as the manuscript of *BeR*.¹⁷⁰⁹

No other duplicates are known from either Syria or Mesopotamia, but this composition is very close to an Akkadian text preserved on Late Babylonian tablets.¹⁷¹⁰ Furthermore the catalogue of the series of Sidu quoted above cites an incipit which may refer to *The Fowler*. Probably related to our text is *The Fowler and his Wife* which, as seen above, is known from OB and MB manuscripts

1699 Differently Kämmerer 1998, 116-117.

1700 Klein 1990, 66 n. 25.

1701 Civil 1989; on the tradition of this text and the Akkadian wisdom literature see Sallaberger 2010.

1702 Nurullin 2014.

1703 Sallaberger 2010, 307-308.

1704 Veldhuis 1997, 66.

1705 Type III tablets are here taken as relevant examples because Type I are multicolumn tablets designed to be inscribed with more than two compositions, and Type II tablets, even though they only contain two texts on the obverse and reverse, comprise a copy written by the master. The closest parallels to E 771+ are therefore those Type III tablets that were occasionally inscribed with two compositions because the first was too short for the daily exercise.

1706 See § 9.4.

1707 Note that the use of -meš (E 771+, 23) as plural marker traces back to the Mesopotamian tradition of the post-Old Babylonian period.

1708 Cohen 2009, 169-170, 221.

1709 Civil 1989, 7, also quotes Msk 74238t = E 747 as a further possible fragment, see § 6.2.20.

1710 BM 53309 and BM 53555 = Lambert 1960, 221.

and is a part of proverb collections.¹⁷¹¹ These two compositions do not preserve any parallel lines and the fragmentary nature of all the manuscripts precludes any possibility of understanding their relationship to each other. It is possible that the text preserved at Emar is a LOB or MB reworking of *The Fowler and his Wife*¹⁷¹² or a different composition created in the Middle Babylonian period. Some errors that cannot be ascribed to the Emar copyist(s) are possible pieces of evidence that the text was composed or reworked in the Middle Babylonian period:

- In še-na bir-bir-re, ‘He scatters his grain’ (E 768A, I, 2), -ani=a (GEN/LOC) is written instead of the expected absolutive form -ani=Ø.¹⁷¹³ Perhaps the influence of the Akkadian accusative can be taken into account here.
- In mušen-ḫi-a (E 768A, I, 5) the typical Akkadian plural marker ḫi.A is used.
- In buru₃-mušen-e-ne¹⁷¹⁴ (E 768A, I, 7) the human plural marker -ene is used for a non-human noun.

An error possibly due to the Emar scribe is the order of prefixes in the verbal form ^dutu-ra in-ta-ba-an-ki, ‘He approached Utu’ (E 768A, I, 3) because the ablative -ta- cannot precede -ba-; the expected form would be: *im-ma-ta-an-gi₄.

Because *The Fowler and his Wife* was used as a school text,¹⁷¹⁵ the same function can probably be attributed to *The Fowler*. Taking into consideration that *The Fowler* and *BeR* were related by their possible mention in the same catalogue and were copied at Emar by the same scribe, they likely arrived in Syria at the same time and through the same route.

6.2.4 The Letter of Sîn-iddinam to Utu – TBR 101

*The Letter of Sîn-iddinam to Utu (SI-Utu)*¹⁷¹⁶ was the only composition from the Sumerian court literature of the Larsa dynasty to be transmitted to the Western periphery. It is preserved on a single tiny fragment from Emar, **TBR 101**. Since this source was found during illegal excavations its find-spot is unrecorded but it likely stems from Temple M₁. Six OB monolingual manuscripts of *SI-Utu* are known.¹⁷¹⁷ Three tablets stem from Nippur: CBS 7072 + N 3147 is a single-column tablet (Type III) containing *SI-Utu* on the reverse whereas the obverse is inscribed with another petition letter from the Larsa court literature, *Sîn-iddinam to Ninisina*; CBS 3829 = STVC 13 is a fragmentary tablet, probably an *imgidda*, preserving a few lines on the reverse;¹⁷¹⁸ CBS 4078 is a lentil-shaped tablet (Type IV) that contains only line 25 on each side. From Sippar stems the unpublished tablet Si 550. Two manuscripts are of unknown provenance:¹⁷¹⁹ AO 6718 = TCL 16 56 is a single-column tablet (Type III) containing the second half of the text; Ashm 1922-258 = OECT 4 25 is a four-sided prism containing four additional letters:¹⁷²⁰ *Pû-Inana to Lugal-ibila*,¹⁷²¹ *Ninšatapa to Rîm-Sîn*, a possible let-

1711 See § 1.1.6.5.

1712 A similar case is *LI-LN* that was created on the model of *The Letter of Inim-Inana to Lugal-ibila*, § 5.3.4.

1713 Cf. for instance *The Lament for Nibru* 4, me-bi a-ba-a in-bir-re, ‘who scattered its divine powers?’

1714 buru₃ ~ buru₄.

1715 See Alster 2005, 391-392.

1716 ETCSL 3.2.5; a new edition of all manuscripts is provided by Brisch 2007, 158-178.

1717 For the manuscripts see Brisch 2007, 170 with previous bibliography.

1718 This source is an extract tablet as lines 23-25 inscribed on the reverse are followed by a horizontal ruling and blank space.

1719 For the provenance of unrecorded tablets of the Larsa literature see Brisch 2007, 33-35.

1720 Brisch 2007, 78.

1721 Civil 2000a, 107-109.

ter from Nanna-manšum to Ninisina and an unknown letter from Sîn-iddinam to Ninisina. *SI-Utu* is one of the few Sumerian literary letters to survive into the first millennium and the only one found in the library of Aššurbanipal¹⁷²² where it was preserved on two bilingual tablets.¹⁷²³ In addition, this composition is quoted in an OB catalogue of literary letters from Uruk.¹⁷²⁴

The Emar fragment was originally part of a three-column tablet containing versions in standard orthography, phonetic orthography and Akkadian, but only the unorthographic version is preserved on both obverse and reverse. Y. Cohen¹⁷²⁵ attributes this manuscript to the Syro-Hittite school with some hesitation, as the tablet is too fragmentary and no colophon is preserved. Lines 23-27 of the composition are preserved on the obverse and lines 40-44 on the reverse. The fragmentary nature of the Emar tablet does not allow us to compare it with the OB manuscripts, especially in the absence of the standard orthography version. Also the relation of the Emar tablet to the late sources is impossible to estimate. Nevertheless, some differences from the other manuscripts can be detected. Line 26 in the Emar text diverges from the extant manuscripts:¹⁷²⁶

26	E	Obv. 7-8	za-lam-ĝar til ₃ -[la] al-du-uš nu [...]
	OB		za-lam-ĝar til ₃ -la ki-diĝir-re-e-ne-ke ₄ nu-mu-un-zu-a
	NA		ʾza-lam-ĝar til-l[a] ki-diĝir-re-e-ne[ke ₄] nu-un-zu-[a] [x (x)] a-šib k[u]š-ʾta-ru ša ₂ aš ₂ -rat DIGIR. [MEŠ l]a i-ʾdu-u ₂ <i>The one who lives in the tent, who knows no place of gods.</i>

Following Civil's restoration the reverse of TBR 101 exhibits a different line order from the other manuscripts as line 43 is placed between lines 40 and 41. The rest of the Emar text does not contain any relevant variants.

The Sumerian court literature of the Larsa dynasty strongly diverges in terms of form, style, content and language from the Ur III and Isin poetry.¹⁷²⁷ The Larsa literature represents an independent stream of tradition of Sumerian literature that was almost excluded from the Nippur scribal schools¹⁷²⁸ which made the Ur III and Isin compositions an essential part of their curriculum. On the contrary the Larsa literature flourished in Ur where most of the sources were recovered.¹⁷²⁹ However, within the corpus of Larsa literature a distinction between praise poems (hymns) and literary letters is required. The letters indeed show motifs very different from those found in the royal hymns of the kings of Larsa. In particular Sîn-iddinam's letters of petition depict the king in a such negative way that it is unthinkable that they were commissioned by him. It is more likely that they were composed after his death, probably at the behest of the rulers of Babylon who were interested in producing a defamatory portrait of Sîn-iddinam.¹⁷³⁰ Moreover, contrary to praise poems, three of the four Larsa letters are attested in Nippur. As pointed out by Brisch, literary letters of Larsa dynasty should be regarded as a product of the Nippur school.¹⁷³¹ This makes it understandable why *SI-Utu* was transmitted to the Western periphery and survived in the first millennium. It is not a coincidence that this is the only composition from the Larsa literature that survived after the Old Babylonian period.

1722 Cf. *LI-LN*, § 5.3.4.

1723 K 8937; K 4615+.

1724 W 17259an = AUWE 23 112 Obv. 13.

1725 Cohen 2009, 224.

1726 According to Civil 1996 the Emar manuscript depends on a different textual tradition.

1727 Brisch 2007, 70-74, 116-120.

1728 For an explanation of the exclusion of the Larsa literature from the Nippur curriculum see Brisch 2007, 73-74.

1729 Brisch 2007, 14.

1730 Brisch 2007, 80-81.

1731 Brisch 2007, 118.

The NA manuscripts replace the name of Larsa with Babylon¹⁷³² and use the Emesal form for ‘city’, *uru*, instead of the main dialect *iri*.¹⁷³³ According to Borger this change was accomplished under the king of the Second Dynasty of Isin, Adad-apla-iddinam, but he is not able to state whether the Akkadian translation was prepared during his reign or earlier. The presence of a surely bilingual recension at Emar clearly points out that the Akkadian translation was composed before the Second Dynasty of Isin. Unfortunately, we are not in a position to know whether the replacement of Larsa with Babylon had already occurred in the Emar manuscript as none of these lines are preserved. However, it is likely that the Emar text relied on the OB manuscript because such a replacement better fits the political ideology of the Second Dynasty of Isin. This could indicate that *SI-Utu* underwent further adaptation after the Kassite period. The NA recension basically follows the OB manuscripts even though variants are attested,¹⁷³⁴ some of which are to be considered as recensional and not only purely orthographic.¹⁷³⁵

The variants illustrated above might suggest that the Emar text depends on a different textual tradition from the extant OB manuscripts. Unfortunately the only known Northern Babylonian manuscript, Si 550, is very poorly preserved and no lines paralleling TBR 101 survive. One may however observe that Si 550 shows some variants.¹⁷³⁶ It can only be said that the Emar source depends on a bilingual MB model which was transmitted to Syria, where the phonetic version was composed.

For the present study it is relevant that one of the OB sources of *SI-Utu*, the prism from the Ashmolean Museum, contains *The Letter of Inim-Inana to Lugal-ibila*¹⁷³⁷ which is the model of *The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ* attested at Hattuša and Ugarit.¹⁷³⁸ Moreover, both *The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ* and *SI-Utu* are perhaps quoted in the same catalogue from Uruk. It appears that it is not a coincidence that these related compositions are attested in the Western periphery and were transmitted to the first millennium. This clearly speaks for a conscious process of selection of the OB repertoire.

6.2.5 Unidentified Literary Text – E 776

E 776 is a tiny fragment apparently from the central part of its tablet preserving five lines from an unidentified Sumerian literary text. The first two lines are set off from the following three by a horizontal ruling. The text is written in phonetic Sumerian but likely the manuscript was originally a three-column tablet¹⁷³⁹ also containing standard Sumerian and Akkadian versions.

6.2.6 Udug-ĥul Tablet III – E 729

The best preserved magical text from Emar is **E 729**, a single-column tablet containing on the obverse three monolingual Sumerian incantations belonging to Tablet III of the series *Udug-ĥul*. The reverse is inscribed with an incantation that starts in Sumerian and ends in Akkadian. The incantations are separated by horizontal rulings.

1732 Borger 1991, 63.

1733 Ll. 12, 20, 34, 35, 37, 40.

1734 See the matrix in Brisch 2007, 171-178.

1735 In addition to the above mentioned lines see ll. 16, 21, 29, 30, 36, 39.

1736 See Brisch 2007, 170.

1737 Brisch 2007, 78.

1738 See § 5.3.4.

1739 The division into paragraphs of two or three lines each is reminiscent of the Emar manuscript of *BeR*.

a) The first paragraph (ll. 1-9) contains a *Legitimationstyp* incantation, forerunner of UH III: 165-177 (CT 16 Pl. 6-7, 230-258).¹⁷⁴⁰ The Emar tablet is the oldest preserved source for this incantation because the OB manuscripts are broken at this point but it was probably encompassed in the gap after UHF 119. Compared to the canonical recension, the Emar tablet presents several variants. Enki (UH III: 166 = CT 16 Pl. 6, 233) is replaced by ^den-sir₂-ra (E 729, 2) whom I was not able to identify. In place of Ningirrimma (UH III: 175 = CT 16 Pl. 7, 253) another god name is written that Arnaud reads as Ningirsu.¹⁷⁴¹ Line UH III: 167 (CT 16 Pl. 6, 235) describing the exorcist approaching the patient is omitted in E 729 as well as the mention of Asalluḫi.

b) The second incantation (ll. 10-23) is another *Legitimationstyp* that is known from first-millennium duplicates, UH III: 124-146 (CT 16 Pl. 5, 170-202),¹⁷⁴² and from an OB tablet from Nippur, Ni 623 + Ni 2320 (UHF 90-98). Unfortunately, the OB tablet is too badly preserved to be used for comparison. The Emar text omits some lines of the canonical recension and has a different line order.¹⁷⁴³ In this regard the line order of the OB tablet seems to correspond to the canonical recension:

E	15	nam-šub-ba-e-ri-du-ga šu-bu-da ₃ -mu-ni
	16	te-lu ₂ -dur ₁₁ -ra-še ₃ ra-ra-ta-mu- ⁿⁱ ^u gu-lu ₂ -tu ^{ra} -aš ₂ [ku di-m]u-ni
	17	[lu ₂]-dur ₁₁ -ra ḫu ^(AN) -luḫ-ḫa-mu-ni
UHF	95	lu ₂ -[dur ₁₁ -ra ḫu-luḫ-ḫa-mu-de ₃]
	96	t[e lu ₂ -dur ₁₁ -ra-še ₃ ra-ra-da-mu-de ₃]
	97	u[gu lu ₂ -dur ₁₁ -ra-ke ₄ gu ₃ -de ₂ -mu-de ₃]
UH ^{III}	136	^r nam ^u -šub eridu ^{ki} -ga šum ₂ -mu-da-mu-de ₃ ¹⁷⁴⁴

Furthermore the Emar recension ends with ka-ḫul-ḡal₂ bar-eš₂ ḫe₂^u-en^u-da-gub (E 729, 22) against niḡ₂-AK-a niḡ₂-ḫul-dim₂-ma sil₇-la₂ igi-mu-ta, ‘... depart from before me’, in the canonical recension (UH III: 144-145 = CT 16 Pl. 5, 201-202). The Emar text is also characterized by several unorthographic writings.

c) The last text on the obverse (ll. 24-35) is a further *Legitimationstyp* incantation. The first part (ll. 24-38) is parallel to the beginning of the OB recension of Tablet III (UHF 01-5) which is unfortunately completely restored on the basis of the first-millennium duplicates (UH III: 1-8).¹⁷⁴⁵ The Emar text expands the two-line legitimation theme of the OB and NA recensions, in which the *āšipu* declares himself the man of Enki and Damgalnunna,¹⁷⁴⁶ with a longer enumeration of deities that includes Sîn, Enki, Damgalnunna, Ninšuburra and Namma. Several recensional variants are attested between the Emar and first-millennium sources.¹⁷⁴⁷

1740 Campbell Thomson 1903, 24-27.

1741 The reading is unsure: ^dnin^u-gir₂-su^u.

1742 Campbell Thomson 1903, 18-23.

1743 UH III: 131, 132, 137, 142-143 (CT 16 Pl. 5, 183, 185, 194, 199-200). Notably E 729 omits the petition for the protection of the patient that is part of *Legitimationstyp* incantations (Falkenstein 1931, 30), udug-saga₁₀-ga ^dlamma sag₁₀-ga da-ḡa₂ ḫe₂-gub, ‘May the good Utukku and Lamma be at your side’ (UH III: 137).

1744 This line is not preserved in UHF. Note that in the Akkadian translation of the canonical recension, *ši-pat eri₄-du₁₀ ina na-de-e-a*, the verb *nadû* translates šub attested in the Emar text and not šum₂ = *nadānu* of the corresponding Sumerian version.

1745 CT 16 Pl. 1, 1-20 and UET 6 391, 1-7; UET 6 392, 1-7.

1746 The canonical recension also mentions Asalluḫi (UET 6 391, 4) who is omitted from the OB recension, see Geller 1985, 85.

1747 See Geller 1985, 85-87.

E 729	UH III
geg ta-na x-u ₂ -DU.DU (24)	a ₂ -sag ₃ mir-gen ₇ ki-a mu-un-du ₇ (2)
silā mu-un-dib-be ₂ (25)	silā mu-un-gur ₁₀ -gur ₁₀ (3)
mu-un-zi-ge-eš (26)	mu-un-da-ru-uš (5)
su ₂ -ġiri ₃ -ġen-na-bi (27)	sa niġen-na-bi-e (6)

The second part of the incantation (ll. 31-35) is badly preserved but it is clear that the Emar text completely diverges from the OB and NA sources. Indeed a much shorter text is contained in E 729; nevertheless it ends with a zi-pa₃ formula that is also attested in the duplicates.

As the following table shows, the Emar tablet completely reverses the sequence of the incantations as they appear in the OB and canonical recensions.

E 729	UHF	UH III
a) 1-9	gap after 119	165-177
b) 10-23	90-98	124-146
c) 24-30 31-35	00-5 -	1-8 -

Sentences in the Emar manuscript break off differently from earlier and later sources. E 729 is not as close to the canonical series as the Middle Assyrian texts are.¹⁷⁴⁸ The full rubric en₂-e₂-ne-nu-ru is unusually placed at the end of the incantations throughout E 729 contrary to the OB and NA sources where, as expected, the rubric is found at the beginning of each incantation.

It is clear that the OB tablet, which stems from Nippur, and the NA sources are close to each other. On the contrary, the Emar tablet depends on a different textual tradition. The unorthographic writings have an inconsistent nature but it is impossible to understand to what extent they are due to the Emar copyist.

6.2.7 Udug-ġul Tablet IV – E 790

E 790 is a tiny fragment from the left edge of its tablet preserving on one side five broken lines belonging to Tablet IV of the series *Udug-ġul*.¹⁷⁴⁹ The other side is broken away. The OB recension is only preserved on a manuscript probably from Sippar BM 78185 (H).

E 790	1	[ġidi]m-ġul [...]
UHF	311	ġidim kur-ta ʿe ₃ -daʿ ħ[e ₂]-me-en
UH IV	130	ġidim kur-ta e ₁₁ -de ₃ ħe ₂ -me-en
E 790	2	[x] edin [...]
UHF	312	lil ₂ -en-na ki-ʿna ₂ ʿ nu-tuku ħ[e ₂]-ʿme-enʿ
UH IV	131	lu ₂ -lil ₂ -la ₂ ki-na ₂ -a nu-tuku-a ħe ₂ -me-en
E 790	3	[ki]-sikil [...]
UHF	313	ʿki-sikilʿ šu ʿnu-du ₇ ʿ-ʿa ħe ₂ -[me-en]
UH IV	132	ki-sikil nu-un-zu-a ħe ₂ -me-en
E 790	4	[ġuru]š a ₂ nu- [...]
UHF	314	ʿġurušʿ a ₂ nu-la ₂ ħe ₂ -ʿmeʿ-ʿen

1748 See § 2.1.6.1.

1749 M. J. Geller *apud* Cohen 2009, 216 n. 242.

UH IV	133	guruš a ₂ nu-la ₂ -e ħe ₂ -me-en
E 790	5	[lu ₂] edin-na [...]
UHF	315	lu ₂ edin-na šub-ba-de ₃ ħe ₂ -me-en
UH IV	134	lu ₂ edin-na šub-ba ħe ₂ -me-en

The Emar text adds -hul in line 1. Line 2 cannot be harmonized with the extant manuscripts but it may contain a variant or refer to UHF 316 = UH IV: 135:

UHF	315	lu ₂ edin-na ba-ug ₅ -ga ħe ₂ -me-en
UH IV	135	lu ₂ edin-na ba-ug ₅ -ga ħe ₂ -me-en

It is clear that E 790 diverges on some points from the extant earlier and later sources.

6.2.8 Tsukimoto Incantation - E 730

One of the most beautiful manuscripts from Emar is a single-column tablet almost completely preserved found during illegal excavations and now housed in a private collection in Japan. This tablet published by Tsukimoto (1999) contains a collection of medical prescriptions and incantations divided into three sections according to the kind of sickness: fever (ll. 1-35), leprosy (ll. 37-93) and urinary tract disease.¹⁷⁵⁰ Each treatment is separated by horizontal rulings and the first two sections are set off by double rulings inscribed with the BAD sign. The tablet bears the scribe's name, Madi-Dagan son of Abī-kapi,¹⁷⁵¹ who is the author of another incantation published by Arnaud.¹⁷⁵² As pointed out by Y. Cohen¹⁷⁵³ these two tablets share the same sign shapes which differ from those typical of Emar, both Syrian and Syro-Hittite, but are reminiscent of the Assyro-Mitannian tablets discovered at Ḫattuša. Cohen regards the Assyro-Mitannian features as the result of external influence, due to the process of transmission of the text, on a tablet belonging to the Syro-Hittite school.¹⁷⁵⁴ The use of *ta-* as 3fsg. claimed by Tsukimoto¹⁷⁵⁵ as a form typical of the Upper Euphrates is not only a trait of Emar¹⁷⁵⁶ and Western periphery Akkadian, it is also characteristic of the Assyrian dialect.¹⁷⁵⁷ These features seem to indicate that also for Emar the Assyro-Mitannian scribal school played a role in the transmission of Mesopotamian culture. The Tsukimoto tablet includes two Sumerian incantations.

a) Lines 25-26 contain the incantation en₂ ka-ra-ra-tum which is written in Sumerian with elements of an unidentified language,¹⁷⁵⁸ probably simply an *abracadabra*. This incantation is here used against fever¹⁷⁵⁹ but has also been found in different contexts¹⁷⁶⁰ and in the first millennium was included in

1750 Tsukimoto 1999, 187.

1751 On this scribe see Cohen 2009, 189-194.

1752 Arnaud 1992, 225-227 = SMEA 30 27.

1753 Cohen 2009, 216-219.

1754 It is to note that the elements attributed by Cohen to the Syro-Hittite school are compatible with the Assyro-Mitannian texts: the shape of the sign LI and the use of a sign for aleph are also common to the Assyro-Mitannian school; for the signs LI and 'A see Schwemer 1998, 19, 33.

1755 Tsukimoto 1999, 188; Cohen 2009, 219, considers this form as 2msg.

1756 Seminara 1998, 346-350.

1757 GAG § 75h.

1758 See Böck 2007, 19.

1759 Finkel 1999a.

1760 Böck 2007, 61-63.

the series *Muššu'u* Tablet VIII/q.¹⁷⁶¹ Compared to late sources the Emar tablet presents a very different text. The incantation was probably also contained in a MA medical tablet, VAT 9587 = BAM II 194, even though it is not preserved on the manuscript. Indeed, both BAM II 194 II, 5-10 and the medical prescription preceding our incantation in the Tsukimoto text (ll. 21-24) mention the *kara-ratum* incantation as a magical treatment.¹⁷⁶² Our text is followed by another incantation (ll. 27-35) which ends the first section and is parallel to § 7 of the magical-ritual tablet from Ugarit RS 17.155 = AuOrS 23 21, 71-78.¹⁷⁶³

b) The second section begins with the Sumerian incantation en_2 me-še₃ ba-da-dal (ll. 37-40) which in the first millennium was incorporated into the series *Muššu'u* Tablet IX/b¹⁷⁶⁴ and *Udug-ḫul* Tablet I (ll. 31-37).¹⁷⁶⁵ Contrary to late sources the Emar text is written in phonetic orthography. Moreover, as shown by Finkel,¹⁷⁶⁶ it only duplicates the first line and partially the second line of late sources, whereas the remaining lines completely diverge. The Emar incantation continues with a list of demons followed by a zi-pa₃ formula.

A possible duplicate of this incantation is **E 730**. This is a tiny fragment from the lower edge of its tablet preserving on one side four broken lines while the other side is broken away. According to Arnaud the fragment may duplicate E 729, 18-23, but if this holds true then E 730 would bear a very different version because some lines are omitted. Consequently, I am inclined to present E 730 as a duplicate of the *Tsukimoto Incantation*, 37-40:

Tsk	37	me-še ₃ pa-da-dal i-ki-du ba-da-an-za-aḥ me-te gub-ba i-ki-du nu-gub-ba
UH I	31	en_2 me-še ₃ ba-da-dal ki-še ₃ ba-da-zaḥ ₂ me-še ₃ gub-ba igi-ḡu ₁₀ nu-gub
Tsk	38	an-nu u ₂ -min ₃ ki u ₂ -me-en bar-da i-ki u ₂ -me-en udug-ḫul a-la ₂ -ḫul
UH I	32	an imin ki imin im imin im-gal imin izi imin igi imin bar imin bar-ta igi imin
E 730	1	[.....]-x- ^{te} ? x-x-na(-)an- [...]
Tsk	39	gidim-ḫul gal ₅ -la ₂ -ḫul diḡir-ḫul maškim-ḫul eme-ḫul-ḡal ₂
E 730	2	[..... gedim-ḫu] gal ₅ -la ₂ -ḫul diḡir-ḫul [...]
Tsk	40	bar-še ₃ ḫe ₂ -en-da-gu-ub zi-an-na ḫe ₂ -pa ₃ zi-ki-a ḫe ₂ -pa ₃ en_2
E 730	3	[..... bar-še ₃ ḫe ₂ -en-d]a-gub zi-an-na ḫe ₂ -[pa ₃]
	4	[zi-ki-a ḫe ₂ -pa ₃ en_2 e ₂ -nu]-ru

E 730 is written in standard orthography as shown by the writing -gub (l. 3) for -gu-ub in the *Tsukimoto Incantation* and the full rubric en_2 e₂-nu-ru. As noted earlier in the discussion of KUB 4 24,¹⁷⁶⁷ forerunners of *Udug-ḫul* Tablets I-II are poorly documented. Due to the fragmentary nature of E 730 and the difficulty of harmonizing line 1 with the extant sources, its attribution to the same text as the *Tsukimoto Incantation* is not assured. Indeed E 730 contains a very stereotyped passage common to several incantations. A further possibility, but in my opinion less probable, is that E 730 is parallel to a section of *Udug-ḫul* Tablet VII. In the OB recension this passage is preserved by two manuscripts

1761 Böck 2007, 295-296: 181-182. Forerunners to Tablet VIII/a are attested at Emar in E 735 and E 736 (Böck 2007, 42) with a MB duplicate from Nippur, Ni 178 = BAM IV 398 (Böck 2007, 36).

1762 Böck 2007, 61-63.

1763 See § 7.3.7.

1764 Böck 2007, 20-21, 26.

1765 Böck 2007, 24.

1766 Finkel 1999a with bibliography.

1767 § 5.3.9.

from Nippur which significantly diverge from one another. Only manuscript C (Ni 2676 + Ni 2997 + Ni 4017 + Ni 4018) is close to our text and also resembles the late recension.¹⁷⁶⁸

UHF	C 829	[udug-ḥul a-la ₂ -ḥul gidim-ḥul gal ₅ -la ₂ -ḥul e ₂ -ta ḥa-ba-ra-e ₃]
	C 830	[bar-ta-bi-še ₃ ḥa-ba-ra-an-gub-ba]
	C 831	u ₃ -b[i ₂ -zu/zi ḥul-dub ₂] zi-an-n[a ḥe ₂ -pa ₃ zi-ki-a ḥe ₂ -pa ₃]
UH VII	126	udug-ḥul a-la ₂ -ḥul gidim-ḥul gal ₅ -la ₂ -ḥul e ₂ -ta ḥa-ba-ra-e ₃ bar-ta-bi-še ḥa-ba-ra-an-gub
	127	u ₃ -bi ₂ -zi ḥul-dub ₂ zi-an-na ḥe ₂ -pa ₃ zi-ki-a ḥe ₂ -pa ₃

E 730 is quite different from *Udug-ḥul* Tablet VII, therefore it is more likely that this fragment duplicates the *Tsukimoto Incantation* and *Udug-ḥul* Tablet I.

6.2.9 Saĝ-geg Incantation – E 732

E 732 is a fragment from the upper left corner of its tablet preserving the opening lines of a monolingual *Saĝ-geg* incantation on the obverse, whereas the reverse is broken away. The incipit recalls the beginning of the first tablet of the canonical series which was also incorporated in *Muššu'u* Tablet I, but the subsequent lines are different.¹⁷⁶⁹ Forerunners of the series *Saĝ-geg* are also known from Ḥattuša and Ugarit.¹⁷⁷⁰ The text in the Emar manuscript is monolingual Sumerian in standard orthography.

6.2.10 Unidentified Udug-ḥul Incantation – E 731

E 731 is a fragment possibly from the lower edge of the reverse of its tablet, as a double horizontal ruling is drawn after the preserved lines and the space below is apparently uninscribed. It preserves five lines and the obverse is broken away. The text, written in standard orthography, is a *Udug-ḥul* style incantation quoting Namma in addition to Enki and Asalluḫi. No such passage citing Namma seems to be attested in either the forerunners or the canonical recensions of the series *Udug-ḥul*.

6.2.11 E 733 – Msk 74107q

E 733 is a large fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving 18 lines of a Sumerian monolingual incantation written in standard orthography. The fragment **Msk 74107q** possibly belongs to the same tablet. The incantation quotes Inana¹⁷⁷¹ and has a mythological character. Unfortunately no earlier or later duplicates are known.

6.2.12 E 740

E 740 is a fragment from the upper left edge of its tablet containing a collection of monolingual incantations written in standard orthography. The obverse preserves three incantations separated by horizontal rulings, whereas the reverse only preserves a few signs on the left-end corner. Unfor-

¹⁷⁶⁸ It is worth noting that the Emar manuscript resembles the OB version that entered the canonical series.

¹⁷⁶⁹ See Rutz 2013, 265.

¹⁷⁷⁰ §§ 5.1.5, 7.3.7.

¹⁷⁷¹ Note the presence of the Emesal form mu-gib (l. 8).

unately no earlier or later duplicates can be identified. The incantations mention Enki and An and two unidentified temples.¹⁷⁷²

6.2.13 E 743

E 743 is a fragment from the upper edge of its tablet preserving three broken lines on the obverse and a few signs on the reverse. The text on the obverse is in monolingual Sumerian in standard orthography and contains the injunction to the demons: [...-ḥu]l-ḡal₂ bar-eš₂ ḥe₂-en-da-[gub] (Obv. 3).

6.2.14 E 744

Two fragments of monolingual incantations in standard orthography are listed under **E 744**: Msk 74107t and Msk 7499b. **Msk 74107t** is a tiny fragment from the upper edge of its tablet that only preserves [d]u₁₁-ga ^das[al-lu₂-ḥi]. **Msk 7499b** is another tiny fragment that only preserves four broken lines.

6.2.15 E 745

E 745 is a fragment from the lower right corner of its tablet preserving six lines on the obverse and eight lines on the reverse. Although the fragment is published as a magical text, one may note that it contains abbreviated verbal forms, ḥe₂- (ll. 11-12), which are more common in literary texts than in incantations. The text is monolingual Sumerian in standard orthography.

6.2.16 E 751 - E 752 - E 746

E 751 is a tiny fragment preserving six broken lines on one side whereas the other is broken away. This fragment seems to contain the instruction section of an incantation. It is interesting to note that the modal prefix in the verbal form u-me-ni[...] is written with the sign u, as is typical of late texts, instead of the OB u₃. The fragment, however, contains a monolingual Sumerian text in standard orthography.

Possibly belonging to the same tablet are two other fragments, **Msk 74107n** listed under **E 746** and **E 752**. The first is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving eight broken lines while the second one is a tiny fragment from the left edge of a tablet or a column. All three pieces contain the word 'purple' written in the late form siki₂-ḥe₂-me-da (E 751, 5; E 752, 3; Msk 74107n, 3).¹⁷⁷³ Moreover, E 752 presents the form šu u-me-[...] (l. 2).

Another fragment listed under E 746 is **Msk 74107m** which apparently does not share any words with the other pieces.

6.2.17 E 756

According to the hand-copy, the vertical ruling at the left edge of the fragment may indicate that **E 756** originally belonged to a multicolumn tablet of which it represents the right column. The fragment preserves six lines set off by horizontal rulings on the obverse and contains a monolingual incantation in standard orthography. The reverse is broken away. The preserved section

¹⁷⁷² e₂-ḡeš'-na₃-a (l. 11) and e₂-ge₆-še-er-da-ba (l. 12) are not attested in George 1993.

¹⁷⁷³ Note that both E 751 and E 752 write siki₂-ḥe₂-me-da²¹ with the sign DA resembling U₂ or TA.

contains the instructions for performing the ritual. As with E 751 the modal prefix u_3 is spelled as u in $u-me-ni-$.

6.2.18 Bilingual Incantations – E 757 - E 763 - E 764

E 757 is a fragment from the left edge of its tablet preserving thirteen lines on one side whereas the other side is broken away. **E 763** is a fragment from the upper right corner of its tablet preserving ten broken lines on one side, whereas the other side is broken away. **E 764** is a tiny fragment preserving five broken lines on one side only. These fragments contain bilingual incantations in interlinear format with couplets separated by horizontal rulings. Judging from the hand-copy of E 757 the tablet may extend to the left with an additional column. Taking into consideration that these fragments are the only manuscripts from Emar preserving bilingual incantations and show the same *mise en tablet*, they probably belong to the same tablet.

6.2.19 Phonetic Sumerian Incantations – E 734 - Msk 74148f

E 734 is a fragment from the right edge of its tablet preserving eleven lines on the obverse whereas the reverse is broken away. The fragment contains an incantation in phonetic writing quoting Enki. Lines are inscribed in paragraphs set off by horizontal rulings. The fragment **Msk 74148f** possibly belongs to the same tablet.

6.2.20 Fragments of Incantations

Several fragments contain monolingual Sumerian incantations in standard orthography: **E 747**, according to Civil, is not an incantation but possibly belongs to *The Fowler*;¹⁷⁷⁴ **E 748**; **E 749** mentions An;¹⁷⁷⁵ **E 753** ends with a $zi-pa_3$ formula and mentions Lamaštu (l. 7); **E 759**; **E 761**; **E 762**; **Msk 74122ar**.¹⁷⁷⁶

6.2.21 Unidentified Text – E 777

E 777 is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving six fragmentary lines from an unidentified Sumerian text, possibly an incantation.¹⁷⁷⁷ The lines are set off by horizontal rulings and no Akkadian translation is preserved but it is not excluded that it was arranged in a parallel column. The text is written in standard orthography.

¹⁷⁷⁴ See fn. 1709.

¹⁷⁷⁵ Note that the nature of this fragment is uncertain; Rutz 2013, 520, classifies it as a lexical list.

¹⁷⁷⁶ Rutz 2013, 541 lists this fragment as either an incantation or a lexical text.

¹⁷⁷⁷ See en_2 (l. 5).

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

7 Sumerian Literary and Magical Texts from Ugarit

Sumerian texts discovered at Ugarit will be treated in the present chapter. As several compositions have duplicates from Ḫattuša and Emar, only the texts that were not previously discussed will be presented here.¹⁷⁷⁸ Sources will be classified according to their script.

7.1 Babylonian Script Tablets

Some Sumerian texts discovered at Ugarit are inscribed on tablets written in Babylonian script. As with tablets in non-Hittite script found in the Hittite capital, it is very difficult to establish whether these manuscripts were imported or whether they were copied at Ugarit by foreign scribes. With only one possible exception, AuOrS 23 61, all the Babylonian script tablets inscribed with Sumerian texts stem from the Lamaštu archive.

Excavation Number	Edition	Composition	Archive
RS 25.130	Ugaritica V 164	a) Ballad of Early Rulers b) Proverbs from Ugarit	Lamaštu
RS 26.141	AuOrS 23 28	Hymn to Enki	Lamaštu
RS 25.456B+	AuOrS 23 25	Incantation	Lamaštu
RS 25.418	AuOrS 23 27	Collection of Incantations	Lamaštu
RS 25.517	AuOrS 23 58	Unidentified Text	Lamaštu
RS 26.143	AuOrS 23 59	Unidentified Text	Lamaštu
RS 28.053C	AuOrS 23 61	Unidentified Text	Maison-aux-tablettes

7.1.1 The Ballad of Early Rulers - Proverbs from Ugarit – RS 25.130

The tablet **RS 25.130 = Ugaritica V 164** contains, on the obverse, *BeR*¹⁷⁷⁹ and, on the reverse (lines 24-39), a collection of proverbs in interlinear bilingual format titled *Proverbs from Ugarit* as the Ugarit manuscript is the main source. A monolingual Sumerian forerunner of this composition is known from the obverse of the OB Nippur tablet CBS 13777.¹⁷⁸⁰ The NA fragment from Nineveh K 6917 + K 13679 which, as seen above, contains the first three lines of *BeR* and has a circular structure similar to RS 25.130, also reports a collection of sayings recalling *Proverbs from Ugarit*. These compositions are thematically related as they feature the vanity theme. The proverbs contained in these three tablets were probably part of a larger collection of sayings.¹⁷⁸¹ The presence of *BeR* together with *Proverbs from Ugarit* on tablets with a very similar layout from both Ugarit and

1778 The fragment RS 20.195f = AuOrS 23 62 is not treated here because there is no clear evidence that it contains a Sumerian text. The few preserved signs are from the lower edge of the reverse which contains the colophon (note the double ruling and the blank space below signs); restoration of the last line here proposed follows one of Arnaud's suggestions: [d]ub 1 kam-'x' til-l[a]. As the only sign preserved above the colophon line is NI, there is no clue to whether the text is written in Sumerian or Akkadian. However, taking into consideration that this would be the only Sumerian text discovered in the house of Rap'ānu, where only another literary text in Akkadian was found it is likely that this fragment was inscribed with an Akkadian text.

1779 For *BeR* see § 6.2.1.

1780 Alster 2005, 323-326.

1781 Alster 2005, 324.

Nineveh presents important evidence that the process of serialization for these compositions had already begun in the Middle Babylonian period.¹⁷⁸²

Although the obverse of CBS 13777 is badly preserved and only lines 16-17, duplicating RS 25.130, 32-35, can be safely read, the two manuscripts seem to have the same sequence of lines.¹⁷⁸³ Text analysis shows the following anomalies:

- In u_4 - da^1 $\dot{\text{š}}u$ - du_3 - a - bi gi_6 - $\langle\dot{\text{š}}u(?)\rangle$ - $\dot{\text{r}}du_3$ - $\dot{\text{r}}a$ - bi [ki] $di\dot{g}ir$ i_3 - in - $\dot{g}al_2$ // *te-em ur-ri-ša u₃ mu-ši-ša it-ti DIĜIR i-ba-aš₂-ši*, ‘The plans for day and night rest with the god’ (RS 25.130, 26-27), the genitive after [ki] $di\dot{g}ir$ is omitted.¹⁷⁸⁴
- The genitive is indicated by $-ke_4$, a feature documented since the Early Old Babylonian period:¹⁷⁸⁵
 - In a - du_3 - nam - lu_2 - u_{18} - lu - ke_4 na - me na - na - zu^1 (RS 25.130, 28), ‘Nobody should make people’s working assignment known’, $-ke_4$ alone indicates the genitive, as is clear from the Akkadian translation: *a-da a-wi-lu-ti mam₂-ma la u₂-’a-ad-da*; the infix $-na-$ in the verbal form is probably a case of metathesis from na - an - zu due to a scribal mistake.
 - In $dumu$ - lu_2 - ad_4 - ad_4 - ke_4 $dumu$ - lu_2 - $kaš_4$ - e dib - ba , ‘A son of a lame man catches up with the son of a runner’ (RS 25.130, 34), the genitive is indicated by $-ke_4$; the ergative would be incorrect because the verb is an intransitive non-finite form.
 - $\langle ne \rangle$ - e $giš^1$ - $\dot{\text{š}}ub$ - ba lu_2 - $silim$ - ma_3 - ke_4 // *an-nu-u₂ i-si-iq šal-m[i]*, ‘This is the lot of the healthy man’ (RS 25.130, 38).
 - Another use of $-ke_4$ to indicate the genitive is possibly attested in $\dot{\text{š}}u$ - kur_2 nam - lu_2 - u_{18} - lu - ke_4 na - me na - an - du_{11} - ga , ‘Nobody should pronounce an insult against other people’ (RS 25.130, 30), if one regards this line as based on the Akkadian expression *ṭapilti* NOUN *qabû*, ‘to speak ill of someone/something’, which is formed with an objective genitive¹⁷⁸⁶ and is documented in the Akkadian translation, *ṭa-pil₂-ti a-wi-lu-ti mam₂-ma <la> i-qab-bi*. To my knowledge this is the only attestation of $\dot{\text{š}}u$ - kur_2 ~ $\dot{\text{š}}u$ - kar_2 with the verb du_{11} .¹⁷⁸⁷ Alternatively $-ke_4$ could indicate the directive only (referring to the direction of the insult), but in light of the Akkadian version this hypothesis seems less likely.
- The word order in igi - tur sig - ga na - me $\langle na$ - $an \rangle$ - gid_2 - i (RS 25.130, 32) is possibly based on the Akkadian version, *ši-ṭu-ut en-ši mam₂-ma la i-leq₂-qi₃*, ‘Nobody should accept the deprecation of someone weak’¹⁷⁸⁸ because the nominal element igi - tur in igi - tur - gid_2 - i is usually placed before the verbal base: lu_2 $dili$ gu_7 - u_3 - gen_7 igi - tur mu - un - gid_2 - i - $eš$, ‘(They) look on with scorn as at a man who eats alone’ (ETCSL 3.3.2, 17);¹⁷⁸⁹ $ukur_3$ bu - lu - $uḥ_2$ si - il - $’le^2$ ’ lu_2 $ni\dot{g}_2$ - $tuku$ - e igi tur nam - ba - e - gid_2 - i , ‘The belching poor man should not look scornfully at the rich man’ (ETCSL 6.1.02, 31).¹⁷⁹⁰ However, Alster emends differently, igi - tur - sig - ga na - me $\langle\dot{\text{š}}u$ na \rangle- gid_2 - i , ‘No

1782 See Heeßel 2011 for the canonization of omina.

1783 Alster 2005, 323.

1784 Alster 2005, 326: 26-27, according to Alster the text is corrupted.

1785 Attinger 1993, 259, Wilcke 1998, 459-464, Edzard 2000, 64, Huber Vulliet 2001, 176-177.

1786 Cf. CAD T, 50.

1787 For $\dot{\text{š}}u$ - kar_2 see Karahashi 2000, 162-163, Attinger 2004 and Alster 2005, 271, 326. To my knowledge there are only two occurrences, both from *Enlil and Sud* (ETCSL 1.2.2, 67, 96), of $\dot{\text{š}}u$ - kar_2 as a substantive but it is associated with gi_4 and written immediately before the verbal form.

1788 For the equivalence igi - tur gid_2 - i = *ši-ṭu₃-tum le-qu₂-u₂* see MSLSS1, 25, v 14.

1789 *The Letter from Lugal-nesaĝ to a King*.

1790 SP 2 + 6.

weak man should accept a deprecation', regarding the verbal form as šu--gid₂ from a hypothetical *(lu₂) sig-ga na-me <šū na>-gid₂-i.¹⁷⁹¹

These examples show that RS 25.130 contains anomalies that are commonly attested in Sumerian literary texts from the Old Babylonian period onward. Moreover, it appears that Akkadian strongly influenced the Sumerian version. On the contrary, only a few mistakes can be attributed to the copyist. As a tablet drafted by a Babylonian scribe, this source represents a work of the Middle Babylonian scribal schools that modified the OB text and added the Akkadian translation.

As explained in more detail below,¹⁷⁹² connections between *Proverbs from Ugarit* and the vanity theme indicate that the composition belongs to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. Unfortunately, the fragmentary nature of CBS 13777 precludes a full comparison of the two manuscripts. Hence, it is difficult to state with total confidence whether RS 25.130 reflects the same textual tradition as the OB tablet.

7.1.2 Hymn to Enki (?) – AuOrS 23 28

RS 26.141 = AuOrS 23 28 is a fragment from a two-column tablet preserving a bilingual text in interlinear format on the obverse, whereas the reverse is broken away. According to Arnaud, the text is a hymn to Enki addressed as master of the scribal art and god of the waters, but as he himself admits¹⁷⁹³ this identification is uncertain because the name of the god is not preserved on the fragment. No line is fully preserved¹⁷⁹⁴ but no phonetic writings¹⁷⁹⁵ seem to be attested.¹⁷⁹⁶ The Babylonian origin of this tablet suggested by Arnaud seems to be confirmed by the shape of the signs RU (§§ 1, 17) and AĜ (§ 5).

Because this fragment is too badly preserved and no duplicates are known there are no indications of the provenance and tradition of the text.

7.1.3 Collection of Incantations – AuOrS 23 25

RS 25.456B + RS 25.129 = AuOrS 23 25 is a single column tablet containing a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian medical and magical texts, some of which present a mixture of the two languages, but no bilingual texts are included. Incantations are set off by horizontal rulings, and are often followed by the subscript ka-inim-ma. Arnaud attributes this tablet to the group *assyrisé*; however, he admits that the shape of the sign TAR is Babylonian and that /qi/ is written with the sign KI, with the reading qi₂, as is common in MB texts instead of the MA KIN/qi.¹⁷⁹⁷ Furthermore, the shape of the sign LI¹⁷⁹⁸ does not correspond to the MA forms, neither the 14th¹⁷⁹⁹ nor the 13th¹⁸⁰⁰ century variants, but is typically Middle Babylonian.¹⁸⁰¹ Hence, AuOrS 23 25 is either a MB manuscript imported

¹⁷⁹¹ Alster 2005, 326: 32-33.

¹⁷⁹² § 9.4.

¹⁷⁹³ Arnaud 2007, 101: "on devine que cette hymne était adressée à Enki-Ea."

¹⁷⁹⁴ Only the right side of the left column and the left side of the right column on the obverse are preserved.

¹⁷⁹⁵ Note that Arnaud misreads some passages.

¹⁷⁹⁶ Note the nice form nu-mu-un-e-[x] = *ul ta*-[...].

¹⁷⁹⁷ Arnaud 2007, 9-10. The sign TAR has a Babylonian form not only in line 3, as pointed out by Arnaud; it is consistently written with an upright wedge underneath the two oblique ones (ll. 15, 30). For qi₂/qi see Aro 1955, 19.

¹⁷⁹⁸ Ll. 11, 13, 25, 26, 59.

¹⁷⁹⁹ Cf. Schwemer 1998, 19, Weeden 2012, 247.

¹⁸⁰⁰ Cf. Weidner 1952-53, van Soldt 2001.

¹⁸⁰¹ BE 14, No. 211.

to Ugarit¹⁸⁰² or a tablet drafted by a Babylonian scribe in the Lamaštu archive.¹⁸⁰³ The tablet shows several incorrect writings.¹⁸⁰⁴

Only two texts are fully written in Sumerian (a = ll. 1-2, d = ll. 34-52) while the other two incantations mix Sumerian and Akkadian (b = ll. 11-14, c = 22-29).¹⁸⁰⁵ A large use of Sumerograms is, however, documented throughout the tablet.

a) As the subscript makes clear, the first text (ll. 1-2) is a poorly understandable incantation against vomit mostly written in phonetic writing.¹⁸⁰⁶

b) Another incantation against vomit is inscribed on lines 11-14, which begins with an Akkadian line followed by three lines in phonetic Sumerian.

c) Lines 22-24 contain a Sumerian *abracadabra*¹⁸⁰⁷ that is part of an Akkadian incantation against diarrhea.

d) The only fully understandable Sumerian text is a Marduk-Ea incantation against the *šimmatu*-disease¹⁸⁰⁸ (lines 34-52). The incantation, which begins with an abbreviated rubric en_2 , reports the full Marduk-Ea formula typical of OB texts. According to Arnaud,¹⁸⁰⁹ the beginning of this incantation (ll. 34-37) is a translation into Sumerian from an Akkadian original. Some lines of the Marduk-Ea formula are written in phonetic orthography in another incantation from Ugarit (AuOrS 23 21 § 8).¹⁸¹⁰

Several anomalies and mistakes are attested in this incantation:

- The chiasmic structure of the first two lines, $en_2 i_3\text{'-}ser_3 lu_2\text{'-}bi lu_2\text{'-}bi dib\text{'}$ // $i_3\text{'-}ser_3 saĝ\text{'-}bi saĝ\text{'-}bi dib$, 'Incantation. (The demon) bound this man, he seized this man. He bound his head, he seized his head' (AuOrS 23 25, 34-35), is perhaps a hint of the influence of Akkadian on the text. Note also the use of -bi as a human possessive.
- $en\text{'-}kal kal\text{'-}la nin\text{'-}na\text{'-}ke_4 ib_2\text{'}$ (AuOrS 23 25, 37) is translated by Arnaud as 'Le grand seigneur est en colère contre l'homme et sa soeur', by reading ib_2 as a verbal form, 'to be angry', and $kal\text{'-}la$ as a mistake for $guruš$. An alternative explanation would be to treat $en\text{'-}kal kal\text{'-}la$ as a case of dittography: $en\text{'-}kal\text{'-}kal\text{'-}la$. It is clear, however, that the passage is corrupted.
- Arnaud's translation of $i_3\text{'-}ser_3 lu_2\text{'-}bi\text{'-}dib igi mu\text{'-}un\text{'-}ši\text{'-}in\text{'-}bar$, 'Il vit le lieu de l'homme saisi', (AuOrS 23 25, 38), suggests that a finite form $i_3\text{'-}ser_3$ is used instead of either (1) a participle followed by a genitive, $**ser_3\text{'-}lu_2\text{'-}dib.a\text{'-}bi.a(k)\text{'-}(še_3)$, or (2) a nominalized dependent sentence, $**lu_2\text{'-}dib.a\text{'-}bi=Ø i_3\text{'-}ser_3\text{'-}a(še_3)$. The position of the verb at the beginning of the sentence is

1802 The value pir_6 of the sign NAM (l. 4) indicated by Arnaud as MA is also attested in Babylonia, see MesZL, 277 No. 134.

1803 van Soldt 2012, 178.

1804 See commentary in Arnaud 2007, 94-96.

1805 Note that the first three lines of an Akkadian incantation against *samānu* (ll. 59-69) are duplicated in KAR 181 Rev. 6 ff. and K 2402+ Rev. 3, cf. CAD S, 112. Other incantations against *samānu* are contained in AuOrS 23 21 § 2 (§ 7.3.7) and in the MA text YOS 11 74 (§ 2.1.6.6); *samānu*-disease is also quoted in KUB 30 1, see fn. 1074.

1806 Arnaud 2007, 94-95.

1807 For this type of Sumerian see Veldhuis 1999, Arnaud 2007, 22.

1808 See the subscript $ka\text{'-}inim\text{'-}ma šim\text{'-}ma\text{'-}tu_4$ (l. 53); for *šimmatu* = paralysis, see CAD Š/3, 7. Two *šimmatu* incantations are known from Emar, E 735 and E 736; in the first millennium they were incorporated into the series *Muššu'u* Tablet VIII/a (Böck 2007, 42), but they do not duplicate the Ugarit text.

1809 Arnaud 2007, 96: 34-37. I am not convinced by Arnaud's transliteration, but I am not able to provide a different one as the hand-copy is not very clear.

1810 See § 7.3.7.

probably influenced by the Akkadian participle which, in status constructus, is followed by its object. Moreover, it seems that there is no difference between the forms *dib* and *dib.a*.

- In ^den-ki dumu¹-ni ^dasal-lu-^hi mu-un-na-ni-ib₂-gi₄-gi₄ (AuOrS 23 25, 42), -ke₄ is omitted, cf. PBS 1/2 127, 20-21, ^den-ki-ke₄ dumu-ni ^dasal-lu₂-^hi mu-un-na-ib₂-gi₄-gi₄. This omission is probably to be attributed to the copyist.¹⁸¹¹
- The verbal form a-ra-ab-da^h-e (AuOrS 23 25, 43-44) omits the 1sg. suffix indicating the subject of the *marû* stem, as is typical in late texts.
- The genitive is indicated by -ke₄ in ^dnin-din-ug₅-ga šatam^{am}-di^gir-re-e-ne-ke₄ // ^dnin-din-ug₅-ga tum₃-di^gir-re-e-ne-ke₄ // ^dnin-din-ug₅-ga sa^g-kalag-di^gir-re-e-ne-ke₄ // aia ^den-ki-ke₄ ^dasal-lu₂-^hi za₃-mi₂, ‘Nindinugga, the gods’ administrator, Nindinugga the *provider* of the gods, Nindinugga the mighty, foremost among the gods, the father Enki, Asallu^hi, are praised’ (AuOrS 23 25, 47-50). All the divine names but Asallu^hi are followed by -ke₄ although they function as absolutes because the verb is a non-finite passive form.
- -an-na- in nam-mu-un-da-an-na-tum₃[?] (AuOrS 23 25, 52) is a possible case of metathesis due to a copying mistake.

Several of these anomalies are common in the development of Sumerian. The influence of the Akkadian language is also evident, notably in less formulaic passages. This incantation is written in standard orthography while phonetic writings are limited to a few cases, perhaps to be attributed to the scribe.

The lack of duplicates suggests that the Sumerian incantations inscribed on this tablet represent a not very common tradition. The use of phonetic writings perhaps indicates that the scribe was educated in scribal conventions common in Northern Babylonia. However, it is worth noting that graphic and orthographic mistakes in this source are unusually frequent for a Babylonian tablet from the Western periphery.

7.1.4 Collection of Incantations – AuOrS 23 27

RS 25.418 is a fragment from the lower edge of its tablet, discovered in the Lamaštu archive, containing a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian incantations. This fragment is closely related to, or possibly belongs to the same tablet as RS 25.422 = AuOrS 23 16.¹⁸¹² Four incantations are partially preserved on this fragment: two are written in Akkadian (ll. 1-4, 11-13) and two in Sumerian (5-10, 14-16).

a) Lines 5-6 on the obverse contain a monolingual Sumerian incantation followed by a poorly preserved subscript.¹⁸¹³ The incantation is badly preserved and it mentions the evil eye. The text seems to be written in standard orthography,¹⁸¹⁴ but the name of the god Utu is spelled phonetically twice in the same line (7), ^du₂-ud-du.¹⁸¹⁵

¹⁸¹¹ Note, however, that in AuOrS 23 21, 85, in-ki dumu-mi₂-a-ni ^dasal-lu₂-^hi mu-un-na-na-ib₂-gi-g[i], -ke₄ is also omitted, see § 7.3.7.

¹⁸¹² Arnaud 2007, 10, 60.

¹⁸¹³ Arnaud (Arnaud 2007, 99), reads ka-inim-ma ^ge₆-a e₂-nu₂-da-a-kam₂, “Incantation de la nuit dans la chambre”.

¹⁸¹⁴ See igi-^huš (l. 5) and [e]n₂-e₂-nu-[ru] (l. 9).

¹⁸¹⁵ Perhaps this writing is a gloss: ^uutu^{tu3}. Note also the writing IGI.I.MA (l. 6) which Arnaud regards as a mistake for igi-tab-ba.

b) Lines 14-16 contain another monolingual Sumerian incantation of which only a few signs are preserved.

Arnaud includes this fragment among the group *assyrisé* that turned out to consist of Babylonian script tablets. Following van Soldt¹⁸¹⁶ the fragment is here regarded as a Babylonian manuscript but its classification is not entirely clear.¹⁸¹⁷ The presence of several Babylonian script tablets in the Lamaštu archive would suggest the same provenance for AuOrS 23 27, but I prefer to suspend judgment in the absence of clear evidence.

7.1.5 AuOrS 23 58

RS 25.517 = AuOrS 23 58 is a tiny fragment that only preserves a few signs on each side. The inscribed text is probably an unidentified literary composition. I tend to regard this fragment as a Babylonian manuscript based on the shape of the sign LI, only partially preserved on line 1, and DA with one upright only (l. 1).¹⁸¹⁸

7.1.6 AuOrS 23 59

RS 26.143 = AuOrS 23 59 is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving an unidentified monolingual Sumerian text on one side, whereas the other side is broken away. I here follow Arnaud¹⁸¹⁹ and van Soldt¹⁸²⁰ who regard this fragment as Babylonian, but note that the sign 𒄩A (l. 2) shows only one *Winkelhaken* as is typical of the Ugarit script.¹⁸²¹ The text seems to be written in standard orthography.¹⁸²²

7.1.7 AuOrS 23 61

RS 28.053C = AuOrS 23 61 is a fragment discovered in the Maison-aux-tablettes, only preserving some signs at the end of a few lines of an unidentified Sumerian text. Following Arnaud¹⁸²³ this fragment is tentatively assigned to the group of Babylonian script tablets, but it could turn out differently. Against this classification, it is to be noted that this would be the only Babylonian script tablet inscribed with a Sumerian text recovered outside the Lamaštu archive. Unfortunately, no hand-copy has been published.

7.2 Hittite Script Tablets

The only Sumerian text in Hittite script stemming from Ugarit is a copy of *The Message of Lu-diğira to his Mother* imported from the Hittite capital and discovered in the Lamaštu archive.

¹⁸¹⁶ van Soldt 2012, 180.

¹⁸¹⁷ The sign TI (l. 13) seems to have the Babylonian shape; however, the sign SAĜ (ll. 2, 4) with a heavy impression of the top front wedge reminds me of the shape of the sign in Assyro-Mitannian texts (cf. Weeden 2012). AuOrS 23 16 shows the MB shapes of the signs LI (l. 8), TA (ll. 11, 18, 21) and KA (ll. 19, 20).

¹⁸¹⁸ Cf. BE 14, No. 145. van Soldt 2012, 180, also regards this fragment as Babylonian.

¹⁸¹⁹ Arnaud 2007, 8.

¹⁸²⁰ van Soldt 2012, 180.

¹⁸²¹ See van Soldt 2012, 175.

¹⁸²² Note that Arnaud's edition misreads a few lines.

¹⁸²³ Arnaud 2001, 8.

Excavation Number	Edition	Composition	Archive
RS 25.421 + RS 25.527 A+B	AuOrS 23 50	The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother	Lamaštu

7.2.1 The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother

See § 5.3.2.

7.3 Ugarit Script Tablets

The largest part of the Sumerian texts from Ugarit were written by local scribes.

Excavation Number	Edition	Composition	Archive
RS 79.25	Arnaud (1982a), 209-216	A Prayer for a King	Maison A
RS 79.25C	Arnaud (1982a), 209-216	A Prayer for a King	Maison A
RS 23.34+ RS 23.363 + RS 23.494 + RS 23.721 + RS 23.721B	AuOrS 23 48 Ugaritica V 165	The Ballad of Early Rulers (Ub)	Maison-aux-tablettes
RS 25.424	Ugaritica V 166	The Ballad of Early Rulers (Uc)	Lamaštu
RS 22.341 + RS 28.053A	AuOrS 23 47	Enlil and Namzitarra	Maison-aux-tablettes
RS 25 ⁷ .135A	AuOrS 23 50	The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother	Lamaštu ?
RS 17.10 RS 17.80	Ugaritica V 15	The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaġ	Bibliothèque du Lettré
RS 86.2210	Arnaud (2001)	The Fox and the Hyena	Maison d'Urtenu
RS 17.155	AuOrS 23 21 Ugaritica V 17	Collection of Incantations	Bibliothèque du Lettré
RS 15.152	Ugaritica V 17b	Collection of Incantations	Royal Palace
RS 16.416	AuOrS 23 13	Incantation	Royal Palace
RS 25.462	AuOrS 23 67	Unidentified Text	Lamaštu
RS 94.2372	AuOrS 23 68	Unidentified Text	Maison d'Urtenu

7.3.1 A Prayer for a King – RS 79.25

See § 6.1.1.

7.3.2 The Ballad of Early Rulers – RS 23.34+ - RS 25.424

See § 6.2.1.

7.3.3 Enlil and Namzitarra – AuOrS 23 47

See § 6.2.2.

7.3.4 The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother

The small fragment **RS 25?.135A**, published by Arnaud¹⁸²⁴ and preserving a few traces on four lines, is the only remnant of a local edition of *MLM*, probably copied from the Hittite tablet as both manuscripts stem from the Lamaštu archive. However, contrary to the Hittite recension, which reports the text in standard Sumerian, phonetic Sumerian, Akkadian and Hittite in parallel columns, this fragment only has Sumerian and Akkadian in interlinear format. The Sumerian seems to be phonetic judging from the writing [m]u₂-ša[r] for mu-šar.

7.3.5 The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaġ

See § 5.3.4.

7.3.6 The Fox and the Hyena – RS 86.2210

Animal fables belong to the genre of wisdom literature. They include narrative episodes, jokes and humorous sayings involving animals who act and speak like humans.¹⁸²⁵ Several fragmentary texts are dedicated to the Fox, reflecting on its cunning and wit.¹⁸²⁶ The fragment **RS 86.2210** (Ug) published by Arnaud (2001) contains a text that, as I will try to demonstrate, shows many similarities with the composition *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant*, a humorous tale in which the Fox tries to deceive Enlil.¹⁸²⁷ The manuscript was originally a three-column tablet containing versions in standard Sumerian, phonetic Sumerian and Akkadian, but only the first two columns are preserved on both sides of the fragment.¹⁸²⁸

The relation among the Fox-tales is unclear due the fragmentary nature of the OB manuscripts. The composition *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant*¹⁸²⁹ is known from an OB manuscript CBS 438 (A)¹⁸³⁰ of unknown provenance, but probably from Sippar¹⁸³¹ as it belongs to the Khabaza collection. A partial duplicate is an OB school tablet from Uruk W 20248,3 (W).¹⁸³² The OB manuscripts help to clarify that some lines of the Ugarit fragment duplicate passages of *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant*:

A	18	ur-gi ₇ -re egir-bi-a in-us ₂ -us ₂ -a
W	ii 17	ur-gi ₇ -re egir _x (ib ₂)-be ₂ im-us ₂ -us ₂
Ug	§ 6 I	[ur-gi ₇ -re e]gir-ba-a // [in]-du-du
II		ur-gi ₇ -r[e] ^{1?} e-gi-i]r-ba-e // in-du-[du]
		<i>The Dog followed (the Fox).</i>

Arnaud reads ur-gu-la, 'lion', but the OB manuscripts make it clear that ur-gi₇-re, 'dog', is implied.

A	19	i ₃ -tar-tar-re-eš zi-ni ħabrud-da giri ₁₇ -a / ba-ni-in-x'
W	ii 18	i ₃ -tar-tar zi-bi ħi ² -li ² giri ₁₇ ku ₄ -ku ₄ -de ₃

¹⁸²⁴ Arnaud 2007, 184.

¹⁸²⁵ For a general introduction to the genre of fables see Alster 2005, 342-345.

¹⁸²⁶ Alster 2005, 346-351.

¹⁸²⁷ ETCSL 5.9.4.

¹⁸²⁸ For the Ugarit script of the tablet see the shapes of the signs LI (§ 4 I) and ĤA (§ 7 II).

¹⁸²⁹ ETCSL 5.9.4.

¹⁸³⁰ Type III tablet.

¹⁸³¹ Alster 2005, 346.

¹⁸³² Type II tablet. See Cavigneaux 1982, 22-27, Cavigneaux 2003, 57-58.

Ug	§ 7 I	zi-an-ni ku-ku-du-ta // giri ₁₇ ša ₃ -ḥabrud-da-ni-eš // ba-an-ku ₄
	II	zi-an-ni-gu-gu-ut-ta // gi-ri ḥa-am-bu-ru-ud-da-//ni-iš ba-an-gu
		(The Fox) entered into a Hyena's hole in order to save its life. ¹⁸³³

On the OB manuscripts Alster states: ‘The expected expression is certainly some form of zi(-ni)--tum₂, ‘he saved life’’,¹⁸³⁴ which is close to the Ugarit text. The verbal forms ku and gu in the Ugarit manuscript must be intended as phonetic writings for ku₅ (TAR). Contrary to Arnaud who translates ‘Pur sauver sa vie, l'hyène entra dans un terrier’, regarding ‘Hyena’ as subject of the sentence, I consider giri₁₇ as to be an anticipatory genitive from *giri₁₇-a ša₃-ḥabrud-da-ne₂-eš₂.¹⁸³⁵

A	20	giri ₁₇ ka ₅ ^a u ₃ -bi ₂ -in-du ₈ en ₃ ab-‘tar-tar-tar’-re
Ug	§ 8 I	giri ₁₇ ka ₅ ^a -e igi ba-an-da
	II	gi-ri ga-e i-ki ba-a[n-da]
		Hyena saw Fox and (asked):
A	21	ka ₅ ^a ugu-ḡu ₁₀ -še ₃ nam-ḡu ₁₀ ḡen-na-zu
Ug	§ 9 I	[k]a ₅ ^a ugu-še ₃ a-na-am ₃ // mi-ḡen-na
	II	ga ^a u ₂ -gu-uš-še a-[na-am(?)] // mi-ge-en-na
		‘Fox, what does it matter to me that you have come to me?’

The remaining lines of the Ugarit fragment are less well preserved and are not duplicated in the extant OB manuscripts, which are also fragmentary, but some parallel forms can be traced:

- In § 2 I, [i]b₂-gi-gi may perhaps refer to line A 14: ‘ki x’-bar²-zu ḥe₂-re-ib₂-gi-gi, ‘Let (your boat) return to your ... place for your sake!’
- In § 2 II, Arnaud reads gem[e₂] but a reading da[m] is perhaps possible; this would refer to dam-gar₃ in the OB manuscripts (A, W, *passim*).
- § 3 shows some similarities with A 15:

Ug	§ 3 I	[...] ‘ḥul’ [?] x-‘il ₂ ^{?’} -gen ₇ // [...] x ki-zu [x (x)-d]a [?] // [.....] bala-e šu-[x]-u ₄ -da
	II	si-si-id [.....] // gi-ku-du-[.....] // ni-gi-na [...] // šu x x [.....]
A	15	si-sa ₂ -bi ḥul [?] (text: IGI.IB)-le bi ₂ -in-du ₈ ḡge ₂ -ma ₂ / niḡ ₂ mu-ra-dim ₂ niḡ ₂ -gi-na
		‘sa ₁₀ ^{?’} -a / ḡešgim-ti mu-NE
W	ii 6-8	[x]-ba-a i-ib-le-e // [(x) e]n-‘ḡu ₁₀ ^{?’} ḡeš-kiḡ ₂ -ti [m]u-e-TUG ₂

- si-si-i[d] at the beginning of § 3 II may be a phonetic writing for si-sa₂-(bi).
- gi-ku-du-[...] may be a writing for ḡge₂-ma₂-šu₂-a; in W ii 11 ḡge₂-ma₂-[niḡen-n]a is attested.
- According to Alster¹⁸³⁶ i-ib-le-e (W) is a phonetic writing for ib₂-bala-e that is similar to bala-e in Ug.
- ni-gi-na is a phonetic writing for niḡ₂-gi-na

1833 See Arnaud 2001, 334.

1834 Alster 2005, 347: 19.

1835 For anticipatory genitive constructions see Zólyomi 1996, 39.

1836 Alster 2005, 349.

As restored here, the sequence of lines in the Ugarit tablet seems to correspond to manuscript A. Several phonetic writings are attested in the standard orthography column, but it is worth noting that some unorthographic writings are also documented in the OB manuscripts.

RS 86.2210 is not a duplicate of any of the OB sources, but it represents either a variant recension or a different composition very close to *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant*. Variation between the two extant OB manuscripts shows that this composition did not have a standardized form in the Old Babylonian period. The Ugarit text witnesses that fables involving the Fox survived in the Middle Babylonian period when the Akkadian version was added. Unfortunately, one cannot state whether the variants of RS 86.2210 depend on an unpreserved OB manuscript or whether they result from reworking by the Middle Babylonian scribal schools. As Sumerian fables of the Fox survived in the first millennium in proverb collections,¹⁸³⁷ it is possible that *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant* was transmitted to Neo Assyrian and Neo Babylonian libraries despite the lack of any preserved manuscript.

7.3.7 Collection of Incantations – AuOrs 23 21

RS 17.155 = Ugaritica V 17 / AuOrS 23 21 is a large single column tablet discovered in the Bibliothèque du Lettré, containing a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian incantations.¹⁸³⁸ A total of eight or nine¹⁸³⁹ incantations set off by rulings are preserved on the tablet, of which two are in monolingual Sumerian in phonetic orthography (§§ 6, 8) and two in Akkadian, but strongly penetrated by phonetic Sumerian (§ 1, 3), while the remainder are in Akkadian (§ 2, 4, 5, 7).

The fragment **RS 15.152** discovered in the Royal Palace is a duplicate of RS 17.155. Only one side is preserved that duplicates AuOrS 23 21, 51-59¹⁸⁴⁰ whereas the other side is broken away.¹⁸⁴¹

AuOrS 23 21 includes incantations against very different illnesses, some of which are only partially understood. In all but § 7 Asalluḫi appears and three incantations, §§ 1, 2, 8, mention headache. The second incantation (§ 2) is against several illnesses among which are the group Lamaštu, Labašu and Aḥḥazu.¹⁸⁴² Part of this incantation, AuOrS 23 21, 20-45,¹⁸⁴³ was incorporated into Tablet V/d of the series *Muššu'u*,¹⁸⁴⁴ whereas the first lines, AuOrS 23 21, 12-19,¹⁸⁴⁵ are not duplicated in the series. This entails that the Ugarit recension reflects an older stage than the first millennium sources. AuOrS 23 21, 71-78 (§ 7)¹⁸⁴⁶ is parallel to the *Tsukimoto Incantation*, 27-35,¹⁸⁴⁷ and is similar, even though it is not a duplicate, to lines 1-10 of another incantation discovered at Ugarit, RS 94.2178 = AuOrS 23 14.¹⁸⁴⁸ This text belongs to the genre of fire incantations and it is quoted in a first millennium medico-magical compendium.¹⁸⁴⁹

¹⁸³⁷ SP 2.69, Alster 1997, 59, see also Lambert 1960, 262; there is also a bilingual fragment (now lost) of the Akkadian Fable of the Fox, Lambert 1960, 190.

¹⁸³⁸ For the poetic structure of this composition see Dietrich 1988, 81-87, Dietrich 1993, 48-51.

¹⁸³⁹ Nougayrol regards the Sumerian text at the end of the obverse, § 3, to be separate from the Sumero-Akkadian incantation on the beginning of the reverse, whereas Arnaud considers these two texts as part of the same incantation. For the sake of simplicity, I here follow Arnaud's partition and lineation.

¹⁸⁴⁰ RS 17.155 Rev. 1-12.

¹⁸⁴¹ For the local script of these manuscripts, see the signs LI, TI, TAR and ŠA.

¹⁸⁴² This incantation is also directed against *samānu*, Böck 2007, 216: 34, see also fn. 1805.

¹⁸⁴³ RS 17.155 Obv. 20-45.

¹⁸⁴⁴ Böck 2007, 181-220, Tablet V, 30-37, 39-68.

¹⁸⁴⁵ RS 17.155 Obv. 12-19.

¹⁸⁴⁶ RS 17.155 Rev. 20-27.

¹⁸⁴⁷ Tsukimoto 1999, 198, for this text see § 6.2.8. The first lines of the two incantations are different but line 27 of the *Tsukimoto Incantation* is parallel to the beginning of § 5 in the Ugarit tablet, AuOrS 23 21, 62 = RS 17.155 Rev. 13.

¹⁸⁴⁸ Cf. Arnaud 1995.

¹⁸⁴⁹ Lambert 1970, 44-45.

a) The first Sumerian incantation, AuOrS 23 21, 67-70 (§ 6),¹⁸⁵⁰ is a poorly understood series of formulae in phonetic orthography mentioning Enki and Asalluḫi.

b) AuOrS 23 21, 79-96¹⁸⁵¹ (§ 8) contain a phonetic Sumerian forerunner to the series *Saĝ-geg* Tablet VI that has a duplicate in standard orthography from Ḫattuša in KBo 14 51, 5ff.¹⁸⁵² This text is a Marduk-Ea incantation reporting the Marduk-Ea formula in full, contrary to the first millennium duplicates where it is abbreviated¹⁸⁵³ as is typical in late texts. The Ugarit text ends with a *zi-pa₃* formula not attested in the late manuscripts. A comparison with first millennium sources is very complicated due to the use of phonetic writings in the Ugarit tablet, but the variants so far described show that it represents a very different recension.

The text is strongly penetrated to an extreme degree by phonetic orthography. The phonetic writings of AuOrS 23 21 represent almost 30% of all attestations from Ugarit and about 32% of all the effective alterations¹⁸⁵⁴ attested in the Ugarit script tablets. This and the presence of a standard orthography duplicate of *Saĝ-geg* Tablet VI from Ḫattuša suggest that the incantations contained in AuOrS 23 21 – or at least some of them – were transmitted to the Western periphery in standard orthography, whereas the phonetic writings should be attributed to the local copyists.

The relation between the two Ugarit manuscripts is not clear as RS 15.152 only preserves a few lines. Nevertheless, one may observe that the two copies only differ in a few purely orthographic variants:

AuOr S 23: 21	RS 15.152
<i>rab-ba</i> (56)	<i>rab-ba₂</i> (6)
<i>pa-ra-ši-i</i> (57)	<i>pa₂-ra-ši-'i'</i> (7)
<i>ul-te-la-a</i> (61)	[...]- <i>la-a'</i> (ZA) (11)
U ₂ .MEŠ (61)	U ₂ '(E ₂).[MEŠ] (11)

According to Arnaud,¹⁸⁵⁵ the collection of incantations inscribed on AuOrS 23 21 and RS 15.152 arrived at Ugarit by Hittite mediation, as shown by the presence of Hittite elements.¹⁸⁵⁶ The identification of KBo 14 51 as a duplicate of one of the incantations inscribed on AuOrS 23 21 may support this hypothesis. It is to be recalled that KBo 14 51 is a Babylonian tablet, so it perhaps represents the model of further Syro-Anatolian copies. It is unknown whether this collection was compiled in Babylonia or in Ḫattuša on the basis of Mesopotamian models, but the absence from AuOrS 23 21 of the first text preserved on KBo 14 51 does not exclude that several incantations were written down on a *Sammeltablet* in the Hittite capital and then transmitted to Ugarit. It is worth noting that the two Ugarit copies of *LI-LN*, which is also attested at Ḫattuša, were found in the Bibliothèque du Lettré.

The Akkadian shows the typical Babylonian dialect without Assyrian elements.¹⁸⁵⁷

To sum up, the incantations inscribed on AuOrS 23 21 seem to reflect different textual traditions from the available first millennium duplicates.

1850 RS 17.155 Rev. 16-19.

1851 RS 17.155 Rev. 27-45.

1852 See § 5.1.5; see this section for the first millennium duplicates.

1853 CT 17 23, 198, SpTU II 2, 152.

1854 For this concept see § 4.5 and fn. 1047.

1855 Arnaud 2007, 13-14.

1856 Arnaud 2007, 85: 61; 86: 76; see also Nougayrol 1968, 35: 1.

1857 Note that in § 7 the Akkadian shows many variants, both orthographic and textual, to the first millennium sources of *Muššu'u* V.

7.3.8 AuOrS 23 13

RS 16.416 = AuOrS 23 13 is a tiny fragment discovered in the Royal Palace and preserving six broken lines of an incantation on one side whereas the other side is broken away. The text is written in phonetic orthography as is clear from the rubric e-ne₂-nu-ru.

7.3.9 AuOrS 23 67

RS 25.462 = AuOrS 23 67 is a landscape tablet in Ugarit script discovered in proximity to the house of Agapšarri but stemming from the Lamaštu archive.¹⁸⁵⁸ Arnaud identifies this piece as a library catalogue listing Sumerian literary compositions in phonetic orthography. However, in my opinion the tablet contains a different composition, possibly a divinatory text. The same sequence of signs til-la in lines 2, 3 and 5 is more suggestive of a refrain than a list of incipits. Personally, I am not fully convinced that the text is written completely in Sumerian due to the consistent use of meš as a plural marker, which, even though attested in other texts from the Western periphery,¹⁸⁵⁹ does not elsewhere appear so frequently in a single tablet.¹⁸⁶⁰ The sequence DIŠ-aš identified by Arnaud as an indication of the beginning of a new title in the list can perhaps be read as the copula -me.¹⁸⁶¹ My suggestion that this text possibly deals with divination derives from the mention of maš-maš-meš, 'diviners', (Obv. 8) and nam-uzu₂, 'divination' (Obv. 9). Unfortunately, I am not able to provide an alternative reading of this text.

7.3.10 AuOrS 23 68

RS 94.2372 = AuOrS 23 68 is a small fragment from the lower right-hand corner of its tablet written in Ugarit script¹⁸⁶² discovered in the Maison d'Urtenu.¹⁸⁶³ Like the previous text, it is regarded by Arnaud as a library catalogue, but in my opinion there is no clear evidence for such a classification. Even though Arnaud's interpretation is not excluded, I would tend to consider this text as an unidentified literary composition written in phonetic Sumerian. May dam-gar₃ refer to Enlil in *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant*, of which a variant version is attested at Ugarit?¹⁸⁶⁴

1858 van Soldt 2012, 182.

1859 See *PfK* where it appears three times, § 6.1.1.

1860 diġir-meš (Obv. 3, 4), 'a[?]-meš (Obv. 5), u₄-meš (Obv. 7), maš-maš-meš (Obv. 8), si-meš (Obv. 10).

1861 See in particular -me-a (Obv. 7).

1862 See the shapes of the signs TI (l. 3) and RU (l. 4), LI (l. 9).

1863 Malbran-Labat 2008.

1864 See § 7.3.6.

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

8 The Sumerian Literary Tradition at Ḫattuša

8.1 Literary Texts

The number of Sumerian literary texts discovered in the Hittite capital is very limited. They do not represent the core of the Old Babylonian corpus but are minor compositions that are poorly attested in OB sources, as the following table demonstrates:

Composition	OB Manuscripts	Nippur Manuscripts	First Millennium
The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	0	0	-
MLM	5	1	-
Edubba E	3	1(?)	-
LI-LN	0	0	+
Nergal D	1	0	+
Dumuzi Text (D-I R?)	3	3	-

No composition belonging to the Tetrad, Decad or House F Fourteen is documented in the Hittite capital. Moreover, the number of OB Nippur manuscripts for each composition is very limited. The only texts from Ḫattuša attested in OB literary catalogues are, possibly, *Edubba E* and *LI-LN*. The first line of *Edubba E* is quoted in four literary catalogues¹⁸⁶⁵ but it is important to remember that other four compositions have the same incipit.¹⁸⁶⁶ Taking into consideration that the other texts are far more common in the Old Babylonian documentation than *Edubba E*,¹⁸⁶⁷ which is only known from three manuscripts, the literary catalogues, with all likelihood, refer to one of the these compositions.¹⁸⁶⁸ Moreover, *Edubba A*, *Edubba C* and *Dialogue 1* belong to the House F Fourteen group, whereas no exemplar of *Edubba E* was found in this building. The same incipit of *LI-LN* is attested in a catalogue of literary letters from Uruk, but it is unclear whether it actually refers to this text and no OB sources are presently known.¹⁸⁶⁹

Nevertheless, some of the Sumerian literary works from Ḫattuša probably had a curricular setting. Scribal letters and short tales like *MLM* were copied in scribal schools,¹⁸⁷⁰ likely in the Intermediary Phase of the curriculum.¹⁸⁷¹ Indeed in addition to *imgida* tablets (Type III), an extract of a few lines of *MLM* is inscribed on an OB lenticular tablet (Type IV) from Susa,¹⁸⁷² a tablet type typical of the

1865 N2: 50 (ETCSL 0.2.1), U1: 24 (ETCSL 0.2.3), U2: 33 (ETCSL 0.2.4), Y2: 6,7,8 (ETCSL 0.2.12).

1866 *Edubba A*, *Edubba C*, *Dialogue 1*, *Dialogue 3*.

1867 Robson 2001, 54.

1868 It is worth noting that in the Yale catalogue Y2 (Hallo 1982) this incipit is repeated in three consecutive lines (6-8), surely referring to different compositions.

1869 The identification of this entry in the catalogue is uncertain, § 5.3.4. Literary letters are also documented in the catalogue at Andrews University, B4 (ETCSL 0.2.11), see Huber Vulliet 2011, 495-496.

1870 Vanstiphout 1999, 83, Tinney 2011, 583-584; in three out five OB tablets of *MLM*, TLB 2 5, CT 42 41, CBS 1554, text lines are set off by rulings as is typical in school texts, cf. Tinney 2011, 581.

1871 For literary letters see Brisch 2007, Kleinerman 2011, Michalowski 2011. For the position of literary letters in the curriculum see Kleinerman 2011, 75-94, Michalowski 2011, 48-49. Minor compositions are not included in the main catalogues, which are usually oriented towards hymns and narratives, see Tinney 2011, 583.

1872 MDP 27 107, Michalowski 2011, 42.

Intermediary Phase.¹⁸⁷³ The so-called *Edubba*-texts,¹⁸⁷⁴ represented at Ḫattuša by *Edubba E*, were also used in the Intermediary Phase of scribal education¹⁸⁷⁵ as they were written on Type II tablets.¹⁸⁷⁶ The association of *MLM* and *Edubba E* with school activities at Ḫattuša is underscored by their attestation on multicolumn tablets that include phonetic Sumerian versions.¹⁸⁷⁷ It is clear that all the curricular Sumerian texts from the Hittite capital belong to the Intermediary Phase.

In addition to curricular texts, isolated Sumerian compositions¹⁸⁷⁸ were recovered at Ḫattuša. The original setting of *Nergal D* is unclear although its duplication rate – only a single OB manuscript is known – is typical of non-curricular texts. The composition is relevant, however, because it is included in the NA ‘Catalogue of Texts and Authors’ as are many important pieces of Mesopotamian scholarship. *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* is perhaps a post-Old Babylonian composition. Nevertheless, whatever the original setting of *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* was, it was used for the education of scribes at Ḫattuša as the addition of the phonetic Sumerian version and the Hittite translation indicates. The Middle Babylonian documentation offers parallel examples of OB non-curricular texts that continued to be copied as exercises after the Old Babylonian period. The text inscribed on KUB 37 41 belongs to the Dumuzi-Inana corpus which consists of liturgical compositions. Other sources (KUB 4 26+,¹⁸⁷⁹ KUB 4 41, KBo 19 98,) contain unidentified texts.

All the Sumerian literary texts from Ḫattuša are in bilingual format even though some tablets do not preserve the Akkadian translation. Hence, they reflect the work of the post-Old Babylonian scribal schools that provided OB Sumerian literary texts with Akkadian translations. Only two compositions from the Hittite capital, namely *LI-LN* and *Nergal D*, are known from the first-millennium documentation; yet the sources from Ḫattuša of these texts are very close to the late duplicates. This is particularly evident for the hymn *Nergal D* because the Ḫattuša and Nineveh manuscripts agree against the OB tablet not only in their bilingual format (even though the Akkadian translation is not preserved in KUB 4 7), but above all in their line order and the presence of segments of text unknown in the OB recension.¹⁸⁸⁰ The literary texts from Ḫattuša reflect an intermediate stage in the process of transmission of Sumerian literature to first-millennium libraries. Indeed, they do not correspond to the first-millennium (canonical) editions because texts underwent further modifications as is clear from *Nergal D* itself. Nevertheless, one may not state with full confidence whether such a late textual tradition is shared by all the Sumerian literary texts from Ḫattuša or whether it is only limited to *LI-LN* and *Nergal D*, due to the lack of first-millennium duplicates for the other compositions. Additionally, it is completely unknown whether *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad*, *MLM*, *Edubba E* and *D-I R* were indeed not transmitted to first-millennium libraries or whether duplicates have not yet been found or simply have not survived.

Most of the manuscripts of Sumerian literary texts from Ḫattuša are written in New Script and date to the 13th century. However, the reception of Sumerian literary texts was not limited to the empire period, but goes back to at least the Middle Kingdom as shown by the presence of older tablets. KBo 19 98 is written in MS and KUB 4 4, containing *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad*, is possibly older than the other manuscripts dated to the late 13th century. Further evidence for an early date of arrival in Ḫattuša of the Sumerian literary texts is provided by CTH 372-374, a group of Hittite prayers: the oldest manuscripts are written in MS and date to the Early Empire or even to an earlier period.¹⁸⁸¹ These prayers begin with a hymn to the Sun-god which ultimately turned out to be based

1873 For the Intermediary Phase and Type II and IV tablets see the Introduction.

1874 For this text type see Alster 2002, 291-293.

1875 Vanstiphout 1999, 83 places these compositions in the second level of the second phase of the scribal curriculum.

1876 See *Edubba A*, Veldhuis 1997, 66, Delnero 2006, 97-98.

1877 For the pedagogical function of phonetic Sumerian versions of standard orthography texts see § 4.5.

1878 For unique texts see Vanstiphout 1999, 82.

1879 It is unclear whether KUB 4 26+ contains a literary or a magical text, see § 5.3.7.

1880 Segments of the OB recension are also not attested in the Ḫattuša and Nineveh manuscripts.

1881 A new edition of these prayers has been provided by Schwemer 2015; one manuscript of CTH 373, KBo 25 111, may represent an OS tablet, see Vanstiphout 1999, 3.

upon an OB Sumerian hymn to Utu.¹⁸⁸² Due to the antiquity of the Hittite manuscripts, which possibly rely on even older models,¹⁸⁸³ the Sumerian hymn was received by the Hittite scribal circles, at the latest, at the beginning of the 14th century, but very likely earlier.

8.2 Incantations

The bulk of the Sumerian and bilingual compositions from Ḫattuša consist of incantations that are part of a larger body of Mesopotamian magical and medical texts discovered in the Hittite capital. Incantations are non-curricular texts and served a practical purpose. Nevertheless incantations were occasionally used in the schooling of scribes and exorcists during the Old Babylonian period.¹⁸⁸⁴ Moreover, the role of the *āšipu* in education increased in the post-Old Babylonian schools.¹⁸⁸⁵ However, the reason for such a massive presence of magical texts in the Hittite capital is not limited to the realm of education but is very much likely related to the presence of foreign experts, namely Babylonian exorcists (*āšipū*) and physicians (*asû*), at the Hittite court.¹⁸⁸⁶ Mesopotamian medical and magical texts were probably brought by these experts who used them in therapeutic and ritual practices.¹⁸⁸⁷ Sumerian and bilingual incantations possibly served the same practical use, at least at the time of their arrival.¹⁸⁸⁸ After the death of the foreign specialists who transmitted such texts to Anatolia, Hittites were probably unable to use the incantations, especially in the case of Sumerian monolingual texts. The *Marduk-Ea-Typ* and the *Prophylaktischer-Typ*, deriving from the Old Babylonian tradition, are the most common types of Sumerian incantations attested at Ḫattuša. Texts that are mainly known from the post-Old Babylonian documentation such as *Kiutu* incantations are also documented in Hittite capital.¹⁸⁸⁹

Contrary to the literary texts, most of the incantations are written in non-Hittite script, either Babylonian or Assyro-Mitannian. This is a further hint that magical texts served a practical purpose because they were written or brought by foreign specialists who actually performed these rituals.

Source	Script	Language	Old Babylonian	First Millennium
KUB 30 1	LOB/MB	S	+	-
KUB 37 109 ¹	LOB/MB	S	(+)	-
KUB 30 2	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KUB 30 4	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KUB 30 3	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KUB 37 108 + KUB 37 110	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KBo 36 13	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KBo 36 15	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KBo 36 16	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KBo 40 103	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KBo 36 21	LOB/MB(?)	S	?	?
KBo 36 19	LOB/MB	S	?	?

¹⁸⁸² Metcalf 2011; for the OB text see Cavigneaux 2009.

¹⁸⁸³ See Schwemer 2015, 363.

¹⁸⁸⁴ Schwemer 2011, 422; for the schooling purpose of magical texts at Ḫattuša see Cohen 2012b.

¹⁸⁸⁵ J. Cale Johnson, 'Scribe and Scholar, Physician and Exorcist', paper presented at the 60th RAI in Warsaw.

¹⁸⁸⁶ Beckman 1983.

¹⁸⁸⁷ See Schwemer 2013.

¹⁸⁸⁸ Schwemer (Schwemer 2013), however, does not assign any practical use to Sumerian and bilingual incantations.

¹⁸⁸⁹ For the types of Sumerian incantations see Falkenstein 1939, Cunningham 1997, Geller 2002.

Source	Script	Language	Old Babylonian	First Millennium
KBo 13 37	Bab	SA(?)	?	?
KBo 14 51	MB	S	a) ? b) -	a) ? b) +
CTH 794	Ass-Mit	SA	a) - b) -	a) - b) +
KBo 36 11+	Ass-Mit	SA	a) + b) ? c) ? d) +	a) + b) ? c) ? d) +
KUB 37 143	Ass-Mit	S (A)	+	+
KUB 37 101	Ass-Mit	SA	?	?
KUB 37 102	Ass-Mit	SA	(+)	+
KUB 37 107	Ass-Mit	(S) A	?	?
KUB 37 95	Ass-Mit	S (A?)	?	?
KUB 4 16	Ass-Mit	(S) A	+	+
KUB 34 3	Ass-Mit	SA	-	-
KUB 37 127	Ass-Mit	SA	?	?
KUB 4 23	MS/NS	SA	?	?
KUB 4 11	NS	SA	+	+
KUB 37 111	NS	SA	~ +	~ +
KBo 36 17	NS	SA	?	?
KBo 1 18	NS	S	-	-
KUB 4 24	NS	S	(+)	+
ABOT 1 43	NS	S (A?)	?	?
KBo 36 20	NS	S	?	?
KUB 34 4	NS	SA	?	?
KUB 37 92	(?)	S	?	?
KBo 36 14	(?)	S	?	?
KBo 36 18	(?)	SA	?	?

1 Probably it belongs to KUB 30 1.

The proportions of monolingual and bilingual texts are almost identical, but the majority of the monolingual incantations¹⁸⁹⁰ are inscribed on Babylonian script tablets (CTH 800), whereas only a few are attested in Hittite NS. All the Assyro-Mitannian texts are instead bilingual.

The arrival of magical texts in Ḫattuša is usually dated to the Late Hittite Empire period,¹⁸⁹⁰ but, as here suggested, the aforementioned group of Babylonian tablets containing monolingual Sumerian incantations (CTH 800) was possibly imported along with other booty from the raid of Muṣili I on Babylonia.¹⁸⁹¹ Therefore, the initial Hittite contact with Sumerian texts probably dates to an earlier period than previously believed.¹⁸⁹² It is likely that these tablets did not reach the Hittite capital alone but arrived in the wake of *āšipū*-priests travelling to Ḫattuša,¹⁸⁹³ and they may constitute the earliest evidence for Mesopotamian material at Ḫattuša together with

¹⁸⁹⁰ Beckman 1983, 101, Klinger 2005, 107; according to Klinger 1998, 369, there is no attestation of Mesopotamian scholarly texts in the Old Hittite period.

¹⁸⁹¹ See § 5.1.1.

¹⁸⁹² Cf. Klinger 2005, 108.

¹⁸⁹³ Foreign scribes are attested at the Hittite capital since the time of Ḫattušili I, Klinger 1998, 372; for the arrival of scribes after the campaigns of Ḫattušili I and Muṣili I see van den Hout 2012a, 41.

the unpreserved models of the Hittite Sargonic legends¹⁸⁹⁴ and the aforementioned prayers to the Sun-god.

Due to the fragmentary nature of most of the manuscripts, many incantations are unidentified and it is unknown whether they had either OB or first-millennium duplicates. OB duplicates are only known for a few texts and these are very limited in number:

Incantations with OB Duplicates				
Source	Script	OB Tablets	Provenance	First Millennium
KUB 30 1	LOB/MB	3	Sippar Sippar Nippur	-
KBo 36 11+	Ass-Mit	a) 1 d) 1	a) Non-Nippur d) Nippur	a) + d) +
KUB 37 143	Ass-Mit	4	Nippur (2) Sippar Unknown	+
KUB 37 102	Ass-Mit	(0)	?	+
KUB 4 16	Ass-Mit	1 ¹	Sippar	+
KUB 37 111	NS	~ 1 ²	Sippar	~ +
KUB 4 11	NS	1	Sippar	+

1 This number only refers to the manuscript preserving the quoted passage(s).
2 This number only refers to the manuscript preserving the quoted passage(s).

With the exception of KUB 30 1, possibly joining with KUB 37 109, all the incantations from Ḫattuša attested in OB manuscripts are bilingual.¹⁸⁹⁵ Almost all the texts attested in late copies entered canonical series, mostly *Udug-ḫul*. From this group KUB 37 111 is kept separate because although it is similar to *Udug-ḫul* Tablet IV it does not duplicate the canonical recension:

Canonical Series	Source	Format	Script
Udug-ḫul II	KUB 4 24	Monolingual	NS
Udug-ḫul III/VI (?)	KUB 37 102	Bilingual - Interlinear	Ass-Mit
Udug-ḫul V	KBo 36 11+(d)	Bilingual - Columns	Ass-Mit
Udug-ḫul VI	KUB 4 16	Bilingual - Columns	Ass-Mit
Udug-ḫul VII	KUB 37 143	Bilingual - Columns	Ass-Mit
Saġ-geg VI	KBo 14 51	Monolingual (?)	MB
Muššū'u VI	KBo 36 11+(a)	Bilingual - Columns	Ass-Mit
Biṭ rimki House II	CTH 794(b)	Bilingual - Interlinear	Ass-Mit

Most of the tablets containing incantations that are forerunners of canonical series are written in Assyro-Mitannian script. The primary reason for this is the better preservation of these manuscripts compared to tablets written in other scripts, but it may also reflect the position of the Assyro-Mitannian texts in the standardization process. As explained below, Assyro-Mitannian texts reflect a later stage than the monolingual incantations CTH 800. It is not precluded that in the case of the CTH 800 incantations, there is a connection between their older stage and the lack of any first-millennium duplicate. The position of Hittite script incantations is not easy to evaluate due to the fragmentary nature of most of the tablets. However, it is to be recalled that KUB 4 11 is to be added to the list of Hittite script texts with first-millennium duplicates even though *Incantation to Utu* was never canonized.

Our comprehension of the relation between the incantations from Ḫattuša and the OB and first-

1894 Beckman 1983, 100-102.

1895 It is worth noting that within this group the only monolingual text, KUB 30 1, is also the only one without any preserved first-millennium duplicate.

millennium sources is greatly limited by the poor preservation of manuscripts, even when duplicates are known. The texts from the Hittite capital do not show a homogeneous picture because they display different degrees of variation when compared to their earlier and later duplicates. First, it should be remarked that no text corresponds to its first-millennium recension with the possible exception of KUB 37 102 (UH III/VI) which, however, bears a very common and formulaic text that can be found in almost identical form not only over time,¹⁸⁹⁶ but also in different magical series. Another text similar to its first-millennium duplicates is the forerunner to the series *Saġ-geġ* KBo 14 51, but several remarks are required: (1) only a small section of the text is preserved; (2) variants are nevertheless attested; (3) this text appears quite similar in all the sources; (4) above all, this is a Babylonian script tablet, hence it is not surprising that it is close to the first-millennium recension. On the contrary the forerunner to *Udug-ḫul* Tablet II, KUB 4 24, is far removed from the first-millennium recension, reflecting an older stage, but unfortunately the Old Babylonian manuscripts are unknown. To my knowledge, this is the oldest manuscript of the second tablet of the series. An additional text different from its first-millennium duplicates is the *Kiutu* incantation CTH 794b.

Texts with both OB and first-millennium duplicates do not present a uniform picture. The Marduk-Ea incantation inscribed on KBo 36 11+(a) is close to both OB and late (*Muššu'u*) recensions as this text shows a high degree of stability over time. The forerunner to *Udug-ḫul* Tablet V inscribed on the same tablet, KBo 36 11+(d), also shows similarity to both OB and first-millennium sources.¹⁸⁹⁷ The *Udug-ḫul* incantation inscribed on KUB 4 16 seems closer to the canonical recension, but it is necessary to note that where it differs from the late duplicates, the latter agree with the OB text. KUB 37 111 differs from both OB and late sources which, however, are similar to each other. Finally, the bilingual recension of *Incantation to Utu*, KUB 4 11, deviates from both OB and first-millennium sources, but an elevated degree of variation is attested among all the manuscripts and this composition never received a canonical form.

On the whole, Sumerian and bilingual incantations from Ḫattuša deviate from both the extant OB and first-millennium sources because they reflect different textual traditions. Only in the case of texts with a high degree of stability from the Old Babylonian period to the first millennium do the Ḫattuša tablets agree with duplicates. Usually, incantations from Ḫattuša represent a stage older than the first-millennium manuscripts as is particularly evident for the *Udug-ḫul* series. Also compared to the MA sources, which are very close to the first-millennium recensions,¹⁸⁹⁸ incantations from the Hittite capital clearly reflect an older stage in the standardization process.¹⁸⁹⁹ The division into tablets, a sign of the systematization occurring in the first millennium that is already attested in the MA tablets, is completely unknown in the texts from Ḫattuša. Moreover, unlike first-millennium sources that organize incantations in typologically coherent series (e.g. *Udug-ḫul*), the archives of the Hittite capital yielded *Sammel tafeln* combining various types of incantations, including Akkadian texts. Comparable examples of *Sammel tafeln* containing incantations of different types are known from the OB documentation.¹⁹⁰⁰ This is a further piece of evidence for the close relationship of the incantations from Ḫattuša to their OB stage. Nevertheless, collections of typologically related incantations¹⁹⁰¹ are attested at Ḫattuša as proven by the Babylonian tablet KUB 30 1 which belongs to a collection of several tablets.¹⁹⁰² Besides bilingual sources, a monolingual forerunner to *Udug-ḫul* is attested at Ḫattuša on KUB 4 24 that is also the only forerunner of this series inscribed on a Hittite script tablet – the rest of the manuscripts are Assyro-Mitannian tablets. KUB 4 24 and possibly KBo 14 51 are also the only incantations attested in a monolingual version from the Hittite capital that have first-millennium duplicates.

Due to the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts, only a limited number of incantations preserve the rubric and some of them do not report it.

1896 It needs to be remembered that the OB manuscripts are broken and do not preserve this passage.

1897 KUB 37 143 is too poorly preserved to be compared with earlier and later duplicates.

1898 See § 2.1.6.1; the MA tablets are also later in date.

1899 See in particular KUB 4 24, § 5.3.9.

1900 Geller 1985, 5

1901 The term ‘series’ is here avoided as it usually only refers to first-millennium recensions.

1902 See the subscript, § 5.1.1.

Source	Script	Language	Rubric
KUB 30 1	LOB/MB	S	Full
KUB 37 108+110	LOB/MB	S	Full
KBo 36 19	LOB/MB	S	Full
KBo 14 51	MB	S	Full
KBo 36 11+	Ass-Mit	SA	a) ? b) - c) - d) -
KBo 1 18	NS	S	-
KUB 4 24	NS	S	Full
KUB 37 92	(?)	S	Full

All the preserved rubrics are appended exclusively to Sumerian monolingual texts, and they show the full form $en_2-e_2-nu-ru$ ¹⁹⁰³ typical of the OB texts.¹⁹⁰⁴ It is worth noting that most of the manuscripts preserving rubrics are Babylonian tablets. This further underscores the old tradition behind some magical texts from Ḫattuša, notably the CTH 800 incantations where most of the occurrences are found. The late abbreviated form en_2 was probably also appended to some bilingual texts as attested in the contemporaneous sources from Emar and Ugarit, but none are preserved.

Marduk-Ea incantations are named for the dialogue between the two gods in which Enki/Ea instructs his son Asalluḫi/Marduk.¹⁹⁰⁵ In the OB texts, the Marduk-Ea formula appears in a long form whereas in late texts it is abbreviated to its first and last lines: $^dAsar-lu_2-ḫi igi im-ma-an-šum_2 / ḡen-na dumu-ḡu_{10} ^dAsar-lu_2-ḫi$. Only a few tablets preserve the Marduk-Ea formula and none of them is written in Hittite script.

Source	Script	Marduk-Ea Formula
KUB 30 1	LOB/MB	abbreviated
KUB 30 3	LOB/MB	complete
KUB 30 4	LOB/MB	complete
KBo 36 15	LOB/MB	abbreviated
KBo 40 103	LOB/MB	abbreviated
KBo 36 11+(a)	Ass-Mit	unorthodox
KBo 36 11+(b)	Ass-Mit	abbreviated
CTH 794a	Ass-Mit	abbreviated

The most common form is the abbreviated formula, but the presence of complete ones once more witnesses that Sumerian incantations from the Hittite capital reflect an intermediate stage between the Old Babylonian period and the first millennium, in which old and late features coexist.

8.3 Tablet Format

Bilingual tablets containing literary texts and incantations are attested in both interlinear and parallel column formats, with very similar proportions.¹⁹⁰⁶ There is no connection between format and script as both formats are documented in tablets of each script.¹⁹⁰⁷

1903 $in-e_2-nu-ru$ in phonetic Sumerian.

1904 In KUB 37 92 the rubric is appended to an Akkadian incantation following a probable monolingual Sumerian text.

1905 Falkenstein 1931, 53-58, 90.

1906 Parallel column format is slightly prevalent (sixteen to twelve manuscripts), but some fragments may belong to the same tablets, e.g. KUB 37 143, KUB 37 101, KUB 37 102.

1907 Tablets identified as LOB/MB are obviously not at issue here as they contain monolingual texts only.

Composition	Source	Script	Format	OB	First Millennium
Incantation	KBo 13 37 ¹	Bab	Interlinear(?)	?	?
Incantation	KBo 36 11+	Ass-Mit	Columns	a) + b) ? c) ? d) +	a) + b) ? c) ? d) +
Incantation	KUB 37 143	Ass-Mit	Columns	+	+
Incantation	KUB 37 101	Ass-Mit	Columns	?	?
Incantation	KUB 37 102	Ass-Mit	Columns	(+)	+
Incantation	KUB 37 107	Ass-Mit	Columns	?	?
Incantation	KUB 4 16	Ass-Mit	Columns	+	+
Incantation	KUB 37 95	Ass-Mit	Columns(?)	?	?
Incantation	CTH 794	Ass-Mit	Interlinear	a) - b) -	a) - b) +
Incantation	KUB 34 3	Ass-Mit	Interlinear (<i>Glossenkeil</i>)	-	-
Incantation	KUB 37 127	Ass-Mit	Interlinear	?	?
Unidentified Text	KBo 19 98	MS	Interlinear	?	?
Incantation	KUB 4 23	MS/NS	Interlinear	?	?
The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8 KBo 12 72 KUB 4 4 KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73	NS	Columns	-	-
MLM	KUB 4 2 KUB 4 97 AuOrS 23 50	NS	Columns	+	-
Nergal D	KUB 4 7	NS	Columns	+	+
Hymn to Nergal (?)	KUB 4 41	NS	Columns	?	?
Edubba E	KUB 57 126	NS	Columns	+	-
LI-LN	KUB 4 39	NS	Columns	(+)	+
Incantation	ABOT 1 43	NS	Columns	?	?
Incantation	KUB 4 11	NS	Interlinear	+	+
Incantation	KUB 37 111	NS	Interlinear ²	~+	~+
Incantation	KBo 36 17	NS	Interlinear	?	?
Incantation	KUB 34 4	NS	Interlinear (<i>Glossenkeil</i>)	?	?
Unidentified Text	KBo 36 24	NS	Columns	?	?
Unidentified Text	KUB 4 10	NS(?)	Columns	?	?
Dumuzi Text (D-I R?)	KUB 37 41	(?)	Interlinear	+	-
Incantation	KBo 36 18	(?)	Interlinear	?	?

1 It is unclear whether the text is bilingual.

2 Occasionally *Glossenkeile* are present.

Incantations are written in both formats in almost equal numbers whereas most of the literary texts are written in parallel column format with the exception of the Dumuzi composition KUB 37 41 and the unidentified text KBo 19 98 in MS. This, however, reflects the nature of literary texts as learning tools: three out of six literary texts in parallel column format also contain versions in phonetic Sumerian and Hittite, which clearly result from pedagogical activities. Hence, the format of the original Babylonian models is unknown. A pedagogical function can be supposed for those texts, both incantations and literary compositions, written on prisms (KBo 1 18, KBo 19 98, KUB 4 39, KUB 4 41), a format unknown to the Hittites¹⁹⁰⁸ but often used for school texts in Mesopotamia during the Old Babylonian period.¹⁹⁰⁹

Tablet format has no correlation with the transmission of texts to the first millennium as both formats may have late duplicates. The situation in Ḫattuša parallels that found in the Middle Babylonian texts where both formats are found in similar quantity. As with the Middle Babylonian texts, this reflects a stage in the transmission of Sumerian literary texts in which there was no standardized format, contrary to the later Middle Assyrian tablets.¹⁹¹⁰

8.4 Tradition and Reception

Throughout this work, it has been argued that several Sumerian texts from Ḫattuša reflect a textual tradition stemming from Northern Babylonia. This is very clear for the unorthographic monolingual incantations CTH 800 because phonetic orthography was a convention particularly adopted in Northern Babylonia during the Old Babylonian period.¹⁹¹¹ Another unorthographic text found at Ḫattuša but written on a Hittite script tablet is KUB 4 26+, although its nature (literary or magical text) is unclear. It is not precluded that this text was transmitted to the Western periphery in phonetic orthography.

The Assyro-Mitannian incantations that are written in standard orthography are the work of Northern Mesopotamian scribal circles,¹⁹¹² regardless of where they were actually drafted. Consequently, it seems reasonable to assume that they reflect textual versions typical of Northern Babylonia.

The available OB sources of incantations entered in the series *Udug-ḫul* usually show a very high degree of similarity to each other, probably because they participated in a common tradition that was widespread throughout Mesopotamia. This is not the place for an extensive treatment of the OB incantations but suffice it to say that Sippar manuscripts of forerunners to *Udug-ḫul* are close to the Nippur tablets.¹⁹¹³ On the contrary, some *Udug-ḫul* incantations from Ḫattuša are quite different from the extant OB manuscripts from Nippur and other sites.

The situation for literary texts is more complex. As pointed out above, there are only a few OB Nippur manuscripts of the compositions attested at Ḫattuša. Nevertheless, several Sumerian literary texts from the Hittite capital ultimately trace back to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition: *MLM*, *Edubba E*, *LI-LN*. During the 13th century, scribal schools in Nippur flourished once again after a period of decline in the early Kassite period,¹⁹¹⁴ boosting the dissemination of texts relying on the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition in Mesopotamia and in the Western periphery. However, the fact that a composition reflects the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition does not in itself imply that the Mesopotamian models transmitted to Anatolia contained the textual variants that were known, for instance, in Nippur. Direct interconnections with Kassite Nippur can only be seen in the Emar documentation and not at Ḫattuša.¹⁹¹⁵ Therefore, it is not precluded that even those texts belonging to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition were transmitted to the

1908 See Waal 2012, 224.

1909 Tinney 1999, 160.

1910 Cf. Cooper 1971, 5-6.

1911 See § 4.

1912 See Schwemer 1998, 50.

1913 See § 1.1.10.1.

1914 Hallo 1989; for a more extensive treatment of Nippur in the post-Old Babylonian period see §§ 9.4, 10.

1915 See § 9.4.

Hittite capital in a variant textual form, perhaps stemming from Northern Babylonian centers, as part of a common Mesopotamian body of knowledge.¹⁹¹⁶ These compositions probably belong to a widespread repertoire used in the Intermediary Phase of the curriculum. Indeed, towards the end of the Old Babylonian period scribes from southern Mesopotamia emigrated to the North, thereby disseminating their repertoire of texts. Another text possibly linked to the Nippur tradition is the Dumuzi composition inscribed on KUB 37 41 because the majority of the OB manuscripts for Dumuzi-Inana hymns were found in Nippur. However, due to the fragmentary nature of the manuscript it cannot be ascertained whether the text was entirely written in phonetic orthography. The literary compositions *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* and *Nergal D* cannot be assigned to any specific segment of the Sumerian literary tradition. If Sumerian literary and magical texts were transmitted to Ḫattuša from centers located in Northern Babylonia, it is nearly impossible to locate those centers more precisely.¹⁹¹⁷ The widespread importance of Sippar as a religious and intellectual center would make the city of the god Šamaš the privileged place for the origin of the Mesopotamian scholarly material transmitted to the Hittite capital. The attestation of a copy of *Incantation to Utu* at Ḫattuša could strengthen this hypothesis. However, it should be noted that the available OB sources from Sippar differ from the manuscripts from Ḫattuša.¹⁹¹⁸ Moreover, the Sippar manuscripts of *Incantation to Utu* also diverge from KUB 4 11.

A comparison with the LBA Mesopotamian sources clearly shows that none of the Middle Babylonian or Middle Assyrian Sumerian texts, which are mostly from Nippur or belong to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition, are attested at Ḫattuša. Particularly important is the absence of *Lugal-e* and *Angim* which are documented in both Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian corpora and were transmitted to first-millennium libraries. Emesal liturgies are completely absent from the documentation of Ḫattuša as well as from Emar and Ugarit.¹⁹¹⁹ The only compositions from Ḫattuša with LBA Mesopotamian duplicates are incantations. The series *Udug-ḫul* is attested in all the LBA corpora¹⁹²⁰ but only Tablet VII is known from both Ḫattuša¹⁹²¹ and Mesopotamian manuscripts. Unfortunately, no parallel passages are preserved.¹⁹²² It is not a coincidence that, besides *Udug-ḫul* incantations, *Incantation to Utu*, which originated in Northern Babylonia, is the only composition that is documented at Ḫattuša and in Middle Babylonian sources.

It is quite likely that the same paths of transmission were followed by at least some pieces of Akkadian literature.¹⁹²³ The Mesopotamian manuscripts of the Sargonic tales documented at Ḫattuša¹⁹²⁴ probably stem from Northern Babylonia¹⁹²⁵ even though the Hittite texts were possibly enriched by a tradition preserved from the time of the Old Assyrian merchants of Kaniš.¹⁹²⁶ It is not a coincidence that the only preserved OB source of one of the Sargonic tales attested at Ḫattuša in a Hittite ver-

1916 One of the unorthographic incantations inscribed on KUB 30 1 is known in standard orthography sources from Nippur and Sippar.

1917 Arguing that Northern Babylonia was the source of the Sumerian material from the Hittite capital by no means precludes that the transmission was mediated by other centers and/or scribal milieu.

1918 See KUB 30 1 (§ 5.1.1) and KBo 36 11+ (§ 5.2.1). This is probably associated with a certain degree of similarity between Sippar and Nippur sources.

1919 The only text possibly partially written in Emesal dialect is KUB 37 41, if it actually contains *D-I R*.

1920 Not all the tablets of this series are preserved in either MB or MA corpora.

1921 KUB 37 143.

1922 For the possible MB tablet see § 1.1.10.1.

1923 I here refer to compositions transmitted to Ḫattuša without Hurrian mediation; for the role of Mitanni in the transmission of Mesopotamian literature see Beckman 1983, Archi 2007.

1924 Beckman 2001.

1925 For different hypotheses on the transmission to Anatolia of the tales regarding the Old Akkadian rulers see Westenholz 2011, 286-291. For the Northern Babylonian orthographic conventions of KBo 19 98 see Westenholz 1997, 282.

1926 van de Mierop 2000, 157; the preservation of this tradition from the Old Assyrian period may explain the popularity of tales of the Sargonic rulers in the Hittite world (de Martino 1993, Beckman 2001, 88-91); this popularity is much more evident when compared with the Gilgameš epos, which seems to be limited to scribal circles, see Beckman 2003, 37-38.

sion, *Gula-AN and the Seventeen Kings against Naram-Sîn*,¹⁹²⁷ is a tablet from Sippar.¹⁹²⁸ Differences between the two recensions¹⁹²⁹ may simply be explained by the fact that the Hittite version is a free adaptation like all the texts in the Hittite language related to the Old Akkadian kings.¹⁹³⁰ Contrary to the Sumerian-Akkadian compositions, the Hittite versions of the Sargonic legends are not appended to the original Mesopotamian texts in a parallel column, but they represent independent editions as is clear from the absence of Akkado-Hittite bilingual tablets.¹⁹³¹ Consequently, there is no need to assume that both the Sippar and the Hittite sources must go back to Old Akkadian traditions as claimed by G. Westenholz.¹⁹³²

The Sumerian texts from the Hittite capital do not represent a homogeneous stage in the history of Sumerian literature. The unorthographic monolingual incantations reflect the OB stage. The Assyro-Mitannian texts represent a later stage resulting from the process of the adaptation and selection of Old Babylonian material made by the post-Old Babylonian scribal schools. The presence on an Assyro-Mitannian manuscript of a *Kiutu* incantation, a type of composition that is mostly attested in post-Old Babylonian sources, further evidences the later stage of this group of tablets. However, when the Assyro-Mitannian texts were written down this process was still in its initial phase.

Literary texts also reflect the post-Old Babylonian stage in the process of transmission. One composition, *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad*, was perhaps composed or deeply reworked during the Kassite period.

Akkadian translations reflect different stages in the standardization process. For instance the Akkadian translation of the Assyro-Mitannian incantation KBo 36 11 +(a) differs from its first-millennium duplicates, whereas that of *LI-LN* (KUB 4 39), in Hittite script, is very close to the late copies.

To sum up, the Sumerian texts discovered in the Hittite capital reflect the almost completely lost Sumerian textual corpus of the Late Old Babylonian and Middle Babylonian period. Different literary and textual traditions are represented in the Sumerian texts from Ḫattuša. However, it seems that a substantial part of this material was received from the Northern Babylonian scribal schools. The nearly contemporaneous Middle Babylonian texts (approximately 13th century), mostly from Nippur, have little relation to the corpus from the Hittite capital.

The transmission of Sumerian texts to the Hittite capital did not occur at a single moment but in several waves. Similarly, different phases of transmission can be seen for the Akkadian literary texts as illustrated by the epic of Gilgameš.¹⁹³³ Dissemination of the Mesopotamian material to Anatolia also involved foreign scribes employed in the Hittite court as masters and translators who, beginning in the 17th and 16th century, started a form of schooling.¹⁹³⁴ The best known case is that of Ḫanikkuli, the author of the Naram-Sîn prisms (KBo 19 98-99), whose father was a Mesopotamian scribe working at the Hittite court.¹⁹³⁵ He belongs to the second generation of Mesopotamian specialists settled at Ḫattuša that was already assimilated into Hittite culture, bearing Hittite names and writing in Hittite script. The chronological sequence of the Sumerian material from the Hittite capital may be sketched as follows:

1927 KBo 3 13 (CTH 311).

1928 BM 79989, Westenholz 1997, 246-257. For the role of the Naram-Sîn texts in Late Old Babylonian Sippar see Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 226 n. 27.

1929 van de Mierop 2000, 138-140, Westenholz 2011, 294-298.

1930 See Torri 2009b.

1931 For a list of Akkado-Hittite literary texts see Klinger 2010, 311.

1932 Westenholz 2011, 297; note that the OA pronunciation of the land of Marḫaši as Baraḫšum/Paraḫšum (RGTC 1, 24-25; 2, 25, 128; 3, 38, 160), assumed by Westenholz as evidence of the OA tradition of the Hittite text, is attested in the Akkadian version of *MLM* (l. 24), see § 5.3.2.

1933 At least two different Akkadian versions were known at Ḫattuša, George 2003, 24-27, see also Beckman 2003, 48-49, Klinger 2005, 114-117.

1934 See Gordin 2013, 68-69.

1935 Beckman 1983; for this scribe see also van den Hout 2009, 82-83, Gordin 2013, 67-69, Schwemer 2013.

Old Kingdom	Monolingual Incantations in phonetic orthography (CTH 800)
Middle Kingdom	Sumerian Forerunner to the Hittite Prayers to the Sun-god Prism KBo 19 98
Early Empire	Assyro-Mitannian Incantations Fragment KUB 4 23 (?) The Hymn to Iškur-Adad (model of KUB 4 4?) Saĝ-geg VI (KBo 14 51)
Late Empire	Literary Texts New Script Incantations

For the sake of simplicity tablets with different scripts, i.e. of different provenance, are listed together in the table, but the reader must be aware that the proposed dating has different meanings in relation to the script. As far as the LOB/MB Sumerian monolingual incantations are concerned, internal evidence leads us to date their importation after the raid of Muršili I to Babylonia; consequently their drafting should be placed slightly earlier. Assyro-Mitannian tablets are also here regarded as manuscripts imported after the defeat of the Mitannian kingdom by Suppiluliuma I in the middle of the 14th century.¹⁹³⁶ These tablets were drafted around the same period or possibly earlier in the late 15th century. On the contrary, if Assyro-Mitannian tablets were drafted in Ḫattuša by Assyrian scribes working in the Hittite capital, they were perhaps written down later in the 14th century or even in the early 13th century.¹⁹³⁷ The dating of the Hittite NS tablets obviously refers to the time of their drafting, not of the reception of their Mesopotamian models. The case of *The Hymn to Iškur Adad* illustrates that NS tablets may be copies of earlier manuscripts, hence relying on Mesopotamian models that arrived at an earlier date. The oldest preserved Hittite copy of a Sumerian text is the MS tablet KBo 19 98.

Two further aspects deserve attention, namely the role of Mitanni and Assyria in the transmission of Sumerian texts to Anatolia. The Hurrian milieu, which played an important role in the transmission of Akkadian scholarly material to Anatolia as exemplified by the epic of Gilgameš, seems, conversely, not to have exerted any influence in the reception of Sumerian texts by Hittites, as already argued by previous studies.¹⁹³⁸ The role played by the Assyrian scribal schools is more opaque especially because of its implications for the whole history of the Sumerian literature in the LBA. On the one hand, the Assyro-Mitannian texts, whatever their origin,¹⁹³⁹ clearly speak for Assyrian mediation in the transmission of Sumerian texts to Anatolia. Assyro-Mitannian tablets are copies of Babylonian texts transmitted to the Assyrian scribal schools and represent a bridge to Anatolia for the Mesopotamian material.¹⁹⁴⁰ However, this role seems to be limited to magical texts dated to the mid-14th century. When we move to literary texts, we find a very different picture with only scant traces of Assyrianisms that reflect nothing more than common features of peripheral Akkadian. It is worth noting that none of the texts from the Hittite capital is attested in the MA documentation from the 13th - 12th century. It is remarkable that *LI-LN*, which is known in two NA manuscripts from Assur, is absent from the Middle Assyrian documentation. This probably indicates that much material is lost to us¹⁹⁴¹ although it cannot be excluded that *LI-LN* was only transmitted to Assur in the first millennium. One must also take into account that the conquest of Babylon by Tukulti-Ninurta I and the consequent importation of scholarly material likely led to the replacement of the older tradition with a new one.¹⁹⁴²

1936 See § 8.5.

1937 Due to the difference between Assyro-Mitannian script and the Middle Assyrian script of the 13th century I would not be inclined to date these tablets to the late 13th century.

1938 See Beckman 1983, Klinger 2005.

1939 Whether they are a form of MA texts, or the product of Assyrian scribal circles under Mitannian rule, or the work of Assyrian scribes at the Hittite court, they issue from the Assyrian milieu.

1940 Doubtless, these texts were received by Assyrian scribal schools already in bilingual format; Klinger 2010, 335, expresses the same view.

1941 According to S. Maul (personal communication) there are no Sumerian texts among the circa 100 unpublished MA tablets belonging to a library, see § 2.

1942 Note, however, that some remains of an older tradition are perhaps found in Assur in Rm 376, see § 2.1.6.4.

In order to understand the lines of transmission, the Akkadian hymn on the supremacy of the Sun-god¹⁹⁴³ inscribed on a tablet from Ḫattuša, KBo 1 12,¹⁹⁴⁴ and on a MB manuscript discovered at Assur, KAR 19,¹⁹⁴⁵ is of little help. Unfortunately, the two manuscripts only overlap for a few lines in a fragmentary context.¹⁹⁴⁶ Even though variants are attested,¹⁹⁴⁷ perhaps suggesting different textual traditions, the parallel passage is too limited to determine to what extent the two manuscripts deviated from each other. Hence, we cannot state whether or not the tablet from the Hittite capital relies on the same textual tradition as KAR 19. This question is also tied to the time when KAR 19 was imported to Assur, namely after Tukulti-Ninurta's raid like many other MB tablets, or before. The fragmentary nature of the manuscripts does not allow us to choose between an independent transmission of this composition to Ḫattuša and an Assyrian mediation. To sum up, the role of Assyrian scribes in the dissemination of Sumerian texts to Anatolia in the 15th and 14th century is evident, but for the late 13th century there are no clear data at hand.

8.5 Archival Distribution

Sumerian literary and magical texts with recorded find-spots were discovered in several areas but they mainly come from Building A in Büyükkale:

CTH	Publication	Find-spot	Composition	Script	Language
Building A (Bk. A)					
800.1	KUB 30 1	Room 5 - along the southern half of the eastern wall, in tablet debris ¹	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
800.4	KUB 37 109	Room 5 - along the southern half of the eastern wall, in tablet debris	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
800.4	KUB 37 108 + KUB 37 110	Room 5 - along the southern half of the eastern wall, in tablet debris	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
800	KBo 40 103	Room 5 - along the southern half of the eastern wall, in tablet debris	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
800.2	KUB 30 2	Room 5 - northern end, in tablet debris	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
800.4	KUB 30 3	Room 6 - northern side, in tablet debris	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
800.3	KUB 30 4	Room 6 - northern side, in tablet debris	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
805.1	KBo 36 11+	Rooms 4, 5, 6 ²	Collection of Incantations	Ass-Mit	S A
819	KUB 37 127	Room 4	Incantation	Ass-Mit	S A
805.3	KUB 37 107	Room 5 - center, in tablet debris	Incantation	Ass-Mit	(S) A
806.3	KUB 37 95	Room 5 - along the southern half of the eastern wall, in tablet debris	Incantation	Ass-Mit	S (A?)
813	KUB 34 3	Büyükkale t/9 - debris over Hittite layer	Incantation	Ass-Mit	S A
813	KUB 34 4	Room 4 - northern side, in tablet debris	Incantation	NS	S A
795	KUB 37 41	Room 5 - northern side, in tablet debris	Dumuzi Text (D-I R?)	(?)	S A
813	KUB 37 92	Outside the southern side of Room 6 of magazine building, in tablet debris	Collection of Incantations	(?)	S
819	KBo 36 18	Room 5 - southeastern side, in tablet debris	Unidentified Text	(?)	S A

¹⁹⁴³ Ebeling 1954, Seux 1976, 66-70, Foster 2005, 747-748.

¹⁹⁴⁴ KBo 1 12 is an Akkado-Hittite bilingual tablet in parallel column format, Archi 2007, 185.

¹⁹⁴⁵ For the MB date of KAR 19 see Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. I, 38.

¹⁹⁴⁶ See Seux 1976, 66.

¹⁹⁴⁷ See Seux 1976, 69 n. 35, 70 n. 42.

CTH	Publication	Find-spot	Composition	Script	Language
Building C (Bk. C)					
805.2	KUB 37 143	Büyükkale q-r/16-17 - debris under Phrygian city wall	Incantation	Ass-Mit	SA
Building D (Bk. D)					
800	KBo 36 16	Büyükkale p-q/10-11 - from Phrygian layer	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
801	KBo 36 21	Büyükkale p/8 - under the first Phrygian layer	Incantation	LOB/MB(?)	S
794	KBo 7 1 + KUB 37 115 (+) KBo 7 2	KBo 7 1: Büyükkale m/13 - Room 3 - northern end KUB 37 115: Büyükkale m-n/9-10 - surface find KBo 7 2: Büyükkale n/11 - Room x - ca. 8 m in front of northern wall	Collection of Incantations	Ass-Mit	SA
805.2	KUB 37 101	Büyükkale p/14 - debris over Hittite layer	Incantation	Ass-Mit	(S) A
805.2	KUB 37 102	Büyükkale p/14 - debris over Hittite layer	Incantation	Ass-Mit	SA
801.4	KUB 37 111	Magazine 8	Collection of Incantations	NS	SA
819	KBo 36 14	Büyükkale p/14 - debris over Hittite layer	Incantation	(?)	S (A)
Building K (Bk. K)					
800	KBo 36 13	Büyükkale w/6 - from Phrygian debris near statues	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
Building M (Bk. M)					
800	KBo 36 15	Büyükkale w/18 - in front of the inner edge of the Phrygian city wall	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
812	KBo 36 19	Büyükkale x/20 - debris over Phrygian slope paving	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
Büyükkale (?)					
813	KBo 14 51	Büyükkale - southeastern excavation, from debris shedding	Collection of Incantations	MB	S
Haus am Hang (HaH)					
314	KBo 12 73	L/18 b/5 - old excavation debris	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	NS	S PhS H
806	KBo 36 20	L/18 b/5 - post-Hittite area	Incantation	NS	S
813	KBo 13 37	L/18 c/5 - post-Hittite area	Collection of Incantations	Bab	SA(?)
Temple I (T. I)					
819	KBo 19 98	East street before Magazine 4 - old excavation debris	Unidentified Text	MS	SA
801	KBo 36 17	L/19 - excavation debris	Incantation	NS	SA
Lower City (?)					
819	KBo 36 24	Lower City (?)	Unidentified Text	NS	S (A)

CTH	Publication	Find-spot	Composition	Script	Language
1		Fragments 1404/c and 1412/c were found in Room 5 - northern side, in tablet debris.			
2		523/b + 533/b + 536/b + 640/b stem from Room 4, northern side, in tablet debris; 226/c + 241/c stem from Room 5, along the southern half of the eastern wall, in tablet debris; 656/c + stems from Room 5, center, in tablet debris; 1016/c + 1048/c stem from Room 6, center, in tablet debris; 1829/c stems from Room 5, northern side, in tablet debris; 357/f stems from Büyükkale v/10, Room 6 of magazines, northern part, in the floor ramming.			

Sumerian texts discovered in Building A share both thematic and formal similarities that reveal the deliberate classification of this material by Hittites. Indeed, all but KUB 37 41 are incantations and, except KUB 34 4, all tablets are inscribed in non-Hittite script, either Babylonian or Assyro-Mitannian. Probably also belonging to this library is the small collection of fragments discovered near Building D because at least some of the tablets found in this area come from other locations.¹⁹⁴⁸ Features of these tablets, namely script and text-typology, perfectly fit those stemming from Building A. Indeed, all the texts found in the vicinity of Building D are incantations and are written in non-Hittite script except for KUB 37 111 which, it will be recalled, is perhaps a Hittite copy of an Assyro-Mitannian manuscript. The whole complex of Büyükkale, including Building A, was generally regarded as being completely rebuilt during the Late Hittite Empire, probably under Tutḫaliya IV,¹⁹⁴⁹ but recently Seeher provided evidence that the construction of the entire area cannot be attributed to this king alone.¹⁹⁵⁰ The collection housed in Building A contained material from the Old Kingdom as well as tablets stemming from the Early and Late Empire period, but, as pointed out by Košak, tablets written in the very late ductus, typical for Tutḫaliya IV and his successors, are quite limited in number.¹⁹⁵¹ At least part of this material was brought from other locations within the city.¹⁹⁵² The collection of Building A mostly consists of old tablets and less current texts considered important enough to be preserved for a long period (very few ephemeral documents were found there).¹⁹⁵³ Indeed, some of the oldest documents belonging to this collection are the incantations CTH 800 which, as here suggested, may have been imported after Muršili's raid on Babylonia. The area of Building K, which also housed a small library, yielded only one Sumerian text, but it probably does not belong here as it was found in Phrygian debris. Therefore, this fragment may belong to the Building A library along with the other fragments stemming from Büyükkale because they were also unearthed out of context, mostly in Phrygian layers. Indeed, KUB 37 143, found in the area of Building C, possibly joins KUB 37 101 and 102 which stem from Building D. To sum up, all the Sumerian texts from Büyükkale were originally stored in a single place, the library of Building A, and they are mostly incantations in non-Hittite script.¹⁹⁵⁴ Texts of foreign origin acquired up to the time of Suppiluliuma I were housed in the citadel archives and especially in Building A.¹⁹⁵⁵

The collection of Sumerian texts from Büyükkale is likely what remains of the magical texts imported (or written *in loco*) by foreign experts who moved, over time, to the Hittite capital. It also reveals the intent of the Hittites to preserve such material for a long period for its cultural interest, in addition to its possible practical use at the time of its arrival. There seems to be no evidence for

1948 Pedersén 1998, 50. Tablets housed in Building A were scattered in several places around the area, Košak 1995, 175; for the nature of the collection in Building D see van den Hout 2006, 81-82.

1949 Košak 1995, 174 and n. 9 with further bibliography.

1950 Seeher 2006, 138-140, 142-143; further evidence for an earlier date of the complex is provided by a group of scribes working in Building A under Ḫattušili III, Gordin 2011, 189.

1951 Košak 1995, 179; for the number of dated tablets in Building A see van den Hout 2008, 215.

1952 Alaura 2001, 26.

1953 van den Hout 2005, 283, van den Hout 2006, 96-97; for the content of texts housed in Building A see Archi 2007, 192-196.

1954 Only KUB 34 4 and KUB 37 111 may be attributed with certainty to Hittite scribes.

1955 Archi 2007, 196.

scribal education activities within Building A¹⁹⁵⁶ especially since no duplicates were found there.¹⁹⁵⁷ All the Sumerian incantations are preserved in single copies only, a fact that is unexpected for a scribal school.¹⁹⁵⁸ The only evidence for (multiple) copies of Sumerian texts is provided by the Hittite script manuscripts which obviously depend on (Syro-)Mesopotamian models. The foreign origin of most of the tablets (i.e. Babylonian and Assyro-Mitannian), their dating, the assortment of languages used and the limited number of Hittite script manuscripts are, in my opinion, further signs that this collection was not assembled for teaching purposes. This does not exclude that some tablets were drafted within the building, but the purpose of this collection was the preservation of a text-based cultural heritage. T. van den Hout described the tablet collections from the Hittite capital as archives and specifically as 'living archives'.¹⁹⁵⁹ However, he admits that this definition is not applicable to all text genres and collections.¹⁹⁶⁰ Indeed, part of the collection within Building A, precisely the Sumerian texts, may be defined as a library because its function was limited to the academic and cultural sphere.¹⁹⁶¹ The idea behind the collection of Sumerian texts in Büyükkale is closer to that of modern libraries where only one copy of each book is usually stored, rather than to ancient Near Eastern libraries. Using a more theoretical approach, as illustrated by van den Hout himself,¹⁹⁶² we may describe this tablet collection as a 'historical collection', probably part of a 'historical archive'.¹⁹⁶³ The Sumerian texts in Building A would be one of the earliest attestations of a 'historical archive or library'.¹⁹⁶⁴ Because most of the Sumerian texts housed in Building A were old foreign manuscripts, this group of tablets can be compared to collections of ancient books in modern libraries. In particular, texts under CTH 800 are the only example in the whole Syro-Anatolian documentation of monolingual Sumerian texts in phonetic writing written by foreign scribes¹⁹⁶⁵ that do not belong to a larger collection that also includes Akkadian incantations.¹⁹⁶⁶ These texts very likely reflect a sort of antiquarian interest among the Hittites.¹⁹⁶⁷

Unfortunately, we are not in a position to know whether the collection of Sumerian texts was kept separate from the other texts, because of disturbances to the archaeological context in both ancient and modern times. Fragments were scattered among Rooms 4, 5, 6 and even outside Building A, and sometimes pieces of the same tablets turned up in different find-spots.¹⁹⁶⁸ None of the known Sumerian texts can be identified with the entries listed in the inventory catalogues,¹⁹⁶⁹ mainly stemming

1956 Differently Gordin 2011, 189 and n. 57.

1957 The absence of duplicates is usually considered as indicative of ephemeral documents intended to be discarded (see van den Hout 2008 with previous bibliography) but it goes without saying that Sumerian texts are not everyday documents.

1958 van den Hout 2005, 287-288 and n. 51, distinguishing between translated and non-translated Sumero-Akkadian compositions, correctly states that the latter show a 'very low duplication rate'; we can now add that Sumero-Akkadian incantations from Büyükkale are not to be included among texts with duplicates (Group A) as opposed to *unica* (Group B) according to the classification of the text corpus from Hattuša proposed by van den Hout (van den Hout 2002, 864, van den Hout 2005, 282-283).

1959 van den Hout 2005, 282-285, van den Hout 2008, 211-212; he defines Building A as a 'record center' (van den Hout 2008, 218), but this definition does not cover all the functions of this archive, cf. Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 223-224.

1960 van den Hout 2005, 287-289.

1961 Cf. Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 217-218.

1962 van den Hout 2005, 281-282; the uniqueness of the Sumerian texts is paralleled at Hattuša by the *Landschenkungsurkunden*.

1963 van den Hout 2006.

1964 Cf. van den Hout 2005, 280-282, 289, van den Hout 2008, 219.

1965 As stated above, it is highly improbable that Hittite scribes were able to understand such texts without the help of foreign experts.

1966 AuOrS 23 25 and AuOrS 23 27 include Akkadian incantations, §§ 7.1.3, 7.1.4.

1967 For the Hittite antiquarian curiosity regarding the Sargonic kings see Beckman 2001, 89.

1968 See KBo 36 11+, table fn. 2 at p. 351.

1969 For these texts see Otten 1986, Güterbock 1991-1992 and more recently Dardano 2006; for the closely related inventory labels see Karasu 1996.

from Building A,¹⁹⁷⁰ even though they include Mesopotamian texts – the Akkadian anti-witchcraft ritual *šumma amīlu kašip* (CTH 803)¹⁹⁷¹ and possibly also the celestial omina (CTH 533) known in Akkadian and Hittite versions from Ḫattuša.¹⁹⁷²

The nature of the collection, especially the presence of tablets written in so many different scripts stemming from different periods gathered together for the purpose of preservation, leads me to regard the Assyro-Mitannian texts as imported tablets. Indeed, according to S. Košak's Konkordanz all the Assyro-Mitannian tablets (not only Sumerian texts, but also Akkadian) for which find-spots are known were found in Büyükkale and particularly within Building A. Only two pieces labeled as Assyro-Mitannian in the Konkordanz, IBoT 1 34 and KBo 36 28, stem from outside Büyükkale and specifically from Temple I. The first one is a letter from a king of Ḫanigalbat to the Hittite king that is actually not written in Assyro-Mitannian but in Mitannian script, hence not belonging here.¹⁹⁷³ KBo 36 28 is a fragment from a multicolumn tablet preserving a few broken lines on columns I and II on the obverse, whereas the reverse is broken away except for traces of signs in the colophon. The text, an unidentified incantation mentioning Asalluḫi (Obv. I, 7), is regarded by Wilhelm¹⁹⁷⁴ as 'wohl zweisprachig' but does not preserve any traces of Sumerian and as a consequence it has not been treated in the present study. Indeed, both columns have only an Akkadian text.¹⁹⁷⁵ On paleographical grounds, this fragment does not show any typical trait of the Assyro-Mitannian school that allows us to distinguish its script from the Hittite.¹⁹⁷⁶ For instance, the shape of LU₂ is different from the other Assyro-Mitannian manuscripts.¹⁹⁷⁷ Therefore, I would tend to regard this fragment as the product of a Hittite scribe. If the Assyro-Mitannian script had actually been used at Ḫattuša by foreign scribes, one would expect a larger diffusion within the city, instead of its restriction to a single archive. In this regard, the provenance of the Assyro-Mitannian tablets discovered during the early campaigns could be problematic, since Winckler's excavations were mainly concentrated in Building E and in the area of Temple I and the Haus am Hang.¹⁹⁷⁸ However, we know that in 1907 Makridi Bey initiated a survey in the inner court in the area between Building C and Building A¹⁹⁷⁹ where further tablets were unearthed. Nine tablets labeled as Assyro-Mitannian¹⁹⁸⁰ in Konkordanz have Bo-numbers including the Sumero-Akkadian incantation KUB 4 16. Since not a single Assyro-Mitannian tablet with a recorded find-spot comes from either Building E, Temple I or the Haus am Hang, these tablets may possibly stem from the surveyed area near Building A.¹⁹⁸¹ Further evidence for the remote provenance of the Assyro-Mitannian tablets is the fact that they only contain magical-ritual texts. In my opin-

1970 Dardano 2006, 3.

1971 Dardano 2006, 5-7, Tab. 2.

1972 See Güterbock 1991-1992, 136. KUB 29 11+ is an Akkado-Hittite bilingual with a duplicate from Emar (E 651).

1973 Weeden 2012, 232. Besides IBoT 1 34 three other letters from kings of Ḫanigalbat to Hittite kings (KBo 26 65, KBo 26 66, KUB 3 80) labeled as Assyro-Mitannian in the Konkordanz are actually Mitannian tablets. For the historical treatment of IBoT 1 34 see de Martino 2012; the letter was probably written at Taide, the capital of Mitanni at that time (de Martino's personal communication).

1974 KBo 36, v.

1975 Obv. I 6: *a-na-ku*; Obv. II 3: *a-n[a]*.

1976 J. Miller's insight; I thank Prof. J. Miller for his help with the paleography of some tablets.

1977 The oblique wedges are only three in number and are placed above the three uprights intersecting the initial horizontal, contrary to the Assyro-Mitannian manuscripts in which they are four and more to the left above the head of the horizontal. This form is compatible with the Hittite one, see HZL No. 78.

1978 For tablets from early excavations see below. I wish to express my gratitude to Silvia Alaura for her helpful remarks and for providing me with much information on the matter.

1979 Alaura's personal communication, see Bittel *apud* Neve 1982, XIII-XIV and Abb. V, see also in the same volume Beilage 1; Alaura 1998, 197 Abb. 4, Alaura 2006, 117. In his diaries Winckler also states that in 1906 some tablets were brought to him by workers during the excavation, see Klengel 1993, 512-513, Alaura 2006, 104.

1980 KUB 4 16, KUB 4 27, KUB 4 52, KUB 4 54, KUB 4 98, KUB 37 32, KUB 37 33, KUB 37 81, KUB 37 137; of these tablets KUB 4 16 (see below and § 5.2.3), KUB 4 27 and KUB 4 98 are possibly non-Assyro-Mitannian. To these tablets is to be added the aforementioned Mitannian manuscript KUB 3 80, see fn. 1973.

1981 One should remember that it is not precluded that some Assyro-Mitannian tablets were temporarily stored outside Building A due to the circulation of documents within the city archives for administrative purposes (van den Hout 2005,

ion, the only persons who could have written Assyro-Mitannian tablets at Ḫattuša are not foreign scribes, but *āšipū*-priests, who dealt exclusively with magical texts. If foreign scribes had composed the tablets, we would expect to find other types of texts written in Assyro-Mittanian script, but that is not the case. The question of where foreign script tablets were actually drafted also involves the tablets in Babylonian script, either LOB or MB.¹⁹⁸² A further hint that the non-Hittite script tablets were imported may be the fact that foreign scribes working at Ḫattuša or scribes trained in foreign scribal conventions (usually by their fathers) adopted Hittite script and ductus. This is the case of the aforementioned Ḫanikkuili, son of the Mesopotamian scribe Anu-šar-ilāni, who wrote tablets in Hittite MS.¹⁹⁸³ Additionally, Hurrian scribes drew up Hurrian and Hittite versions of the *Song of Release* in Hittite script.¹⁹⁸⁴

The collection of Sumerian texts stemming from the lower city has a completely different nature. With almost no exceptions, only Hittite script tablets were discovered in the Haus am Hang and in the storerooms surrounding Temple I, whereas the only Sumerian text in non-Hittite script stemming from the lower city is KBo 13 37 which was found in a post-Hittite layer.¹⁹⁸⁵ This distribution corresponds to the remainder of the tablet collection from Ḫattuša because most recent and current texts were drawn up and housed in the lower city, probably at least since the time of Muršili II.¹⁹⁸⁶ Indeed, tablets written in NS represent the vast majority in both the storerooms surrounding Temple I and the Haus am Hang.¹⁹⁸⁷ These two areas were also the venues of scriptoria or scribal schools as recent studies have shown.¹⁹⁸⁸ In this regard, the presence of a trilingual text such as *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* is relevant. The addition of a Sumerian phonetic version and a Hittite translation to a bilingual text is a clear indication of school training. Advanced students or scholars copied bilingual Mesopotamian texts and added further versions as part of their education. Indeed, as noticed by van den Hout,¹⁹⁸⁹ Hittite translations and adaptations of Sumero-Akkadian compositions were almost exclusively found in the lower city, whereas the non-translated Mesopotamian literature stems from Büyükkale. The function of the Sumerian texts in the lower city was therefore connected to schooling, contrary to the texts discovered in Building A. In fact, with the single exception of the list *Kagal* stemming from Building K, all the lexicographic texts, which represent the core of scribal education, were found in the lower city.¹⁹⁹⁰

The largest part of the tablets unearthed during the early campaigns (Bo and VAT numbers) conducted by H. Winckler during 1906-1907 and 1911-1912 have unrecorded or lost find-spots.¹⁹⁹¹ Provenance can be tracked in just a few cases¹⁹⁹² as only scant information can be extracted from Winckler's diaries and letters.¹⁹⁹³ As stated above, tablets discovered during these campaigns are

77-78). Hence Assyro-Mitannian tablets may have been brought to the lower city where scriptoria were located (see below) in order to be used in schooling.

1982 It is not certain that physical analysis of tablets would allow us to determine the provenance of the non-Hittite script tablets, as shown by the study of vocabularies: pXRF analysis of typical Hittite tablets suggests that they come from elsewhere, see Goren, Mommsen, Klinger 2011, 695. On paleography see Wilhelm 1992, Klinger 1998, Klinger 2003, Devecchi 2012.

1983 On the other hand GUR.Šarruma son of EN.UR.SAĜ wrote KUB 37 210 in non-Hittite script, see Schwemer 2013, n. 8

1984 Archi 2007, 190.

1985 All the Sumerian texts stemming from the lower city were found in secondary contexts.

1986 Archi 2007, 196; for the different nature ('komplementär') of the collections housed in the citadel and in the lower city see also Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 222-223.

1987 van den Hout 2008, 216; on the few Old Hittite texts in the HaH see Torri 2009a.

1988 For the Haus am Hang see Torri 2008, Torri 2010; for Temple I see Gordin 2010.

1989 van den Hout 2005, 288.

1990 Klinger 2005, 109, Archi 2007, 192-193, see also Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 225-226.

1991 Often Winckler and Makridi Bey recorded tablet find-spots, but these were lost in the museums, see Alaura 2004, 140-141, Alaura 2006, 117.

1992 Alaura 1998, 197 n. 5, Otten 1938, 40.

1993 Winckler 1907; the excavations are poorly recorded and reports were never published, see Klengel 1993.

mainly from three areas, Building E in Büyükkale, Temple I and the Haus am Hang¹⁹⁹⁴ but they were gathered together indiscriminately.¹⁹⁹⁵ Among these early findings, there are also Sumerian texts mostly in Hittite script.¹⁹⁹⁶

CTH	Inventory Number	Publication	Composition	Script	Language
812	Bo 6345	KUB 4 16	Incantation	Ass-Mit	(S) A
819	Bo 4490	KUB 4 23	Collection of Incantations	MS/NS	SA
314	Bo 503	KUB 4 5	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	NS	(S) PhS H
314	Bo 547 + 486	KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	NS	S PhS A H
314	Bo 5113	KUB 4 4	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	NS	(S) (PhS) A H
315	Bo 3681	KUB 4 2	MLM	NS	(S) PhS (A) (H)
315	Bo 4209	KUB 4 97	MLM	NS	(S) (PhS) A H
807	Bo 450	KUB 57 126	Edubba E	NS	S PhS (A) (H?)
807	Bo 5590	KUB 4 39	LI-LN	NS	S (A)
801.3	Bo 453	KUB 4 7	Nergal D	NS	S (A)
819	Bo 4547	KUB 4 41	Hymn to Nergal (?)	NS	SA
793	Bo 1760	KUB 4 11	Incantation to Utu	NS	SA
801	Bo 2747 Bo 4314	KUB 4 26 (+) HT 13 (+) KUB 37 112	a) <i>šūilla</i> to Adad (A) b) Hymn (?)	NS	S
806.1	VAT 7425	KBo 1 18	Collection of Incantations	NS	S
806.2	Bo 655	KUB 4 24	Collection of Incantations	NS	S
806.4	AnAr 6994	ABoT 1 43	Incantation	NS	S (A?)
819	Bo 7077	KUB 4 10	Unidentified Text	NS(?)	SA(?)

The possibility that these Sumerian tablets in Hittite script came from Building E should be excluded on the basis of the text-types discovered in that archive which, as pointed out by Alaura, are completely different from those stemming from Building A.¹⁹⁹⁷ Indeed, not a single Sumerian text has been discovered in Building E since excavations resumed in 1933, and Akkadian texts of Mesopotamian origin are also rare. The Hittite script of these tablets suggests that they stem from either the area surrounding Temple I or the Haus am Hang. A piece of evidence is provided by one of the fragments of *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad*, Bo 503 (KUB 4 5), which joins 146/t (KBo 12 73), discovered in the Haus am Hang.¹⁹⁹⁸ The very small number of Sumerian texts in Hittite script stemming from Building A makes it less probable that these tablets come from Winckler's aforementioned survey in the area. However, we cannot confidently assign all these tablets to the archives of the lower city. Provenance from the lower city (probably the HaH) is highly probable for the remaining fragments of *The Hymn to Iškur Adad*¹⁹⁹⁹ as well as for *MLM* and KUB 57 126, which also contain phonetic Sumerian and Hittite versions, because as argued in the present study this format is the product of schooling. The prisms KUB 4 39 and KBo 1 18 probably stem from Temple I where other prisms were found.²⁰⁰⁰ The

1994 Horozný 1915, 21-22.

1995 Bittel 1937, 33.

1996 The fragment with unrecorded find-spot ABoT 1 43 in the Archaeological Museum of Ankara may be added here.

1997 Alaura 2001, 25.

1998 According to Klinger 2010, 313 tablets with low find-numbers stem from the same complex; however, this does not preclude that higher Bo-numbers come from the lower city as well.

1999 It is not precluded that KUB 4 4 stems from the citadel because it is older than the other fragments, but the HaH is the more probable find-spot.

2000 See KBo 26; I thank Silvia Alaura for drawing my attention to this point.

script of KUB 4 16 is not completely clear: if it is in fact an Assyro-Mitannian tablet it probably stems from Building A as suggested above;²⁰⁰¹ on the contrary, if it turns out to be a Hittite manuscript (possibly a copy of an Assyro-Mitannian tablet) it could stem from either Building A (likewise KUB 37 111) or the lower city. KUB 4 11 might stem from Büyükkale²⁰⁰² due to its connection with the aforementioned *Prayers to the Sun-god* (CTH 372-374)²⁰⁰³ whose manuscripts were mostly found in Building A. The specific text typology of KUB 4 11²⁰⁰⁴ fits the collection of Sumerian texts from the citadel which, as noted above, consists almost exclusively of incantations. In addition it needs to be recalled that KUB 4 11, although written in NS, differs from the typical Hittite tablets as it shows several paleographic features that go back to the Babylonian model²⁰⁰⁵ as well as old and late Hittite sign forms that suggest an arrival before the 13th century. If this text had any influence on the composition of the *Prayers to the Sun-god*, we have to assume that it was transmitted to Ḫattuša during the Early Empire at the latest, the period to which the oldest manuscripts of CTH 372-374 are dated.²⁰⁰⁶ This early date of arrival might in turn explain the presence of KUB 4 11 in Building A, where less recent tablets were also located.

Texts stemming from the lower city differ from those discovered in the citadel not only in script but also in type. In fact, Sumerian texts different from incantations, such as wisdom texts and hymns, were only found in the libraries of the lower city.²⁰⁰⁷ The pattern of distribution is much more evident if we include the tablets discovered during early campaigns. According to this picture curricular texts stem from the scribal schools in the lower city. It is perhaps not a coincidence that a non-curricular text such as the Dumuzi composition KUB 37 41 is the only Sumerian literary text found in the citadel where, as argued here, no scribal schooling took place.²⁰⁰⁸ The higher number of incantations stemming from the citadel compared to the lower city is also tied to the nature of the collection of Building A, two-thirds of which consists of ritual and magical texts.²⁰⁰⁹ The most outstanding difference is the presence of duplicates in the lower city, which is further evidence for the educational purpose of the Sumerian texts in Temple I and HaH. *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* and *MLM* are in fact preserved in multiple copies. The distribution of Sumerian texts across different archives reflects a diverse function of texts as with other text-typologies.²⁰¹⁰ This may be an additional hint that imported incantations were actually used by foreign experts.

Does the dichotomy in the distribution of the Sumerian compositions also reflect different stages in the transmission and canonization of texts?²⁰¹¹ Unfortunately, there is no clear indication as only a limited number of texts can be compared with first-millennium duplicates. Positive evidence only seems to be available in the case of the monolingual incantations CTH 800, which represent an old

2001 Note however my remarks in fn. 1981.

2002 Alaura's suggestion.

2003 See Alaura, Bonechi 2012, 54-55.

2004 On the incantatory nature of *Incantation to Utu* see Geller 1995, 102-107.

2005 The influence of the Babylonian model on KUB 4 11 is similar to that of an Assyro-Mitannian tablet on KUB 37 111, also found in the citadel.

2006 See above.

2007 Note that the largest part of the Mesopotamian mythological texts were found in the lower city, whereas the Anatolian myths stem from Büyükkale, Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 221.

2008 Note that the script of KUB 37 41 is unclear.

2009 Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 224.

2010 Imported and Anatolian mythological texts, which were housed in different places in Ḫattuša, were used for different purposes, Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 228-229.

2011 This question arises from the assumption that the date of reception may not coincide with the antiquity of the textual tradition: at least hypothetically, it is not excluded that a text that arrived in Anatolia in the late 13th century B.C. may reflect an older textual tradition than a text received earlier in the 14th or 15th century B.C. On the other hand, Hittite NS tablets housed in the lower city, being only copies, may contain texts transmitted to the Hittite capital earlier than some stored in the citadel, but copied as exercises for a longer period of time.

tradition,²⁰¹² and possibly literary texts, probably housed in the lower city (with the sole exception of KUB 37 41), which, conversely, reflect a later stage in the standardization process. However, this outcome is mostly based on the only literary texts with first-millennium duplicates, *Nergal D* and *LI-LN*, whose provenance is only supposed, because their find-spots are not recorded. Assyro-Mitannian incantations as remarked above do not show a coherent picture even though they differ from their first-millennium duplicates. The stage in the standardization process represented by the Hittite NS incantations in relation to the Assyro-Mitannian texts is unclear. The only Hittite script incantation with first-millennium duplicates is KUB 4 24 (find-spot unknown) which diverges from the first-millennium recension. Only for the library in Büyükkale is there clear evidence that it housed older tablets that reflected older textual traditions. On the other hand, it is unclear to what extent the texts from the lower city reflect a later stage than those housed in the citadel because only a few have first-millennium duplicates and all of them have unrecorded find-spots. The following tables, based on the proposed analysis, tentatively combine tablets whose find-spot is known with tablets with unrecorded find-spot.²⁰¹³

Büyükkale						
CTH	Publication	Composition	Script	Language	Old Babylonian	First Millennium
800.1	KUB 30 1	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	+	-
800.4	KUB 37 109	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	(?)	-
800.2	KUB 30 2	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
800.4	KUB 30 3	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
800.3	KUB 30 4	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
800.4	KUB 37 108 + KUB 37 110	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
800	KBo 36 13	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
800	KBo 36 15	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
800	KBo 36 16	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
800	KBo 40 103	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
801	KBo 36 21	Incantation	LOB/MB(?)	S	?	?
812	KBo 36 19	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
813	KBo 14 51	Collection of Incantations	MB	S	a) ? b) -	a) ? b) +
794	KBo 7 1 + KUB 37 115 (+) KBo 7 2	Collection of Incantations	Ass-Mit	SA	a) - b) -	a) - b) +
805.1	KBo 36 11+	Collection of Incantations	Ass-Mit	SA	a) + b) ? c) ? d) +	a) + b) ? c) ? d) +
805.2	KUB 37 143	Incantation	Ass-Mit	S (A)	+	+
805.2	KUB 37 101	Incantation	Ass-Mit	SA	?	?
805.2	KUB 37 102	Incantation	Ass-Mit	SA	(+)	+
805.3	KUB 37 107	Incantation	Ass-Mit	(S) A	?	?
806.3	KUB 37 95	Incantation	Ass-Mit	S (A?)	?	?
813	KUB 34 3	Incantation	Ass-Mit	SA	-	-
819	KUB 37 127	Incantation	Ass-Mit	SA	?	?
812	KUB 4 16	Incantation	Ass-Mit	(S) A	+	+

2012 As seen above, KUB 30 1 is the only incantation that is known from the OB documentation but lacks first-millennium duplicates.

2013 Texts with a recorded find-spot are listed in bold type.

Büyükkale						
793	KUB 4 11	Incantation to Utu	NS	SA	+	+
801.4	KUB 37 111	Collection of Incantations	NS	SA	~ +	~ +
813	KUB 34 4	Incantation	NS	SA	?	?
795	KUB 37 41	Dumuzi Text (D-I R?)	(?)	SA	+	-
813	KUB 37 92	Collection of Incantations	(?)	SA	?	?
819	KBo 36 18	Incantation	(?)	SA	?	?
819	KBo 36 14	Incantation	(?)	S (A)	?	?
Lower City						
CTH	Publication	Composition	Script	Language	OB	First Mill.
813	KBo 13 37	Collection of Incantations	Bab	SA(?)	?	?
819	KUB 4 23	Collection of Incantations	MS/NS	SA	?	?
314	KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73 KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8 KUB 4 4	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	NS	S PhSA H	-	-
315	KUB 4 2 KUB 4 97	MLM	NS	(S) PhSA (H)	+	-
807	KUB 57 126	Edubba E	NS	S PhS (A) (H?)	+	-
807	KUB 4 39	LI-LN	NS	S (A)	(-)	+
801.3	KUB 4 7	Nergal D	NS	S (A)	+	+
819	KUB 4 41	Hymn to Nergal (?)	NS	SA	?	?
801	KUB 4 26 (+) HT 13 (+) KUB 37 112	a) <i>šulla</i> to Adad (A) b) Hymn (?)	NS	b) S	?	?
806.1	KBo 1 18	Collection of Incantations	NS	S	?	?
806.2	KUB 4 24	Collection of Incantations	NS	S	(+)	+
801	KBo 36 17	Incantation	NS	SA	?	?
806	KBo 36 20	Incantation	NS	S	?	?
806.4	ABoT 1 43	Incantation	NS	S (A?)	?	?
819	KBo 19 98	Unidentified Text	MS	SA	?	?
819	KUB 4 10	Unidentified Text	NS(?)	SA(?)	?	?
819	KBo 36 24	Unidentified Text	NS	SA(?)	?	?

Texts from the lower city, the only ones that can be used to reconstruct the curriculum, show that Sumerian was still part of the scribal training at Ḫattuša at the end of the 13th century in the form of lexical lists as well as literary texts. Based on our knowledge of the Old Babylonian curriculum, Hittite scribes copied short compositions in the Intermediary Phase after lexical lists. This marked the highest level of Hittite proficiency in Sumerian, reached by a very limited number of scholarly scribes.

8.6 Concluding Remarks

Two different groups of Sumerian texts are known from the tablet collections of the Hittite capital. One, consisting almost exclusively of incantations written in non-Hittite script, served a practical purpose in rituals performed by Mesopotamian priests to repel diseases. On the basis of the archaeological evidence this collection was housed in Building A likely for cultural-antiquarian reasons but it is not excluded that magical texts continued to be used by Mesopotamian practitioners.²⁰¹⁴ The other group of Sumerian texts, made up of Hittite script tablets, includes incantations as well as literary texts used in the education of scribes. Some of these literary texts had a curricular setting in the Old Babylonian period and were used in schooling in the Hittite capital. Nevertheless, it is likely that the study of Sumerian was limited to a small circle of scholarly scribes who were concerned with non-ephemeral documents.²⁰¹⁵ Copying Sumerian texts probably had little role in the education of scribes employed in the state administration. The knowledge of Sumerian that Hittite scribes needed for writing Hittite and Akkadian texts was limited to logograms that were learned by means of lexical lists.²⁰¹⁶

Texts from Ḫattuša reflect an early stage of the process of selection, adaptation and innovation of Sumerian literature undertaken in the post-Old Babylonian period as is clear from the coexistence of old and late traditions.²⁰¹⁷ These sources represent a substantial part of the poorly known corpus of Middle Babylonian Sumerian literature. Sumerian texts from the Hittite capital reflect different traditions; some clearly derive from the Northern Babylonian tradition while others rely on the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. Throughout this work, it has been argued that most of the grammatical and orthographic anomalies and mistakes found in the tablets from Ḫattuša are commonly attested elsewhere in the Sumerian tradition, hence they were already contained in the Mesopotamian models transmitted to Anatolia.

2014 Two types of practitioners are here referred to: (1) Mesopotamian experts who moved to Ḫattuša after those who brought or wrote the magical tablets housed in Building A; (2) second generations of Mesopotamian experts settled in the Hittite capital, who were trained by their fathers.

2015 Besides Hittite, scribal education at Ḫattuša was mainly focused on Akkadian, see Fincke 2009b, 111-112.

2016 According to Klingler 2010, 307 n. 7, lexical lists in the Hittite scribal schools were tools for learning cuneiform writing but not languages. Note that no extract tablets or elementary exercises in Sumerian were found at the Hittite capital; only a tu-ta-ti exercise is written on a tablet of the series *Erimḫuš* (KBo 26 20), Klingler 2005, 112. This material is also lacking for Hittite and Akkadian, see Klingler 2012, 85-86

2017 The same stage of textual tradition is evident for lexical lists, Klingler 2005, 110-111.

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

9 The Sumerian Literary Tradition at Emar and Ugarit

The recovery of the same compositions at Emar and Ugarit necessarily lead us to present a synthesis of the Sumerian literary tradition in the two cities in a single chapter.

9.1 Literary Texts

The corpus of the Sumerian or bilingual literary texts unearthed at Emar and Ugarit is limited to ten compositions and a few additional unidentified fragments. As with the documentation from the Hittite capital, not a single composition belonging to the Tetrad, Decad or House F Fourteen is documented at Emar or Ugarit. The only texts attested in an OB literary catalogue are *SI-Utu* and perhaps *LI-LN*. Comparison with the contemporaneous sources from Mesopotamia shows that none of the Sumerian literary texts found at Emar and Ugarit is known in the Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian documentation with the partial exclusion of the fable *The Fowler*, as an extract of the closely related composition *The Fowler and his Wife* is attested on a Kassite tablet.²⁰¹⁸

The only attestation of popular OB texts in Syria is an Akkado-Hurrian bilingual recension of *The Instructions of Šuruppak*, a composition included in the so called House F Fourteen.²⁰¹⁹ This unique recension²⁰²⁰ is inscribed on a fragment of unknown provenance housed in a private collection in Munich that was identified by Civil as part of *The Instructions of Šuruppak* after its publication by Krebern timer (1996). Hence, it is the only literary composition from the OB Sumerian corpus attested in LBA manuscripts from both Mesopotamia and the Western periphery. As discussed earlier, a monolingual Akkadian version of *The Instructions of Šuruppak* is preserved in MB and MA copies,²⁰²¹ but according to Alster the Akkado-Hurrian version is independent from the extant Mesopotamian sources.

Composition	Provenance	OB Tablet Format	OB	First Millennium
BeR	Emar – Ugarit	I	+	+ Catalogue
EaN	Emar – Ugarit	I/II/III	+	Catalogue
MLM	Ugarit	III	+	-
SI-Utu	Emar	III/IV/P	+	+
LI-LN	Ugarit	-	Catalogue(?)	+
Proverbs from Ugarit	Ugarit	I	+	(+)
The Fowler	Emar	-	-	Catalogue (?) Akkadian (?)
The Fox and the Hyena	Ugarit	II/III	(+)	?
Hymn to Enki(?)	Ugarit	-	-	-
PfK	Emar – Ugarit	-	-	-

2018 § 1.1.6.5.

2019 § 1.1.6.1.

2020 Another Akkado-Hurrian bilingual is documented at Ugarit in RS 15.10 = AuOrS 23 46.

2021 A monolingual Akkadian recension of *Lugal-e* is also known, see Seminara 2001, 40.

As with the documentation from Hattuša, the texts from Emar and Ugarit do not represent the core of the Old Babylonian Sumerian literary corpus. A selection of minor compositions from the Old Babylonian literature rather than long epics or poems, such as *Lugal-e* and *Angim*, reached the Syrian scribal schools. Nevertheless, some compositions from the Western periphery served an educational purpose in the Old Babylonian scribal schools. As far as *MLM* and *LI-LN* are concerned, their pedagogical function has already been underlined.²⁰²² The curricular setting of other compositions can be determined on the basis of the type of tablet on which they were written in the Old Babylonian period. Literary texts were not usually written on Type II tablets, which conversely were used for elementary compositions, namely lexical lists, model contracts and proverbs. Nevertheless, a limited number of literary compositions are found on Type II literary tablets²⁰²³ representing the Intermediary Phase in the curriculum.²⁰²⁴ One of the texts attested on Type II tablets is the vanity theme composition *EaN*. Out of seven OB manuscripts of *EaN*, three are Type II tablets. An additional text possibly belonging here is *The Fox and the Hyena*²⁰²⁵ because the Uruk manuscript²⁰²⁶ containing *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant*, a composition closely related to, or possibly even a forerunner of our text, is a Type II tablet.²⁰²⁷ The pedagogic nature of fables is well known in many cultures and Fox tales were incorporated in proverb collections that were commonly used in scribal education.²⁰²⁸ A further composition likely used in schooling is the fable *The Fowler* from Emar because the related text *The Fowler and his Wife* is also attested on a Type II tablet and exists as a part of proverb collections.²⁰²⁹ The Royal Correspondence of Larsa, of which one exemplar, *SI-Utu*, is attested at Emar, was utilized in the education of scribes probably in the Intermediary Phase.²⁰³⁰ Indeed, this text is attested on a lentil-shaped tablet from Nippur²⁰³¹ (Type IV). Another OB manuscript of *SI-Utu* is a prism of unknown provenance,²⁰³² another tablet format often used in schooling. The same prism contains the *Letter of Ininm-Inana to Lugal-ibila* which represents the model of *LI-LN*.²⁰³³ This entails that these two compositions belonged to the same phase of the curriculum because texts inscribed on compilation tablets were learned at the same stage.²⁰³⁴ An additional link between *SI-Utu* and *LI-LN* derives from their possible quotation in the same catalogue from Uruk. These connections counter Kleinerman's conclusion²⁰³⁵ that 'there is no unambiguous evidence to place the Sumerian Epistolary Miscellany (SEpM) – to which *LI-LN* is related as the *Letter of Ininm-Inana to Lugal-ibila* belongs to this group – either before or after the Decad.'²⁰³⁶ Moreover, the presence of *LI-LN* in the

2022 See § 8.1.

2023 See Veldhuis 1997, 65-66, Tinney 1999, 167. An updated list of compositions inscribed on Type II tablets has been provided by the writer in the paper 'The Fortune of Wisdom Literature in the Ancient Near East: the Case of the Vanity Theme' presented at the 60th Rencontre d'Assyriologique International held in Warsaw: *Lipit-Ishtar B*, *Lipit-Ištar A*, *Enlil and Namzitarra*, *Lisina A*, *Fable of the Goose and the Raven*, *Edubba A*, *Emesal Lament me-e i-li ga-am₂-du₁₁*, *Akkadian Sargon letter*, *The Fox and a Dog*, *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant*, *The Fowler and his Wife* and four unidentified texts.

2024 Kleinerman 2011, 75-81.

2025 § 7.3.6.

2026 This tablet also contains *The Fox and the Dog*.

2027 See description in Cavigneaux 1982, 22.

2028 Veldhuis 2000b, 384-385; see also Cohen 2013, 57-59, with previous bibliography for a survey of the role of proverbs in Mesopotamian education.

2029 § 1.1.6.5.

2030 Brisch 2007, 87-89.

2031 CBS 4078; for lentil-shaped tablets from Nippur see Falkowitz 1983/1984.

2032 See § 6.2.4.

2033 Kleinerman 2011, 85-86 n. 38.

2034 See Kleinerman 2011, 71-74.

2035 Kleinerman 2011, 81-94.

2036 The data and analysis provided by Kleinerman herself, in my opinion, indicate that SEpM, which shares features with compositions of the Intermediary Phase as well as the Decad, was studied at a certain point between these two groups as a way of making the transition towards longer and more complex texts.

Syro-Anatolian documentation, where no Decad compositions were recovered, strongly suggests that SEpM was learned in the Intermediary Phase. Furthermore, *SI-Utu* and *LI-LN* are the only literary letters that survive in the first-millennium documentation.

The curricular context of *BeR* and *Proverbs from Ugarit* can be established on the basis of their connection as a group of texts. These compositions all manifest the so called vanity theme, as do *EaN* and *Nothing is of Value (N-V)* a text attested in four different versions in OB manuscripts only.

Vanity Theme

Nothing is of Value
Ballad of Early Rulers
Enlil and Namzitarra
Proverbs from Ugarit

These short wisdom compositions reflect on the limits of mortal life and express the concept that material things are worthless and have no lasting value. According to Alster²⁰³⁷ the vanity theme literature falls into the category of critical wisdom, which rejects the perpetuation of existing values expressed in the traditional conservative outlook of father-to-son instructions such as *The Instructions of Šuruppak*. Besides the Type II tablets mentioned above, the composition *EaN* was also inscribed on Old Babylonian *Sammeltafeln* containing four additional literary works which form the so called Lisina Group.²⁰³⁸ This also includes *Nothing is of Value* Version D. It is worth noting that *Lisina A* was an elementary composition inscribed on Type II and Type IV tablets,²⁰³⁹ hence belonging to the same stage in the curriculum as *EaN*. Moreover, *Nothing is of Value* is attested on Type IV tablets.²⁰⁴⁰ This text provides the link with *BeR*. Indeed *Nothing is of Value* Version C was inscribed on the same Old Babylonian *Sammeltafeln* containing *BeR* which comprise four literary texts.²⁰⁴¹ In addition, *Nothing is of Value* Version B is written on another *Sammeltafel*, CBS 13777, which is the only OB preserved manuscript of *Proverbs from Ugarit*. The strong interconnection of these compositions is not limited to the Old Babylonian period but extends to later times. One of the manuscripts of *BeR* from Ugarit is the Babylonian script tablet RS 25.130, either imported or written *in loco* by a foreigner scribe, which also contains *Proverbs from Ugarit*. In the first millennium the NA fragment of *BeR* contains a collection of sayings recalling *Proverbs from Ugarit*.

Lisina Group

Lisina A
Letter or Edubba Text (?)
Nothing is of Value D
Enlil and Namzitarra
nam-dub-sar-ra

Ballad Sammeltafeln

Hymn to Marduk
Abī-Ešuh B6
Nothing is of Value C
Ballad of Early Rulers

CBS 13777

Proverbs of Ugarit
Nothing of Value B

RS 25.130 (MB manuscript)

Ballad of Early Rulers
Proverbs from Ugarit

2037 Alster 2005, 25-28.

2038 Only 3NT 326+ and UM 29-16-79A contain the full Lisina Group, whereas N 3097 has the Lisina Group letter and *EaN*, and CBS 4605, the only Type III tablet of these manuscripts, includes *EaN* and nam-dub-sar-ra.

2039 Tinney 1999, 167.

2040 Ni 2192, YBC 7283. In addition to the Tetrad and proverbs, Type IV tablets include: *Nothing is of Value*, *Codex of Lipit-Ištar*, *Lisina A*, *An Elegy on the death of Nanaya*, *Letter of Šin-iddinam to Utu*, *Šū-ilišu A*, *Enlil A*, *Lipit-Ištar A*, a royal hymn and a hymn or list of names.

2041	BM 80091 (A):	BM 80184 (B):	CBS 1208 (D)
	Hymn to Marduk	[Hymn to Marduk]	Hymn to Marduk
	Abī-Ešuh B	Abī-Ešuh B	Abī-Ešuh B
	[NV-C]	NV-C	NV-C
	BeR	BeR	BeR

A further connection between *BeR* and *Nothing is of Value* can be seen in a few parallel lines:²⁰⁴²

BeR 6	an-ta e ₂ -ur ₃ -ra-ke ₄ -ne-ne ki-ta e ₂ -da-ri-ke ₄ -ne-ne
NV-C 5	an-ta e ₂ -ur ₃ -ra-ni ki-ta e ₂ da-ri ₂ -ka-ni

Above are/is their/his elevated house(s), below are/is their/his everlasting house

BeR 21	niĝ ₂ -sa ₆ (?)-ga diĝir-re-e-ne bi ₂ -in-šum ₂ -ma-am
NV-C 8	niĝ ₂ -sa ₆ (?)-ga diĝir-re-e-ne bi ₂ -in-šum ₂ -ma-(re)

(for him) who gives the good stuff of the gods (life is found)

To sum up, two vanity theme compositions, *EaN* and *N-V*, appear to have been used in schooling along with other texts in the Intermediary Phase of the curriculum on the basis of their attestation on Type II and Type IV tablets. The presence of the vanity theme compositions on tablets and together with other compositions attested on Type II and Type IV tablets, namely *Lisina A*, indicates that all of them belong to the same stage of the curriculum: the Intermediary Phase. The transmission and preservation of vanity theme compositions from the Old Babylonian period until the first millennium is strongly tied to their function in the scribal education.

The royal hymn *PfK* was not a curricular text, and it is not excluded that it was composed for the cultic sphere. Nevertheless it was adopted in scribal circles, at least at Emar and Ugarit. On the basis of its similarity to the *Hymn to Marduk for a King* inscribed on the same *Sammeltafeln* as *BeR*²⁰⁴³ as well as its length we may also assign *PfK* to the Intermediary Phase.

One may conclude that most of the Sumerian literary texts from Emar and Ugarit were connected with the education of scribes in the Old Babylonian period. It becomes clear that it was not by accident that such Sumerian literary texts were transmitted to LBA Syria. They are not a random assortment of texts but members of a group of compositions learned at the same stage of the curriculum in the Old Babylonian period, namely in the Intermediary Phase. Some texts are also thematically related such as the vanity theme compositions.

All the identified Sumerian literary texts from Emar and Ugarit have come to us in bilingual format,²⁰⁴⁴ which reflects the post-Old Babylonian stage of Sumerian literature when Akkadian translations were added to monolingual texts. Several compositions were transmitted to the first millennium and are preserved either in copies or attested in literary catalogues. Due to the fragmentary nature of either LBA or first-millennium manuscripts, comparison with late duplicates is possible only for *LI-LN* which, as noted above, is very close to the late sources. Some similarities have also been pointed out between LBA manuscripts and the NA fragment of *BeR* but the late duplicate is too badly preserved. Comparison with earlier sources is easier and shows that the Emar-Ugarit recensions usually diverge from the extant OB manuscripts because they reflect a later stage. The Emar-Ugarit recensions of several texts, including vanity theme compositions, *BeR*, *EaN* and *Proverbs from Ugarit*, and *The Fox and the Hyena*, result from the reworking and adaptation of OB texts by Middle Babylonian scribal schools. Throughout this study it has been demonstrated that there is no evidence for the alleged Syrian reworking of Sumero-Akkadian compositions on Mesopotamian models. Modification and adaptation of OB monolingual texts occurred within the Mesopotamian stream of tradition through the work of the Middle Babylonian scribes as part of the process of the selection and transmission of Sumerian literary material. Even the incorporation of an Akkadian wisdom text in the same tablet as *EaN* (E 771+) had a precedent in OB school practices and was also motivated by thematic relations between the two compositions.

²⁰⁴² Cf. Alster 2005, 274.

²⁰⁴³ See § 6.1.1.

²⁰⁴⁴ It is likely that the fragments (from both Emar and Ugarit) containing unidentified texts were also bilingual.

9.2 Incantations

The number of Sumerian incantations discovered in the Syrian archives is impossible to ascertain due to the fragmentary nature of the Emar manuscripts. Several Emar fragments may indeed belong to the same tablets.

Excavation Number	Edition	Script	Language	Old Babylonian	First Millennium
Emar					
Msk 74102a + Msk 74107ai + Msk 74114l	E 729	SH	S	a) (+) b) + c) +	a) + b) + c) +
Msk 74232i	E 790	?	S	+	+
-	Tsukimoto (1999)	SH	a) Abracadabra b) PhS	a) - b) (+)	a) + b) +
Msk 74102o	E 730	?	S	+?	+?
Msk 74107ak	E 732	?	S	-	(+)
Msk 74199q	E 731	?	S	?	?
Msk 74228a	E 733	?	S	?	?
Msk 74107q	-	?	S	?	?
Msk 74183	E 740	?	S	?	?
Msk 74107t	E 744	?	S	?	?
Msk 7499b	E 744	?	S	?	?
Msk 74122t	E 743	SH	S	?	?
Msk 74107p	E 745	?	S	?	?
Msk 74199r	E 751	?	S	?	?
Msk 74234h	E 752	?	S	?	?
Msk 74107n	E 746	?	S	?	?
Msk 74107m	E 746	?	S	?	?
Msk 74114b	E 756	SH	S	?	?
Msk 74165g	E 757	SH	SA	?	?
Msk 74101a	E 763	?	SA	?	?
Msk 7485e	E 764	SH	SA	?	?
Msk 74173e	E 734	SH	PhS	?	?
Msk 74148f	-	?	Ph(?)S	?	?
Msk 74238t	E 747	?	S	?	?
Msk 74122bb	E 748	?	S	?	?
Msk 74109d	E 749	?	S	?	?
Msk 74135b	E 753	?	S	?	?
Msk 74107ac	E 759	?	S	?	?
Msk 74117l	E 761	?	S	?	?
Msk 74200f	E 762	?	S	?	?
Msk 74122ar	-	?	S	?	?
Msk 74143e	E 777	?	S	?	?
Ugarit					
RS 25.129 + RS 25.456B	AuOrS 23 25	MB	a) PhS b) PhS c) Abracadabra d) S	a) - b) - c) - d) -	a) - b) - c) - d) -
RS 16.416	AuOrS 23 13	Ug	PhS	-	-

Excavation Number	Edition	Script	Language	Old Babylonian	First Millennium
RS 17.155	AuOrS 23 21	Ug	a-§6) PhS b-§8) PhS	a-§6) - b-§8) -	a-§6) - b-§8) +
RS 25.418	AuOrS 23 27	?	a) S b) S	a) - b) -	a) - b) -

The majority of the incantations from Emar and all those from Ugarit are monolingual. One may notice, however, that several texts from Ugarit show a mixture of Sumerian and Akkadian.²⁰⁴⁵ This is also the case of the incantation on the reverse of E 729.

Only the incantations from *Udug-ḫul* III and IV, contained in E 729 and E 790, are known to have OB duplicates, which are preserved in tablets from Nippur and Sippar respectively. Possibly also the *Tsukimoto Incantation* (b) and E 730 containing an incantation from *Udug-ḫul* I have OB duplicates but no manuscript is preserved. The number of first-millennium duplicates, all of which are part of canonical series, is more consistent:

Canonical Series	Source	Format	Script
Udug-ḫul I / Muššu'u IX/b	Tsukimoto Incantation (b) E 730	Monolingual	SH ?
Udug-ḫul III	E 729	Monolingual	SH
Udug-ḫul IV	E 790	Monolingual	?
Muššu'u VIII/q	Tsukimoto Incantation (a)	Monolingual	SH
Saġ-geg I / Muššu'u I (?)	E 732	Monolingual	?
Saġ-geg VI	AuOrS 23 21(b-§8)	Monolingual	Ug

The Emar and Ugarit sources reflect a very different textual tradition from the late manuscripts.

Two Marduk-Ea incantations are known: AuOrS 23 25(d) and AuOrS 23 21(b-§8). Despite the difference in script – the first is a Babylonian tablet while the latter is written by an Ugaritic scribe – both present the full Marduk-Ea formula as typical of the OB tradition. Conversely, they report the short form of the rubric, en₂. The rubric is preserved both in full and in abbreviated form, showing that there was not yet a standardized form at that time.²⁰⁴⁶

Source	Script	Language	Rubric
E 729	SH	S	Full
E 730	?	S	Full
Tsukimoto Incantation	SH	a) S b) PhS	a) Abbreviated b) Abbreviated
AuOrS 23 25	MB	a) PhS b) PhS c) Abracadabra d) S	a) - b) Abbreviated c) Abbreviated d) Abbreviated
AuOrS 23 13	Ug	PhS	Full
AuOrS 23 21	Ug	a-§6) PhS b-§8) PhS	a-§6) Abbreviated b-§8) Abbreviated
AuOrS 23 27	?	a) S b) S	a) Full b) -

²⁰⁴⁵ See AuOrS 23 21 §§ 1, 3; AuOr 23: 25, 12-14, 22-24. To this group may be added RS 94.2178 = AuOrS 23 14 and RS 94.2964 = AuOrS 23 15, not included in the present work because they are clearly Akkadian incantations that make much use of Sumerograms.

²⁰⁴⁶ Note that the Akkadian incantation E 758 also reports the full rubric.

Incantations are mostly preserved on tablets written by local scribes; only two manuscripts are Babylonian script tablets.²⁰⁴⁷ With a few exceptions, Emar tablets contain incantations in standard orthography whereas at Ugarit the use of phonetic orthography for magical texts is more widespread. Unorthographic writings are also attested in the Babylonian tablet AuOrS 23 25 but they present a very limited set of phonetic alterations.²⁰⁴⁸

Almost all incantations from Emar are preserved in single copies. However, some fragments are probably duplicates of the same text: E 730 has been identified as a possible duplicate of the *Tsukimoto Incantation* (b). As Y. Cohen has observed,²⁰⁴⁹ the lack of duplicates probably signifies that incantations were kept as library copies. At Ugarit multiple copies are documented at least for AuOrS 23 21 (RS 17.155, RS 17.152) found in different archives, viz. the Bibliothèque du Lettré and the Royal Palace.

To sum up, Sumerian incantations from Emar and Ugarit represent an early phase in the process of the selection and transmission of magical texts from the second to the first millennium, very close to the OB stage. Indeed, serialization as attested in the later MA texts is unknown in the Emar and Ugarit sources. Moreover division of texts into lines is removed from late duplicates. Nevertheless, they reflect a different textual tradition from the extant OB manuscripts. This tradition deviates from the mainstream of the Sumerian incantation tradition and probably represents the product of local workshops likely situated in Northern Babylonia. Contrary to literary texts, no Sumerian incantation is preserved in duplicates from both Emar and Ugarit whereas *Saġ-geg* VI, documented at Ugarit, is also attested in a tablet from Ḫattuša that is unfortunately poorly preserved.²⁰⁵⁰

9.3 Bilingual Texts

As seen above, almost all the bilingual texts are literary compositions; only three fragments from Emar, possibly all belonging to the same tablet, contain bilingual incantations. Both interlinear and parallel column formats are attested but the latter is far more common. However, the three bilingual fragments of incantations are in interlinear format. Both formats are attested in each city even though the interlinear format seems more popular at Emar (four out eleven) than among the tablets in Ugarit script (two out nine), but the quantity of data is too limited to draw any conclusions.

Source	Composition	Archive	Script	Language	Format	OB	First Millennium
E 767	BeR	TM ₁	SH	S PhSA	Columns	+	+
RS 25.130	a) BeR b) Proverbs from Ugarit	Lamaštu	MB	SA	Interlinear	a) + b) +	a) + b) (+)
RS 25.424	BeR	Lamaštu	Ug	(PhS) A	Interlinear(?) <i>Glossenkeil</i>	+	+
RS 23.34+	BeR	MaT	Ug	PhSA	Columns	+	+
E 771+	EaN	TM ₁	SH	SA	Columns	+	(+)
AuOrS 23 47	EaN	MaT	Ug	(S) A	Columns	+	(+)
AuOrS 23 50	MLM	Lamaštu	NS	S PhSA H	Columns	+	-
RS 25?.135A	MLM	Lamaštu	Ug	Ph(?)SA	Interlinear	+	-
TBR 101	SI-Utu	?	SH	(S) PhS (A)	Columns	+	+
RS 17.10	LI-LN	Lettré	Ug	PhS (A)	Columns	(+)	+
RS 17.80	LI-LN	Lettré	Ug	(S) A	Columns	(+)	+
E 768A	The Fowler	TM ₁	SH	S PhS (A)	Columns	-	(+)

²⁰⁴⁷ AuOrS 23 25, AuOrS 23 27.

²⁰⁴⁸ Compare the many alterations in AuOrS 23 21.

²⁰⁴⁹ Cohen 2009, 216.

²⁰⁵⁰ § 5.1.5.

E 768B	The Fowler	TM ₁	SH	(S) (PhS) A	Columns	-	(+)
E 769	The Fowler	TM ₁	SH	S (PhS) (A)	Columns	-	(+)
E 770	The Fowler	TM ₁	?	(S) PhS A	Columns	-	(+)
RS 86.2210	The Fox and the Hyena	Urtenu	Ug	S PhS (A)	Columns	?	?
E 775	PfK	TM ₁	S	SA	Interlinear	-	-
RS 79.25	PfK	Maison A	Ug	PhS (A)	Columns	-	-
RS 79.25C	PfK	Maison A	Ug	(S) A	?	-	-
AuOrS 23 28	Hymn to Enki (?)	Lamaštu	MB	SA	Interlinear	-	-
E 757	Incantation	TM ₁	SH	SA	Interlinear	?	?
E 763	Incantation	TM ₁	SH	SA	Interlinear	?	?
E 764	Incantation	TM ₁	SH	SA	Interlinear	?	?

As is clear from the manuscripts of *BeR* the same composition may occur on different tablet formats even within the same city. Unexpectedly, texts inscribed on parallel column format tablets from Emar and Ugarit occur more frequently in the first-millennium documentation. However, this proportion may be skewed by the smaller quantity of interlinear format tablets that have been recovered at Emar and Ugarit; moreover, we do not know the original format of the Mesopotamian tablets that served as models for texts written on multicolumn tablets containing versions in standard Sumerian, phonetic orthography and Akkadian. As already argued, phonetic versions were composed by local scribes upon bilingual texts. Perhaps the fact that the two bilingual Babylonian script tablets from Ugarit are both written in interlinear format would indicate that this was the most common format among the tablets transmitted to the Western periphery. The dearth of data does not allow us to see any relevant difference in the distribution of tablet formats across the archives of Ugarit. However, it is worth noting that the local editions of *BeR* are written on different tablet formats in the Lamaštu archive and in the Maison-aux-tablettes.

At Ugarit standard and unorthographic Sumerian could be written on different tablets as shown by the manuscripts of *BeR*, *LI-LN* and *PfK*. This practice, which is a clear indication that the tablets were used in schooling, is unknown at Ḫattuša and Emar.

9.4 Tradition and Reception

The majority of the Sumerian literary texts recovered at Emar and Ugarit can be attributed to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition.

Composition	Provenance	OB Tablets	Nippur Tablets	First Millennium
BeR	Emar – Ugarit	3	0	+ Catalogue
EaN	Emar – Ugarit	7	7	Catalogue
MLM	Ugarit	5	1	-
SI-Utu	Emar	6	3	+
LI-LN	Ugarit	Catalogue (?)	0	+
Proverbs from Ugarit	Ugarit	1	1	(+)
The Fowler	Emar	-	-	Catalogue (?) Akkadian (?)
The Fox and the Hyena	Ugarit	2(?)	0	?
Hymn to Enki(?)	Ugarit	-	-	-
PfK	Emar – Ugarit	-	-	-

Into this category fall the vanity theme compositions. The Nippur tradition is clearly evident for *EaN* not only because all the OB manuscripts stem from that city, but also because of the protago-

nists of the tale: Enlil, the god of Nippur, and Namzitarra, a temple administrator of Nippur. The only OB manuscript preserving *Proverbs from Ugarit* is the aforementioned *Sammeltafel* from Nippur CBS 13777. This tablet also contains *Nothing is of Value* which is mostly preserved on Nippur sources. Moreover, as argued above²⁰⁵¹ *EaN* and *Nothing is of Value* are attested on *Sammeltafel*n containing *Lisina A* which is only known from Nippur sources. We can therefore state that *EaN* and *Proverbs from Ugarit* were well known in the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition represented by the Nippur scribal milieu. The identification of the tradition of *BeR* is more problematic. On account of the provenance of the OB manuscripts – probably Sippar – one might be tempted to attribute this composition to the Northern Babylonian tradition. However, the strong relationship among the vanity theme compositions – both thematic and with regard to their position in the curriculum – as a group of texts transmitted together over time, supports the claim that *BeR* also belongs to the same stream of tradition.²⁰⁵² The connection of *BeR* with the Nippur scribal milieu was also recognized in antiquity. *BeR* is mentioned in the NA catalogue of the series of Sidu, a collection of thirty-five wisdom compositions, so called after its supposed compiler. According to the so-called ‘Catalogue of Texts and Authors’,²⁰⁵³ Sidu was a lamentation-priest and chief-scholar of Nippur.²⁰⁵⁴ Even though the attribution of texts to this author may be pseudepigraphic, a fiction elaborated in late times in the attempt to confer prestige and antiquity on a collection of literary works, the association of Sidu with the city of Nippur appears to be clear. Furthermore this is evidenced by the attestation of the name Sidu in the *Sylbenalphabet B*, a list of ancient names known only from Nippur.²⁰⁵⁵

Although connections between *BeR* and the Nippur tradition are evident, it is not fully clear whether or not it was actually attested in Nippur. Possibly, as suggested by Alster, *BeR* was inscribed on the unpreserved part of the aforementioned *Sammeltafel* CBS 13777. I would like to suggest another explanation that takes into account the date of the Ballad *Sammeltafel*n. The kingdom of Abī-ešuh can be considered the *terminus post quem* for the drafting of the three tablets, as one of the compositions is a hymn dedicated to this king. In the latter part of the reign of Samsu-iluna (1749-1712), the father of Abī-ešuh, southern Babylonian cities were abandoned or drastically reduced in size due to an ecological breakdown and the rise of the Sealand dynasty. This led priests, scribes and scholars to leave the southern cities and relocate in the North from the time of Samsu-iluna²⁰⁵⁶ down to the end of the Old Babylonian period.²⁰⁵⁷ The scribes of Nippur, even though the city did not completely collapse, as recent studies have demonstrated²⁰⁵⁸ pursued new careers in the North, notably in Babylon.²⁰⁵⁹ In this context southern Babylonian scholars disseminated their repertoire of texts and their tradition,²⁰⁶⁰ establishing a mixed scribal environment in the Northern Babylonian centers.²⁰⁶¹ *BeR* may be a product of this scribal milieu,²⁰⁶² composed upon the vanity theme which

2051 § 9.1.

2052 In this regard see the earlier discussion of the parallel lines in *BeR* and *Nothing is of Value*.

2053 Lambert 1962, 66: VI 13.

2054 For the identification see Frahm 2010, 168-176.

2055 Frahm 2010, 174.

2056 Charpin 1986, 402-415.

2057 Pientka 1998, 195-196.

2058 George 2009, 136-142. The last document from Nippur dates to the thirtieth year of Samsu-iluna’s reign (1720 B.C.), Cole 1996, 12 n. 42.

2059 Pientka 1998, 190-195, Charpin 1999-2000, 324.

2060 Cf. Michalowski 2003, 112.

2061 In this regard see Charpin 2004, 345-346. Perhaps it is in this context that the northern locations, Kiš, Kutha and Dilbat, were integrated into the sequence of cities mentioned in Enlil *Balaġs*, see Gabbay 2014a, 153, § 1.1.9.2.

2062 The presence of southern (Alulu, Gilgameš) and northern (Etana) kings may be an expression of this cultural environment.

was well known in Nippur.²⁰⁶³ The *Sammeltafel*n themselves combine a mainstream composition such as *Nothing is of Value* with texts that do not reflect the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition such as the hymn *Abī-ešuḫ B* and the *Hymn to Marduk for a King*. Regardless of where it was actually composed, *BeR* was not the product of a local scribal circle but results from a tradition widespread throughout Mesopotamia that has been here termed the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition.²⁰⁶⁴

Another composition possibly belonging to the same stream of tradition as *BeR* is *The Fowler* because it is perhaps cited in the catalogue of the series of Sidu. Moreover, the related composition *The Fowler and his Wife* was well known in the OB period as a learning tool, notably in Nippur. As argued above, *MLM*,²⁰⁶⁵ *LI-LN*²⁰⁶⁶ and *SI-Utu*²⁰⁶⁷ are also products of the Nippur scribal milieu.

The tradition of *PfK* cannot be clearly identified, but it does not seem to belong to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition.

All the compositions belonging to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition attested at Emar – *BeR*, *EaN*, *SI-Utu*, *The Fowler* – are written on Syro-Hittite tablets. Direct interconnections between Kassite Nippur and Emar have been demonstrated by J. Peterson²⁰⁶⁸ for the ḡeš-list of *Urra* III-Va and Va-VII. Two MB Nippur tablets, N 6044 and CBS 4598 = PBS 12/1 17, show a high degree of correspondence with the Emar manuscripts. However, the distinction drawn between Syrian and Syro-Hittite scholarly texts by Y. Cohen²⁰⁶⁹ allows us to improve on Peterson's observation: only Syro-Hittite sources are close to the Nippur recension of *Urra*. Unfortunately, the ḡeš-list section contained in N 6044 is only preserved on Syro-Hittite manuscripts²⁰⁷⁰ but the section inscribed on PBS 12/1 17 is known to us from both Syrian and Syro-Hittite tablets.²⁰⁷¹ While the Syro-Hittite manuscript (Msk 731048) duplicates the MB tablet from Nippur,²⁰⁷² the Syrian tablet strongly diverges, reflecting a non-Nippur tradition. The same section of *Urra* is preserved in a source from Ḥattuša, the MS prism KBo 26 5B, which presents yet another textual tradition different from both Nippur and Syro-Hittite tablets.

Nippur	Emar Syro-Hittite	Emar Syrian	Ḥattuša	Canonical Urra IV
PBS 12/1 17	Msk 731048	Msk 731030 Obv. V	KBo 26 5B III	MSL 5
14 ḡeš min (gu-za) para ₁₀	1 ḡiš gu-za para ₁₀	26 ḡeš gu-za lugal	x	87 ḡeš gu-za para ₁₀
15 ḡeš min im-ma-la ₂	2 ḡeš gu-za im-[ma-la ₂]	27 ḡiš gu-za šaḡ-šum-ma	1 [ḡeš gu-za im-m]a-[a ₂]	88 ḡeš gu-za lugal
16 ḡeš min ki-uš	3 ḡeš gu-za ki-ba[la]	28 ḡeš gu-za ma ₂ -gan-na	2 [ḡe]š gu-za ki-g[al']	89 ḡeš gu-za ku ₃ -an
17 ḡeš min gidim	4 ḡeš gu-za gidim	29 ḡeš gu-za ma ₂ -lah ₅	3 ḡeš gu-za gidim	90 ḡeš gu-za im-ma-la ₂
18 ḡeš min ša ₃ -ḡul ₂ -la	5 ḡeš gu-za ša ₃ -ḡul ₂ -la	30 ḡeš gu-za ki-bala	4 ḡeš gu-za anše	91 ḡeš gu-za ki-uš
19 ḡeš min anše	6 ḡeš gu-za anše	31 ḡeš gu-za gidim-ma	5 ḡeš gu-za l[ugal]	92 ḡeš gu-za ḡeš-gar ₃

2063 It should also be taken into account that the documentation of Sippar shows closer similarity to the Nippur tradition than the texts from Diyala do.

2064 It is to recall that the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition does not coincide *tout court* with the Nippur repertoire although it is mainly known from the Nippur documentation; see Introduction and fn. 58.

2065 § 5.3.2.

2066 § 5.3.4.

2067 § 6.2.4.

2068 Peterson 2006.

2069 Cohen 2009.

2070 Peterson 2006, 580 n. 17, *Urra* V-VIIb = E 545: Msk 74233b (+) Msk 74103w (+) Msk 7498m (+) Msk 74107w + Msk 74201e, scribe = Šaggar-abu son of Ba'al-qarrād; Msk 74209a + Msk 7526, scribe = Ba'al-mālik son of Ba'al-qarrād, see Rutz 2013, 497.

2071 Peterson 2006, 584, *Urra* III-Va, Syrian: Msk 731030, scribe = Rībi-Dagan; Msk 74163b, scribe = unpreserved; Syro-Hittite: Msk 731048, scribe = Ba'al-mālik son of Ba'al-qarrād, see Rutz 2013, 496.

2072 Peterson 2006, 585-586.

Nippur	Emar Syro-Hittite	Emar Syrian	Ḫattuša	Canonical Urra IV
PBS 12/1 17	Msk 731048	Msk 731030 Obv. V	KBo 26 5B III	MSL 5
20 ġeš min lugal	7 ġeš gu-za lugal	32 ġeš gu-za ša ₃ -ġešgal'-la	6 ġeš gu-za [(šaḫ-šum-ma)]	93 ġeš gu-za gidim
21 ġeš min šaḫ ₂ -šum-ma	8 ġeš gu-za šaḫ ₂ -šum-ma	33 ġeš gu-za niġ ₂ -unken'-na	7 ġeš gu-za ʔ[^{es} k]in-ti	94 ġeš gu-za ša ₃ -ḫul ₂ -la
22 ġeš min kin-ti	9 ġeš gu-za ʔ ^{es} kin-ti	34 ġeš gu-za kaskal	8 ġeš gu-za na.MES	95 ġeš gu-za anše
23 ġeš min ma ₂ -gan	10 ġeš gu-za ma ₂ -gan-na	35 ġeš gu-za anše	9 ġeš gu-za [x x t]i ⁷	96 ġeš gu-za šaḫ-šum-ma
24 ġeš min ma ₂ -lah ₅	11 ġeš gu-za ma ₂ -lah ₅	36 ġeš gu-za ʔ ^{es} kin-ti	10 ġeš gu-za ḫ[ar]-ḫ[a]r ⁷	97 ġeš gu-za ʔ ^{es} kin-ti
25 ġeš min niġ ₂ -niġen ₂ -na	12 ġeš gu-za niġ ₂ -unken-na	37 ġeš gu-za gar ₃ -ba	11 ġeš gu-za m[a ₂ ⁷ -(?)]	98 ġeš gu-za ma ₂ -gan-na
26 ġeš min gar ₃ -ba	13 ġeš gu-za gar ₃ -ba	38 ġeš gu-za gar ₃ -ba ku ₃ -si ₂₂ ġar-ra	12 ġeš gu-za kask[al]	99 ġeš gu-za me-luḫ-ḫa
27 ġeš min gar ₃ -ba urudu ġar-ra	14 ġeš gu-za gar ₃ -ba urudu ġar-ra	39 ġeš gu-za gar ₃ -ba ku ₃ -babbar ġar-ra	13 ġeš gu-za gar ₃ -[ba]	100 ġeš gu-za ma ₂ -lah ₅
28 ġeš min gar ₃ -ba [za] bar ġar-ra	15 ġeš min gar ₃ -ba za[bar ġar-ra]	40 ġeš gu-za gar ₃ -ba zabar ġ[ar-ra]	14 ġeš gar ₃ -[ba] ku ₃ -s[i ₂₂ -ġar-ra]	101 ġeš gu-za niġ ₂ -niġen-na
29 ġeš min gar ₃ -ba ku ₃ -babbar ġar-ra	16. ġeš gu-za ga[r ₃ -ba ku ₃ -babbar ġar-ra]	41 ġeš gu-za gar ₃ -ba urudu [ġar-ra]	15 ġeš gu-za g[ar ₃]-b[a] k[u ₃]-b[abbar]	102 ġeš gu-za di-ku ₅
				103 ġeš gu-za gar ₃ -ba
				104 ġeš gu-za gar ₃ -ba ku ₃ -si ₂₂ ġar-ra
				105 ġeš gu-za gar ₃ -ba ku ₃ -babbar ġar-ra
				106 ġeš gu-za gar ₃ -ba urudu ġar-ra
				107 ġeš gu-za-gar ₃ -ba zabar ġar-ra

That the Nippur and Syro-Hittite manuscripts reflect a late stage is evident from their similarities to the canonical recension. Entries in canonical *Urra* IV 90-95 present the same sequence as PBS 12/1 17, 15-19 and Msk 731048, 2, 4-6 – only line 92 is added in the canonical recension; canonical *Urra* IV 96-103 correspond to PBS 12/1 17, 21-26 and Msk 731048, 8-13 except for the insertion of ll. 99 and 102. Conversely, the Syrian and Ḫattuša sources diverge from the first-millennium recension – they reflect an older stage in the standardization process and are at some distance from the Nippur tradition.

An examination of the *Sag-tablet* may provide further evidence. This lexical list is preserved at Emar on a tablet written by the Syrian scholarly scribe Ba'al-bārû son of Mašru-ḫamiš,²⁰⁷³ but is virtually unknown at Nippur. The OB manuscripts stem in fact from Northern Babylonia, Sippar and Kiš.²⁰⁷⁴ The only possible Nippur tablet is a fragment of the pre-OB recension,²⁰⁷⁵ but its provenance is uncertain.²⁰⁷⁶ Thus, the *Sag-tablet* was likely transmitted to Emar from a Northern Babylonian scribal school. Another indication of the different traditions reflected in the two Emar schools is provided by the incantation *man(m) lušpur* which is preserved on the reverse of the Syrian tablet of *Urra* III-Va written by Ribi-Dagan (E 737) and on a Syro-Hittite fragment (E 738). Although badly preserved, the Syro-Hittite source seems to diverge from the Syrian text.²⁰⁷⁷

2073 For this scribe see Cohen 2009, 121-126.

2074 MSLSS1, 7.

2075 MSLSS1, 15, further pre-OB fragments stem from Susa and Ebla.

2076 The fragment may be from Fara, see MSL SS 1, 15 n. 1.

2077 See Cohen 2009, 216.

It is clear that the Sumerian literary and lexical texts from Emar written on Syro-Hittite tablets are associated with the Nippur tradition. Conversely, the Syrian lexical lists and the only Sumerian literary composition inscribed on a Syrian tablet (*PfK*) seem to have little connection with the Nippur tradition. The dating of the Emar tablets and the historical context of Babylonia in the post-Old Babylonian period are elements that should be taken into account for understanding this dichotomy. Syrian and Syro-Hittite tablets from Emar cover different time spans.²⁰⁷⁸ Syrian tablets are the oldest and can be dated to a period from the 14th to the mid-13th century. The Syro-Hittite school replaced the Syrian format from approximately the second quarter of the 13th century and continued until the early 12th century. As mentioned above, southern Babylonia and Nippur faced a long period of decadence that began in the latter part of Samsu-iluna's reign. Even though scholarly activities did not completely fall off in southern Babylonia, as demonstrated by the recovery of literary texts dated to the Sealand dynasty,²⁰⁷⁹ the Nippur scribal schools flourished once again only after the demise of the Sealand dynasty around the beginning of the 14th century, under the sponsorship of the Kassite kings.²⁰⁸⁰ However, it is only in the second half of the 13th century that major reconstructions were carried out in Nippur, under the kings Kudur-Enlil (1254-1246 B.C.) and Šagarakti-Šuriaš (1245-1233 B.C.).²⁰⁸¹ The Middle Babylonian tablets from Nippur can mostly be dated to the 13th century and likely to the second half.²⁰⁸² Therefore the time frame of the Nippur renaissance suits the span of the Syro-Hittite documentation. It is probably within this context that the Nippur tradition found its way into the Syro-Hittite scholarly texts.

A small archive or cache discovered in House 5 in Chantier A²⁰⁸³ at Emar includes some nine documents, originally stored in a jar, that display paleographic and linguistic traits typical of Kassite tablets. One of these documents, the promissory note E 26, is dated to the 2nd year of the Babylonian king Meli-Šipak/ḫu, which is equivalent to the absolute date of 1185/1175.²⁰⁸⁴ This document quotes a certain Kidin-Gula who was a Babylonian scribe working as a teacher in Zū-Ba'la's school in Temple M₁.²⁰⁸⁵ According to a colophon found on a copy of the list *Izi*, Kidin-Gula was the teacher of one of Ba'al-qarrād's sons, either Ba'al-malik or Šaggar-abu – the latter is the scribe of *BeR* and *The Fowler*. We can surmise that Kidin-Gula, serving as a teacher at the Emar school, imported lexical and literary compositions and transferred his knowledge to the local students. He may have been one of the primary sources of the scholarly material from Emar, which indeed can be mostly dated to the third generation of Zū-Ba'la's family, namely Ba'al-qarrād's sons. The Syro-Hittite Sumerian literary texts can therefore be dated to the late 13th or early 12th century.

The scholarly texts from Ugarit can be dated to approximately the same period. A valuable synchronism between the Maison d'Urtenu at Ugarit and House 5 in Chantier A at Emar has been established by Cohen, Singer (2006).²⁰⁸⁶ The tablets from the Maison d'Urtenu indeed date to the last thirty years before the destruction of Ugarit.²⁰⁸⁷ Internal synchronisms allow us to date the rest of the private archives where scholarly tablets were found to the same period, namely the end of

2078 On the chronology of the Emar texts see Cohen, D'Alfonso 2008.

2079 George 2007a, George 2013, 129-131.

2080 Hallo 1989.

2081 OIP 111, 8-9.

2082 Tablets from regularly excavated Kassite levels date to the 13th century, see OIP 111, 93.

2083 See Cohen 2004, 89-93.

2084 Cf. Arnaud 1975.

2085 For this teacher see Cohen 2004, Cohen 2009, 183-189.

2086 Note that two manuscripts of *Šimā Milka* were found in the Maison d'Urtenu, see Malbran-Labat 2008, 37.

2087 Malbran-Labat 2000, 241.

the 13th and the beginning of the 12th century.²⁰⁸⁸ Indeed the Lamaštu archive and the Maison-aux-tablettes remained in use until the destruction of Ugarit in 1175 B.C.²⁰⁸⁹ The central archive of the Royal Palace is slightly older, as it dates to Amittamru II (1260-1235 B.C.).²⁰⁹⁰

The presence of Babylonian scribes is also documented at Ugarit. However, contrary to Emar where all the tablets were drafted by local scribes, at Ugarit Babylonian script tablets were found in the Lamaštu archive. Due to the high number of manuscripts and some local colorings it is probable that these tablets were drafted at Ugarit by Babylonian scribe(s) working as teacher(s). The Babylonian script tablets represent the largest portion of texts in the Lamaštu archive while only a few manuscripts are written in Ugarit script.²⁰⁹¹ No scribe name is preserved on any of the Babylonian tablets, and the only scribe mentioned in the Lamaštu archive is Gamir-ḥaddu, son of the scribe Nu'me-rašap who worked under the king Ibīranu (1235-1225 B.C.). Gamir-ḥaddu's activities, therefore, have to be placed at the time of Ibīranu and his successors,²⁰⁹² i.e. at the end of the 13th and beginning of the 12th century. Assuming that this archive did not serve as a repository for older texts, the Babylonian script tablets should be dated to the same period.²⁰⁹³ As a consequence, because this archive yielded two manuscripts of *BeR*, for the time being, we have to assume that two different versions of the text – one closer to the OB tablets from Sippar inscribed on the Babylonian script tablet RS 25.130 and the other written on the Ugarit script tablet RS 25.424, presenting the same text as the Emar manuscript – were known and copied at the same time in the same archive. Any possible chronological difference between these two manuscripts is not appreciable for us. Even their respective relationship and origin cannot be accurately ascertained. This further implies that between the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 12th century two different versions of *BeR* circulated in Mesopotamia, and both were transmitted to the Western periphery.

Scribal schools of Babylon likely took part in the dissemination of the mainstream of the Sumerian tradition to the Western periphery witnessed in the Syro-Hittite scholarly texts. This role can be seen in the MB tablet from Babylon VAT 13372 that contains a recension of *Urra* Tablet VII close to the Syro-Hittite and Ugarit manuscripts on the list.²⁰⁹⁴

Another line of transmission initiated toward the end of the 13th century that opened up a path to the North for the Babylonian scholarly material was perhaps the conquest of Babylon by Tukulti-Ninurta I. As I argued earlier,²⁰⁹⁵ the MA material relies on the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. A piece of evidence for the impulse given by Assyrian mediation to the transmission of Mesopotamian material in the late 13th – early 12th century can be detected in the possible identification of the Tukulti-Ninurta epic in a fragment from Ugarit.²⁰⁹⁶ The Akkadian version of *The Debate between the Date Palm and the Tamarisk* is known in manuscripts

2088 See Cohen 2013, 31-33.

2089 van Soldt 1991, 191, 210; the Bibliothèque du Lettré is not clearly datable, see van Soldt 1991, 164-165.

2090 van Soldt 1991, 92.

2091 van Soldt 1991, 373-374.

2092 van Soldt 1991, 27.

2093 The birth incantation *A Cow of Šin* is preserved on a Babylonian fragment from the Lamaštu archive (RS 25.436 = AuOrS 23 20) and on sources from Ḥattuša (KUB 4 13), Nineveh, and on a MA tablet from Assur. Unfortunately the Ugarit fragment is too badly preserved to determine its relation to the other manuscripts and to attempt to reconstruct a chronological sequence. Notably, the relation between the Ugarit fragment and the two MA manuscripts would be relevant here, but one must note that they contain two different recensions. All the sources present a high degree of variation and the Ugarit fragment seems to be different from both the Ḥattuša and MA tablets, which also diverge from each other. See Röllig 1985, Veldhuis 1991.

2094 van Soldt 2011, 209-211.

2095 § 2.2.

2096 RS 25.435 = AuOrS 23 36; although the identification of this fragment as part of the Tukulti-Ninurta epic is not fully certain and the MA manuscripts are badly preserved (see Machinist 1978, 124-127), according to Stefan Jakob (personal communication at 60th Rencontre d'Assyriologique International in Warsaw) there are sufficient grounds to attribute the fragment from Ugarit to the epic.

from Emar and Assur, but one should note that the two sources exhibit several differences.²⁰⁹⁷ Additionally, the presence of an Assyrian scribe at Ugarit is documented in the Southern Palace.²⁰⁹⁸

As for the dissemination of texts associated with the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition, another factor to be considered is the widespread nature of this tradition since the Old Babylonian period – a nature that was likely reinforced by the Nippur renaissance during the Kassite period. Indeed, texts used in the scribal curriculum were part of a common Mesopotamian body of knowledge. As already noted with respect to the documentation of Ḫattuša, texts reflecting the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition might have been transmitted to the Western periphery in variant forms that developed in minor centers, perhaps in Northern Babylonia. Direct interconnections with the Nippur tradition illustrated so far would suggest that these texts were transmitted from the main centers of Mesopotamian scholarship, i.e. Nippur and Babylon. Such interconnections, however, can be only detected for the lexical lists of the Syro-Hittite tradition. Conversely, there is no clear evidence for literary texts, simply because no duplicates from contemporaneous Mesopotamian sources are preserved. Unfortunately, the provenance of the Babylonian script tablet from Ugarit containing *BeR* is unknown. Therefore, it cannot be understood whether the Syrian recensions of *BeR* and the other literary texts diverging from the extant OB sources were produced in Nippur or in Babylon as a consequence of the revival of scholarship in these centers or whether they reflect local variants composed in Northern Babylonian scribal circles. That texts from the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition may have been disseminated from minor centers is perhaps suggested by the possible Northern Babylonian origin of *Kidin-Gula* or, as proposed by Y. Cohen, the land of *Suḫu*.²⁰⁹⁹ At any rate, one must take into account that at the time when *Kidin-Gula* moved to Emar, Nippur scribal schools had regained their importance and their influence had spread to the North, possibly prompted by the Assyrian conquest of Babylon. *Kidin-Gula* was therefore part of a widespread and common scribal tradition.²¹⁰⁰

To sum up, the Syro-Hittite material and the scholarly texts from Ugarit are contemporary to the second flourishing of the Nippur scribal schools in the mid-13th century that clearly played a role in the dissemination of texts associated with the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition both in Mesopotamia and in the Western periphery. The Syrian scholarly material, which relies on a different tradition from the Syro-Hittite school, is conversely older. As mentioned above, the only Sumerian literary text preserved on a Syrian school tablet, *PfK*, does not reflect the mainstream Sumerian literary tradition. At Ugarit this composition is inscribed on a tablet stemming from Maison A, whose epigraphic findings are distinguished from the remainder of the scholarly material by the fact that they were found in a secondary context.²¹⁰¹ Hence, tablets from Maison A perhaps date to an earlier phase. This date would fit the period of textual production of the Syrian school at Emar. It is perhaps not a coincidence that a composition that does not belong to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition is documented at Emar and Ugarit in manuscripts dated to a period when the revitalized Nippur tradition had probably not yet been disseminated in the Western periphery.

Transmission of scholarly material occurred in several waves by means of Mesopotamian scribes and scholars traveling to the West. This is reflected in the circulation of different *Vorlagen* of the same compositions in the Western periphery as shown by variances between Emar and Ugarit sources.²¹⁰² Dissemination of this material in Syria did not occur by the direct transmission of knowledge from Emar to Ugarit following the East-West route but through a

2097 Wilcke 1989, 168-169.

2098 van Soldt 2001; note also the Assyrian tablet, possibly from Emar, RE 19, dated to Ninurta-apil-Ekur (1181-1169), see Cohen, D'Alfonso 2008, 14-15.

2099 Cohen 2004, 92.

2100 As seen earlier, the main centers of Northern Babylonia, Sippar, Kiš and Babylon, had been influenced by the southern tradition since the Old Babylonian period.

2101 van Soldt 1991, 224.

2102 See Hoskisson 1991, 24.

more complex path, and it is not excluded that other Syrian centers were involved. In the case of Ugarit, texts such as *LI-LN* and *MLM* reached the city by way of a detour through Ḫattuša.²¹⁰³

Incantations seem to provide a different picture. Contrary to literary texts, they are mostly monolingual and rely on literary and textual traditions far removed from the extant OB Nippur sources and first-millennium duplicates.²¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, they are preserved on Syro-Hittite tablets at Emar, and on manuscripts contemporary with the literary texts at Ugarit, among which is a Babylonian script tablet. Several reasons can be adduced for this state of affairs. (1) First of all, if, as argued above, Northern Babylonian scribal schools were involved in the transmission of the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition, such a mixed scribal environment may have disseminated texts of different traditions. (2) It is not precluded that texts such as incantations that arrived in the Western periphery before the late 13th – early 12th century continued to be copied according to the current scribal convention, viz. Syro-Hittite. (3) We also have to take into account that tablets from Emar are very fragmentary, and our comprehension is obviously partial. (4) Most of the incantations, notably all of those from Ugarit, do not have known OB duplicates, therefore we are entirely unaware of how, and if, these texts were written in earlier times. (5) It is not certain that incantations were transmitted by the same foreign specialists who conveyed literary texts. Although interconnected, scribal schooling and magic belong to two different branches of Mesopotamian knowledge. Indeed, it is difficult to attribute the poorly written collection of incantations in Babylonian script AuOrS 23 25 to the same scribe who made a fine copy of one of the manuscripts of *BeR* (RS 25.130). (6) Lastly, the tradition of *abracadabra* spells attested in the *Tsukimoto Incantation* is not clearly identifiable. The most likely scenario is that incantations reflect an older tradition than literary texts but, whether they were transmitted at an earlier date and continued to be copied at Emar and Ugarit until their destruction, or whether they arrived together with literary texts, cannot be ascertained. Some incantations were probably copied at an earlier date than literary texts – the scribe of the *Tsukimoto Incantation*²¹⁰⁵ dates to a generation earlier than that of the copyist of *BeR* and *The Fowler*.²¹⁰⁶ However, the hypothesis of a joint arrival of literary texts and incantations cannot be discarded because in the Late Bronze Age older and later traditions coexisted and standardization had not yet been accomplished. The impossibility of dating the Babylonian script tablets from the Lamaštu archive to a different period than that of the Ugarit script tablets leads us to attribute the incantations from that archive to the same line of transmission as the other magical texts.

The *Tsukimoto Incantation* and the Akkado-Hurrian version of *The Instructions of Šuruppak* show that Hurrians played a role in the transmission of this material even though its limits are not easy to define.²¹⁰⁷ Contrary to Arnaud's assumption²¹⁰⁸ we cannot speak of an Assyrian tradition disseminated to the Western periphery, but as noted above the conquest of Babylon by Tukulti-Ninurta may have spurred the transmission of this material.

To conclude, different traditions can be detected in the Sumerian corpora from Emar and Ugarit. Dissemination of the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition was prompted by the flourishing of scribal activity in Nippur and Babylon during the late Kassite period as well as by the fact that some compositions were widespread throughout Mesopotamia for their association with the Intermediary phase of the curriculum. Northern Babylonian centers were also involved in the transmission of Sumerian literary and magical texts to Emar and Ugarit. The role of the OB Syrian scribal schools, notably Mari and Ebla, cannot be investigated at the present state of research.

2103 §§ 5.3.2, 5.3.4.

2104 They do not simply represent the MB reworking and adaptation of known OB compositions as literary texts, but rather preserve a very different tradition from the OB corpus.

2105 As stated above the transmission of this text probably occurred earlier than the moment when the actual copy was written down.

2106 See § 9.5.1.

2107 Cf. Cohen 2013, 210-211.

2108 Arnaud 1980, 250-251.

9.5 Archival Distribution and Scribes

9.5.1 Emar

All the Sumerian texts stem from a single building, the so-called Temple M₁. The reconstruction of find-spots made by Rutz allows us to know where Sumerian texts were located in the building. The majority of lexical, literary and magical texts were found in the west corner of Locus 1, the so-called 'cella'.²¹⁰⁹ Joins made between fragments found in different rooms²¹¹⁰ clearly show that the LBA building was highly disturbed by the Islamic layers. With the sole exception of *PfK* found in Locus 1 Central, all the Sumerian literary and magical texts were discovered in Locus 1 West. Syrian scholarly texts are found in Locus 1 West – see for instance *Urra* XI-XII²¹¹¹ – but many of them stem from Locus 1 Central or the former R trench that most probably corresponds, at least in part, with Locus 1 Central or Locus 3.²¹¹² Taking into consideration that scholarly texts were not found in their original place of storage, partially because they were shifted around according to educational needs and because the old material was surely used for reference, hence moved from one place to another, and also due to the aforementioned archaeological disturbance of the LBA layers, it is not precluded that Syrian tablets were deliberately stored in a different area from the Syro-Hittite texts.²¹¹³

The so called Temple M₁ was a private house, the residence of the Zū-Ba'la family of diviners, and the venue of a scribal school. Consequently, scribal teaching in LBA Emar took place in a private building in accord with the OB educational system. Members of the Zū-Ba'la family are mentioned in Syro-Hittite scholarly texts as scribes, either as students or teachers. The family archive spans over four generations but most of the documentation, as mentioned above, dates to the third generation. Only one member of this family, Šaggar-abu son of Ba'al-qarrād, is attested as a scribe of literary compositions, both of which are Sumerian texts: *BeR* and *The Fowler*.²¹¹⁴ In their colophons, written in a cryptographic style, he bears the title of lu₂-azu, 'diviner', indicating that at the time when he copied these tablets he was the diviner of Emar and likely had already completed his scribal education. In the colophon of a celestial omen Šaggar-abu is attested as a student, gab₂-zu-zu, while in a fragmentary colophon he is possibly identified as a teacher.²¹¹⁵ As seen above, the Babylonian scribe Kidin-Gula worked in Zū-Ba'la's school and was a teacher of one of Ba'al-qarrād's sons.

Another Syro-Hittite scribe attested in our corpus is Madi-Dagan who was active in the period of Ba'al-qarrād, hence one generation before Šaggar-abu.²¹¹⁶ He bears the title of Chief Scribe and he was probably an Emarite in the service of the Hittite bureaucracy. The only Sumerian text drafted on a Syrian school tablet, *PfK*, was written by Tuku-^dE₂-ḫur-saĝ who is otherwise unknown.²¹¹⁷

The majority of the Sumerian texts from Emar are attested in single copies that were probably used as master copies. Nevertheless, remains were found of multiple copies of *BeR*,²¹¹⁸ *The Fowler* and possibly the *Tsukimoto Incantation*. The corpus of Sumerian texts from Temple M₁ was a library collection housed for educational purposes and academic-cultural interest.

2109 Rutz 2013, 122-123.

2110 Rutz 2013, 128.

2111 Rutz 2013, 500.

2112 Rutz 2013, 113.

2113 Note that all the Syrian legal documents involving the royal family from Temple M₁ were found in the former R trench, Rutz 2013, 291.

2114 Cohen 2009, 169-170.

2115 Cohen 2009, 69.

2116 See Cohen 2009, 189-194.

2117 Cohen 2009, 135-136.

2118 Fragment Msk 74159j.

9.5.2 Ugarit

Similarly to Emar, scribal education at Ugarit took place in private houses which were often the residences of important officials. However, contrary to Emar, Sumerian texts from Ugarit were found in several locations.

Excavation Number	Composition	Edition	Script	Language
Lamaštu				
RS 25.130	a) The Ballad of Early Rulers b) Proverbs from Ugarit	Ugaritica V 164	MB	SA
RS 25.424	The Ballad of Early Rulers	Ugaritica V 166	Ug	(PhS) A
RS 25.421+	The Message of Lu-diğira to his Mother	AuOrS 23 50	NS	S PhSA H
RS 25?.135A	The Message of Lu-diğira to his Mother	AuOrS 23 50	Ug	SA
RS 26.141	Hymn to Enki (?)	AuOrS 23 28	MB	SA
RS 25.129+	Collection of Incantations	AuOrS 23 25	MB	S
RS 25.418	Collection of Incantations	AuOrS 23 27	MB?	S
RS 25.517	Unidentified Text	AuOrS 23 58	MB	S
RS 26.143	Unidentified Text	AuOrS 23 59	Bab	S
RS 25.462	Unidentified Text	AuOrS 23 67	Ug	S?
Bibliothèque du Lettré				
RS 17.10	Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesağ	Ugaritica V 15	Ug	PhS (A)
RS 17.80	Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesağ	Ugaritica V 15	Ug	(Ph?S) A
RS 17.155	Collection of Incantations	AuOrS 23 21	Ug	S
Maison-aux-tablettes				
RS 23.34+	The Ballad of Early Rulers	Ugaritica V 165	Ug	PhS A
RS 22.341+	Enlil and Namzitarra	AuOrS 23 47	Ug	(S) A
RS 28.053	Unidentified Text	AuOrS 23 61	MB?	S
Maison A				
RS 79.25	A Prayer for a King	Arnaud (1982a), 209-216	Ug	PhS (A)
RS 79.25C	A Prayer for a King	Arnaud (1982a), 209-216	Ug	A
Maison d'Urtenu				
RS 86.2210	The Fox and the Hyena	Arnaud (2001)	Ug	S PhS (A)
RS 94.2372	Unidentified Text	AuOrS 23 68	Ug	S
Royal Palace				
RS 16.416	Incantation	AuOrS 23 13	Ug	S
RS 15.152	Collection of Incantations	AuOrS 23 21	Ug	S

As mentioned above, the collection of the Lamaštu archive, which yielded the largest number of Sumerian literary and religious texts, mostly comprises tablets written in Babylonian script that are the product of foreign scribe(s). The tablet imported from the Hittite capital containing *MLM* was found in this archive as well as the local recension preserved on a tiny fragment. Sumerian texts found in the other archives are written in Ugarit script.²¹¹⁹

²¹¹⁹ The only possible exception is AuOS 23: 61, but its paleographic categorization is uncertain. Note that the possible Babylonian script tablet RS 20.121+ = Ugaritica V 119, inscribed with the Weidner God List, stems from the House of Rap'ānu, see van Soldt 1995, 175 n. 30.

The Lamaštu archive, the Bibliothèque du Lettré and the Maison-aux-tablettes mainly contained scholarly material – lexical, religious and literary texts – and probably housed libraries.²¹²⁰ The recovery of many letters and administrative documents in the Maison d’Urtenu, in addition to scholarly texts, shows that this building served as an archive where part of the state bureaucracy was kept. In the Royal Palace administrative documents represent the majority, whereas only a scanty number of scholarly texts were found.²¹²¹ This indicates that scribal education did not take place in the Royal Palace. As stated above the tablets found in Maison A come from a secondary context. The distribution of Sumerian texts among the archives does not display any appreciable difference in terms of text typology, likely because of the small size of the corpus. Texts are preserved in several copies often stemming from different archives, such as the manuscripts of *BeR* and the collection of incantations AuOrS 23 21. This is evidence that tablets of Sumerian texts from Ugarit derive from school activities. Indeed, the scribe of one manuscript of *BeR* (Ub) is explicitly labeled as a student in the colophon. However, tablets in Babylonian and Hittite (i.e. *MLM*) scripts from the Lamaštu archive should be regarded as library copies. The presence of the same compositions in different archives indicates that scholarly texts circulated among scribal schools. Tablets that only contain phonetic Sumerian versions of texts that were transmitted to Ugarit in standard orthography clearly reveal their pedagogical nature. It is not a coincidence that the two copies of *LI-LN* – containing the phonetic Sumerian version and the Akkadian translation respectively – stem from the Bibliothèque du Lettré where several extract tablets were found.

None of the Sumerian literary and religious texts preserve a colophon with the name of either a scribe or a teacher.²¹²² The only literary texts preserving scribe names are two Akkadian compositions found in the Maison-aux-tablettes: a copy of *Atraḫasis*²¹²³ written by Nu‘me-Rašap and *Šimā Milka*²¹²⁴ written by Šiptia.²¹²⁵ Several teachers are attested: four in the Maison-aux-tablettes, five in the House of Rap’ānu, and only one in the Lamaštu archive.²¹²⁶ The latter is the aforementioned Gamir-Ḥaddu who is also attested in colophons from the Maison-aux-tablettes and the House of Rap’ānu. This indicates that not only the same literary texts were known in different archives within the city but also that scribes were teaching in various schools. Names of teachers preserved in colophon are indigenous²¹²⁷ with the exception of the aforementioned Assyrian scribe working in the so called Southern Palace, Naḫiš-šalmu.²¹²⁸ According to van Soldt,²¹²⁹ owners of private houses where archives and libraries were found were possibly scribes themselves and ran scribal schools. Urtenu was perhaps a scribe²¹³⁰ but unfortunately no scribe names are preserved on the tablets from his archive. In some schools such as in the Maison-aux-tablettes, whose owner is unknown,²¹³¹ the Ugaritic language was taught in addition to Akkadian.

2120 Note that no extract tablets were found in the Lamaštu archive (van Soldt 1991, 751-753), whereas the Bibliothèque du Lettré is rich in this type of tablet, see van Soldt 1991, 163-165, van Soldt 2000, 232.

2121 van Soldt 1991, 74.

2122 The copy of *BeR* RS 23.24+ does not preserve the name of the scribe, see § 6.2.1.

2123 RS 22.421.

2124 RS 22.439.

2125 See Arnaud 2007, 178-179.

2126 van Soldt 1995, 221.

2127 According to Arnaud’s reading, the teacher of Šiptia may bear a Babylonian name: Arad-Nergal.

2128 van Soldt 2001.

2129 van Soldt 2000.

2130 van Soldt 2000, 242.

2131 van Soldt 1991, 190, suggests the identification of ^{LU2}UGULA.KALAM.MA, who is the addressee of a letter, with the owner of the house.

9.6 Concluding Remarks

Although Sumerian literary and religious texts from Emar and Ugarit can collectively be placed in the post-Old Babylonian stage, they reflect different phases in the process of standardization of the scholarly material. Transmission of this material occurred in several waves and different traditions can be identified. At Emar two waves can be clearly recognized in the Syrian and Syro-Hittite tablets. The former reflect an older stage and are removed from the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. The latter, to be dated to the late 13th and early 12th century, are closer to the MB Nippur tradition. This dichotomy is very clear when comparing the lexical lists from MB Nippur and Emar: only the Syro-Hittite texts are close to the Nippur manuscripts. Such a distinction is less evident in the texts from Ugarit, but they seem to reflect the same tradition as the Syro-Hittite tablets from Emar.²¹³² The dating of the tablets from Ugarit further supports this picture as they are contemporaneous with the Syro-Hittite texts. Probably to be dated to an earlier phase are the fragments found, out of context, in Maison A and containing *PfK* which not coincidentally is the only Sumerian literary composition attested on a Syrian school tablet at Emar.

In the late 13th century, the revival of the scribal schools in Nippur and Babylon promoted by the Kassite kings was an important factor for the transmission of the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition to the Western periphery, possibly further supported by Tukulti-Ninurta's conquest of Babylon.²¹³³ A line of transmission involving the mediation of the Hittite empire brought *MLM*, *LI-LN* and perhaps the *Saġ-geg* incantation inscribed on AuOrS 23 21 to Ugarit. Dissemination of Sumerian material from the Hittite empire to Syria occurred in the direction of Ugarit but not between Ḫattuša and Emar. Variances between sources from Emar and Ugarit indicate that the transmission of Sumerian literary and religious texts to the Western periphery was not limited to the above described waves but probably included other phases. It is also not excluded that other Syrian centers such as Karkemiš and Aleppo were involved. Incantations seem to reflect an older tradition than literary texts and possibly arrived at an earlier date.

Contrary to Ḫattuša, at Emar and Ugarit scribal schooling took place in private houses within family circles according to the Old Babylonian system of education. While at Emar the majority of the preserved tablets containing Sumerian texts probably represent master copies, Sumerian compositions from Ugarit have come to us in multiple copies, drafted by students as exercises. All the literary texts and most of the incantations were transmitted to Emar and Ugarit in standard orthography format. Only later did local scribes add phonetic versions as exercises. Variation between phonetic versions in the Emar and Ugarit sources indicates that they were independently created by indigenous scribes. Only a limited number of incantations are written in phonetic orthography.

The alleged Syrian reworking of Sumerian compositions according to local themes, argued by some scholars for *BeR*, *PfK* and *EaN*, must be rejected based on Mesopotamian parallels. Analysis of grammar and orthography has shown that the majority of mistakes were not produced locally but are common to the diachronic development of Sumerian. Because texts from the Western periphery depend on Mesopotamian models, variances between Emar and Ugarit manuscripts tell us that the process of standardization was still in a fluid phase and different versions of the same compositions coexisted in Babylonia. The Sumerian literary texts transmitted to Emar and Ugarit are strongly related thematically and represent the Intermediary Phase of the OB curriculum. On the basis of the present evidence it is unclear whether incantations were actually performed at Emar and Ugarit. Even though two *azû* are known from the documentation of Emar, and Madi-Dagan, the copyist of the *Tsukimoto Incantation*, calls himself an *apakallu* priest,²¹³⁴ no *āšipu* (incantation-priest) is attested at Emar or Ugarit. Therefore it is not precluded that incantations were limited to the realm of the school. On the other hand their 'textualization' in a predominantly monolingual version may suggest that incantations were associated with oral practices in which the Akkadian translation was not perceived as necessary because the magical power was encoded in the recitation of Sumerian formulas.

2132 Note that most of the lexical lists from Ugarit are still unpublished.

2133 If we could assign the Babylonian script tablets from the Lamaštu archive to an earlier date, then the recension of *BeR* closer to the OB Sippar tablets, RS 25.130, could reflect an older tradition, whereas the Emar-Ugarit recension would represent the (renewed) MB Nippur tradition.

2134 Cohen 2009, 193 and n. 116.

10 Conclusions

Toward a History of Sumerian Literature in the Late Bronze Age

When William Hallo approached the history of Sumerian literature in the 1976 volume dedicated to Thorkild Jacobsen, our knowledge of the mechanisms of textual production, selection and standardization over time was less thorough than it is today. The present work allows us to attempt a reconstruction of the history of Sumerian literature in the transitional moment between textual production during the Old Babylonian period and canonization in the first millennium.

Sumerian literature is mainly known from the Old Babylonian documentation of Nippur. In the latter part of Samsu-iluna's reign (1749-1712), wars and failure of the water supply caused the depopulation of southern Babylonia. The city of Nippur was occupied for a short period by the first king of the Sealand dynasty, Ilīma-ilum, who was a contemporary of Samsu-iluna and his son Abiešuh.²¹³⁵ Nevertheless Nippur remained under the control of the kings of Babylon until the latter part of Ammišaduqa's reign.²¹³⁶ In the Late Old Babylonian period Southern Babylonian priests, scribes and scholars were exiled to the North where they disseminated their repertoire of texts. However, scholarly activities did not completely fall off in southern Babylonia as demonstrated by the recovery of literary texts dated to the Sealand dynasty.²¹³⁷ A renewal of scholarship in Nippur occurred after the demise of the Sealand dynasty at the hands of the Kassite rulers and especially from the mid-13th century as a result of the Nippur renaissance. The corpus of Middle Babylonian Sumerian literary texts can be dated approximately to the 13th century. In the late 13th century the Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta I defeated the Kassite ruler Kaštiliaš IV and conquered Babylon, importing scholarly texts to Assur as part of the booty. These tablets, representing part of the body of texts in the Middle Assyrian libraries of Assur, date to the 12th – early 11th century. In the Middle Babylonian period, the OB material was reorganized through the selection and adaptation of Sumerian texts. Many compositions were provided with Akkadian translations, but unilingual texts were still copied. The process of canonization was still in an embryonic phase in the Kassite period;²¹³⁸ that further modifications occurred later during the Second Dynasty of Isin is evident from the MA texts, which reflect a more advanced stage of standardization than the MB corpus. The majority of the MB and MA texts rely on the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition even though compositions belonging to the Northern Babylonian tradition such as *Incantation to Utu* are documented in the Kassite period.

At the end of the Old Babylonian period (1595), after the fall of the first dynasty of Babylon to the Hittite king Muršili I, scholarly material started to be transmitted to Syria and Anatolia. In general terms, Sumerian literary texts recovered at Ḫattuša, Emar and Ugarit reflect the post-Old Babylonian stage of the history of Sumerian literature. Nevertheless, the Western periphery corpus does not represent a single and homogeneous phase in the selection, standardization and transmission of the Old Babylonian material. Comparison with the approximately contemporaneous Mesopotamian sources has shown that, with the exclusion of a variant recension of *Incantation to Utu* (KUB 4 11) and an Akkado-Hurrian version of *The Instructions of Šuruppak*, none of the compositions known to date from the MB and MA tablets are attested in the Western periphery corpus. To the texts attested

2135 See Cole 1996, 12 n. 42.

2136 George 2009, 136-142.

2137 George 2007a, George 2013, 129-131.

2138 Western periphery recensions of *BeR*, *EaN* and *Nergal D* show that this process had already started in the MB period, see below.

both in Mesopotamia and in the Western periphery we may add *BeR* because one of the Ugarit manuscripts is a Middle Babylonian script tablet, either imported or written *in loco* by a foreign scribe. While for some compositions the lack of duplicates is due to the chance of archaeological discovery, other texts were clearly not transmitted to the Western periphery. Notably, the long mythological texts *Lugal-e* and *Angim*, which were among the most popular compositions from the Old Babylonian period up to the first millennium, are unknown in the Western periphery documentation. Also, Eme-sal liturgies never crossed the border of Mesopotamia. Texts and knowledge reached the Western periphery in the wake of foreign (i.e. Mesopotamian) specialists – e.g. scribes and exorcists – and/or by means of military campaigns.

Sumerian texts from the Western periphery do not reflect a homogenous tradition. The Northern Babylonian tradition is clearly identifiable in texts written in phonetic orthography. However, one must distinguish between unorthographic texts transmitted to the Western periphery – mostly the monolingual incantations written on Babylonian script tablets CTH 800 – and phonetic versions added to compositions transmitted in standard orthography. The latter are the product of local scribes who learned phonetic orthography by means of lexical lists derived from a Northern Babylonian tradition.

Transmission of the Sumerian material occurred in several waves that may reflect different traditions. The unorthographic monolingual incantations CTH 800, which show similarities with the texts from Meturan, represent the earliest wave and the oldest tradition (LOB). A second wave spreading toward Ḫattuša comprises the Assyro-Mitannian incantations that are the product of local scribal tradition(s) from Northern Mesopotamia/Babylonia. These texts are later than the monolingual incantations in phonetic orthography, as their bilingual format indicates. In roughly the same period occurred the transmission of *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* to the Hittite capital as well as *PfK*, attested in a Syrian school tablet from Emar and in two manuscripts from Ugarit. It is not precluded that these two compositions were composed in the Kassite period on the basis of Old Babylonian themes and texts. During the 13th-12th century the dissemination of these texts (e.g. *MLM*, *LI-LN* and the vanity theme compositions) was boosted by the second flourishing of the Nippur school and the conquest of Babylon by Tukulti-Ninurta. Another possible source of the material found in the Western periphery is perhaps the Sealand scribal schools. Some orthographic features of a tablet of Gilgameš from the Sealand²¹³⁹ recall habits attested in Syria and Anatolia, but the material from Southern Babylonia from this period is too scanty to be used in the present study.²¹⁴⁰ Dissemination of the Sumerian material to the Western periphery can be tentatively summarized as follows:

Century	City	Composition
16 th – 15 th	Ḫattuša	Monolingual Incantations in Phonetic Writing (CTH 800)
15 th – mid-14 th	Ḫattuša	Sumerian Forerunner to the Hittite Prayers to the Sun-god Prisms KBo 19 98
14 th – 13 th	Ḫattuša	Assyro-Mitannian Incantations Fragment KUB 4 23 (?) The Hymn to Iškur-Adad (Model of KUB 4 4?) Saġ-geg VI (KBo 14 51)
	Emar Ugarit	A Prayer for a King Incantations (?)

2139 George 2007a, 63.

2140 The only published Sumerian text from the Sealand dynasty is a *Balaġ* to Enlil, see § 1.1.9.2.

Century	City	Composition
13 th	Ḫattuša	Eduḫba E Nergal D Dumuzi Text (D-I R?) The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaġ New Script Incantations including Incantation to Utu
	Ugarit	The Message of Lu-diġira to his mother The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaġ Incantations (?)
	Emar	Tsukimoto Incantation (?) Incantations (?)
late 13 th – early 12 th	Emar	The Ballad of Early Rulers Enlil and Namzitarra The Fowler
	Ugarit	The Letter of Sîn-iddinam to Utu Proverbs from Ugarit The Fox and the Hyena Hymn to Enki (?) Incantations

According to the reconstruction proposed in the table, the earliest texts transmitted to the Western periphery rely on the Northern Babylonian tradition. This is due to the geographical proximity of Northern Babylonian centers as well as the decline of scribal activities in Nippur and Southern Babylonia in the early Kassite period. Transfer of knowledge between Northern Babylonia, specifically Ešnunna, and Syria (Mari) is already attested in the Old Babylonian period.²¹⁴¹ It is likely that in this phase the transmission of this material followed the same routes. It is worth noting that the only Sumerian text from Alalaḫ whose documentation dates to the 15th – 14th century is an unorthographic incantation,²¹⁴² reflecting a scribal convention common in Northern Babylonia. After the revival of the Nippur scribal schools the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition spread in Mesopotamia and beyond, as witnessed in the 13th century documents from the Western periphery.

Not all the texts from the Western periphery are documented in either earlier or later periods. For instance, Syro-Anatolian manuscripts of *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* and *PfK* are the only sources known to date. Comparison with first-millennium duplicates, when available, yields very different scenarios. Some texts are far removed from late duplicates, notably incantations, while others such as *LI-LN* are very close to the preserved first-millennium sources. Distinctions should also be made on the basis of text typology, as incantations are further removed from the extant OB and first-millennium sources than literary texts are. This can be understood in light of the lesser degree of textual stability across space and time that non-curricular texts such as incantations usually show.²¹⁴³ Sumerian incantations attested in copies from the Western periphery that entered first-millennium series are *Uduġ-ḫul* Tablets I to VII, *Muššu'u* Tablets VI, VIII, IX,²¹⁴⁴ *Saġ-geġ* I (= *Muššu'u* Tablet I) and VI, and a forerunner to *Bīt rimki* House II. It is worth noting that tablets from Syria and Anatolia represent the oldest sources of *Saġ-geġ* and *Bīt rimki*. Western periphery manuscripts containing these incantations do not reflect the serialization that can be seen in the later MA sources, but frequently include miscellaneous incantations.

2141 Charpin 2012.

2142 AT 453.

2143 See Tinney 2011, 591-593.

2144 Other Akkadian incantations belonging to the series *Muššu'u* are attested at Emar and Ugarit, see Böck 2007, 42-43.

Canonical Series	Source	Format	Script
Udug-ḥul I / Muššu'u IX/b	Tsukimoto Incantation(b) E 730	Monolingual	SH SH(?)
Udug-ḥul II	KUB 4 24	Monolingual	NS
Udug-ḥul III	E 729	Monolingual	SH
Udug-ḥul III/VI(?)	KUB 37 102	Bilingual – Interlinear	Ass-Mit
Udug-ḥul IV	E 790	Monolingual	SH(?)
Udug-ḥul V	KBo 36 11+(d)	Bilingual – Columns	Ass-Mit
Udug-ḥul VI	KUB 4 16	Bilingual – Columns	Ass-Mit
Udug-ḥul VII	KUB 37 143	Bilingual – Columns	Ass-Mit
Muššu'u VI	KBo 36 11+(a)	Bilingual – Columns	Ass-Mit
Muššu'u VIII/q	Tsukimoto Incantation(a)	Monolingual	SH
Saġ-geg I / Muššu'u I (?)	E 732	Monolingual	SH(?)
Saġ-geg VI	KBo 14 51 AuOrS 23 21(b-§8)	Monolingual(?) Monolingual	MB Ug
Bit rimki House II	CTH 794(b)	Bilingual – Interlinear	Ass-Mit

To sum up, the Western periphery corpus reflects a very fluid moment in the history of Sumerian literature, when some innovations and tendencies mostly known from the first-millennium sources first appeared on the scene, while others were still unknown. Serialization and the consistent use of the interlinear format typical of first-millennium documentation, which occur in MA texts,²¹⁴⁵ are unattested in both Western periphery and Middle Babylonian documentation. Nevertheless, Western periphery recensions of *BeR*, *EaN* and *Nergal D* derive from the adaptation and modification of OB texts that occurred in the process of standardization during the Middle Babylonian period. Indeed, the Ḫattuša recension of *Nergal D* is much closer to the first-millennium duplicates than to the single OB manuscript.²¹⁴⁶ These three texts – but probably this consideration is applicable to other compositions that do not have first-millennium duplicates or that are poorly preserved in fragmentary manuscripts – show that the process of standardization consisted in rephrasing and adding lines to the OB texts as well as modifying their line order. The compositions *The Fowler* and *The Fox and the Hyena* may also be added here. If they result from modification of the OB *The Fowler and his Wife* and *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant* and do not represent independent compositions, they provide further examples of adaptation. The absence from the LBA Mesopotamian documentation of texts known from the Western periphery that exist in first-millennium copies such as *BeR*, *LI-LN* and *SI-Utu* clearly evidences that what has come down to us from the Middle Babylonian period is only a small part of the actual textual production. We also need to recall that much material from Babylon is still unpublished. The Western periphery texts help to fill this gap, providing insights into the lost Middle Babylonian repertoire. The best example is provided by *BeR*, which is attested at Ugarit on a tablet written by a Babylonian scribe but unknown in Mesopotamian LBA sources. The Sumerian literary texts from the Western periphery are to be understood as internal to the Mesopotamian stream of tradition. As demonstrated in detail, the alleged adaptation of Mesopotamian literary texts to the local cultural milieu must be rejected. The modification of OB Sumerian compositions occurred in the Middle Babylonian scribal schools and not in the Western periphery. Nevertheless, the creation of compositions upon Mesopotamian themes occurs in Syria and Anatolia, but never in the original language. Examples are the Hurrian and Hittite versions of Gilgameš and the Hittite versions of the Sargonic tales. It is not by coincidence that these texts, which can be called free adaptations, never appear on the same tablet as the original Mesopotamian composition. The creation of compositions based on themes derived from a different language is not a phenomenon that first arises in the Western periphery. It is common to the Mesopotamian literature itself and generally

²¹⁴⁵ See for instance *Lugal-e* and *Udug-ḥul*.

²¹⁴⁶ Unfortunately, no first-millennium manuscripts of *EaN* are preserved and the only one of *BeR* is too fragmentary to be of use.

to all ancient Near Eastern cultures, as attested in the Akkadian versions of the Gilgameš epic, *The dispute between the Date Palm and the Tamarisk*, and to a certain extent the biblical text. Similarly, some masterpieces of Western literature are examples of cross-linguistic adaptation, such as the *Aeneid* and *Orlando Furioso*.

The corpora of Sumerian literary and magical texts from Ḫattuša, on the one hand, and from Emar and Ugarit, on the other hand, are very different. With the exception of the compositions transmitted from Ḫattuša to Ugarit, *MLM*, *LI-LN* and perhaps *Saġ-geġ* VI, the repertoire of texts recovered at Ḫattuša is completely different from the Emar-Ugarit corpus.²¹⁴⁷ Outside of those texts, the only connections between the Hittite and Syrian spheres are provided by the NA 'Catalogue of Texts and Authors' which quotes *Nergal D* and the series of Sidu which includes *BeR* and *The Fowler*. Among the texts from the Hittite capital only *MLM*, *LI-LN* and *Edubba E* can be traced back to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. The remainder of the Sumerian corpus from the Hittite capital relies on different traditions that in some cases were centered in Northern Babylonia. Moreover, the Mesopotamian material from Ḫattuša reflects an older stage in the standardization process compared to the Emar-Ugarit texts. The documentation from the Hittite capital covers a longer time frame than the Emar and Ugarit archives, and some texts directly reflect the OB (or LOB) stage, for example CTH 800. The older stage of the material from Ḫattuša is evident in the few pieces of literature preserved in all three centers – for example, the wisdom text *Šimâ Milka*, which incorporates both the classical, positive father-to-son instructions, as known from *The Instructions of Šuruppak*, and the more pessimistic vanity theme.²¹⁴⁸ The Emar (Syro-Hittite) and Ugarit sources of *Šimâ Milka* parallel each other whereas the Ḫattuša manuscript reveals an older textual tradition.²¹⁴⁹ The same holds true for the Gilgameš epic.²¹⁵⁰ The earlier stage of the Ḫattuša material, compared to the Syro-Hittite documentation from Emar, is also recognizable in the aforementioned ġeš section of the list *Urra*.²¹⁵¹ The Ḫattuša recension preserved in the MS prism KBo 26 5B diverges from the Nippur and Syro-Hittite tablet from Emar which, conversely, displays a level of standardization closer to the first-millennium recension. Nevertheless, Sumerian literary texts from Ḫattuša, Emar and Ugarit were all used in the same stage in the scribal curriculum, the Intermediary Phase. Tablets from the Western periphery as well as the Middle Babylonian documentation witness that compositions such as *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad*, *PfK* and perhaps the Dumuzi composition KUB 37 41, which originally were likely non-curricular texts, found their way into the curriculum in the post-Old Babylonian period. All the Sumerian literary texts from the Western libraries are indeed short compositions whereas the long epics and myths that in the OB curriculum formed the Advanced Phase, including the Decad and the House F Fourteen, are totally unknown. In my opinion these compositions, at least in the Syrian and Anatolian curriculum, were substituted by Akkadian texts such as *Šimâ Milka* which, given its relationship to the vanity theme compositions of the Intermediary Phase, was probably the first text learned in the Advanced Phase.²¹⁵² The scribal curriculum in the Western periphery focused on Akkadian, the international diplomatic language, and studying long Akkadian compositions likely appeared to Western scribes to be much more useful than mastering Sumerian epic and myths.

2147 I presented some thoughts on why different material is attested at Ḫattuša, Emar and Ugarit in the paper 'The Fortune of Wisdom Literature in the Ancient Near East: the Case of the Vanity Theme', given at the 60th Rencontre d'Assyriologique Internationale in Warsaw.

2148 For a discussion of key themes of this composition see Cohen 2013, 118-123.

2149 Dietrich 1991, 65-67; the variants in Cohen 2013, 84-101, refer to the Ḫattuša manuscript.

2150 The Ḫattuša sources represent an older recension (OB) than the Emar-Ugarit recension, which is closer to the standard Babylonian text, George 2003, 24-26.

2151 See § 9.4.

2152 It is understood that the Intermediary Phase also comprises short Akkadian compositions.

Curriculum ¹	
Elementary Phase	Lexical Lists ²
Intermediary Phase	A Prayer for a King Dumuzi Text (D-I R?) Edubba E Enlil and Namzitarra Proverbs from Ugarit The Ballad of Early Rulers The Fowler The Fox and the Hyena The Hymn to Iškur-Adad The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ The Letter of Sîn-iddinam to Utu The Message of Lu-diĝira to his Mother
Advanced Phase	Atraĥasis The Epic of Gilgameš Šimâ Milka

¹ Texts in the table are listed in alphabetic order.

² Lexical lists from the Western periphery are extensively treated in Scheucher 2012; for a survey of this material see Viano *forthcoming*.

Because long Sumerian compositions are attested in Mesopotamia in the Late Bronze Age, it is clear that the material found in the Western periphery was carefully selected and not haphazardly transmitted. It is not a coincidence that the Emesal liturgies, which are known from MA and MB sources and would become very popular in the first millennium, are unknown in the Western libraries. These compositions used in liturgical contexts were entirely unfamiliar in Syria and Anatolia and had no practical function in the education of a Western Semitic or Hittite scribe. Each of the three centers had its own religious and cultic practices in which Emesal texts would have found no place. On the contrary, the large amount of incantations – another non-curricular text type – discovered at Hattuša was a consequence of the importation of Mesopotamian specialists who used these texts in magic rituals.

A question that is left open for further research, hopefully to be facilitated by new textual discoveries, is to understand whether the third and early second millennium Syrian scribal schools, notably Ebla and Mari, played any role in the formation of a scribal tradition in the Western periphery during the Late Bronze Age.²¹⁵³

²¹⁵³ Civil 1995, 2306, see also Civil 1984a.

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

Bibliography

- Alaura, S. (1998). «Die Identifizierung der im „Gebäude E“ von Büyükkale-Boğazköy gefundenen Tontafelfragmente aus der Grabung von 1933». *AoF*, 25, pp. 193-214.
- Alaura, S. (2001). «Archive und Bibliotheken in Ḫattuša». In: Wilhelm, G. (Hrsg.), *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie* (Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999). Wiesbaden. StBoT, 45, pp. 12-26.
- Alaura, S. (2004). «Osservazioni sui luoghi di ritrovamento dei trattati internazionali a Boğazköy-Ḫattuša». In: Groddek, D.; Röfle, S. (Hrsg.), *Šarnikzel Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken Emil Orgetorix Forrer*. Dresden. DBH, 10, pp. 139-147.
- Alaura, S. (2006). „Nach Boghasköi!“ *Zur Vorgeschichte der Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy-Ḫattuša und zu den archäologischen Forschungen bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*. Berlin. Sonderschrift der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft, 13.
- Alaura, S.; Bonechi, M. (2012). «Il carro del dio del sole nei testi cuneiformi delletà del bronzo». *SMEA*, 54, pp. 5-115.
- Alster, B. (1990). «The Sumerian Poem of Early Rulers and Related Poems». *OLP*, 21, pp. 5-25.
- Alster, B. (1991a). «Incantation to Utu». *ASJ*, 13, pp. 27-96.
- Alster, B. (1991b). «The Instructions of Urninurta and Related Compositions». *Or*, 60, pp. 141-157.
- Alster, B. (1991c). «The Sumerian Folktale of the Three Ox-Drivers from Adab». *JCS*, 43, pp. 27-38.
- Alster, B. (1991-1992). «Early Dynastic Proverbs and other Contributions to the Study of Literary Texts from Abū Šalābikh». *AfO*, 38-39, pp. 1-51.
- Alster, B. (1992). «The Manchester Tammuz». *ASJ*, 14, pp. 1-46.
- Alster, B. (1993). «Photographs to Incantation to Utu». *ASJ*, 15, pp. 265-285.
- Alster, B. (1997). *Proverbs of Ancient Sumer. The World's Earliest Proverb Collections*. 2 vols. Bethesda. da.
- Alster, B. (1999). «Updates to Šuruppak's Instructions, Proverbs of Ancient Sumer, and Ancient Rulers». *NABU*, 1999-88, pp. 85-89.
- Alster, B. (2002). «Textes de sagesse». *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, 73, pp. 283-301.
- Alster, B. (2005). *Wisdom of Ancient Sumer*. Bethesda.
- Alster, B. (2006). «New Sources for Dumuzi's Dream». *ZA*, 96, pp. 1-30.
- Alster, B. (2007). *Sumerian Proverbs in the Schøyen Collection*. Bethesda. CUSAS, 2.
- Alster, B.; Jeyes, U. (1986). «A sumerian Poem about Early Rulers». *ASJ*, 8, pp. 1-11.
- Archi, A. (1983). «Die Adad-Hymne ins Hethitische übersetzt». *Or*, 52, pp. 20-30.
- Archi, A. (2007). «Transmission of Recitative Literature by the Hittites». *AoF*, 34, pp. 185-203.
- Arnaud, D. (1975). «Les textes d'Emar et la chronologie de la fin du Bronze récent». *Syria*, 52, pp. 87-92.
- Arnaud, D. (1977-78). «Religion assyro-babylonienne». *AEPHESR*, 86, pp. 183-190.
- Arnaud, D. (1980). «Traditions urbaines et influences semi-nomades à Emar à l'âge du Bronze Récent». In: Margueron, J.C. (éd.), *Le Moyen-Euphrate, zone de contacts et d'échanges. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg (10-12 mars 1977)*. Leiden, pp. 245-264.
- Arnaud, D. (1982a). «Le Textes cunéiformes suméro-accadiens des campagnes 1979-1980 à Ras Shamra-Ougarit». *Syria*, 59, pp. 199-222.
- Arnaud, D. (1982b). «Les Textes suméro-accadiens: un florilège». In: Beyer, D. (éd.), *Meskéné - Emar, Dix ans de travaux 1972-1982*. Paris, pp. 43-51.
- Arnaud, D. (1985-1987). *Recherches au pays d'Aštata. Emar VI: Les textes sumériens et accadiens*. 4 vols. Paris.
- Arnaud, D. (1992). «Tablettes de genres divers du Moyen-Euphrate». *SMEA*, 30, pp. 195-245.
- Arnaud, D. (1995). «L'incantation ougaritaine contre le 'Feu': RS.17.155 2 § 8». *AuOr*, 13, pp. 137-139.
- Arnaud, D. (2001). «Textes de bibliothèque». In: Arnaud, D.; Yon, M. (éds.), *Études ougaritiques: I, Travaux 1995-1985*. Paris. RSO, 14, pp. 333-337.

- Arnaud, D. (2007). *Corpus des textes de bibliothèque de Ras Shamra-Ougarit (1936-2000) en sumérien, babylonien et assyrien*. Barcelona. AuOrS, 23.
- Aro, J. (1955). *Studien zur mittelbabylonischen Grammatik*. Helsinki. StOr, 20.
- Attinger, P. (1993). *Eléments de linguistique sumérienne. La construction de du₁/e/di «dire»*. Fribourg; Göttingen. OBO Sonderband.
- Attinger, P. (1998). «Inanna et Ebiḫ». *ZA*, 88, pp. 164-195.
- Attinger, P. (2004). «Les 'verbes composés' en sumerien». *NABU*, 2004-79, pp. 79-82.
- Attinger, P. (2005). «A propos de AK 'faire'». *ZA*, 95, pp. 46-64.
- Attinger, P. (2007). «Addenda et corrigenda à Attinger dans Mittermayer 2006». *NABU*, 2007-37, pp. 37-39.
- Beaulieu, P.A. (1992). «New Light on Secret Knowledge in Late Babylonian Culture». *ZA*, 82, pp. 98-111.
- Beaulieu, P.A. (1995). «An Excerpt from a Menology with Reverse Writing». *ASJ*, 17, pp. 1-14.
- Beckman, G. (1983). «Mesopotamians and Mesopotamian Learning at Ḫattusha». *JCS*, 35, pp. 97-114.
- Beckman, G. (2001). «Sargon and Naram-Sin in Ḫatti: Reflections of Mesopotamian Antiquity among the Hittites». In: Kuhn, D.; Stahl, H. (Hrsg.), *Die Gegenwart des Altertums. Formen und Funktionen des Altertumsbezugs in den Hochkulturen der Alten Welt*. Heidelberg, pp. 85-91.
- Beckman, G. (2003). «Gilgamesh in Hatti». In: Beckman, G.; Beal, R.H.; McMahon, J.G. (eds.), *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Winona Lake, pp. 37-57.
- Beckman, G. (2008). «La Religion d'Émar». In: Del Olmo Lete, G. (éd.), *Mythologie et Religion des Sémites Occidentaux*, vol. 2. Leuven; Paris; Dudley. OLA, 162, pp. 1-22.
- Behrens, H. (1978). *Enlil und Ninlil. Ein sumerischer Mythos aus Nippur*. Roma. StPohl SM, 8.
- Berger, P.R. (1969). «Zu den Wirtschafts und Rechtsurkunden Ugaritica V». *UF*, 1, pp. 121-125.
- Bergmann, E.S.J. (1964). «Untersuchungen zu syllabisch geschriebenen sumerischen Texten». *ZA*, 56, pp. 1-43.
- Bergmann, E.S.J. (1965). «Untersuchungen zu syllabisch geschriebenen sumerischen Texten». *ZA*, 57, pp. 31-42.
- Bernhardt, I.; Kramer, S.N. (1956-57). «Götter-Hymnen und Kult-Gesänge der Sumerer auf Zwei Keilschrift-„Katalogen“ in der Hilprecht-Sammlung». *WZJ*, 6, pp. 389-395.
- Bittel, K. (1937). «Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy 1936». *MDOG*, 75, pp. 1-51.
- Black, J. (1980). «Review of: Cooper, J.S. (1978), *The Return of Ninurta to Nippur*. *Analecta Orientalia*, 52, Roma». *AfO*, 27, pp. 154-159.
- Black, J. (1987). «Sumerian *Balag* Compositions». *BiOr*, 44, pp. 36-79.
- Black, J. (2005). «Songs of the Goddess Aruru». In: Sefati, Y.; Artzi, P.; Cohen, C.; Eichler, B.L.; Hurowitz, V.A. (eds.), *An Experienced Scribe Who Neglects Nothing*. *Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein*. Bethesda, pp. 39-62.
- Black, J.; Zólyomi, G. (2007). «Introduction to the Study of Sumerian». In: Ebeling, J.; Cunningham, G. (eds.), *Analysing Literary Sumerian. Corpus-based Approaches*. London; Oakville, pp. 1-32.
- Böck, B. (2007). *Das Handbuch Muššu'u „Einreinigung“. Eine Serie sumerischer und akkadischer Beschwörungen aus dem 1. Jt. vor Chr.* Madrid. BPOA, 3.
- Boissier, A. (1926). «Lipit-Ištar, législateur». *Babyloniaca*, 9, pp. 19-22.
- Böllentrücher, J. (1904). *Gebete un Hymnen an Nergal*. Leipzig. LSS, 1.
- Bonechi, M. (2010). «On BM 78614 (Bilingual Hymn to Utu)». *NABU*, 2010-70, pp. 79-80.
- Borger, R. (1967). «Das dritte „Haus“ der Serie Bit Rimki (VR 50-51, Schollmeyer HGŠ NR. 1)». *JCS*, 21, pp. 1-17.
- Borger, R. (1973). «Keilschrifttexte verschiedenen Inhalts». In: Beek, M.A.; Kampman, A.A.; Nijland, C.; Ryckmans, J. (eds.), *Symbolae biblicae et Mesopotamicae Francisco Mario Theodoro de Liagre Böhl dicatae*. Leiden, pp. 38-55.
- Borger, R. (1986). «Neue Lugale-Fragmente». *Or*, 55, pp. 446-449.
- Borger, R. (1991). «Ein Brief Sin-idinnams von Larsa an den Sonnengott sowie Bemerkungen über „Joins“ und das „Joinen“». *NAWG*, 2, pp. 37-84.

- Brisch, N.M. (2007). *Tradition and the Poetics of Innovation. Sumerian Court Literature of the Larsa Dynasty (c. 2003-1763 BCE)*. Münster. AOAT, 339.
- Campbell Thomson, R. (1903). *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*. London.
- Caplice, R. (1980). «Il bilinguismo nei testi medio-assiri». *VO*, 3, pp. 131-138.
- Castellino, G.R. (1969). «Incantation to Utu». *OrAnt*, 8, pp. 1-57.
- Castellino, G.R. (1972). *Two Šulgi Hymns (BC)*. Roma. Studi Semitici, 42.
- Cavigneaux, A. (1982). «Schultexte aus Warka». *BaM*, 13, pp. 21-30.
- Cavigneaux, A. (1987). «Notes Sumérologiques». *ASJ*, 9, pp. 45-66.
- Cavigneaux, A. (1991). «Nouveaux fragments des Géorgiques». *AuOr*, 9, pp. 37-46.
- Cavigneaux, A. (1996a). *Altbabylonische Texte aus dem Planquadrat Pe XVI - 4/5*. Mainz. AUWE, 23.
- Cavigneaux, A. (1996b). «Miettes de l'Edubbâ». In: Tunca, Ö.; Deheselle, D. (éds.), *Tablettes et Images aux Pays de Sumer et d'Akkad. Mélanges offertes à Monsieur H. Limet*. Liège, pp. 11-26.
- Cavigneaux, A. (2003). «Fragments littéraires susiens». In: Sallaberger, W.; Volk, K.; Zgoll, A. (Hrsg.), *Literatur, Politik und Recht in Mesopotamien. Festschrift für Claus Wilcke*. Wiesbaden. Orientalia Biblica et Christiana, 14, pp. 53-62.
- Cavigneaux, A. (2009). «Duex hymnes sumériens à Utu». In: Faivre, X.; Lion, B.; Michel, C. (éds.), *Et il y eut un esprit dans l'Homme. Jean Bottéro et la Mésopotamie*. Paris, pp. 3-18.
- Cavigneaux, A.; Al-Rawi, F. (1993a). «New Sumerian Literary Texts from Tell Haddad (Ancient Meturan): A first Survey». *Iraq*, 55, pp. 91-105.
- Cavigneaux, A.; Al-Rawi, F. (1993b). «Textes magiques de Tell Haddad (Textes de Tell Haddad II)». *ZA*, 83, pp. 170-205.
- Cavigneaux, A.; Al-Rawi, F. (1994). «Charmes de Sippar et de Nippur». In: Gasche, H.; Tanret, M.; Jassen, C.; Degraeve, A. (éds.), *Cinquante-deux réflexions sur le Proche-Orient Ancien offertes en hommage à Léon De Meyer*. Ghent, pp. 73-89.
- Cavigneaux, A.; Al-Rawi, F. (1995a). «Textes magiques de Tell Haddad (Textes de Tell Haddad II). Deuxième partie». *ZA*, 85, pp. 19-46.
- Cavigneaux, A.; Al-Rawi, F. (1995b). «Textes magiques de Tell Haddad (Textes de Tell Haddad II). Troisième partie». *ZA*, 85, pp. 169-220.
- Cavigneaux, A.; Al-Rawi, F. (2002). «Liturgies exorcistiques agraires (Textes de Tell Haddad IX)». *ZA*, 92, pp. 1-59.
- Chang, K.W. (1981). *Dichtungen der Zeit Tukulti-Ninurtas I. von Assyrien*. Seoul.
- Charpin, D. (1986). *Le clergé d'Ur au siècle d'Hammurabi (XIX^e - XVIII^e siècles av. J.-C.)*. Genf. Hautes Études Orientales, 22.
- Charpin, D. (1999-2000). «Review of: Pientka, R. (1998), *Die spätaltbabylonische Zeit: Abiešuḫ bis Samsuditana. Quellen, Jahresdaten, Geschichte*. IMGULA 2, Münster». *AfO*, 46-47, pp. 322-324.
- Charpin, D. (2004). «Histoire politique du Proche-Orient amorrite (2002-1595)». In: Attinger, P.; Sallaberger, W.; Wäfler, M. (Hrsg.), *Mesopotamien. Die altbabylonische Zeit*. Fribourg; Göttingen. OBO, 160/4, pp. 25-484.
- Charpin, D. (2012). «Mari à l'école d'Ešnunna: écriture, langue, formulaire». In: Mittermayer, C.; Ecklin, S. (eds.), *Altorientalische Studien zu Ehren von Pascal Attinger*. Fribourg; Göttingen. OBO, 256, pp. 119-137.
- Çiğ, M.; Kramer, S.N. (1976). «The Ideal Mother: a Sumerian Portrait». *Belleten*, 40, pp. 413-421.
- Civil, M. (1964). «The 'Message of Lú-Dingir-ra to His Mother' and a Group of Akkado-Hittite 'Proverbs'». *JNES*, 23, pp. 1-11.
- Civil, M. (1969). «Sur un texte sumérien d'Ugarit». *RA*, 63, p. 179.
- Civil, M. (1972). «Supplement to the Introduction to ISET I». *Or*, 41, pp. 83-90.
- Civil, M. (1974-77). «Enlil and Namzitarra». *AfO*, 25, pp. 65-71.
- Civil, M. (1975). «Lexicography». In: Lieberman, S.J. (ed.), *Sumerological Studies in Honor of Thorkild Jacobsen on His Seventieth Birthday, June 7, 1974*. Chicago. AS, 20, pp. 123-157.
- Civil, M. (1976). «The Song of the Plowing Oxen». In: Eichler, B.L. (ed.), *Kramer Anniversary Volume. Cuneiform Studies in Honor of Samuel Noah Kramer*. Kevelaer; Neukirchen-Vluyn. AOAT, 25, pp. 83-95.
- Civil, M. (1983). «Enlil and Ninlil: The Marriage of Sud». *JAOS*, 103, pp. 43-66.

- Civil, M. (1984a). «Bilingualism in Logographically Written Languages: Sumerian in Ebla». In: Cagni, L. (ed.), *Il bilinguismo a Ebla. Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Napoli, 19-22 aprile 1982)*. Napoli, pp. 75-97.
- Civil, M. (1984b). «Notes on the 'Instructions of Šuruppak'». *JNES*, 43, pp. 281-298.
- Civil, M. (1987). «An Edubba text from Boghazköy». *NABU*, 1987-47, pp. 25-27.
- Civil, M. (1989). «The Textes from Meskene-Emar». *AuOr*, 7, pp. 5-25.
- Civil, M. (1994). *The Farmer's Instructions. A Sumerian Agricultural Manual*. Barcelona. AuOrS, 5.
- Civil, M. (1995). «Ancient Mesopotamian Lexicography». In: Sasson, J. (ed.), *Civilization of the Ancient Near East*, vol. 4. New York, pp. 2305-2314.
- Civil, M. (1996). «Sin-iddinam in Emar and SU.A=Šimaški». *NABU*, 1996-41, pp. 36-37.
- Civil, M. (1997). «The Instructions of King Ur-Ninurta: A New Fragment». *AuOr*, 15, pp. 43-53.
- Civil, M. (2000a). «From the Epistolary of the Edubba». In: George, A.R.; Finkel, I.L. (eds.), *Wisdom, Gods and Literature. Studies in Assyriology in Honour of W.G. Lambert*. Winona Lake, pp. 105-118.
- Civil, M. (2000b). «Modal Prefixes». *ASJ*, 22, pp. 29-42.
- Civil, M. (2006). «The Song of the Millstone». In: Del Olmo Lete, G.; Feliu, L.; Millet Albà, A. (eds.), *Šapal tibnim mû illakû. Studies Presented to Joaquín Sanmartín on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Barcelona. AuOrS, 22, pp. 121-138.
- Civil, M. (2007). «Early Semitic Loanwords in Sumerian». In: Roth, M.T.; Farber, G.; Stolper, M.W.; Von Bechtolsheim, P. (eds.), *Studies Presented to Robert D. Biggs. June 4, 2004*. Chicago. AS, 27, pp. 11-33.
- Clayden, T. (1996). «Kurigalzu I and the Restoration of Babylonia». *Iraq*, 58, pp. 109-121.
- Cohen, M.E. (1975). «The Incantation-Hymn: Incantation or Hymn?». *JAOS*, 95, pp. 592-611.
- Cohen, M.E. (1977). «Another Utu Hymn». *ZA*, 67, pp. 1-19.
- Cohen, M.E. (1981). *Sumerian Hymnology: The Eršemma*. Cincinnati.
- Cohen, M.E. (1988). *The Canonical Lamentations of Ancient Mesopotamia*. 2 vols. Potomac.
- Cohen, M.E. (1993). *The Cultic Calendars of the Ancient Near East*. Bethesda.
- Cohen, Y. (2004). «Kidin-Gula - The foreign Teacher at the Emar Scribal School». *RA*, 98, pp. 81-101.
- Cohen, Y. (2006). «Who was the Scribe of the Emar 'Ballade'?). *NABU*, 2006-76, pp. 76-77.
- Cohen, Y. (2009). *The Scribes and Scholars of the City of Emar in the Late Bronze Age*. Winona Lake. HSS, 59.
- Cohen, Y. (2010). «'Enlil and Namzitarra': The Emar and Ugarit Manuscripts and a new Understanding of the 'Vanity Theme' Speech». *RA*, 104, pp. 87-97.
- Cohen, Y. (2012a). «The Historical and Social Background of the Scribal School at the City of Emar in the Late Bronze Age». In: van Egmond, W.S.; van Soldt, W.H. (eds.), *Theory and Practice of Knowledge Transfer. Studies in School Education in the Ancient Near East and Beyond. Papers Read at Symposium in Leiden, 17-19 December 2008*. Leiden. PIHANS, 121, pp. 115-127.
- Cohen, Y. (2012b). «The Ugu-mu Fragment from Ḫattuša; Boğazköy KBo 13.2». *JNES*, 71, pp. 1-12.
- Cohen, Y. (2012c). «'Where is Bazi? Where is Zizi?' The List of Early Rulers in the *Ballad* from Emar and Ugarit, and the Mari Rulers in the Sumerian King List and Other Sources». *Iraq*, 74, pp. 137-152.
- Cohen, Y. (2013). *Wisdom from the Late Bronze Age*. Atlanta. WAW, 29.
- Cohen, Y.; D'Alfonso, L. (2008). «The Duration of The Emar Archives and the Relative and Absolute Chronology of the City». In: D'Alfonso, L.; Cohen, Y.; Sørenhagen, D. (eds.), *The City of Emar among the Late Bronze Age Empires. History, Landscape, and Society = Proceedings of the Konstanz Emar Conference (25-26 April 2006)*. Münster. AOAT, 349, pp. 3-25.
- Cohen, Y.; Singer, I. (2006). «A Late Synchronism between Ugarit and Emar». In: Amit, Y.; Ben Zvi, E.; Finkelstein, I.; Lipschits, O. (eds.), *Essays on Ancient Israel in Its Near Eastern Context. A Tribute to Nadav Na'aman*. Winona Lake, pp. 123-140.
- Cole, S.W. (1996). *Nippur in Late Assyrian Times*. Winona Lake. SAAS, 4.
- Cooper, J.S. (1971). «Bilinguals from Boghazköi. I». *ZA*, 61, pp. 1-22.
- Cooper, J.S. (1972). «Bilinguals from Boghazköi. II». *ZA*, 62, pp. 62-81.
- Cooper, J.S. (1978). *The Return of Ninurta to Nippur*. Roma. Analecta Orientalia, 52.
- Cooper, J.S. (1980). «Review of: Behrens (1978), *Enlil und Ninlil. Ein sumerischer Mythos aus Nippur*. StudiaPhol 8, Roma». *JCS*, 32, pp. 175-188.
- Cooper, J.S. (1983). *The Curse of Agade*. Baltimore; London.

- Cooper, J.S. (2000). «Right Writing: Talking about Sumerian Orthography and Texts». *ASJ*, 22, pp. 43-52.
- Cooper, J.S.; Heimpel, W. (1983). «The Sumerian Sargon Legend». *JAOS*, 103, pp. 67-82.
- Cunningham, G. (1997). *'Deliver me from Evil'. Mesopotamian Incantations 2500-1500 BC*. Roma. StPohl SM, 17.
- Cooper, J.S. (2007). «A Catalogue of Cumerian Literature (Based on Miguel Civil's Catalogue of Sumerian Literature)». In: Ebeling, E.; Cunningham, G. (eds.), *Analysing Literary Sumerian. Corpus-based Approaches*. London; Oakville, pp. 351-412.
- Dardano, P. (2006). *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Hattuša*. Wiesbaden. StBoT, 47.
- de Jong Ellis, M. (1979). «Akkadian Literary Texts and Fragments in the University Museum». *JCS*, 31, pp. 216-231.
- de Martino, S. (1992). «Il ductus come strumento di datazione nella filologia ittita». *La Parola del Passato*, 47, pp. 81-98.
- de Martino, S. (1993). «KUB XXVII 38: Ein Beispiel kultureller und linguistischer Überlagerung in einem Text aus dem Archiv Boğazköy». *SMEA*, 31, pp. 121-134.
- de Martino, S. (2012). «La lettera IBoT 1.34 e il problema dei sincronismi tra Hatti e Assiria nel XIII secolo a.C.». In: Lanfranchi, G.B.; Morandi Bonacossi, D.; Pappi, C.; Ponchia, S. (eds.), *Leggo! Studies Presented to Frederick Mario Fales on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Wiesbaden, pp. 195-200.
- Del Olmo Lete, G. (2008). «Mythologie et Religion de la Syrie au II^e Millenaire av. J.C. (1500-1200)». In: Del Olmo Lete, G. (ed.), *Mythologie et Religion des Sémites Occidentaux*, vol. 2. Leuven; Paris; Dudley. OLA, 162, pp. 23-162.
- Delnero, P. (2006). *Variation in Sumerian Literary Compositions: A Case Study Based on the Decad* [Doctoral Dissertation]. University of Pennsylvania.
- Delnero, P. (2010). «Sumerian Literary Catalogues and the Scribal Curriculum». *ZA*, 100, pp. 32-55.
- Delnero, P. (2012). «Memorization and the Transmission of Sumerian Literary Compositions». *JNES*, 71, pp. 189-208.
- Devecchi, E. (2012). «The So-Called 'Mixed Ductus' in the Akkadian Texts from Boğazköy». In: Devecchi, E. (ed.), *Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age. Papers Read at a Symposium in Leiden, 17-18 December 2009*. Leiden. PIHANS, 119, pp. 47-63.
- Dietrich, M. (1988). «Marduk in Ugarit». *SEL*, 5, pp. 79-101.
- Dietrich, M. (1990). «Die akkadische Texte der Archive und Bibliotheken von Emar». *UF*, 22, pp. 25-48.
- Dietrich, M. (1991). «Der Dialog zwischen Šūpē-amēli un seinem Vater!». *UF*, 23, pp. 34-68.
- Dietrich, M. (1992). «„Ein Leben ohne Freude...“ Studien über eine Weisheitskomposition aus den Gelehrtenbibliotheken von Emar und Ugarit». *UF*, 24, pp. 9-29.
- Dietrich, M. (1993). «Babylonian Literary Texts from Western Libraries». In: de Moor, J.C.; Watson, W.G.E. (eds.), *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose*. Kevelaar; Neukirchen-Vluyn. AOAT, 42, pp. 41-67.
- Dietrich, M. (1996). «Aspects of the Babylonian Impact on Ugaritic Literature and Religion». In: Wyatt, N.; Watson, W.G.E.; Lloyd, J.B. (eds.), *Ugarit, Religion and Culture. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Ugarit, Religion and Culture. Edinburgh, July 1994. Essays Presented in Honour of Professor John C.L. Gibson*. Münster. UBL, 12, pp. 33-47.
- Dietrich, M. (1998). «*buluṭ bēlī* „Lebe, mein Köning!“». *UF*, 30, pp. 155-200.
- Durham, J.W. (1976). *Studies in Boğazköy Akkadian* [Doctoral Dissertation]. Harvard University.
- Ebeling, E. (1918). *Quellen zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion I*. Leipzig. MVAG, 23/1.
- Ebeling, E. (1928). «Reste akkadischer Weisheitsliteratur». *MAOG*, 4, pp. 21-29.
- Ebeling, E. (1952-53). «Zwei Tafeln der Serie utukku limnūtu». *AfO*, 16, pp. 295-304.
- Ebeling, E. (1954). «Ein Hymnus auf die Suprematie des Sonnengottes in Exemplaren aus Assur und Boghazköi». *Or*, 23, pp. 209-216.
- Edzard, D.O. (2000). «Wann ist Sumerisch als gesprochene Sprache ausgestorben?». *ASJ*, 22, pp. 53-70.
- Edzard, D.O. (2003). *Sumerian Grammar*. Boston. HdO, 71.

- Edzard, D.O.; Wilcke, C. (1977). «Vorläufiger Bericht über die Inschriftenfunde Frühjahr 1973, Frühjahr 1974, Herbst 1974». In: Hrouda, B. (Hrsg.), *Isin-Išān Bahriyāt I. Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen 1973-1974*. München. ABAW, 79, pp. 83-91.
- Falkenstein, A. (1931). *Die Haupttype der sumerischen Beschwörung*. Lipsia. LSS NF, 1.
- Falkenstein, A. (1939). «Sumerische Beschwörungen aus Boğazköy». *ZA*, 45, pp. 8-41.
- Falkenstein, A. (1949). *Grammatik der Sprache Gudeas von Lagaš I*. Roma. Analecta Orientalia, 28.
- Falkenstein, A. (1950). «Sumerische religiöse Texte». *ZA*, 49, pp. 80-150.
- Falkenstein, A. (1952-1953). «Zu einem syllabisch geschriebenen Emesal-Text». *AfO*, 16, pp. 60-64.
- Falkenstein, A. (1953). «Zur Chronologie der sumerischen Literatur». *MDOG*, 85, pp. 1-13.
- Falkenstein, A. (1959). *Sumerische Götterlieder*, vol. 1. Heidelberg.
- Falkenstein, A. (1963). «Sumerische Religiöse Texte 4». *ZA*, 55, pp. 11-67.
- Falkowitz, R.S. (1983/1984). «Round Old Babylonian School Tablets from Nippur». *AfO*, 29/30, pp. 18-45.
- Ferrara, A.J. (2006). «The Size and Versions of Inanna's Descent». In: Guinan, A.K.; De Jong Ellis, M.; Ferrara, A.J. (eds.), *If a Man Builds a Joyful House: Assyriological Studies in Honor of Erle Verdun Leichty*. Boston. CM, 31, pp. 127-138.
- Fincke, J.C. (2003-2004). «The Babylonian Texts of Nineveh. Report on the British Museum's Ashurbanipal Library Project». *AfO*, 50, pp. 111-149.
- Fincke, J.C. (2009a). «KUB 4, 16: *utukkū lemnūtu* Tafel 6 aus Ḫattuša». *NABU*, 2009-41, pp. 53-55.
- Fincke, J.C. (2009b). «Zu den Akkadischen Hemerologien aus Ḫattuša (CTH 546), Teil I. Eine Hemerologie für das „Rufen von Klagen“ (*šigū šasû*) und das „Reinigen seines Gewandes“ (*šubāt-su ubbubu*): KUB 4, 46 (+) KUB 43, 1». *JCS*, 61, pp. 111-125.
- Finkel, I.L. (1986). «On the Series Sidu». *ZA*, 76, pp. 250-253.
- Finkel, I.L. (1988). «Adad-apla-iddina, Esagil-kīn-apli, and the Series SA.GIG». In: Leichty, E.; de Jong Ellis, M.; Gerardi, P. (eds.), *A Scientific Humanist. Studies in Memory of Abraham Sachs*. Philadelphia, 9, pp. 143-159.
- Finkel, I.L. (1991). «Muššu'u, Qutāru and the Scribe Tanittu-Bēl». *AuOr*, 9, pp. 91-104.
- Finkel, I.L. (1999a). «Magic and Medicine at Meskene». *NABU*, 1999-30, pp. 28-30.
- Finkel, I.L. (1999b). «On Some Dog, Snake and Scorpion Incantations». In: Abusch, T.; van der Toorn, K. (eds.), *Mesopotamian Magic Textual, Historical, and Interpretative Perspective*. Groningen. AMD, 1, pp. 213-250.
- Fleming, D.E. (1992). «A Limited Kingship: Late Bronze Emar in Ancient Syria». *UF*, 24, pp. 59-71.
- Fleming, D.E. (1996). «The Emar Festivals: City Unity and Syrian Identity under Hittite Hegemony». In: Chavalas, M.W. (ed.), *Emar: The History, Religion, and Culture of a Syrian Town in the Late Bronze Age*. Bethesda, pp. 81-121.
- Fleming, D.E. (2000). *Time at Emar. The Cultic Calendar and the Rituals from the Diviner's House*. Winona Lake. MC, 11.
- Fleming, D.E.; Démare-Lafont, S. (2009). «Tablet Terminology at Emar: 'Conventional' and 'Free Format'». *AuOr*, 27, pp. 19-26.
- Flückiger-Hawker, E. (1996). «Der «Louvre-Katalog» TCL 15 28 und sumerische na-ru₂-a - Kompositionen». *NABU*, 1996-119, pp. 105-106.
- Flückiger-Hawker, E. (1999). *Urnamma of Ur in Sumerian Literary Tradition*. Freiburg. OBO, 166.
- Foster, B.R. (2005). *Before the Muses. An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*. Bethesda.
- Frahm, E. (2010). «The Latest Sumerian Proverbs». In: Melville, S.C.; Slotsky, A.L. (eds.), *Opening the Tablet Box. Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Benjamin R. Foster*. Leiden; Boston, pp. 155-184.
- Freydank, H. (1990). «Berliner Fragmente zu an-gim dīm-ma». *AoF*, 17, pp. 180-181.
- Freydank, H. (1991). *Beiträge zur mittelassyrischen Chronologie un Geschichte*. Berlin. Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients, 21.
- Freydank, H. (1997). «Mittelassyrische Opferlisten aus Assur». In: Waetzoldt, H.; Hauptmann, H. (eds.), *Assyrien im Wandel Der Zeiten*. Heidelberg. CRRAI, 39 (HSAO 6), pp. 47-52.
- Freydank, H. (2000). «Addenda und Corrigenda zu mittelassyrischen Eponymen». In: Marzahn, J.; Neumann, H. (Hrsg.), *Assyriologica et Semitica. Festschrift für Joachim Oelsner anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 18. Februear 1997*. Münster. AOAT, 252, pp. 67-72.
- Gabbay, U. (2014a). «A Balaḡ to Enlil from the First Sealand Dynasty». *ZA*, 104, pp. 146-170.
- Gabbay, U. (2014b). «The *kalû* and *kalûtu* Literature in Assyria». *Orient*, 49, pp. 115-144.

- Gabbay, U. (2015). *The Eršema Prayers of the First Millennium BC*. Wiesbaden. HES, 2.
- Gadd, C.J. (1937). «The Infancy of a Man in a Sumerian Legend». *Iraq*, 4, pp. 33-34.
- Gadotti, A. (2010). «A Woman Most Fair. Investigating the Message of Ludingira to his Mother». In: Kleinerman, A.; Sasson, J.M. (eds.), *Why Should Someone Who Knows Something Conceal It? Cuneiform Studies in Honor of David I. Owen on His 70th Birthday*. Bethesda, pp. 115-130.
- Gantzert, M. (2011). *The Emar Lexical Texts* [Doctoral Dissertation]. Leiden University.
- Gelb, I.J.; Kienast, B. (1990). *Die Altakkadischen Königsinschriften des dritten Jahrtausends v. Chr.* Stuttgart. FAOS, 7.
- Geller, M.J. (1980). «A Middle Assyrian Tablet of *utukkū lemnūtu*, Tablet 12». *Iraq*, 42, pp. 23-51.
- Geller, M.J. (1985). *Forerunners to Uduĝ-hul*. Wiesbaden. FAOS, 12.
- Geller, M.J. (1989). «A New Piece of Witchcraft». In: Behrens, H.; Loding, D.; Roth, M.T. (eds.), *Dumu-e₂-dub-ba-a. Studies in honor of Åke W. Sjöberg*. Philadelphia, pp. 193-205.
- Geller, M.J. (1990). «Astronomy and Authorship». *BSOAS*, 53, pp. 209-213.
- Geller, M.J. (1992). «CT 58, NO. 70. A Middle Babylonian Eršahunga». *BSOAS*, 55, pp. 528-532.
- Geller, M.J. (1995). «Very Different Utu Incantations». *ASJ*, 17, pp. 101-126.
- Geller, M.J. (1997). «The Last Wedge». *ZA*, 87, pp. 43-95.
- Geller, M.J. (2000). «Incipits and Rubrics». In: George, A.R.; Finkel, I.L. (eds.), *Wisdom, Gods and Literature. Studies in Assyriology in Honour of W.G. Lambert*. Winona Lake, pp. 225-258.
- Geller, M.J. (2002). «Incantations et Magie». *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, 73, pp. 270-283.
- Geller, M.J. (2006). «Mesopotamische Bezwingungen». *Phoenix*, 52, pp. 47-63.
- Geller, M.J. (2007). *Evil Demons. Canonical Utukkū Lemnūtu Incantations*. Helsinki. SAACT, 5.
- Geller, M.J. (2010). «Late Babylonian *Lugale*». In: Baker, H.D.; Robson, E.; Zólyomi, G. (eds.), *Your Praise is Sweet. A Memorial Volume for Jeremy Black from Students, Colleagues and Friends*. London, pp. 93-100.
- George, A.R. (1993). *House Most High. The Temples of Ancient Mesopotamia*. Winona Lake. MC, 5.
- George, A.R. (2003). *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*. Oxford.
- George, A.R. (2007a). «The Civilizing of Ea-Enkidu: An Unusual Tablet of The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic». *RA*, 101, pp. 59-80.
- George, A.R. (2007b). «The Gilgamesh Epic at Ugarit». *AuOr*, 25, pp. 237-254.
- George, A.R. (2009). *Babylonian Literary Texts in the Schøyen Collection*. Bethesda. CUSAS, 10.
- George, A.R. (2012). «Review of: Peterson, J. (2011), *Sumerian Literary Fragments in the University Museum, Philadelphia*. BPOA 9, Madrid». *BSOAS*, 75, pp. 368-370.
- George, A.R. (2013). *Babylonian Divinatory Texts Chiefly in the Schøyen Collection*. Bethesda. CUSAS, 18.
- Gesche, P.D. (2000). *Schulunterricht in Babylonien im ersten Jahrtausend v. Chr.* Münster. AOAT, 275.
- Gordin, S. (2010). «*Scriptoria* in Late Empire Period Ḫattusa: The Case of the É GIŠ.KIN.TI». In: Cohen, Y.; Gilan, A.; Miller, J.L. (eds.), *Pax Hethitica. Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*. Wiesbaden. StBoT, 51, pp. 158-177.
- Gordin, S. (2011). «The Tablet and its Scribe: Between Archival and Scribal Spaces in Late Empire Period Ḫattusa». *AoF*, 38, pp. 177-198.
- Gordin, S. (2013). «The Socio-historical Setting of Hittite Schools of Writing as reflected in Scribal Habits». In: Gordin, S. (ed.), *Visualizing Knowledge and Creating Meaning in Ancient Writing Systems*. Berlin. BBVO, 23, pp. 61-83.
- Goren, Y.; Mommsen, H.; Klinger, J. (2011). «Non-destructive provenance study of cuneiform tablets using portable X-ray fluorescence (pXRF)». *JAS*, 38, pp. 684-696.
- Groneberg, B. (2003). «Searching for Akkadian Lyrics: From Old Babylonian to the 'Liederkatalog' KAR 158». *JCS*, 55, pp. 55-74.
- Güterbock, H.G. (1991-1992). «Bemerkungen über die im Gebäude A auf Büyükkale gefundenen Tontafeln». *AfO*, 38-39, pp. 132-137.
- Hallo, W.W. (1967). «New Texts from the Reign of Sin-iddinam». *JCS*, 21, pp. 95-99.
- Hallo, W.W. (1976). «Toward a History of Sumerian Literature». In: Lieberman, S.J. (ed.), *Sumerological Studies in Honor of Thorkild Jacobsen on His Seventieth Birthday, June 7, 1974*. Chicago. AS, 20, pp. 181-203.
- Hallo, W.W. (1981). «Review of: Cooper, J.S. (1978), *The Return of Ninurta to Nippur*. *Analecta Orientalia*, 52, Roma». *JAOS*, 101, pp. 253-257.

- Hallo, W.W. (1982). «Notes from the Babylonian Collection, II: Old Babylonina Har-ra». *JCS*, 34, pp. 81-93.
- Hallo, W.W. (1989). «Nippur Originals». In: Behrens, H.; Loding, D.; Roth, M.T. (eds.), *Dumu-e₂-dub-ba-a. Studies in honor of Åke W. Sjöberg*. Philadelphia, pp. 237-247.
- Hallo, W.W. (1990). «Assyriology and the Canon». *The American Scholar*, 59, pp. 105-108.
- Hallo, W.W. (1991). «The Concept of Canonicity in Cuneiform and Biblical Literature: A Comparative Appraisal». In: Younger Jr., K.L.; Hallo, W.W.; Batto, B.F. (eds.), *The Biblical Canon in Comparative Perspective. Scripture in Context IV*. Lewiston. Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies, 11, pp. 1-19.
- Hallo, W.W. (1992). «The Syrian Contribution to Cuneiform Literature and Learning». In: Chavalas, M.W.; Hayes, J.L. (eds.), *New Horizons in the Study of Ancient Syria*. Malibu. BiMes, 25, pp. 69-88.
- Heeßel, N.P. (2009). «The Babylonian Physician Rabâ-ša-Marduk. Another Look at Physicians and Exorcists in the Ancient Near East». In: Attia, A.; Buisson, G. (eds.), *Advances in Mesopotamian Medicine from Hammurabi to Hippocrates. Proceedings of the International Conference «Oeil malade et mauvais oeil», Collège de France, Paris, 23rd June 2006*. Leiden; Boston. CM, 37, pp. 13-28.
- Heeßel, N.P. (2011). «„Sieben Tafeln aus sieben Städten“. Überlegungen zum Prozess der Serialisierung von Texten in Babylonien in der zweiten Hälfte des zweiten Jahrtausends v. Chr.». In: Cancik-Kirschbaum, E.; van Ess, M.; Marzahn, J. (Hrsg.), *Babylon. Wissenskultur in Orient und Okzident*. Berlin. Topoi. Berlin Studies of the Ancient World, 1, pp. 171-195.
- Hoffner Jr., H.A.; Melchert, H.C. (2008). *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Winona Lake.
- Horowitz, W. (1998). *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography*. Winona Lake. MC, 8.
- Horozný, F. (1915). «Die Lösung des hethitischen Problems. Ein vorläufiger Bericht». *MDOG*, 56, pp. 17-50.
- Hoskisson, P.Y. (1991). «Emar as an Empirical Model of the Transmission of Canon». In: Younger Jr., K.L.; Hallo, W.W.; Batto, B.F. (eds.), *The Biblical Canon in Comparative Perspective. Scripture in Context IV*. Lewiston. Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies, 11, pp. 21-32.
- Huber Vulliet, F. (2001). «La Correspondance Royale d'Ur, un corpus apocryphe». *ZA*, 91, pp. 169-206.
- Huber Vulliet, F. (2011). «Letters as Correspondence, Letters as Literature». In: Radner, K.; Robson, E. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*. Oxford, pp. 486-507.
- Huehnergard, J. (1979). *The Akkadian Dialects of Carchemish and Ugarit* [Doctoral Dissertation]. Harvard University.
- Huehnergard, J. (1989). *The Akkadian of Ugarit*. Atlanta. HSS, 34.
- Hunger, H. (1968). *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone*. Kevelaer; Neukirchen-Vluyn. AOAT, 2.
- Hunger, H.; von Weiher, E. (1976/1988). *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk*. Berlin.
- Jacobsen, T. (1991). «Abstruse Sumerian». In: Mordechai, C.; Eph'al, I. (eds.), *AH, Assyria... Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography presented to Hayim Tadmor*. Jerusalem. Scripta Hierosolymitana, 33, pp. 279-291.
- Jagersma, B. (2010). *A Descriptive Grammar of Sumerian* [Doctoral Dissertation]. Universiteit Leiden.
- Jakob, S. (2003). *Mittelassyrische Verwaltung und Sozialstruktur: Untersuchungen*. Leiden; Boston. CM, 29.
- Jestin, R.R. (1958). «Textes religieux sumériens». *RA*, 52, pp. 191-202.
- Jucquois, G. (1966). *Phonétique comparée des dialectes moyen-babyloniens du nord et de l'ouest*. Louvain. Bibliothèque du Muséon, 53.
- Kämmerer, T.R. (1998). *Šimâ milka*. Induktion und Reception der mittelbabylonischen Dichtung von Ugarit, Emār und Tell el-'Amarna. Münster. AOAT, 251.
- Karahashi, F. (2000). *Sumerian Compound Verbs with Body-Part Terms* [Doctoral Dissertation]. University of Chicago.
- Karasu, C. (1996). «Some Remarks on Archive-Library Systems of *Ḫattuša-Boğazköy*». *ArchAn*, 2, pp. 39-59.
- Kärki, I. (1967). *Die Sprache der Sumerischen Königsinschriften der Frühaltbabylonischen Zeit*. Helsinki. StOr, 35.
- Kärki, I. (1986). *Die Königsinschriften der dritten Dynastie von Ur*. Helsinki. StOr, 58.

- Klein, J. (1976). «Šulgi and Gilgameš: Two Brother-Peers (Šulgi 0)». In: Eichler, B.L. (ed.), *Kramer Anniversary Volume. Cuneiform Studies in Honor of Samuel Noah Kramer*. Kevelaer; Neukirchen-Vluyn. AOAT, 25, pp. 271-292.
- Klein, J. (1990). «The 'Bane' of Humanity: A Lifespan of One Hundred Twenty Years». *ASJ*, 12, pp. 57-70.
- Klein, J. (2000). «'The Ballad about Early Rulers' in Eastern and Western Traditions». In: Van Lerberghe, K.; Voet, G. (eds.), *Languages and Cultures in Contact. At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Syro-Mesopotamian Realm. Proceedings of the 42th RAI*. Leuven. CRRAI, 42 (OLA 96), pp. 203-216.
- Kleinerman, A. (2011). *Education in Early 2nd Millennium BC Babylonia. The Sumerian Epistolary Miscellany*. Leiden; Boston. CM, 42.
- Klengel, H. (1993). «Hugo Wincklers Tagebücher». *IstMitt*, 43, pp. 511-516.
- Klinger, J. (1998). «„Wer lehrte die Hethiter das Schreiben?“ Zur Paläographie früher Texte in akkadischer Sprache aus Boğazköy: Skizze einiger Überlegungen und vorläufiger Ergebnisse». In: Sedat, A.; Aygül, S. (eds.), *Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology*. Çorum, September 1996, 22-16. Ankara, pp. 365-375.
- Klinger, J. (2003). «Zur Paläographie akkadischsprachiger Texte aus Ḫattuša». In: Beckman, G.; Beal, R.H.; McMahon, J.G. (eds.), *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Winona Lake, pp. 237-248.
- Klinger, J. (2005). «Die hethitische Rezeption mesopotamischer Literatur und die Überlieferung des Gilgameš-Epos in Ḫattuša». In: Prechel, D. (Hrsg.), *Motivation und Mechanismen des Kulturkontaktes in der späten Bronzezeit*. Firenze. Eothen, 13, pp. 103-127.
- Klinger, J. (2010). «Literarische sumerische Texte aus den hethitischen Archiven aus paläographischer Sicht - Teil II». *Aof*, 37, pp. 306-340.
- Klinger, J. (2012). «Literarische sumerische Texte aus den hethitischen Archiven aus Überlieferungsgeschichtlicher Sicht - Teil I». In: Devecchi, E. (ed.), *Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age. Papers Read at a Symposium in Leiden, 17-18 December 2009*. Leiden. PIHANS, 119, pp. 79-93.
- Košak, S. (1995). «The Palace Library 'Building A' on Büyükkale», *Studio Historiae Ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Leiden. PIHANS, 74, pp. 173-179.
- Kramer, S.N. (1948). «Fragments of Diorite Statue of Kurigalzu in the Iraq Muesem». *Sumer*, 4, pp. 1-38.
- Krebernik, M. (1996). «Fragment einer Bilingue». *ZA*, 86, pp. 170-176.
- Krebernik, M. (2001). «Ein ki-^dutu-Gebet aus der Hilprecht-Sammlung». *ZA*, 91, pp. 238-252.
- Krecher, J. (1966a). «Die sumerischen Texte in „syllabischer“ Orthographie». *ZA*, 58, pp. 16-65.
- Krecher, J. (1966b). *Sumerische Kultlyrik*. Wiesbaden.
- Krecher, J. (1967). «Zum Emesal-Dialekt des Sumerischen». In: Edzard, D.O. (Hrsg.), *Heidelberger Studien zum alten Orient. Adam Falkenstein zum 17. September 1966* Heidelberg. HSAO, 1, pp. 87-110.
- Krecher, J. (1968). «Die sumerischen Texte in „syllabischer“ Orthographie». *WO*, 4, pp. 252-277.
- Krecher, J. (1969). «Schreiberschulung in Ugarit: Die Tradition von Listen und sumerischen Texten». *UF*, 1, pp. 131-158.
- Kümmel, H.M. (1969). «Ugaritica Hethitica». *UF*, 1, pp. 159-165.
- Kunstmann, W.G. (1932). *Die babylonische Gebetsbeschwörung*. Leipzig. LSS NF, 2.
- Kutscher, R. (1975). *Oh Angry Sea (a-ab-ba hu-luh-ha): The History of a Sumerian Congregational Lament*. New Haven; London.
- Laessøe, J. (1955). *Studies on the Assyrian Ritual and Series bît rimki*. København.
- Lambert, W.G. (1960). *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*. Oxford.
- Lambert, W.G. (1962). «A Catalogue of Texts and Authors». *JCS*, 16, pp. 59-77.
- Lambert, W.G. (1965). «A Middle Assyrian Tablet of Incantations». In: Güterbock, H.G.; Jacobsen, T. (eds.), *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on His Seventy-fifth Birthday, April 21, 1965*. Chicago. AS, 16, pp. 283-288.
- Lambert, W.G. (1967). «Enmeduranki and related Matters». *JCS*, 21, pp. 126-138.
- Lambert, W.G. (1970). «Fire Incantations». *AfO*, 23, pp. 39-45.

- Lambert, W.G. (1972). «Review of: Pettinato, G. (1971), *Das altorientalische Menschenbild und die sumerischen und akkadischen Schöpfungsmythen*. AHAW, Heidelberg». *BSOAS*, 35, pp. 134-135.
- Lambert, W.G. (1974a). «DINGIR.ŠA.DIB.BA Incantations». *JNES*, 33, pp. 267-322.
- Lambert, W.G. (1974b). «The Seed of Kingship». In: Garelli, P. (éd.), *Le Palais et la Royauté (Archéologie et Civilisation)*. XIX Rencontre assyriologique internationale, Paris, 29 juin - 2 juillet 1971. Paris. CRRAI, 19, pp. 427-440.
- Lambert, W.G. (1976). «Tukulti-Ninurta I and the Assyrian King List». *Iraq*, 38, pp. 85-94.
- Lambert, W.G. (1989). «The Laws of Hammurabi in the First Millennium». In: Lebeau, M.; Talon, P. (éds.), *Reflets des deux fleuves. Volume de mélanges offerts à André Finet*. Leuven. Akkadica Supplementum, 6, pp. 96-97.
- Lambert, W.G. (1992). *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum. Third Supplement*. London.
- Lambert, W.G. (1995). «Some New Babylonian Wisdom Literature». In: Day, G.; Gordon, R.P.; Williamson, H.G.M. (eds.), *Wisdom in Ancient Israel*. Cambridge, pp. 30-42.
- Lambert, W.G. (2006). «Enbilulu and the Calendar». In: Guinan, A.K.; De Jong Ellis, M.; Ferrara, A.J.; Freedman, S.M.; Rutz, M.T.; Sassamannshausen, L.; Tinney, S.; Waters, M.W. (eds.), *If a Man Builds a Joyful House. Assyriological Studies in Honor of Erle Verdun Leichty*. Leiden; Boston. CM, 31, pp. 237-241.
- Lambert, W.G. (2013). *Babylonian Creation Myths*. Winona Lake. MC, 16.
- Lambert, W.G.; Millard, A.R. (1968). *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum. Second Supplement*. London.
- Langdon, S. (1909). *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*. Paris.
- Laroche, E. (1964). «Un hymne trilingue a Iškur-Adad». *RA*, 58, pp. 69-78.
- Laroche, E. (1968). «Textes de Ras Shamra in langue hittite». In: Nougayrol, J.; Laroche, E.; Virolleaud, C.; Schaeffer, C.F.A. (éds.), *Ugaritica V. Nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit, commentaires des textes historiques*. Paris. Mission de Ras Shamra, 16, pp. 769-784.
- Limet, H. (1996). «Le Texte KAR 158». In: Gasche, H.; Hrouda, B. (éds.), *Collectanea Orientalia. Histoire, arts de l'espace et industrie de la terre. Etudes offertes en hommage à Agnès Spycket*. Neuchâtel; Paris. Civilisations du Proche-Orient Série I, Archéologie et environnement, 3, pp. 151-158.
- Liverani, M. (1974). «La royauté syrienne de l'âge du bronze récent». In: Garelli, P. (éd.), *Le Palais et la Royauté (Archéologie et Civilisation)*. XIX Rencontre assyriologique internationale, Paris, 29 juin - 2 juillet 1971. Paris. CRRAI, 19, pp. 329-356.
- Liverani, M. (1988). *Antico Oriente. Storia società economia*. Bari.
- Liverani, M. (1994). *Guerra e diplomazia nell'antico oriente 1600-1100 a.C.* Bari.
- Livingstone, A. (1980). «A Fragment of a Work Song». *ZA*, 70, pp. 55-57.
- Löhnert, A. (2009). „Wie die Sonne tritt heraus!“ *Eine Klage zum Auszug Enlils mit einer Untersuchung zu Komposition und Tradition sumerischer Klagelieder in altbabylonischer Zeit*. Münster. AOAT, 365.
- Lorenz, J.; Rieken, E. (2010). «Überlegungen zur Verwendung mythologischer Texte bei den Hethitern». In: Fincke, J.C. (Hrsg.), *Festschrift für Gernot Wilhelm anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 28. Januar 2010*. Dresden, pp. 217-234.
- Ludwig, M.C. (1990). *Untersuchungen zu den Hymnen des Išme-Dagan von Isin*. Wiesbaden. SANTSAG, 2.
- Machinist, P.B. (1978). *The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I. A Study in Middle Assyrian Literature* [Doctoral Dissertation]: Yale University.
- Malbran-Labat, F. (2000). «Les textes akkadiens découverts à Ougarit en 1994». In: Van Lerberghe, K.; Voet, G. (eds.), *Languages and Cultures in Contact. At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Siro-Mesopotamian Realm. Proceedings of the 42th RAI*. Leuven. CRRAI, 42 (OLA 96), pp. 237-244.
- Malbran-Labat, F. (2008). «Catalogue raisonné des textes akkadiens de la 'Maison d'Urtēnu'». In: Roche, C. (éd.), *D'Ougarit à Jérusalem. Recueil d'études épigraphiques et archéologiques offert à Pierre Brodreuil*. Paris. Orient & Méditerranée, 2, pp. 21-38.
- Maul, S.M. (1988). „Herzberuhigungsklagen“. *Die sumerisch-akkadischen Eršarunga-Gebete*. Wiesbaden.

- Maul, S.M. (2003). «Die Reste einer mittelassyrischen Beschwörerbibliothek aus dem Königspalast zu Assur». In: Sallaberger, W.; Volk, K.; Zgoll, A. (Hrsg.), *Literatur, Politik und Recht in Mesopotamien. Festschrift für Claus Wilcke*. Wiesbaden. *Orientalia Biblica et Christiana*, 14, pp. 181-194.
- Maul, S.M. (2013). «Ein altorientalischer Pferdesegen – Seuchenprophylaxe in der assyrischen Armee». *ZA*, 103, pp. 16-37.
- Mayer, W. (1971). *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik des Mittelassyrischen*. Kevelaer; Neukirchen-Vluyn. AOATS, 2.
- Maynard, J.A. (1917). «Studies in Religious Texts from Assur». *AJSL*, 34, pp. 21-59.
- Metcalf, C. (2011). «New Parallels in Hittite and Sumerian Praise of the Sun». *WO*, 41, pp. 168-176.
- Michalowski, P. (1981). «An Old Babylonian Literary Fragment Concerning the Kassites». *AION*, 41, pp. 385-389.
- Michalowski, P. (1985). «On Some Early Sumerian Magical Texts». *Or*, 54, pp. 216-225.
- Michalowski, P. (1987). «On the Early History of the Ershahunga Prayer». *JCS*, 39, pp. 37-48.
- Michalowski, P. (1998). «Literature as a Source of Lexical Inspiration: Some Notes on a Hymn to the Goddess Inana». *Written on Clay and Stone. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Krystyna Szarzyńska on the Occasion of Her 80th Birthday*. Warsaw, pp. 65-73.
- Michalowski, P. (2000). «The Life and Death of the Sumerian Language in Comparative Perspective». *ASJ*, 22, pp. 177-202.
- Michalowski, P. (2003). «The Libraries of Babel: Text, Authority, and Tradition in Ancient Mesopotamia». In: Dorleijn, G.; Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (eds.), *Cultural Repertoires. Structure, Function, and Dynamics*. Leuven; Paris; Dudley. Groningen Studies in Cultural Change, 3, pp. 105-129.
- Michalowski, P. (2011). *The Correspondence of the Kings of Ur. An Epistolary History of an Ancient Mesopotamian Kingdom*. Winona Lake. MC, 15.
- Mittermayer, C. (2006). *Altbabylonische Zeichenliste der sumerisch-literarischen Texte*. Fribourg; Göttingen. OBO Sonderband.
- Moran, W. (1974). «An Apotropaic Formula in KUB 30 6». *JCS*, 26, pp. 55-58.
- Myers, J. (2007). «Šamaš of Sippar and the First Dynasty of Babylon». In: Roth, M.T.; Farber, G.; Stolper, M.W.; von Bechtolsheim, P. (eds.), *Studies Presented to Robert D. Biggs. June 4, 2004*. Chicago. AS, 27, pp. 193-199.
- Neve, P. (1982). *Büyükkale die Bauwerke. Grabungen 1954-1966*. Berlin. BoHa, 12.
- Nötscher, F. (1927). *Enlil in Sumer und Akkad*. Hannover.
- Nougayrol, J. (1968). «Textes suméro-accadiens des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit». In: Nougayrol, J.; Laroche, E.; Virolleaud, C.; Schaeffer, C.F.A. (éds.), *Ugaritica V. Nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit, commentaires des textes historiques*. Paris. Mission de Ras Shamra, 16, pp. 1-447.
- Nurullin, R. (2014). «An Attempt at Šimâ milka (Ugaritica V, 163 and Duplicates). Part I: Prologue, Instructions II, III, IV». *Babel und Bibel*, 7, pp. 175-229.
- Otten, H. (1938). «Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy im Jahre 1937. H. Die Keilschrifturkunden». *MDOG*, 76, pp. 40-47.
- Otten, H. (1986). «Archive und Bibliotheken in Ḫattuša». In: Veenhof, K.R. (ed.), *Cuneiform Archives and Libraries. Papers Read at the 30e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale Leiden, 4-8 July 1983*. Leiden. CRRAL, 30 (PIHANS 57), pp. 184-190.
- Pedersén, O. (1985-1986). *Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur. A survey of the Material from the German Excavations*. 2 vols. Uppsala.
- Pedersén, O. (1998). *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500-300 B.C.* Bethesda.
- Pedersén, O. (2005). *Archive und Bibliotheken in Babylon. Die Tontafeln der Grabung Robert Koldeweys 1899-1917*. Berlin. ADOG, 25.
- Peiser, F.E.; Kohler, J. (1905). *Urkunden aus der Zeit der dritten babylonischen Dynastie*. Berlin.
- Peterson, J. (2006). «Direct Interconnections between the Lexical Traditions of Kassite Babylonia and the Periphery». *UF*, 38, pp. 577-592.
- Peterson, J. (2007). «The Middle Babylonian Combination Extract N 3783 + N 5031 obverse». *NABU*, 2007-34, pp. 34-35.
- Peterson, J. (2010a). «Sumerian Literary Fragments in the University Museum, Philadelphia II». *UF*, 42, pp. 535-572.

- Peterson, J. (2010b). «Sumerian Literary Fragments in the University Museum, Philadelphia III». *UF*, 42, pp. 573-612.
- Peterson, J. (2011). *Sumerian Literary Fragments in the University Museum, Philadelphia*. Madrid. BPOA, 9.
- Peterson, J. (2013). «A Post-OB Extract of Lugal-e from Nippur». *NABU*, 2013-67, pp. 110-111.
- Pettinato, G. (1971). *Das altorientalische Menschenbild und die sumerischen und akkadischen Schöpfungsmythen*. Heidelberg. AHAW.
- Pettinato, G. (2005). *Mitologia Assiro-Babilonese*. Torino.
- Pientka, R. (1998). *Die spätaltbabylonische Zeit: Abiesuh bis Samsuditana. Quellen, Jahresdaten, Geschichte*. Münster. IMGULA, 2.
- Ponayotov, S.; Geller, M.J. (2014). «'Femme fatale'». *NABU*, 2014-25, pp. 35-38.
- Reiner, E.; Civil, M. (1967). «Another Volume of Sultantepe Tablets». *JNES*, 26, pp. 177-211.
- Robson, E. (2001). «The Tablet House: A Scribal School». *RA*, 95, pp. 39-66.
- Robson, E. (2002). «More than Metrology: Mathematics Education in an Old Babylonian Scribal School». In: Steele, J.M.; Imhausen, A. (eds.), *Under One Sky. Astronomy and Mathematics in the Ancient Near East*. Münster. AOAT, 297, pp. 325-365.
- Röllig, W. (1985). «Der Mondgott und die Kuh. Ein Lehrstück zur Problematik der Textüberlieferung im Alten Orient». *Or*, 54, pp. 260-273.
- Römer, W.H.P. (1965). *Sumerische ‚Königshymnen‘ der Isin-Zeit*. Leiden.
- Rubio, G. (2000). «On the Orthography of the Sumerian Literary Texts from the Ur III Period». *ASJ*, 22, pp. 203-225.
- Rüster, C.; Wilhelm, G. (2012). *Landschenkungsurkunden hetitischer Könige*. Wiesbaden. StBoT Beiheft, 4.
- Rutz, M.T. (2006). «Textual Transmission between Babylonia and Susa». *JCS*, 58, pp. 63-96.
- Rutz, M.T. (2013). *Bodies of Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia. The Diviners of Late Bronze Age Emar and Their Tablet Collection*. Leiden; Boston. AMD, 9.
- Sallaberger, W. (2010). «Skepsis gegenüber väterlicher Weisheit: Zum altbabylonische Dialog zwischen Vater und Sohn». In: Baker, H.D.; Robson, E.; Zólyomi, G. (eds.), *Your Praise is Sweet. A Memorial Volume for Jeremy Black from Students, Colleagues and Friends*. London, pp. 303-317.
- Sallaberger, W. (2011). «Sumerian Language Use at Garšana. On Orthography, Grammar, and Akkado-Sumerian Bilingualism». In: Owen, D.I. (ed.), *Garšana Studies*. Bethesda. CUSAS, 6, pp. 335-372.
- Salvini, M.; Trémouille, M.-C. (2003). «Les Textes Hittites de Meskéné; Emar». *SMEA*, 45, pp. 225-271.
- Saporetti, C. (1979). *Gli eponimi medio-assiri*. Malibu. BiMes, 9.
- Sassmannshausen, L. (1997). «Mittelbabylonische Runde Tafeln aus Nippur». *BaM*, 28, pp. 185-208.
- Sassmannshausen, L. (2008). «Babylonische Schriftkultur des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr. in den Nachbarländern und im östlichen Mittelmeerraum». *AuOr*, 26, pp. 263-293.
- Scheucher, T.S. (2012). *The Transmissional and Functional Context of the Lexical Lists from Ḫattuša and from the Contemporaneous Traditions in Late-Bronze-Age Syria* [Doctoral Dissertation]. Universität Leiden.
- Schramm, W. (1997). *BANN, BANN! Eine sumerische-akkadische Beschwörungsserie*. Göttingen. GAAL, 2.
- Schwemer, D. (1998). *Akkadische Rituale aus Ḫattuša. Die Sammeltafel KBo XXXVI 29 und verwandte Fragmente*. Heidelberg. TH, 23.
- Schwemer, D. (2001). *Die Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen: Materialien und Studien nach den schriftlichen Quellen*. Wiesbaden.
- Schwemer, D. (2007). «KUB 4.11 und die Komposition „Incantation to Utu“». *NABU*, 2007-2, pp. 2-3.
- Schwemer, D. (2011). «Magic Rituals: Conceptualization and Performance». In: Radner, K.; Robson, E. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*. Oxford, pp. 418-442.
- Schwemer, D. (2013). «Gauging the Influence of Babylonian Magic: The Reception of Mesopotamian Traditions in Hittite Ritual Practice». In: Cancik-Kirschbaum, E.; Klinger, J.; Müller, G.G.W. (eds.), *Diversity and Standardization. Perspectives on Social and Political Norms in the Ancient Near East*. Berlin, pp. 145-171.

- Schwemer, D. (2015). «Hittite Prayers to the Sun-god for Appeasing an Angry Personal God. A Critical Edition of CTH 372-74 (with a glossary by Ch. Steitler)». In: Jacques, M. (éd.), *'Mon dieu, qu'ai-je donc fait?' Les diġir-ša-dab₍₅₎-ba et la piété privée en Mésopotamie*. Fribourg; Göttingen. OBO, 273, pp. 349-393, 421-457.
- Seeher, J. (2006). «Ḫattuša - Tuḫalija-Stadt? Argumente für eine Revision der Chronologie der hethitischen Hauptstadt». In: van den Hout, T. (ed.), *The Life and Times of Ḫattušili III and Tuḫaliya IV. Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Honour of J. de Roos, 12-13 December 2003, Leiden*. Leiden. PIHANS, 103, pp. 131-146.
- Sefati, Y. (1998). *Love Songs in Sumerian Literature. Critical Edition of the Dumuzi-Inanna songs*. Ramat Gan.
- Seminara, S. (1998). *L'accadico di Emar*. Roma. MVS, 6.
- Seminara, S. (2000). «Le istruzioni di Šūpê-amēli. Vecchio e nuovo a confronto nella 'sapienza' siriana del Tardo Bronzo». *UF*, 32, pp. 487-529.
- Seminara, S. (2001). *La versione accadica del Lugal-e. La tecnica babilonese della traduzione dal sumerico e le sue 'regole'*. Roma. MVS, 8.
- Seux, M.J. (1976). *Hymnes et prières aux dieux de Babylonie et d'Assyrie*. Paris. LAPO, 8.
- Shehata, D. (2009). *Musiker und ihr vokales Repertoire. Untersuchungen zu Inhalt und Organisation von Musikerberufen und Liedgattungen in altbabylonischer Zeit*. Göttingen. GBAO, 3.
- Shibata, D. (2008). «A Nimrud Manuscript of the Fourth Tablet of the Series *mīs pī*, CTV IV 170 (+) 188, and a *Kiutu* Incantation to the Sun God». *Iraq*, 70, pp. 189-204.
- Singer, I. (1999). «A Political History of Ugarit». In: Watson, W.G.E.; Wyatt, N. (eds.), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Leiden; Boston; Köln. HdO, 39, pp. 603-733.
- Sjöberg, Å.W. (1960). *Der Mondgott Nanna-Suen in der sumerischen Überlieferung*. Stockholm.
- Sjöberg, Å.W. (1961a). «Ein Selbstpreis des Königs Ḫammurabi von Babylon». *ZA*, 45, pp. 51-70.
- Sjöberg, Å.W. (1961b). «Ein syllabisch geschriebener Urnammu-Text». *OrSu*, 10, pp. 3-12.
- Sjöberg, Å.W. (1962). «*giri_x* (=KA)-zal». *ZA*, 55, pp. 1-10.
- Sjöberg, Å.W. (1966). «Review of: Römer, W.H. Ph. (1965), *Sumerische 'Königshymnen' der Isin-Zeit*. Leiden». *Or*, 35, pp. 286-304.
- Sjöberg, Å.W. (1974-75). «Miscellaneous Sumerian Texts I». *OrSu*, 23-24, pp. 159-181.
- Sjöberg, Å.W. (1975a). «in-nin-ša-gur₄-ra A Hymn to the Goddess Inanna by the en - Priestess Enḫeduanna». *ZA*, 65, pp. 161-253.
- Sjöberg, Å.W. (1975b). «The Old Babylonian Edubba». In: Lieberman, S.J. (ed.), *Sumerological Studies in Honor of Thorkild Jacobsen on His Seventieth Birthday, June 7, 1974*. Chicago. AS, 20, pp. 159-179.
- Sjöberg, Å.W. (1976). «Hymns to Ninurta with Prayers for Šūsîn of Ur and Būrsîn of Isin». In: Eichler, B.L. (ed.), *Kramer Anniversary Volume. Cuneiform Studies in Honor of Samuel Noah Kramer*. Kevelaer; Neukirchen-Vluyn. AOAT, 25, pp. 411-426.
- Sjöberg, Å.W. (1982). «Miscellaneous Sumerian Texts III». *JCS*, 34, pp. 62-80.
- Sjöberg, Å.W. (1993). «CBS 11319+ An Old-Babylonian Schooltext from Nippur». *ZA*, 83, pp. 1-21.
- Sjöberg, Å.W. (2005). «A New Shulgi Hymn». In: Sefati, Y.; Artzi, P.; Cohen, C.; Eichler, B.L.; Hurowitz, V.A. (eds.), *'An Experienced Scribe Who Neglects Nothing'. Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein*. Bethesda, pp. 291-300.
- Sladek, W.R. (1974). *Inanna's Descent to the Netherworld* [Doctoral Dissertation]. John Hopkins University.
- Sommerfeld, W. (1985). «Der Kurigalzu-Text MAH 15922». *AfO*, 32, pp. 1-22.
- Starke, F. (1990). *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des Keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden. StBoT, 31.
- Steinkeller, P. (2003). «An Ur III Manuscript of the Sumerian King List». In: Sallaberger, W.; Volk, K.; Zgoll, A. (Hrsg.), *Literatur, Politik und Recht in Mesopotamien. Festschrift für Claus Wilcke*. Wiesbaden. *Orientalia Biblica et Christiana*, 14, pp. 267-292.
- Tallqvist, K. (1938). *Akkadische Götterepitheta*. Helsinki. StOr, 7.
- Thomsen, M.L. (1984). *The Sumerian Language. An Introduction to its History and Grammatical Structure*. Copenhagen. Mesopotamia, 10.
- Thomsen, M.L. (1987). *Zauberdiagnose und Schwarze Magie in Mesopotamien*. Copenhagen. CNI Publikations, 2.

- Tinney, S. (1996). *The Nippur lament. Royal Rhetoric and Divine Legitimation in the Reign of Išme-Dagan of Isin (1953-1935 B.C.)*. Philadelphia. Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund, 16.
- Tinney, S. (1998). «Texts, Tablet, and Teaching. Scribal Education in Nippur and Ur». *Expedition*, 40, pp. 40-50.
- Tinney, S. (1999). «On the Curricular Setting of Sumerian Literature». *Iraq*, 61, pp. 159-172.
- Tinney, S. (2011). «Tablets of Schools and Scholars: a Portrait of the Old Babylonian Corpus». In: Radner, K.; Robson, E. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*. Oxford, pp. 577-596.
- Torri, G. (2008). «The scribes of the House on the Slope». *SMEA*, 50, pp. 771-782.
- Torri, G. (2009a). «The Old Hittite Textual Tradition in the 'Haus am Hang'». In: Pecchioli Daddi, F.; Torri, G.; Corti, C. (eds.), *Central-North Anatolia in the Hittite Period. New Perspectives in Light of Recent Research. Acts of the International Conference Held at the University of Florence (7-9 February 2007)*. Roma. *Studia Asiana*, 5, pp. 207-222.
- Torri, G. (2009b). «Sargon, Anitta, and the Hittite Kings against Purušhanda». *AoF*, 36, pp. 110-118.
- Torri, G. (2010). «The Scribal School of the Lower City of Hattuša and the Beginning of the Career of Anuwanza, Court Dignitary and Lord of Nerik». In: Biga, M.G.; Liverani, M. (a cura di), *ana turri gimilli. Studi dedicati al Padre Werner R. Mayer, S.J. da amici e allievi*. Roma. *Quaderni di Vicino Oriente*, 5, pp. 383-396.
- Tsukimoto, A. (1999). «'By the Hand of Madi-Dagan, the Scribe and *Apkallu*-Priest' - A Medical Text from the Middle Euphrates Region-». In: Watanabe, K. (ed.), *Priests and Officials in the Ancient Near East. Papers of the Second Colloquium on the Ancient Near East - The City and its Life held at the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan (Mitaka, Tokyo), March 22-24, 1996*. Heidelberg, pp. 187-200.
- Vacín, L. (2014). «Were Sumerian Royal Hymns Copied from Monuments?». *NABU*, 2014-42, pp. 73-75.
- van de Mieroop, M. (2000). «Sargon of Agade and his Successors in Anatolia». *SMEA*, 42, pp. 133-159.
- van de Mieroop, M. (2011). «Hammurabi's self-presentation». *Or*, 80, pp. 305-338.
- van den Hout, T. (2002). «Another View of Hittite Literature». In: De Martino, S.; Pecchioli Daddi, F. (a cura di), *Anatolia Antica. Studi in Memoria di Fiorella Imparati*. Firenze. *Eothen*, 11, pp. 857-878.
- van den Hout, T. (2005). «On the Nature of the Tablet Collections of Hattuša». *SMEA*, 47, pp. 277-289.
- van den Hout, T. (2006). «Administration in the Reign of Tutḫaliya IV and the Later Years of the Hittite Empire». In: van den Hout, T. (ed.), *The Life and Times of Hattušili III and Tutḫaliya IV = Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Honour of J. de Roos, 12-13 December 2003, Leiden*. Leiden. *PIHANS*, 103, pp. 77-106.
- van den Hout, T. (2008). «A Classified Past: Classification of Knowledge in the Hittite Empire». In: Biggs, R.D.; Myers, J.; Roth, M.T. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 51st Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Held at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, July 18-22, 2005*. Chicago. *CRRAI*, 51 (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 62), pp. 211-219.
- van den Hout, T. (2009). «Reflections on the Origins and Development of the Hittite Tablet Collections in Hattuša and their Consequences for the Rise of Hittite Literacy». In: Pecchioli Daddi, F.; Torri, G.; Corti, C. (eds.), *Central-North Anatolia in the Hittite Period. New Perspectives in Light of Recent Research. Acts of the International Conference Held at the University of Florence (7-9 February 2007)*. Roma. *Studia Asiana*, 5, pp. 71-96.
- van den Hout, T. (2012a). «Administration and Writing in Hittite Society». In: Balza, M.E.; Giorgieri, M.; Mora, C. (a cura di), *Archivi, depositi, magazzini presso gli Ittiti. Nuovi materiali e nuove ricerche = Proceedings of the Workshop held at Pavia, June 18, 2009*. Pavia. *Studia Mediterranea*, 23, pp. 41-58.
- van den Hout, T. (2012b). «The Ductus of Alalah VII Texts and the Origin of Hittite Cuneiform». In: Devecchi, E. (ed.), *Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age. Papers Read at a Symposium in Leiden, 17-18 December 2009*. Leiden. *PIHANS*, 119, pp. 147-170.
- van der Toorn, K. (2000). «Cuneiform Documents from Syria-Palestine Texts, Scribe and Schools». *ZDPV*, 116, pp. 97-113.

- van Dijk, J.J.A. (1953). *La Sagesse Sumero-Accadienne. Recherches sur les genres littéraires des textes sapientiaux*. Leiden.
- van Dijk, J.J.A. (1966). «L'hymne à Marduk avec intercession pour le roi Abī'ešuh». *MIO*, 12, pp. 57-74.
- van Dijk, J.J.A. (1983). *LUGAL UD ME-LÁM-bi NIR-ĜÁL. Le récit épique ed didactique des Travaux de Ninurta, du Déluge e de la Nouvelle Création*. 2 vols. Leiden.
- van Dijk, J.J.A. (1989). «Ein spätaltbabylonischer Katalog einer Sammlung sumerischer Briefe». *Or*, 58, pp. 441-452.
- van Dijk, J.J.A. (1998). «Inanna raubt den „großen Himmel“. Ein Mythos». In: Maul, S.M. (Hrsg.), *Festschrift für Rykle Borger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 24. Mai 1994. tikip sanatakki mala bašmu...* Groningen. CM, 10, pp. 9-38.
- van Huyssteen, P.J.J. (1991). «Assyrianisms in the Emar Letters». *Journal for Semitics*, 3, pp. 109-121.
- van Soldt, W.H. (1991). *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit: Dating and Grammar*. Kevelaer; Neukirchen-Vluyn. AOAT, 40.
- van Soldt, W.H. (1995). «Babylonian Lexical, Religious and Literary Texts and Scribal Education at Ugarit and its Implications for Alphabetic Literary Texts». In: Dietrich, M.; Loretz, O. (Hrsg.), *Ugarit: Ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum im Alten Orient. Ergebnisse un Perspektiven der Forschung. Band I : Ugarit und seine Umwelt*. Münster. ALASP, 7, pp. 171-212.
- van Soldt, W.H. (1999). «The Syllabic Akkadian Texts». In: Watson, W.G.E.; Wyatt, N. (eds.), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Leiden; Boston; Köln. HdO, 39, pp. 28-45.
- van Soldt, W.H. (2000). «Private Archives at Ugarit». In: Bongenaar, A.C.V.M. (ed.), *Interdependency of Institutions and Private Entrepreneurs. Proceedings of the 2nd MOS Symposium, Leiden, December 11-12, 1998*. Leiden. PIHANS, 87 (MOS Studies 2), pp. 229-245.
- van Soldt, W.H. (2001). «Naḥiš-Šalmu, an Assyrian Scribe Working in the 'Southern Palace' at Ugarit». In: van Soldt, W.H. (ed.), *Veenhof Anniversary Volume. Studies Presented to Klaas R. Veenhof on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday*. Leiden, pp. 429-444.
- van Soldt, W.H. (2011). «The Role of Babylon in Western Peripheral Education». In: Cancik-Kirschbaum, E.; van Ess, M.; Marzahn, J. (Hrsg.), *Babylon. Wissenskultur in Orient und Okzident*. Berlin. Topoi. Berlin Studies of the Ancient World, 1, pp. 197-211.
- van Soldt, W.H. (2012). «The Palaeography of Two Ugarit Archives». In: Devecchi, E. (ed.), *Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age. Papers Read at a Symposium in Leiden, 17-18 December 2009*. Leiden, 119, pp. 171-183.
- van Soldt, W.H. (2013). «The Extent of Literacy in Syria and Palestine during the Second Millennium B.C.E.». In: Feliu, L.; Llop, J.; Millet Albà, A.; Sanmartín, J. (eds.), *Time and History in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 56th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Barcelona 26-30 July 2010*. Winona Lake. CRRAI, 56, pp. 19-31.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1979). «How did they learn Sumerian?». *JCS*, 31, pp. 118-126.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1980). «Some Notes on 'Enlil and Namzitarra'». *RA*, 74, pp. 67-71.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1995). «On the Old Babylonian Eduba Curriculum». In: Drijvers, J.W.; MacDonald, A.A. (eds.), *Centres of Learning. Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*. Leiden; New York; Köln. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 61, pp. 3-16.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1999). «'I can put anything in its right place'. Generic and Typological Studies as Strategies for the Analysis and Evaluation of Mankind's Oldest Literature». In: Roest, B.; Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (eds.), *Aspects of Genre and Type in Pre-Modern Literary Cultures*. Groningen. COMERS Communications, 1, pp. 79-99.
- Veldhuis, N. (1991). *A Cow of Šin*. Groningen. Library of Oriental Texts, 2.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1996). «The Cuneiform Tablet as an Educational Tool». *Dutch Studies*, 2, pp. 11-26.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1997). *Elementary Education at Nippur. The Lists of Trees and Wooden Objects* [Doctoral Dissertation]. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1999). «The Poetry of Magic». In: Abusch, T.; van der Toorn, K. (eds.), *Mesopotamian Magic. Textual, Historical, and Interpretative Perspectives*. Groningen. AMD, 1, pp. 35-48.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (2000a). «Kassite Exercises: Literary and Lexical Extracts». *JCS*, 52, pp. 67-94.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (2000b). «Sumerian Proverbs in their Curricular Context». *JAOS*, 120, pp. 383-399.

- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (2003). «Sumerian Literature». In: Dorleijn, G.; Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (eds.), *Cultural Repertoires. Structure, Function, and Dynamics*. Leuven; Paris; Dudley. Groningen Studies in Cultural Change, 3, pp. 29-43.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (2006). «How did they learn Cuneiform? Tribute/Word List C as an Elementary Exercise». In: Michalowski, P.; Veldhuis, N. (eds.), *Approaches to Sumerian Literature. Studies in Honour of Stip (H.L.J. Vanstiphout)*. Leiden; Boston, pp. 181-200.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (2008). «Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription». *JCS*, 60, pp. 25-51.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (2014). *History of the Cuneiform Lexical Tradition*. Münster. GMTR, 6.
- Viano, M. (2010). «Community and Individuals at Emar». *AoF*, pp. 132-152.
- Viano, M. (2012a). «A Middle Babylonian Fragment of Angim in the University of Pennsylvania Museum». *NABU*, 2012-31, pp. 42-44.
- Viano, M. (2012b). «A Sumerian Hymn from Boğazköy». *WO*, 42, pp. 231-237.
- Viano, M. (2015). «Writing Sumerian in the West». In: Archi, A. (ed.), *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 57th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Rome 4-8 July 2011*. Winona Lake. CRRAI, 57, pp. 381-392.
- Viano, M. (forthcoming). «Fonti dalla periferia». In: Verderame, L. (a cura di), *Catalogare, organizzare, spiegare: le liste lessicali nell'antica Mesopotamia e nelle aree vicine*. Roma.
- Volk, K. (1995). *Inanna und Šukaletuda. Zur historisch-politischen Deutung eines sumerischen Literaturwerkes*. Wiesbaden. SANTAG, 3.
- von Soden, W. (1979). «Assyriasmen im Akkadischen von Ugarit un das Problem der Verwaltungssprache im Mitannireich». *UF*, 11, pp. 745-751.
- von Weiher, E. (1970). «Ein Vokabularfragment aus Boğazköy». *ZA*, 62, pp. 109-114.
- Waal, W. (2012). «Chronological Developments in Hittite Scribal Habits and Tablets Shapes». In: Devecchi, E. (ed.), *Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age. Papers Read at a Symposium in Leiden, 17-18 December 2009*. Leiden. PIHANS, 119, pp. 217-227.
- Waetzoldt, H. (1989). «Der Scribe als Lehrer in Mesopotamien». In: von Hohenzollern, J.G.P.; Liedtke, M. (Hrsg.), *Schreiber, Magister, Lehrer*. Bad Heilbrunn, pp. 33-50.
- Wagensonner, K. (2008). «Nin-Isina(k)s Journey to Nippur. A Bilingual Divine Journey Revisited». *WZKM*, 98, pp. 274-294.
- Wagensonner, K. (2011a). «New Light on 'Šîn-iddinam and Iškur'». *KASKAL*, 8, pp. 11-41.
- Wagensonner, K. (2011b). «A Scribal Family and its Orthographic Peculiarities. On the Scientific Work of a Royal Scribe and his Sons». In: Selz, G.J.; Wagensonner, K. (eds.), *The Empirical Dimension of Ancient Near Eastern Studies. Die empirische Dimension altorientalischer Forschungen*. Wien. WOO, 6, pp. 645-701.
- Walker, C.B.F.; Dick, M. (2001). *The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia. The Mesopotamian Mīs Pī Ritual*. Helsinki. SAALT, 1.
- Wasserman, N. (1997). «Another Fragment of a Bilingual Hymn to Utu». *ASJ*, 19, pp. 261-266.
- Weeden, M. (2011a). «Adapting to new Contexts: Cuneiform in Anatolia». In: Radner, K.; Robson, E. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*. Oxford, pp. 597-617.
- Weeden, M. (2011b). *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship*. Wiesbaden. StBoT, 54.
- Weeden, M. (2012). «Assyro-Mitannian or Middle Assyrian?». In: Devecchi, E. (ed.), *Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age. Papers Read at a Symposium in Leiden, 17-18 December 2009*. Leiden. PIHANS, 119, pp. 229-251.
- Weidner, E. (1952-53). «Die Bibliothek Tiglatpilesers I.». *AfO*, 16, pp. 197-215.
- Westenholz, J.G. (1997). *Legends of the Kings of Akkade. The Texts*. Winona Lake. MC, 7.
- Westenholz, J.G. (2005). «Sing a Song for Šulgi». In: Sefati, Y.; Artzi, P.; Cohen, C.; Eichler, B.L.; Hurowitz, V.A. (eds.), *'An Experienced Scribe Who Neglects Nothing'. Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein*. Bethesda, pp. 343-373.
- Westenholz, J.G. (2011). «The Transmission and Reception of the Sargonic Sagas in the Hittite World». In: Hutter, M.; Hutter-Braunsar, S. (Hrsg.), *Hetitische Literatur. Überlieferungsprozesse, Textstrukturen, Ausdrucksformen und Nachwirken. Aktes des Symposiums von 18. bis 20. Februar 2010 in Bonn*. Münster. AOAT, 391, pp. 285-303.
- Wiggermann, F.A.M. (1988). «An Unrecognized Synonym of Sumerian sukkał». *ZA*, 78, pp. 225-240.

- Wiggermann, F.A.M. (2008). «A Babylonian Scholar in Assur». In: van der Spek, R.J. (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Near Eastern World View and Society Presented to Marten Stol on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday, 10 November 2005, and His Retirement from the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*. Bethesda, pp. 203-234.
- Wilcke, C. (1973). «Sumerische literarische Texte im Manchester und Liverpool». *AfO*, 24, pp. 1-18.
- Wilcke, C. (1976). «Formale Gesichtspunkte in der Sumerischen Literatur». In: Lieberman, S.J. (ed.), *Sumerological Studies in Honor of Thorkild Jacobsen on His Seventieth Birthday, June 7, 1974*. Chicago. AS, 20, pp. 205-316.
- Wilcke, C. (1988). «Die sumerische Königsliste end erzählte Vergangenheit». In: von Ungern-Sternberg, J.; Reinau, H. (Hrsg.), *Vergangenheit in mündlicher Überlieferung*. Stuttgart, pp. 113-140.
- Wilcke, C. (1989). «Die Emar-Version von „Dattelpalme und Tamariske“ – ein Rekonstruktionversuch». *ZA*, 79, pp. 161-190.
- Wilcke, C. (1992). «Aḫ, die ‘Brüder’ von Emar. Untersuchungen zur Schreibtradition am Euphratknie». *AuOr*, 10, pp. 115-150.
- Wilcke, C. (1998). «Zu „Gilgameš und Akka“. Überlegungen zur Zeit von Entstehung und Niederschrift, wie auch zum Text des Epos mit einem Exkurs zur Überlieferung von „Šulgi A“ und von „Lugalbanda II“». In: Dietrich, M.; Loretz, O. (Hrsg.), *dubsar anta-men Studien zur Altorientalistik. Festschrift für Willem H.Ph. Römer zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres mit Beiträgen von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen*. Münster. AOAT, 253, pp. 457-485.
- Wilcke, C. (2000). *Wer las und schrieb in Babylonien und Assyrien. Überlegungen zur Literalität im Alten Zweistormland*. München. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 6.
- Wilhelm, G. (1989). «Die zweite Tafel der Serie Kagal in Ḫattusa». *ZA*, 79, pp. 73-79.
- Wilhelm, G. (1992). «Zur babylonisch-assyrischen Schultradition in Ḫattuša». In: Alp, S. (ed.), *The First Hittitology Congress - Uluslararası 1. Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri (19-21 Temmuz 1990)*. Çorum, pp. 83-93.
- Winckler, H. (1907). «Vorläufiger Nachrichten über die Ausgrabungen in Boghaz-köi im Sommer 1907. 1. Die Tontafelfunde». *MDOG*, 35, pp. 1-59.
- Wyatt, N. (2007). «The Religious Role of the King in Ugarit». In: Younger Jr., K.L. (ed.), *Ugarit at Seventy-Five*. Winona Lake, pp. 41-74.
- Yon, M., ed. (1987). *Le Centre de La Ville. 38^e - 44^e Campagnes (1978-1984)*. Paris. RSO, 3.
- Zgoll, A. (1997). *Der Rechtsfall der En-ḫedu-Ana im Lied nin-me-šara*. Münster. AOAT, 246.
- Zólyomi, G. (1996). «Genitive Construction in Sumerian». *JCS*, 48, pp. 31-47.
- Zólyomi, G. (2000). «W 16743ac (= AUWE 23 101)». *NABU*, 2000-38, pp. 41-42.

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

Index of Cuneiform Sources

Notes to the Index

Cuneiform sources are listed in alphabetic order with both publication and museum number when available.

For a few relevant manuscripts from Hattuşa that are referred to with their CTH number, occurrences of CTH are given separately.

'Msk' numbers are only given for fragments without E numbers and 'tfn' corresponds to Table footnote.

Source	Page
2N-T 345 (A 29976)	68
2N-T 348 (IM 58953)	68
2N-T 357 (IM 57961)	68
2N-T 358	68
2N-T 363 (IM 58955)	68
2N-T 364 (IM 58956)	68
3N-T 168 (A 30175)	62
3N-T 195 = OIP 97 No. 42	36, 66
3N-T 230 + 3N-T 236	287 (1508)
3N-T 296 (IM 58430)	44
3N-T 326 (IM 58427) + 3N-T360 (A 30218)	311 (1686)
3N-T 387 (IM 58456)	55
3N-T 901	40 (tfn. 1)
12N 580	68
12N 587	68
12N 589	68
12N 597	68
12N 599	68
12N 653	69
12N 655	69
4R2 11	104, 105
4R2 18, 6 = Sm 1708	120
5R 33 = K 4149+	290 (1523)
5R 52, 2 = K 15190 + 1879-7-8, 23	104, 104 (656), 105, 106 (tfn. 24), 107
A 3518	52
A 17634	97, 97 (586), 98, 98 (599)
A 30202	37 (88)
ABoT 1 43 (CTH 806.4)	134, 251, 280, 340, 344, 355, 355 (1996), 358

Source	Page
AO 3925 (+ ?) Edin. 09-405, 27 = TCL 15 3 + BL VI	147, 188, 201, 203, 204, 215, 218
AO 6316 = TCL 15 38	147, 174, 182, 183, 185, 198, 200, 202, 203, 204, 206, 210, 215, 216, 219
AO 6330 = TCL 15 39	257, 260
AO 6718 = TCL 16 56	314
AO 7673 = TCL 16 73	44
AO 7738 + CBS 1521 = TCL 16 79 + PBS 12/1 25	36, 73
AO 7739 + AO 8149 = TCL 16 80 + TCL 16 83	35, 61
AO 8186 + ÉPHÉ 523 = TCL 16 85 + van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, Pl. 78	43 (134)
AO 24146	146, 174, 185, 189, 191, 192, 194, 195, 205, 206,
Ashm 1922-258 = OECT 4 25	314
Ashm 1930-362 = OECT 5 10	145, 175, 211, 215
Ass. 4532 = LKA 75	89, 116, 117, 118, 118 (761, 762), 125, 127
Ass. 4539	114 (733), 126 (845)
AT 453	23 (2), 75, 383 (2142)
AuOrS 23 13 = RS 16.416	139, 145, 163, 167, 170, 188, 215, 331, 336, 365, 366, 377
AuOrS 23 14 = RS 94.2178	334, 366 (2045)
AuOrS 23 15 = RS 94.2964	366 (2045)
AuOrS 23 16 = RS 25.422	329, 330 (1817)
AuOrS 23 20 = RS 25.436	373 (2093)
AuOrS 23 21 = RS 17.155	139, 143, 145, 159 (930), 163, 164, 165, 167, 170, 171, 172, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195, 197, 199, 200, 201, 207, 210, 211, 212, 213, 215, 216, 218, 219, 223, 224, 227 (1057), 236, 236 (1124), 320, 328, 328 (1805), 329 (1811), 331, 334, 334 (1840, 1843, 1845, 1846, 1847), 335, 335 (1850, 1851) 366, 366 (2045), 367, 367 (2048), 377, 378, 379, 384
AuOrS 23 25 = RS 25.129 + RS 25.456B	139, 142, 143, 144, 159, 167, 172, 173, 176 (960), 190, 200, 210, 211, 215, 216, 217, 223, 225, 227, 325, 327, 328, 329, 352 (1966), 365, 366, 367, 367 (2047), 375, 377
AuOrS 23 27 = RS 25.418	139, 144, 159, 178, 181, 189, 199, 325, 329, 330, 352 (1966), 366, 367 (2047), 377
AuOrS 23 28 = RS 26.141	139, 325, 327, 368, 377
AuOrS 23 36 = RS 25.435	373 (2096)
AuOrS 23 37 = RS 25.431A	290, 291
AuOrS 23 46 = RS 15.10	361 (2020)
AuOrS 23 47 = RS 22.341 + RS 28.053A	139, 311, 331, 367, 377
AuOrS 23 50 = RS 25.421 + (RS 25.527 A+B) (CTH 315); see also under CTH 315	132 (882), 133, 139, 152, 153, 154, 166, 169, 170, 171, 174, 176, 177, 181, 184, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 194, 197, 198, 201, 202, 203, 205, 206, 208, 209, 211, 212, 213, 216, 217, 218, 222, 251, 256, 257, 257 (1268), 331, 344, 367, 377
AuOrS 23 58 = RS 25.517	139, 325, 330, 377
AuOrS 23 59 = RS 26.143	139, 144, 159, 182, 325, 330, 377
AuOrS 23 61 = RS 28.053	139, 325, 330, 377
AuOrS 23 67 = RS 25.462	139, 331, 336, 377
AuOrS 23 68 = RS 94.2372	139, 331, 336, 377

Source	Page
AUWE 23 101 = W 16743ac	42, 42 (117)
AUWE 23 112 = W 17259an	268 (1339), 315 (1724)
BAM II 194 = VAT 9587	320
BAM IV 398 = Ni 178	320 (1761)
BAM V 508	244 (tfn. 3; 1163)
Belleten 40, 417-418 = Ni 2759	257
BL 194	104
BM 17117 = CT 42 41	257, 337 (1870)
BM 32330	268
BM 35362	105
BM 38283	64
BM 38593	104
BM 38600 (80-111-12, 484)	37 (88)
BM 40846	104
BM 50522 + BM 52767 + BM 52946 + BM 77468 + ?	58 (287)
BM 53309	313 (1710)
BM 53555	313 (1710)
BM 54316 = CT 58 53	54 (250)
BM 54692	36, 76, 76 (436), 84
BM 63606 + BM 66888 = CT 58 80	73, 73 (401)
BM 78164 = CT 58 70	36, 69, 70, 70 (373), 82, 83, 85, 86 (493)
BM 78173 = CT 44 15	147 (tfn. 2)
BM 78185	278, 318
BM 78198 = CT 44 14	34 (79), 146, 179, 219
BM 78375 = CT 44 29	234 (1108), 245
BM 78614	73
BM 79037	69 (366)
BM 79949	147, 175, 195, 208, 219
BM 79989	347 (1928)
BM 80091	288 (1511), 299, 303 (1645), 363 (2041)
BM 80184	303 (1645), 309, 363 (2041), 299
BM 81700 = CT 58 61	36, 67
BM 83021	36, 69
BM 92671	71
BM 98496	89, 112, 113, 124, 293
BM 121076	104
BM 121117	89, 121, 122, 124, 126 (846), 128
BM 122625 + BM 122651 + BM 123380	88, 90, 91, 91 (524, 525), 92, 92 (528), 128
BM 122652 + BM 98745	88, 95, 95 (563), 96, 128
BM 123365	89
BM 123372	88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 93 (536)
BM 128027 = CT 51 182	238

Source	Page
BM 130460	268
BM 130660	89, 114, 114 (735), 115 (738), 116
BM 134793	89
BMS 20 (+) BMS 49	273
Bu 88-5-12, 6 = CT 4 3	238, 239, 240
CBS 35 = PBS 10/2 3	34 (79), 146, 183 (973), 185, 186, (982), 191
CBS 112 = PBS 10/2 13	109, 146, 182, 185, 191, 195, 198, 201, 206, 210, 211, 215
CBS 332 = PBS 1/2 122	230
CBS 438	332
CBS 563	73, 74, 234, 274
CBS 587 + CBS 353	36, 73
CBS 589	73
CBS 591	71, 72, 245, 245 (1166)
CBS 1208	288 (1511), 299, 303 (1645), 363 (2041)
CBS 1422	34 (80)
CBS 1529	75, 116, 117, 118, 118 (761, 765), 245
CBS 1531	42
CBS 1532	71, 72, 246
CBS 1554 = JNES 23, 6	257, 337 (1870)
CBS 1601	61
CBS 1642	268
CBS 1686 + CBS 1533	36, 73, 274
CBS 2218+	104
CBS 2357 = HAV 20	55
CBS 3558 + Ni 9696 (+) Ni 4557	35, 49, 85
CBS 3829 = STVC 13	314
CBS 3832	34, 42, 85
CBS 4078	314, 362 (2031)
CBS 4598 = PBS 12/1 17	370, 371
CBS 4605 = PBS 12/1 31	311 (1686), 363
CBS 4615 = PBS 12/1 44	36, 66
CBS 6898 = STVC 134	282
CBS 7055 = STVC 57	253 (1224), 256
CBS 7072 + N 3147	314
CBS 7133	69
CBS 7884	69
CBS 7917 + N 4784	311 (1686)
CBS 8039	35, 63, 84 (tfn. 2)
CBS 8534	282
CBS 8547	36, 69
CBS 9205	37 (88), 40 (tfn. 1)
CBS 9899	35, 79 (451)

Source	Page
CBS 10295	34 (80)
CBS 10306	46 (162)
CBS 10457	53, 85 (490), 234 (1105)
CBS 10900	34, 46, 85
CBS 10903	35, 53, 54, 85
CBS 10972+	64 (341)
CBS 11319+	65 (352), 227
CBS 11341 = PBS 1/1 11	34, 47, 47 (170), 81, 83, 85, 86 (494)
CBS 11359 = PBS 1/1 8	108 (676)
CBS 11553	34 (80)
CBS 11933	230
CBS 11945	60, 61
CBS 13509	34, 45, 85, 234 (1103)
CBS 13777	299, 299 (1603), 325, 326, 327, 363, 369
CBS 13853 + CBS 8315 + CBS 8176	37 (88)
CBS 13860	35, 54, 55, 85
CBS 13892	55 (257)
CBS 13990	36, 66, 85
CBS 14054 = STVC 79	50, 50 (214)
CBS 14062 = STVC 75	50, 50 (213, 217, 218)
CBS 15132	99, 100
CBS 15203	35, 54, 56, 85
CBS 19795	55 (257)
CBS 19831	36, 66
CNMA 10051 = JCS 8, 82-83	106 (tfn. 12), 146, 185, 189, 191, 195, 198, 200, 203, 210, 213, 215
CT 4 3 = Bu 88-5-12, 6	238, 239, 240
CT 15 10	108 (678)
CT 16 Pl. 5	317, 317 (1743)
CT 16 Pl. 6-7	317
CT 16 Pl. 15	244 (tfn. 3; 1163)
CT 17 14	236 (1126), 237 (1129)
CT 17 20	237 (1129)
CT 17 23	236, 335 (1853)
CT 18 2 = K 4375	261
CT 24 20-46 = K 4349	97 (589), 126 (845)
CT 42 1	101, 105, 107
CT 42 41 = BM 17117	257, 337 (1870)
CT 44 14 = BM 78198	34 (79), 146, 179, 219
CT 44 15 = BM 78173	147 (tfn. 2)
CT 44 29 = BM 78375	234 (1108), 245
CT 46 1	234 (1108)
CT 46 3	234 (1108)

Source	Page
CT 51 168	55, 295 (1567)
CT 51 182 = BM 128027	238
CT 58 46	271, 272
CT 58 53 = BM 54316	54 (250)
CT 58 61 = BM 81700	36, 67
CT 58 70 = BM 78164	36, 69, 70, 70 (373), 82, 83, 85, 86 (493)
CT 58 80 = BM 63606 + BM 66888	73, 73 (401)
CTH 314; see also under CTH 314 sources (p. 133)	133, 144, 152, 166, 169, 171, 177, 181, 187, 188, 189, 193, 197, 199, 200, 201, 212, 213, 214, 217, 221, 222, 228, 250, 251, 252, 253, 253 (1229), 254, 265, 350, 355, 358
CTH 315; see also under CTH 315 sources (p. 133)	133, 144, 152, 153, 154, 166, 169, 170, 171, 174, 176, 177, 181, 184, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 194, 197, 198, 199, 201, 202, 205, 206, 208, 209, 211, 212, 213, 216, 217, 218, 222, 228, 250, 251, 256, 265, 271, 355, 358
CTH 533	353
CTH 794; see also under KBo 7 1+	31, 75, 134, 144, 151, 180, 181, 199, 204, 214, 237, 247, 248, 249, 249 (1199), 240, 341, 342, 343, 344, 350, 357, 384
CTH 800; see also under CTH 800 sources (pp. 133-134)	30, 132, 133, 134, 142, 142 (928), 143, 172, 196, 196 (991), 224, 225, 226, 227, 229, 232, 233, 234, 234 (1105), 235, 235, 236, 236 (1121), 340, 341, 343, 345, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 356, 357, 382, 385
CTH 803	353
CTH 805.1; see also under KBo 36 11+	134, 237, 238, 349, 357
CTH 805.2; see also under KUB 37 101 and KUB 37 102	134, 237, 244, 350, 357
CTH 805.3; see also under KUB 37 107	134, 237, 244, 246, 349, 357
CTMMA 2 3	104, 105
CTN 4 101 = ND 4405/47	120
E 26	372
E 545	370 (2070)
E 556D = Msk 74149	226
E 651	353 (1972)
E 729	136, 145, 158, 166, 170, 171, 173, 178, 187, 188, 200, 202, 206, 208, 210, 211, 212, 214, 215, 216, 217, 316, 317, 317 (1743), 318, 320, 365, 366, 384
E 730	136, 319, 320, 321, 365, 366, 367, 384
E 731	136, 321, 365
E 732	136, 236 (1124), 237, 321, 365, 366, 384
E 733	136, 145, 158, 166, 321, 365
E 734	136, 143, 158, 166, 178, 179, 181, 184, 190, 193, 195, 196, 214, 216, 223, 227 (1057), 323, 365
E 735	320 (1761), 328 (1808)
E 736	320 (1761), 328 (1808)
E 737	371
E 738	371
E 740	136, 145, 158, 223, 321, 365
E 743	136, 145, 158, 188, 322, 365

Source	Page
E 744 = Msk 7499b and Msk 74107t	136, 322, 365
E 745	136, 322, 365
E 746 = Msk 74107m and Msk 74107n	136, 322, 365
E 747	136, 313 (1709), 323, 365
E 748	136, 323, 365
E 749	136, 323, 365
E 751	136, 145, 158, 187, 322, 322 (1773), 323, 365
E 752	136, 322, 322 (1773), 365
E 753	136, 323, 365
E 756	136, 322, 365
E 757	137, 323, 365, 368
E 758	366 (2046)
E 759	137, 323, 365
E 761	137, 323, 365
E 762	137, 323, 365
E 763	137, 323, 365, 368
E 764	137, 323, 365, 368
E 767	136, 144, 155, 156, 166, 170, 171, 172, 173, 178, 179, 181, 184, 187, 189, 190, 191, 193, 197, 199, 200, 205, 206, 211, 212, 214, 216, 217, 218, 222, 223, 228, 298, 305 (1657), 309, 367
E 767B = Msk 74159j	136, 298, 305 (1656), 307 (tfn. 2), 376 (2118)
E 768A + E 538 S	136, 144, 156, 157, 166, 170, 181, 187, 189, 190, 191, 206, 214, 217, 228, 313, 314, 367
E 768B	136, 313, 368
E 769	136, 157, 166, 313, 368
E 770	136, 144, 157, 181, 184, 191, 214, 228, 313, 368
E 771+	136, 145, 157, 166, 174, 184, 187, 223, 311, 312, 313, 313 (1705, 1707), 364, 367
E 773; see E 771+	157, 223
E 775	136, 145, 157, 166, 170, 171, 173 (951), 178, 179, 181, 184, 187, 215, 216, 217, 222, 285, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 297 (1576, 1579), 312 (1693), 368
E 776	137, 144, 157, 178, 181, 190, 194, 228, 316
E 777	137, 323, 365
E 790	137, 318, 319, 365, 366, 384
H 74	145, 192, 195, 201
H 77	146, 179, 183, 185, 198, 218, 219
H 83	146, 185, 203
H 97	145, 173, 179, 182, 183, 183 (971), 185, 186 (982), 188, 189, 191, 192, 193, 195, 196, 202, 207, 210, 211, 213, 215, 216, 218, 232, 233, 253 (1231)
H 103	146, 183, 191, 192, 195, 196, 202, 203, 215,
H 110	145, 210, 212, 219
H 139	145, 219
H 178	145, 179, 188, 189, 212, 213

Source	Page
H 179 + H 188 (+) H 186 (+) H 187 (+ fragments without number)	145, 188, 206, 213
HAV 20 = CBS 2357	55
HS 1477 + HS 1478 = TMH NF 3 53 + TMH NF 4 53	80, 80 (459), 123
HS 1492 + HS 1493 + HS 1557 + HS 2532 + HS 7432 + HS 2986	49 (tfn. 2)
HS 1512	36, 47, 75, 84, 85, 86 (494), 249, 274
HT 13	133, 142 (929), 143, 154, 155 (tfn. 1), 169, 177, 227 (1057), 251, 273, 273 (1386, 1387), 355, 358
IB 591	97
IBoT 1 34	353, 353 (1973)
IM 13365 = TIM 9 29	36, 68, 85
IM 50009 (+) IM 50140a-b (+) IM 50010 (+) IM 50011	36, 77
IM 51176 = TIM 9 24	55, 146, 192, 201, 218
IM 51529 = TIM 9 23	146, 218
IM 51530 = TIM 9 26	147 (tfn. 4)
IM 51543 = TIM 9 21	146, 210
IM 51545 = TIM 9 20	146, 188
IM 51650 = TIM 9 52	147 (tfn. 4)
IM 53977 = TIM 9 35	146, 178, 185, 191, 194, 195, 201, 207, 210, 215, 218
IM 55403 = TIM 9 1	58, 59, 146, 174, 175, 182, 185, 188, 191, 195, 198, 200, 203, 210, 211, 212, 213, 215, 216, 219
ISET I p. 85 = Ni 4101	46 (162)
ISET I p. 130 = Ni 4112	46 (162)
ISET I p. 136 = Ni 4193	60
ISET I p. 185 = Ni 9798	108 (676)
ISET I p. 208 = Ni 13227	34, 46, 85
ISET II Pl. 1 = Ni 4535	46 (162)
ISET II Pl. 26 = Ni 9734 + UM 29-15-399; see under UM 29-15-399	35, 50, 50 (211, 212, 215, 217), 51, 85
ISET II Pl. 121 = Ni 3206	62, 62 (329)
J. Rylands Library Box 24 P 28	230
JCS 31, 143 = University of Iowa No. 18	62, 62 (325)
JCS 8, 82-83 = CNMA 10051	106 (tfn. 12), 146, 185, 189, 191, 195, 198, 200, 203, 210, 213, 215
JNES 23, 6 = CBS 1554	257, 337 (1870)
JON 38	121 (801)
K 38	43 (140)
K 2402+	328 (1805)
K 2657	109 (685)
K 3341+	105
K 3462	246 (1174)
K 3517+	105
K 4149+ = 5R 33	290 (1523)
K 4175 + Sm 57 + 1880-7-19, 184 (+) 1882-3-23, 146	97, 97 (586), 98,
K 4349 = CT 24 20-46	97 (589), 126 (845)

Source	Page
K 4375 = CT 18 2	261
K 4615+	315 (1723)
K 4809 + K 4952	271
K 4899+	105
K 5111 + Sm 28+38+1298+1580	238, 239
K 6917 + K 13679	299, 325
K 8937	315 (1723)
K 8959	90 (tfn. 3)
K 9041	76
K 15190 + 1879-7-8, 23 = 5R 52, 2	104, 104 (656), 105, 106 (tfn. 24), 107
K 18450	56
K 19848	90
KAR 4 = VAT 9307	89, 97, 98, 103 (651), 122 (802), 124, 125 (834), 128
KAR 9 + KAR 348 = VAT 9440 + VAT 10607 + VAT 11573	89, 107, 107 (668), 108, 108 (676, 681), 109, 124, 125, 128, 128 (859)
KAR 12+ = VAT 9441 (+) VAT 10648 + VAT 11216	88, 95, 95 (567), 96
KAR 13 = VAT 9306	88, 90, 91, 91 (524), 92, 128
KAR 14 = VAT 9710	88, 90, 91, 91 (524), 92, 92 (528), 93, 127, 128
KAR 15 = VAT 9308	82 (477), 89, 99, 100, 125 (834), 128
KAR 16 = VAT 9304	82 (477), 89, 99, 100, 125 (834), 128
KAR 17 = VAT 10565	88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 93 (535)
KAR 18 = VAT 8884	88, 95, 96, 96 (576), 128, 128 (859)
KAR 19	349, 349 (1945)
KAR 24 = VAT 9833	89, 114, 114 (735), 115, 116 (743), 128
KAR 27 = VAT 10151	58 (288), 94 (551), 122
KAR 44	120 (790)
KAR 91 = VAT 10035	87, 89, 119 (767), 120, 124, 125, 125 (834), 127, 128, 128 (859)
KAR 97 = VAT 10176	82, 84, 84 (487), 89, 100, 101, 101 (632), 103, 122, 124, 125, 127
KAR 103 = VAT 10251	89, 103, 124, 125
KAR 113 = VAT 10066	89, 121, 124
KAR 119 = VAT 10610	82, 84, 89, 102, 102 (642), 122, 125, 127, 129 (865)
KAR 128 (+) KAR 129 = VAT 9942 + VAT 10103	89, 103 (651), 109, 109 (687), 110, 110 (689, 690, 694, 698), 111, 111 (710), 112, 112 (710, 711, 716), 124, 127 (852), 129 (865), 290, 291
KAR 158	122, 123, 123 (818, 819), 127
KAR 181	328 (1805)
KAR 333 = VAT 9508	89, 121
KAR 363 = VAT 10628	88, 90, 91, 93
KAR 370a-c + KAR 251 = VAT 10643a-c + VAT 10959	88, 90, 91, 92, 92 (tfn. 1), 93
KAR 375 = VAT 8243	89, 104, 104 (656), 106, 106 (tfn. 5, 7, 9, 17, 23, 24, 31; 659), 107, 107 (660) 125, 127
KAV 218 = VAT 9416	122 (807)

Source	Page
KBo 1 12	349, 349 (1944)
KBo 1 18 (CTH 806.1)	134, 251, 267 (1332), 279, 279 (1442, 1443, 1444), 340, 343, 345, 355, 358,
KBo 1 41	226
KBo 3 13 (CTH 311)	347 (1927)
KBo 7 1 + KUB 37 115 (+) KBo 7 2 (CTH 794); see also under CTH 794	134, 237, 247, 247 (1185, 1186), 350, 357
KBo 12 72 (CTH 314); see also under CTH 314	133, 250, 251, 251 (1214), 252, 254, 255, 255 (1254)
KBo 13 37 (CTH 813)	132, 134, 229, 235, 236, 280 (1451), 340, 344, 350, 354, 358
KBo 14 51 (CTH 813)	134, 229, 236, 237, 275, 335, 340, 341, 342, 343, 348, 350, 357, 382, 384
KBo 19 98 (CTH 819)	134, 251, 267 (1332), 280, 281, 283 (1466)
KBo 26 5B	370, 371, 385
KBo 26 20	359 (2016)
KBo 26 65	353 (1973)
KBo 26 66	353 (1973)
KBo 36 11 (KUB 37 100a + 103 + 106 L. Col. + 144) + KUB 37 100a Rev. + KUB 37 106 R. Col. + ABoT 2 255 (CTH 805.1); see also under CTH 805.1	70 (372), 134, 144, 151, 152, 165, 173, 177, 179, 180, 184, 187, 188, 192, 193, 199, 204, 206, 207, 209, 214, 218, 221, 237, 238, 239, 240, 240 (1147), 241, 243, 245 (1169), 250 (1208), 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 346 (1918), 347, 349, 352 (1968), 357, 384
KBo 36 13 (CTH 800); see also under CTH 800	133, 143, 147, 148, 165, 168, 169, 177, 180, 186, 197, 207, 208, 209, 213, 214, 218, 229, 230 (1066), 233, 236 (1119), 339, 350, 357
KBo 36 14 (CTH 819)	134, 281, 283, 340, 350, 358
KBo 36 15 (CTH 800); see also under CTH 800	133, 142 (924), 143, 148, 165, 168, 169, 180, 186, 189, 199, 229, 231 (1077), 233, 234 (1097), 339, 343, 350, 357
KBo 36 16 (CTH 800); see also under CTH 800	133, 143, 148, 191, 200, 229, 233, 339, 350, 357
KBo 36 17 (CTH 801)	134, 251, 280, 340, 344, 350, 358
KBo 36 18 (CTH 819)	135, 281, 283, 340, 345, 350, 358
KBo 36 19 (CTH 812)	134, 142 (928), 143, 148, 168, 169, 229, 234, 234 (1102, 1104), 235, 339, 343, 350, 357
KBo 36 20 (CTH 806)	134, 251, 280, 340, 350, 358
KBo 36 21 (CTH 801)	134, 229, 235, 339, 350, 357
KBo 36 24 (CTH 819)	134, 251, 281, 344, 351, 358
KBo 36 28	353
KBo 40 103 (CTH 800); see also under CTH 800	134, 143, 148, 168, 172, 198, 214, 229, 233, 234 (1097), 339, 343, 349, 357
KM 89404	35, 54, 55, 85
Kroch-05	62 (325)
KUB 29 11+	353 (1972)
KUB 3 21	252 (1219)
KUB 3 80	353 (1973, 1980)
KUB 4 2 (CTH 315); see also under CTH 315	133, 152, 166, 181, 199, 205, 222, 250, 256, 257, 263 (1310), 344, 355, 358
KUB 4 4 (CTH 314); see also under CTH 314	133, 250, 251, 252, 254 (1234), 255, 255 (1253, 1254), 256, 338, 344, 348, 355, 355 (1999), 358, 382

Source	Page
KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73 (CTH 314); see also under CTH 314	133, 152, 166, 169, 171, 177, 181, 187, 188, 189, 193, 197, 199, 200, 201, 212, 214, 217, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 255 (1248), 256, 344, 350 (KBo 12 73), 355, 358
KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8 (CTH 314); see also under CTH 314	133, 152, 166, 169, 187, 189, 193, 213, 221, 222, 250, 251, 251 (1214), 252, 253, 254, 255 (1254; KUB 4 8), 344, 355, 358
KUB 4 7 (CTH 801.3)	133, 145, 154, 166, 172, 177, 179, 187, 211, 251, 271, 271 (1372), 272, 278, 338, 344, 355, 358
KUB 4 10 (CTH 819)	134, 251, 281, 344, 355, 358
KUB 4 11 (CTH 793)	31, 74, 134, 251, 274, 278, 340, 341, 342, 344, 346, 355, 356, 356 (2005), 358, 381
KUB 4 13	119, 120, 373 (2093)
KUB 4 16 (CTH 812)	134, 237, 246, 247, 247 (1183), 340, 341, 342, 344, 353, 353 (1980), 355, 356, 357, 384
KUB 4 23 (CTH 819)	134, 251, 279, 340, 344, 348, 355, 358, 382
KUB 4 24 (CTH 806.2)	134, 145, 154, 170, 173, 192, 213, 251, 275, 320, 340, 341, 342, 342 (1899), 343, 355, 357, 358, 384
KUB 4 26	133, 142 (929), 143, 154, 155 (tfn. 1), 175, 177, 187, 189, 200, 202, 209, 214, 217, 218, 227 (1057), 251, 273, 273 (1387, 1388), 338, 338 (1879), 345, 355, 358
KUB 4 26 (+) HT 13 (+) KUB 37 112 (CTH 801)	see single fragments
KUB 4 27	353 (1980)
KUB 4 36	234 (1103)
KUB 4 39 (CTH 807)	133, 145, 154, 195, 228, 251, 268, 270 (1355), 344, 345, 347, 355, 358
KUB 4 41 (CTH 819)	133, 251, 267 (1332), 272, 273, 338, 344, 345, 355, 358
KUB 4 52	353 (1980)
KUB 4 54	353 (1980)
KUB 4 97 (CTH 315); see also under CTH 315	133, 251, 256, 257, 344, 355, 358
KUB 4 98	353 (1980)
KUB 30 1 (CTH 800.1); see also under CTH 800	121 (795), 133, 142 (924), 143, 148, 149, 150, 165, 168, 169, 171, 172, 177, 180, 183, 186, 189, 191, 194, 197, 197 (992), 198, 199, 202, 204, 207, 208, 209, 212, 213 (1017), 214, 217, 218, 219 (1026), 221, 229, 230, 230 (1076), 231, 231 (1078), 232, 232 (1087), 233, 234, 234 (1097, 1102, 1104), 236 (1119), 328 (1805), 339, 340 (tfn. 1), 341, 341 (1895), 342, 343, 346 (1916, 1918), 349, 357, 357 (2012)
KUB 30 2 (CTH 800.2); see also under CTH 800	133, 143, 150, 165, 168, 171, 172, 177, 180, 193, 198, 199, 202, 217, 221, 229, 233, 234, 339, 349, 357
KUB 30 3 (CTH 800.4); see also under CTH 800	133, 143, 150, 168, 169, 174, 180, 186, 207, 214, 229, 233, 234 (1096), 339, 343, 349, 357
KUB 30 4 (CTH 800.3); see also under CTH 800	133, 143, 150, 165, 168, 169, 172, 198, 199, 209, 214, 229, 233, 234 (1096), 236 (1119), 339, 343, 349, 357
KUB 34 3 (CTH 813)	134, 237, 249, 250 (1207), 340, 344, 349, 357
KUB 34 4 (CTH 813)	134, 145, 154, 166, 251, 280, 340, 344, 350, 351, 351 (1954), 358
KUB 37 32	353 (1980)
KUB 37 33	353 (1980)
KUB 37 41 (CTH 795)	133, 142 (927), 281, 283, 338, 344, 345, 346, 346 (1919), 350, 351, 356, 356 (2008), 357, 358, 385
KUB 37 81	353 (1980)

Source	Page
KUB 37 85	246 (1177)
KUB 37 92 (CTH 813)	134, 281, 283, 340, 343, 343 (1904), 350, 358
KUB 37 95 (CTH 806.3)	134, 237, 250, 340, 344, 349, 357
KUB 37 101 (CTH 805.2); see also under CTH 805.2	134, 237, 245, 245 (1169), 340, 344, 344 (1906), 350, 351, 357
KUB 37 102 (CTH 805.2); see also under CTH 805.2	134, 144, 152, 194, 221, 237, 245, 340, 341, 342, 344, 344 (1906), 350, 357, 384
KUB 37 107 (CTH 805.3); see also under CTH 805.3	134, 237, 246, 340, 344, 349, 357
KUB 37 108 + KUB 37 110 (CTH 800.4); see also under CTH 800	134, 143, 151, 168, 169, 179, 229, 233, 234 (1102), 339, 343, 349, 357
KUB 37 109 (CTH 800.4); see also under CTH 800	133, 142 (924), 143, 151, 168, 169, 172, 180, 194, 201, 202, 229, 230 (1066), 339, 341, 349, 357
KUB 37 111 (CTH 801.4)	134, 145, 154, 155, 181, 184, 186, 187, 190, 195, 203 (1003), 205, 206, 209, 211, 212, 217, 222, 246 (1177, 1181), 251, 275, 276, 278, 340, 341, 342, 344, 350, 351, 351 (1954), 356, 356 (2004), 358
KUB 37 112	133, 142 (929), 143, 155, 155 (tfn 1), 166, 178, 251, 273, 273 (1386, 1388), 355, 358
KUB 37 123-125	234 (1103)
KUB 37 124	271 (1370)
KUB 37 127 (CTH 819)	134, 237, 250, 340, 344, 349, 357
KUB 37 137	353 (1980)
KUB 37 138	259 (1280)
KUB 37 143 (CTH 805.2); see also under CTH 805.2	134, 237, 244, 245, 340, 341, 342 (1897), 344, 344 (1906), 346 (1921), 350, 351, 357, 384
KUB 37 210	354 (1983)
KUB 57 126 (CTH 807)	133, 144, 154, 169, 172, 177, 179, 181, 184, 187, 189, 190, 201, 205, 208, 214, 218, 222, 228, 251, 265, 266, 267, 344, 355, 358
LB 2111 = TLB 2 3	52
LB 2112 = TLB 2 5	257, 337 (1870)
LB 2125 = TLB 2 7	265, 267
LB 806 = Peiser Urkunden 92	35, 56, 57, 85
LKA 53	273
LKA 65 = VAT 10365 + VAT 11777	268
LKA 75 = Ass. 4532	89, 116, 117, 118, 118 (761, 762), 125, 127
MAH 10828	35, 49, 50
MARV 5 2 = VAT 15492	126, 126 (841)
MDP 27 107	257, 337 (1872)
MLC 1301 = YOS 11 74	89, 121, 125, 328 (1805)
MM 487b	35, 59, 60, 60 (304), 85
MMUM 35516 + Völkerkundemuseum Vienna No. 25363	146, 173, 189
MS 2065	36, 65, 83, 85, 227
MS 2291	35, 57, 58
MS 3310	36, 65, 83
MS 3323	36, 65, 83, 85
MS 3362	36, 68
MS 3366	58

Source	Page
MS 3405	36, 68
Msk 7499b = E 744	136, 322, 365
Msk 74107m = E 746	136, 322, 365
Msk 74107n = E 746	136, 322, 365
Msk 74107q	136, 321
Msk 74107t = E 744	136, 322, 365
Msk 74122ar	137, 323, 365
Msk 74148f	136, 323, 365
Msk 74159j = E 767B	136, 298, 305 (1656), 307 (tfn. 2), 376 (2118)
Msk 74163b	370 (2071)
Msk 731030	370, 370 (2071)
Msk 731048	370, 370 (2071), 371
N 1237	62
N 1316	287 (1504)
N 1747	34, 37, 40, 41
N 1774	40 (tfn.1)
N 2203	34, 41
N 2431	34, 41, 47, 271 (1371)
N 2541	46 (162)
N 2571	51 (221)
N 3097	311 (1686), 363 (2038)
N 3169	56, 85
N 3395	35, 63, 83, 84 (487), 85
N 3455	34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 (100), 292 (1547)
N 3462	102
N 3495	35, 50, 51, 85 (tfn. 1)
N 3498	35, 51, 85
N 3507	50 (219)
N 3520	51 (221, 223)
N 3529	35, 56, 85
N 3719	34, 43
N 3783 + N 5031	34, 43, 63, 66
N 4529	36, 66
N 5149	311 (1686)
N 5447	35, 64, 64 (341)
N 5909	311 (1686)
N 6044	370
N 6126	34, 37, 39, 41 (100)
N 6286 (+) CBS 11153	34, 43, 44, 85, 234 (1103, 1106; N 6286)
N 7918	62
National Museum Copenhagen 10068	62 (328)
NBC 11433	105

Source	Page
NBC 5452	287
ND 4405/47 = CTN 4 101	120
Ni 178 = BAM IV 398	320 (1761)
Ni 623 + Ni 2320	317
Ni 631	71, 244, 245, 245 (1166)
Ni 679	35, 64
Ni 2192	363 (2192)
Ni 2477 = SLTN 79	46, 46 (162)
Ni 2676 + Ni 2997 + Ni 4017 + Ni 4018	36, 71, 72, 85, 245, 321
Ni 2707	37 (88)
Ni 2759 = Belleten 40, 417-418	320
Ni 3206 = ISET II Pl. 121	62, 62 (329)
Ni 4035 = SLTN 137	58 (294), 59
Ni 4101 = ISET I p. 85	46 (162)
Ni 4112 = ISET I p. 130	46 (162)
Ni 4193 = ISET I p. 136	60
Ni 4535 = ISET II Pl. 1	46 (162)
Ni 9798 = ISET I p. 185	108 (676)
Ni 13227 = ISET I p. 208	34, 46, 85
OECT 4 25 = Ashm 1922-258	314
OECT 5 10 = Ashm 1930-362	145, 175, 211, 215
OECT 5 132	57 (tfn. 1)
OECT 6 Pl. XXII + CLAM 802 + BL 167 + BL 142	104, 106 (tfn. 6)
OIP 97 No. 42 = 3N-T 195	36, 66
PBS 1/1 8 = CBS 11359	108 (676)
PBS 1/1 11 = CBS 11341	34, 47, 47 (170), 81, 83, 85, 86 (494)
PBS 1/2 122 = CBS 332	230
PBS 1/2 127	329
PBS 10/2 3 = CBS 35	34 (79), 146, 183 (973), 185, 186, (982), 191
PBS 10/2 12 + VS 2 12 + VS 2 16	105
PBS 10/2 13 = CBS 112	109, 146, 182, 185, 191, 195, 198, 201, 206, 210, 211, 215
PBS 10/4 12	234 (1103)
PBS 12/1 17 = CBS 4598	370, 371
PBS 12/1 31 = CBS 4605	311 (1686), 363
PBS 12/1 44 = CBS 4615	36, 66
Peiser Urkunden 92 = LB 806	35, 56, 57, 85
PRAK B 357	108 (676)
PRAK C 32	105
RE 19	374 (2098)
Rm 376	89, 119, 120 (791), 123, 124, 125, 349 (1942)
RS 15.10 = AuOrS 23 46	361 (2020)

Source	Page
RS 15.152	139, 331, 334, 335, 377
RS 16.416 = AuOrS 23 13	139, 145, 163, 167, 170, 188, 215, 331, 336, 365, 366, 377
RS 17.10	133, 139, 144, 160, 167, 175, 178, 181, 182, 184, 187, 189, 190, 192, 196, 198, 200, 201, 207, 210, 212, 215, 216, 218, 219, 228, 251, 268, 270, 331, 367, 377
RS 17.80	133, 139, 251, 268, 270, 290 (1532), 291 (1541), 331, 367, 377
RS 17.155 = AuOrS 23 21	139, 143, 145, 159 (930), 163, 164, 165, 167, 170, 171, 172, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195, 197, 199, 200, 201, 207, 210, 211, 212, 213, 215, 216, 218, 219, 223, 224, 227 (1057), 236, 236 (1124), 320, 328, 328 (1805), 329 (1811), 331, 334, 334 (1840, 1843, 1845, 1846, 1847), 335, 335 (1850, 1851) 366, 366 (2045), 367, 367 (2048), 377, 378, 379, 384
RS 20.121+ = Ugaritica V 119	377 (2119)
RS 22.341 + RS 28.053A = AuOrS 23 47	139, 311, 331, 367, 377
RS 22.421	378 (2123)
RS 22.439	378 (2124)
RS 23.34+ 23.363 + 23.494 + 23.721 + 23.721B = Ugaritica V 165	139, 144, 160, 161, 167, 170, 171, 172, 179, 182, 184, 187, 188, 190, 193, 199, 200, 201, 204, 205, 211, 215, 216, 217, 218, 223, 224, 228, 298, 331, 367, 377
RS 25.130 = Ugaritica V 164	139, 144, 159, 167, 184, 211, 298, 325, 326, 327, 363, 367, 373, 375, 377, 379 (2133)
RS 25?.135A	139, 257, 331, 332, 367, 377,
RS 25.422 = AuOrS 23 16	329, 330 (1817)
RS 25.418 = AuOrS 23 27	139, 144, 159, 178, 181, 189, 199, 325, 329, 330, 352 (1966), 366, 367 (2047), 377
RS 25.421 + (RS 25.527 A+B) = AuOrS 23 50 (CTH 315); see also under CTH 315	132 (882), 133, 139, 152, 153, 154, 166, 169, 170, 171, 174, 176, 177, 181, 184, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 194, 197, 198, 201, 202, 203, 205, 206, 208, 209, 211, 212, 213, 216, 217, 218, 222, 251, 256, 257, 257 (1268), 331, 344, 367, 377
RS 25.424 = Ugaritica V 166	139, 299, 331, 367, 373, 377
RS 25.431A = AuOrS 23 37	290, 291
RS 25.435 = AuOrS 23 36	373 (2096)
RS 25.436 = AuOrS 23 20	373 (2093)
RS 25.456B + RS 25.129 = AuOrS 23 25	139, 142, 143, 144, 159, 167, 172, 173, 176 (960), 190, 200, 210, 211, 215, 216, 217, 223, 225, 227, 325, 327, 328, 329, 352 (1966), 365, 366, 367, 367 (2047), 375, 377
RS 25.462 = AuOrS 23 67	139, 331, 336, 377
RS 25.517 = AuOrS 23 58	139, 325, 330, 377
RS 25.527 A+B	257 (1268)
RS 26.141 = AuOrS 23 28	139, 325, 327, 368, 377
RS 26.143 = AuOrS 23 59	139, 144, 159, 182, 325, 330, 377
RS 28.053 = AuOrS 23 61	139, 325, 330, 377
RS 79.25	139, 144, 161, 162, 167, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 187, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 198, 199, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 215, 216, 218, 219, 223, 224, 228, 285, 290 (1532), 291, 291 (1542), 292, 293, 294, 295, 297, 297 (1586), 331, 368, 377,
RS 79.25C	139, 285, 331, 368, 377

Source	Page
RS 86.2210	139, 144, 162, 163, 167, 170, 171, 172, 178, 179, 182, 184, 188, 189, 190, 193, 195, 199, 207, 212, 215, 216, 217, 219, 223, 224, 228, 331, 332, 334, 368, 377
RS 94.2178 = AuOrS 23 14	334, 366 (2045)
RS 94.2372 = AuOrS 23 68	139, 331, 336, 377
RS 94.2964 = AuOrS 23 15	366 (2045)
S 7/1600 (IM 95317)	146, 213
Sb 12366	45 (249)
SBH 14	105
SBH 17	105
SBH 29	105
SBH 33	104, 105
SBH 36	105
SBH I	104, 105
Si 331	37 (83), 59 (297)
Si 550	314, 316
SLTN 79 = Ni 2477	46, 46 (162)
SLTN 137 = Ni 4035	58 (294), 59
Sm 1708 = 4R2 18, 6	120
SMEA 30 27	319 (1752)
SpTU II 2	236, 237 (1128), 335 (1853)
STT 197	248
STVC 13 = CBS 3829	314
STVC 57 = CBS 7055	253 (1224), 256
STVC 75 = CBS 14062	50, 50 (213, 217, 218)
STVC 79 = CBS 14054	50, 50 (214)
STVC 134 = CBS 6898	282
TBR 101	135 (887), 136, 144, 157, 158, 166, 170, 181, 184, 187, 188, 190, 197, 201, 211, 223, 228, 314, 315, 316, 367
TCL 15 3 + BL VI = AO 03925 (+ ?) Edin. 09-405, 27	147, 188, 201, 203, 204, 215, 218
TCL 15 38 = AO 6316	147, 174, 182, 183, 185, 198, 200, 202, 203, 204, 206, 210, 215, 216, 219
TCL 15 39 = AO 6330	257, 260
TCL 16 56 = AO 6718	314
TCL 16 73 = AO 7673	44
TCL 16 79 + PBS 12/1 25 = AO 7738 + CBS 1521	36, 73
TCL 16 80 + TCL 16 83 = AO 7739 + AO 8149	35, 61
TCL 16 85 + van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, Pl. 78 = AO 8186 + ÉPHÉ 523	43 (134)
TCS III No. 27	253 (1224)
TIM 9 1 = IM 55403	58, 59, 146, 174, 175, 182, 185, 188, 191, 195, 198, 200, 203, 210, 211, 212, 213, 215, 216, 219
TIM 9 20 = IM 51545	146, 188
TIM 9 21 = IM 51543	146, 210

Source	Page
TIM 9 23 = IM 51529	146, 218
TIM 9 24 = IM 51176	55, 146, 192, 201, 218
TIM 9 26 = IM 51530	147 (tfn. 4)
TIM 9 29 = IM 13365	36, 68, 85
TIM 9 35 = IM 53977	146, 178, 185, 191, 194, 195, 201, 207, 210, 215, 218
TIM 9 52 = IM 51650	147 (tfn. 4)
TLB 2 3 = LB 2111	52
TLB 2 5 = LB 2112	257, 337 (1870)
TLB 2 7 = LB 2125	265, 267
TMH NF 3 53 + TMH NF 4 53 = HS 1477 + HS 1478	80, 80 (459), 123
Tsukimoto Incantation	135 (887), 137, 143, 158, 159, 170, 188, 190, 195, 217, 219, 222, 223, 227 (1057), 319, 320, 321, 334, 334 (1847), 365, 366, 367, 375, 376, 379, 383, 384
UET 1 146 Fragment b	52
UET 6 165	265, 267 (1334)
UET 6 166	265
UET 6 393	238
UET 6 395	49 (tfn. 2)
Ugaritica V 4	302
Ugaritica V 119 = RS 20.121+	377 (2119)
Ugaritica V 164 = RS 25.130	139, 144, 159, 167, 184, 211, 298, 325, 326, 327, 363, 367, 373, 375, 377, 379 (2133)
Ugaritica V 165 = RS 23.34+ 23.363 + 23.494 + 23.721 + 23.721B	139, 144, 160, 161, 167, 170, 171, 172, 179, 182, 184, 187, 188, 190, 193, 199, 200, 201, 204, 205, 211, 215, 216, 217, 218, 223, 224, 228, 298, 331, 367, 377
Ugaritica V 166 = RS 25.424	139, 299, 331, 367, 373, 377
UM 29-13-254B	62
UM 29-13-322	69
UM 29-13-419A	35, 59, 60, 61, 85 (490)
UM 29-13-495	34, 41
UM 29-13-542	36, 76
UM 29-13-543	36, 67
UM 29-13-545	34, 41
UM 29-13-560	35, 56, 85
UM 29-13-990	46 (162)
UM 29-15-9 + UM 29-15-158	46 (162)
UM 29-15-174	65 (352), 227
UM 29-15-231	46
UM 29-15-393	234 (1106)
UM 29-15-399 + Ni 9734 (= ISET II Pl. 26)	35, 50, 50 (211, 212, 215, 217), 51, 85
UM 29-15-611	37 (88)
UM 29-15-667	62
UM 29-15-848	35, 62

Source	Page
UM 29-15-944	36, 67
UM 29-15-979	60
UM 29-16-35	34, 42
UM 29-16-79A	311 (1686), 363 (2038)
UM 29-16-198 + UM 29-16-219 + N 1519 + N 1572	49
UM 29-16-383	67
UM 29-16-719	61, 62
UM 29-16-951	64
UM 55-21-309	282
University of Iowa No. 18 = JCS 31, 143	62, 62 (325)
VAT 604 + VAT 614 + VAT 1350 + VAT 1370 = VS 2 3	123, 123 (815), 146, 188, 205, 210, 213, 215
VAT 608 + VAT 1345 = VS 2 1	146, 196
VAT 613 + VAT 1335 + VAT 1349 = VS 2 4	146, 185
VAT 1320 = VS 2 47	34 (79), 146, 210
VAT 1338 + VAT 1406 + VAT 2164 + VAT 1348 = VS 2 5	105, 108 (676)
VAT 1372 = VS 2 75	146, 203
VAT 1419 = VS 2 94	146, 147 (tfn. 2), 183, 183 (973), 185, 191, 195, 198, 200, 206, 218
VAT 1437 = VS 2 48	146, 183, 185, 191, 198
VAT 4596 = VS 10 182	147, 173
VAT 6448 (+) VAT 6479 + VAT 6503 = VS 10 205	60, 60 (309)
VAT 6464 + 6604 = VS 10 206	60, 60 (309)
VAT 6977 + VAT 6978 = VS 10 204	58, 58 (295, 296), 59, 60
VAT 8243 = KAR 375	89, 104, 104 (656), 106, 106 (tfn. 5, 7, 9, 17, 23, 24, 31; 659), 107, 107 (660) 125, 127
VAT 8884 = KAR 18	88, 95, 96, 96 (576), 128, 128 (859)
VAT 9304 = KAR 16	82 (477), 89, 99, 100, 125 (834), 128
VAT 9306 = KAR 13	88, 90, 91, 91 (524), 92, 128
VAT 9307 = KAR 4	89, 97, 98, 103 (651), 122 (802), 124, 125 (834), 129
VAT 9308 = KAR 15	82 (477), 89, 99, 100, 125 (834), 128
VAT 9416 = KAV 218	122 (807)
VAT 9440 + VAT 10607 + VAT 11573 = KAR 9 + KAR 348	89, 107, 107 (668), 108, 108 (676, 681), 109, 124, 125, 128, 128 (859)
VAT 9441 (+) VAT 10648 + VAT 11216 = KAR 12+	88, 95, 95 (567), 96
VAT 9487	126, 126 (845)
VAT 9508 = KAR 333	89, 121
VAT 9587 = BAM II 194	320
VAT 9710 = KAR 14	88, 90, 91, 91 (524), 92, 92 (528), 93, 127, 128
VAT 9833 = KAR 24	89, 114, 114 (735), 115, 116 (743), 128
VAT 9942 + VAT 10103 = KAR 128 (+) KAR 129	89, 103 (651), 109, 109 (687), 110, 110 (689, 690, 694, 698), 111, 111 (710), 112, 112 (710, 711, 716), 124, 127 (852), 129 (865), 290, 291
VAT 10035 = KAR 91	87, 89, 119 (767), 120, 124, 125, 125 (834), 127, 128, 128 (859)
VAT 10038	87, 89, 119

Source	Page
VAT 10066 = KAR 113	89, 121, 124
VAT 10151 = KAR 27	58 (288), 94 (551), 122
VAT 10172	121 (801)
VAT 10176 = KAR 97	82, 84, 84 (487), 89, 100, 101, 101 (632), 103, 122, 124, 125, 127
VAT 10251 = KAR 103	89, 103, 124, 125
VAT 10365 (=LKA 65) + VAT 11777	268
VAT 10565 = KAR 17	88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 93 (535)
VAT 10610 = KAR 119	82, 84, 89, 102, 102 (642), 122, 125, 127, 129 (865)
VAT 10628 = KAR 363	88, 90, 91, 93
VAT 10643a-c + VAT 10959 = KAR 370a-c + KAR 251	88, 90, 91, 92, 92 (tfn. 1), 93
VAT 10810	89, 103, 104 (652), 124, 125
VAT 11019	120
VAT 13372	373
VAT 13723+	120 (790)
VAT 15492 = MARV 5 2	126, 126 (841)
VAT 17081 = VS 24 120	122 (807)
VAT 17119 = VS 24 25	36, 69, 85
VAT 17142 = VS 24 69	34 (80)
VAT 17166 = VS 24 75	34, 44, 85
VAT 17223 = VS 24 38	36, 67
VAT 17224 = VS 24 39	36, 67, 85
VAT 17316 = VS 24 70	34 (80)
VAT 17353 = VS 24 113	36, 64, 82, 85
VAT 17357 = VS 24 72	36, 67, 85
VAT 17460 = VS 24 76	66 (355)
VAT 17563 = VS 24 15	36, 67
VAT 19236 = VS 24 41	35, 52, 85
VS 2 1 = VAT 608 + VAT 1345	146, 196
VS 2 3 = VAT 604 + VAT 614 + VAT 1350 + VAT 1370	123, 123 (815), 146, 188, 205, 210, 213, 215
VS 2 4 = VAT 613 + VAT 1335 + VAT 1349	146, 185
VS 2 5 = VAT 1338 + VAT 1406 + VAT 2164 + VAT 1348	105, 108 (676)
VS 2 7 + VS 2 13	105
VS 2 17	105
VS 2 25	104, 105
VS 2 47 = VAT 1320	34 (79), 146, 210
VS 2 48 = VAT 1437	146, 183, 185, 191, 198
VS 2 75 = VAT 1372	146, 203
VS 2 94 = VAT 1419	146, 147 (tfn. 2), 183, 183 (973), 185, 191, 195, 198, 200, 206, 218
VS 10 182 = VAT 4596	147, 173
VS 10 204 = VAT 6977 + VAT 6978	58, 58 (296), 59, 60
VS 10 205 = VAT 6448 (+) VAT 6479 + VAT 6503	60, 60 (309)

Source	Page
VS 10 206 = VAT 6464 + 6604	60, 60 (309)
VS 17 40	256
VS 24 15 = VAT 17563	36, 67
VS 24 25 = VAT 17119	36, 69, 85
VS 24 38 = VAT 17223	36, 67
VS 24 39 = VAT 17224	36, 67, 85
VS 24 41 = VAT 19236	35, 52, 85
VS 24 69 = VAT 17142	34 (80)
VS 24 70 = VAT 17316	34 (80)
VS 24 72 = VAT 17357	36, 67, 85
VS 24 75 = VAT 17166	34, 44, 85
VS 24 76 = VAT 17460	66 (355)
VS 24 113 = VAT 17353	36, 64, 82, 85
VS 24 120 = VAT 17081	122 (807)
W 16743ac = AUWE 23 101	42, 42 (117)
W 17259an = AUWE 23 112	268 (1339), 315 (1724)
W 20248,3	332
YBC 4616 = YOS 11 5	279 (1436)
YBC 4624	256
YBC 4665	42
YBC 9875	73
YOS 9 39-61	52
YOS 11 5	279 (1436)
YOS 11 6	279 (1436)
YOS 11 70	102 (636)
YOS 11 74 = MLC 1301	89, 121, 125, 328 (1805)

With written sources dated to the end of the fourth millennium B.C., Sumerian is the most ancient language so far documented and remained the language of education in scribal circles for over three millennia. In the Late Bronze Age the dissemination of Sumerian literature, which is best known from Old Babylonian sources, reached the Western periphery, i.e. Syria and Anatolia. This book investigates the transmission of Sumerian literary texts to the Western periphery and offers a comprehensive study of Sumerian literature in the Late Bronze Age.



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia