

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A further one hundred MA tablets, still unpublished, were unearthed in the same area of the Anu-Adad temple but it is unclear whether they belong to the same collection or to a separate archive.⁵⁰⁷ Two tablets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	Balaĝ to Enlil	KAR 375	Nötscher (1927), 99-108	SA
Assur – M2 (?)	VAT 9440 + VAT 10607 + VAT 11573	Eršaĝuĝa 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 pî 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 Wagensohn 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-ĝal₂ šu-niĝen 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	lu ni-ba-at ⁴	lu-u ₂ n[a ² -...]
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	be-lum
437	^d NIN.URTA	^d MIN
438	^{na4} su-u	MIN
438	a-na	ana
438	^{geš} TUKUL.MEŠ-ia	kak'-ki-i[ā]
439	ka-sur-ru-u ₂	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) ḥe₂-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-maḥ (MA) VS di-ku₅-gen₇ (NA) = *kīma dajjāni* is a stylistic variant belonging to a tradition.
- 530. ḥe-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-ḫasīs* epic. Indeed according to the colophon *The Creation of Mankind* and *Atra-ḫasīs* 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-ĝeštin-na-ke ₄	kar-ĝeštin-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	saĝ-ki-zalag ₂ -ga-a-ni	[saĝ-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 precativ *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 $\hat{g}issu^{zu}-bi = \text{ši-li-šu}$ (Rev. 8).
- A few phonetic or odd writings are attested: tir-ra-an-na instead of tir-an-na, ‘rainbow’ (Obv. 5); ša_4 (DU; Obv. 12)⁶³⁶ for ša_5 (AK)⁶³⁷ = hašāšu ,⁶³⁸ $\text{šu-nu} = i-na qa-ti-[\text{šu}]$ for šu-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 $\text{edin-na še}_{25}-\text{gi}_4-\text{gi}_4 \text{ pa-ra sag}_3-\text{sag}_3$, ‘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 $\text{lu}_2-\text{mašgagen}(\text{MAŠ.EN.KAK})-e$ (KAR 119 Obv. 11).⁶⁴⁶
- In $\text{aš-daḥ a-ša}_3-\text{ga-tab-ba-na-ka} [\dots] = ar-da-du \text{ša}_2 \text{ ina A.ŠA}_3 \text{ tap-pi-šu} [\dots]$, ‘The thief, who [...] in the field of his partner’ (KAR 119 Obv. 17-18), the insertion of -(g)a- after ša_3 is mistaken.
- The ablative is used with locative meaning in $\text{ki-bi-ta igi-zu ḡar-ra-}[\text{zu-ne}]$, ‘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 ša_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 $\text{AK}=\text{ša}_5$ see Attinger 2005, 51-53.

⁶³⁸ CAD H, 130-131; for the expression *kima qanī hašāšu* 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 $\text{ka}_2-\text{gal muzug}_2(\text{U}_2.\text{KA})$, see RIA 9, 540.

⁶⁴⁴ See George 1993, 147.

⁶⁴⁵ aš-daḥ instead of $\text{aš}_2-\text{daḥ}$ 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 1 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>Eršaḫūga</i> gi-izi-la ₂ guru ₃ ^{ru}
	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>Balaḡ</i> e ₂ -e še am ₃ -ša ₄
	NBC 11433, 4-7 (X6) ¹⁸	OB	<i>Balaḡ</i>
	[CTMMA 2 3] (B15)	NB	<i>Balaḡ</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>Balaḡ</i> (No. 13) am-e para ₁₀ -an-na-ra <i>kirugu</i> b+7, ll. 67-70 ²¹
II 33-43	CT 42 1 Obv. 33-36 (X9)	LB	<i>Balaḡ</i> (No. 16) a-ab-ba-ḫu-luḫ-ḫa <i>kirugu</i> III, ll. 34-37
	SBH I Obv. 14, 24-35 (B8)	LB	<i>Balaḡ</i> (No. 6) am-e amaš-a-na <i>kirugu</i> 1, ll. 13-18 ²²
II 58- III 5	5R 52, 2 Obv. 1-6 (Ku 14) ²³		<i>Balaḡ</i> to Enlil
	SBH 29 Rev. 7-15 ²⁴	LB	<i>Balaḡ</i> (No. 16) a-ab-ba-ḫu-luḫ-ḫa <i>kirugu</i> XI ²⁵ , ll. 163-170
II 58- III 5	5R 52, 2 Obv. 12-21 (Ku 14)	NA	<i>Balaḡ</i> to Enlil
	VS 2 25 I, 18-19 (S5)	OB	<i>Balaḡ</i> e ₂ -e še am ₃ -ša ₄
III 7-10	VS 2 7 + VS 2 13 Obv. 10-11 (S6)	OB	<i>Balaḡ</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>Balaḡ</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>Balaḡ</i> to Enlil
	SBH 17 Obv. 13-14 (B10)	LB	<i>Balaḡ</i> (No. 3) e ₂ -tur ₃ -gen ₇ niḡen-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
III 27-36	5R 52, 2 Rev. 13-16 (Ku14)	NA	<i>Balaḡ</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>Balaḡ</i> (No. 11) uru ₂ -ḫul-a-ke ₄
	4R ² 11 Obv. 33-34, 38 (Ku4)	NA	<i>Balaḡ</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 ^{ĝeš} -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-aʿ-lal
5R 52, 2 Obv. 23 a-še-erʿ 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 ʰutu-gen₇ e₃-ta – KAR 9+

VAT 9440 = KAR 9 + VAT 11573 = KAR 348 + VAT 10607⁶⁶⁷ is a single-column tablet containing the Emesal liturgy ʰutu-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-êtir 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-êtir 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 *Eršaḥuġa* 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 *Eršaḥuġa* 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 ġal₂) 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 *puḥru*, '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 kiġ₂--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-su₃-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 [...] kiġ₂ 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-ḥu-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 = *šaḥatu*, '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 ġessal^{sal4}(ĜĒŠ.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 *zibu*.

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, [...]kiġ₂-ġa₂-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); <ḫu>-ul--za ~ ḫul₂--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-ḫul* or the like, and if ^aa-la₂[?]-ḫul[?] 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 Ḫattuša, 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-[ni] 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 *Eršaḥuḡa* 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 *Eršaḥuḡa* 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 *Eršaḥunga* 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	+	+	+
Mīs pī 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-Sîn	<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	Sîn-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 Wagensooner 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+.

