

## The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

### 5 Sumerian Literary and Magical Texts from Ḫattuša

This chapter is dedicated to the discussion and analysis of each Sumerian literary and magical text discovered in the Hittite capital. Texts will be presented according to the script of manuscripts.

#### 5.1 Babylonian Script Tablets

A group of tablets written in Babylonian script contains Sumerian incantations.

CTH	Publication	Composition	Find-spot Area	Script	Language
800.1	KUB 30 1	Incantation	Bk. A	LOB/MB	PhS
800.4	KUB 37 109	Incantation	Bk. A	LOB/MB	PhS
800.2	KUB 30 2	Incantation	Bk. A	LOB/MB	PhS
800.4	KUB 30 3	Incantation	Bk. A	LOB/MB	PhS
800.3	KUB 30 4	Incantation	Bk. A	LOB/MB	PhS
800	KBo 36 13	Incantation	Bk. K	LOB/MB	PhS
800	KBo 36 15	Incantation	Bk. M	LOB/MB	PhS
800	KBo 36 16	Incantation	Bk. D	LOB/MB	PhS
812	KBo 36 19	Incantation	Bk. M	LOB/MB	PhS
800	KBo 40 103	Incantation	Bk. A	LOB/MB	PhS
800.4	KUB 37 108 KUB 37 110	Incantation	Bk. A	LOB/MB	PhS
801	KBo 36 21	Incantation	Bk. D	LOB/MB(?)	Ph(?)S
813	KBo 14 51	Collection of Incantations	Bk.	MB	SA
813	KBo 13 37	Collection of Incantations	HaH	Bab	Ph(?)SA(?)

##### 5.1.1 Monolingual Incantations – CTH 800

Under CTH 800 is listed a group of monolingual incantations written in phonetic writing sharing the same sign shapes.<sup>1062</sup>

The best preserved manuscript is KUB 30 1 (A),<sup>1063</sup> a two-column tablet inscribed with two incantations. This source was part of a series of tablets as is clear from the subscript [dub]-x-kam<sub>2</sub>-ma nu-til.<sup>1064</sup> The fragment KUB 37 109 probably belongs to the same manuscript.

<sup>1062</sup> See <http://www.hethiter.net>, introduction to KBo 36 and Wilhelm 1992, 84.

<sup>1063</sup> Manuscripts and lineation according to Geller 1989.

<sup>1064</sup> Falkenstein 1939, 8, suggests that this was the fourth tablet of the series as he reads -x- as -4-.

The obverse contains a Marduk-Ea incantation<sup>1065</sup> against witchcraft,<sup>1066</sup> known from three OB tablets in standard orthography. CBS 332 = PBS 1/2 122 (B) is a partially bilingual<sup>1067</sup> single-column tablet in interlinear format belonging to the Khabaza collection, hence probably from Sippar.<sup>1068</sup> J. Rylands Library Box 24 P 28 (C)<sup>1069</sup> is a single-column tablet of unknown provenance but probably from Sippar too.<sup>1070</sup> CBS 11933 (D) is a two-column tablet from Nippur. PBS 1/2 122 is possibly later than the other OB manuscripts, not only because of the presence of the Akkadian translation but also because of some late grammatical features and errors in the Sumerian version.<sup>1071</sup>

The reverse of KUB 30 1 contains a poorly preserved Marduk-Ea incantation, but no duplicates are known so far.

All the manuscripts significantly diverge from one another and have different line orders. Moreover, J. Rylands Library Box 24 P 28 and CBS 11933 add sections not attested in the other tablets.<sup>1072</sup> KUB 30 1 represents a different recension and not simply a phonetic version of one of the OB manuscripts, as shown in the following examples:

- In line 9 KUB 30 1 follows D in the verbal form against C; the verbal form is not preserved in B.

9	H	I 14	lu-ul-lu pa-ap-ḥa-al-la [kli- <sup>1</sup> a <sup>1</sup> n[u-u]n-za-a // ba-ni-ib-di-ib-be <sub>2</sub>
	B	19	[lu <sub>2</sub> -ulu <sub>3</sub> ] pap-ḥal-la ki-nu-zu <sup>1</sup> -a <sup>1</sup> ba <sup>1</sup> -[...]
		20	[a-wi-lam m]u-ut-ta-al-li-kam i-na la <sup>1</sup> i <sup>1</sup> -du <sup>1</sup> -u <sub>2</sub> <sup>1</sup> [...]
	C	10	lu <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>18</sub> -lu pap-ḥal-la ki <sup>1</sup> -nu-zu-a-ni <sup>1</sup> ba-an-ḡen <sup>1</sup>
	D	9	lu <sub>2</sub> -ulu <sub>3</sub> <sup>1</sup> pap-ḥal <sup>1</sup> -l[a] <sup>1</sup> ki <sup>1</sup> -nu-zu-a-ni // ba-ab-dib
			<i>She made the distraught man walk about disoriented.</i>

- In lines 10-11 KUB 30 1 diverges from all the OB manuscripts, notably from D:

10	A	I 16-18	lu-bi šu-si-iq-qa ba-an-še <sup>1073</sup> // gi-ri-si-iq-qa ba-an-še // sa-ad-ni-im im-šu-ub
	B	21	<sup>1</sup> lu <sub>2</sub> <sup>1</sup> -ulu <sub>3</sub> -bi a <sub>2</sub> -šu-ḡiri <sub>3</sub> -ni sa <sup>1</sup> - <sup>1</sup> ad <sup>1</sup> -[nim .....]
		22	i-na ma-na-ni-šu [ša] <sup>1</sup> -aš <sub>2</sub> -ša-tu <sub>3</sub> <sup>1</sup> [id-di]
	C	11	lu <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>18</sub> -lu-bi a <sub>2</sub> -šu-ḡiri <sub>3</sub> -ni sa-ad-nim <sup>1074</sup> im-šub
	D	10	<sup>1</sup> lu <sub>2</sub> <sup>1</sup> -ulu <sub>3</sub> -bi a <sub>2</sub> -šu-ḡiri <sub>3</sub> -na // [...-a]d-ni ugu-na // i-im-šub
			<i>She caused paralysis in the victim's limbs.</i>
11	A	I 19	za- <sup>1</sup> ag <sup>1</sup> -še im-g[u]-g[u-r]a a-gi-ga i-i <sup>1075</sup>
	B	23	za <sub>3</sub> -še im-gigurum <sup>1076</sup> a-geg <sup>1</sup> e <sub>3</sub> <sup>1</sup> [...]
		24	a-ḥa-a-šu <i-dat>uš-š[a- ...]

**1065** For this typology see Falkenstein 1931, 44 ff.

**1066** This incantation has similarities with the series *Maqlû*, cf. Thomsen 1987, 15; on the identification of the antagonist as a female see Geller 1989, 201. Mention of Gilgameš in KUB 37 109, 4 and in KBo 36 13 R. Col., 15, gi-il-ga-m[i-iš], is relevant as he is also attested in *Maqlû*, Geller 1989, 202-203: 31, 41.

**1067** Lines 23-26 have no Akkadian translation.

**1068** See § 1 and fn. 78.

**1069** Hand-copy in AfO 24 Table II.

**1070** See Wilcke 1973, 1-2.

**1071** See verbal forms in Falkenstein 1939, 34: 2, 4; also note the phonetic writing u<sub>3</sub>-ub-da for u<sub>3</sub>-ub-du<sub>11</sub>-ga, Geller 1989, 202: 15. An error is also attested in manuscript C where -de<sub>2</sub> is replaced by -du<sub>11</sub>, Wilcke 1973, 13: 7.

**1072** See ll. 33-40, 50-57, 67ff. in Geller 1989.

**1073** On še as a phonetic writing for šer<sub>3</sub> see Geller 1989, 202: 10.

**1074** sa-ad-nim = *samānu*, CAD S, 111; incantations against *samānu* are attested in the MA documentation (§ 2.1.6.6) and at Ugarit, see § 7.1.3 and fn. 1805, § 7.3.7 and fn. 1842.

**1075** For a gi-ga i-i = 'to utter a cry of pain', see Attinger 1993, 416.

**1076** For gigurum see Zgoll 1997, 324-325; on the basis of the reading gurum of the sign GAM and the phonetic writing in KUB 30 1, I would suggest a reading gugurum.

C	12	za <sub>3</sub> -še im-gigurum
D	11	za <sub>3</sub> -še im-gigurum // 'a <sub>2</sub> -ni?' [mu]-'un'-ĝal <sub>2</sub> (The victim) bends on his side and utters a cry of pain.

- According to Geller's edition lines 62-63, u<sub>3</sub>-u[š]-'š'u' [...] // gi-iš-šu-ub-gi-im<sup>1077</sup> [.....] (KUB 30 1 II, 17-18) are only attested in the Ḫattuša manuscript. Probably also line KUB 30 1 II, 4, uš-[r]a-an-[ni ...], which Geller identifies with line 46, is not attested in the other manuscripts.<sup>1078</sup>

46	B	11	sa-UD gazinbu-gen <sub>7</sub> uš <sub>7</sub> -zu-e-ne ħe <sub>2</sub> -b[al]a <sup>2</sup> -uš
		12	ši-ir-a-ni-ša ki-ma ga-ši-ši-im ka-ša-ap-tu <sub>2</sub> šu-a-ti [l]i-iĥ-ru-u <sub>2</sub>
	D	46	sa-UD gazinbu-g[en <sub>7</sub> .....] ħe <sub>2</sub> -b[ala- ...] May they dig as with a stake at that witch, at her flesh.

Furthermore, contrary to the other manuscripts, KUB 30 1 reports the abbreviated Marduk-Ea formula<sup>1079</sup> as is typical in late texts.

Errors and anomalies are often the product of phonetic writings:

- In line 3, ħa-ma-an-ze<sub>2</sub>-er šu im-ma-[...] (KUB 30 1, I 6-7), the directive case -e documented in C is omitted. As a consequence the verbal form has two direct objects<sup>1080</sup> (note that no OO is written in the verbal form):

3	A	I 6-7	i-gi-in im-ma-ab-[zu] // ħa-ma-an-ze <sub>2</sub> -er šu im-ma-[.....]
	B	7	i <sub>3</sub> -ĝen im <sup>1</sup> abzu ħabrud-da siki-ħamanzer [...]
		8	eġ-lam u <sub>3</sub> wa-ar-da-tu' [...] il-li-ik-ma ti-ġa-am i-na ABZU i-na ħu-u[r-ri-im...]
	C	4	[ħabr]ud-da siki-ħamanzer-re [š]u i[m-.....]
	D	2	[.....]ħabru]da-'da' ħamanzer
	D	3	[.....] 'šu im?'-ma-ab-ti She went; she took the Abzu-clay from a hole and loose hair.

- In line 4 the verbal form dim<sub>2</sub>, which is attested in B, mu-un-dim<sub>2</sub>, and corresponds to Akkadian *epēšu*, is incorrectly replaced by gim in KUB 30 1, I, 8, mu-un-gi-im.<sup>1081</sup> Furthermore in šu ma-an-g[u-ur], the prefix BA is miswritten as MA.<sup>1082</sup>

4	A	I 8	a-la-am mu-un-gi-im ħa-ma-a[n-ze <sub>2</sub> -er] / šu ma-an-g[u-ur]
	B	9	alam mu-un-dim <sub>2</sub> ħamanzer šu i[m <sup>2</sup> -...] i-pu-uš-ma mu-ša-ġe <sub>4</sub> [...]
	C	5	alam mu-un-dim <sub>2</sub> 'ħamanzer-re' x[.....]x
	D	4	[alam] mu-un-dim <sub>2</sub> ħamanzer-a / šu ba-an-gur She fashioned a figurine and wrapped it in the loose hair.

- In line 6 KUB 30 1 has sa instead of ki because the sign KI was misread as DI, then read as sa<sub>2</sub> and rendered phonetically as sa:<sup>1083</sup>

1077 A similar writing is attested in KBo 36 15 Rev. 6: [g]i-iš-bu-šu.

1078 Geller transliterates KUB 30 1 II, 4, as 'sa-UD ma<sup>2</sup>-da<sup>2</sup>-[al...]' but Falkenstein's reading, uš-[r]a-an-[ni...], seems to be more correct.

1079 Note that C and D do not have the line ĝen-na dumu-ĝu<sub>10</sub> 'asal-lu<sub>2</sub>-ĥi, cf. l. 20.

1080 Cf. Attinger 1993, 228-229.

1081 Geller 1989, 201: 4.

1082 The 1sg. IO makes no sense in the context.

1083 Geller 1989, 201: 6; note also the miswriting IR for ni due to graphic similarity, Falkenstein 1939, 28: 10.

6	A	I 10	uš i-ni'(IR)-di sa bi-in-[.....]
	B	13	uš <sub>7</sub> i-ni-in-de <sub>2</sub> ki-a [.....] <i>'ru-uh'tam id-di-ma i-na er-se-tim i[q-bir]</i>
	C	7	[u]š <sub>7</sub> i-ni-in-du <sub>11</sub> ki-a 'bi <sub>2</sub> '-in-tum <sub>2</sub> -m[a]
	D	6	[uš <sub>7</sub> ] i-ni-in-de <sub>2</sub> // [... k]i-a bi <sub>2</sub> -in-tum <sub>2</sub> <i>She spat on it, and buried it in the earth.</i>

- In line 8 the sign KA(eme) of eme-ĝar was misread as inim, resulting in the writing i-ni-im-ĝa<sub>2</sub>-ar (KUB 30 1, I 13).<sup>1084</sup>

The analysis has shown that KUB 30 1 cannot be directly traced back to any of the extant OB manuscripts and reflects a later textual tradition. As seen in Chapter 4, KUB 30 1 and the manuscripts listed under CTH 800 represent a group of texts written with orthographic conventions typical of Northern Babylonia. Both in terms of orthography and typology the closest parallel can be found in the corpus of magical texts from Meturan that were used as examples of Old Babylonian unorthographic texts in Chapter 4. Indeed, these are collections of Sumerian monolingual incantations in phonetic writing dated to the time of Ḫammu-rābi.<sup>1085</sup> Moreover, one of the incantations inscribed in the tablet from Meturan H 97 contains a passage (IV, 13-17) partially parallel to KUB 30 1 I, 12-18.<sup>1086</sup>

A		uš kaš [...] i-ni-im-ĝa <sub>2</sub> -ar ḫu-u[l ...] x x lu-ul-lu pa-ap-ḫa-al-la [k]i-'a' n[u-u]n-za-a ba-ni-ib-di-ib-bi lu-bi šu-si-iq-qa ba-an-še gi-ri-si-iq-qa ba-an-še sa-ad-ni-im im-šu-ub
H 97		ka-ša de <sub>2</sub> -a e-me-ĝar ḫu-lu ta-qa lu <sub>2</sub> -ulu <sub>3</sub> ! <pap>-ḫal-la ki nu-za-a-ni ba-ab-dab <sub>5</sub> <sup>1087</sup> lu <sub>2</sub> -lu-bi šu-si-qa ba-an-du ka-ku-ĝal <sub>2</sub> -a-ni IGI ba-ba šu-ni šu ĝiri <sub>3</sub> kuš <sub>3</sub> -na sa-ad-ni-im ba-an-šu-ub

It is worth noting the similarity of the phonetic spellings šu-si-qa (H 97 IV, 15) and šu-si-iq-qa (KUB 30 1 I, 16). The Meturan text also helps to clarify KUB 30 1 I, 12:

8	A	I 12-13	i-UŠ-ta-aq-qa uš kaš [.....] // i-ni-im-ĝa <sub>2</sub> -ar ḫu-u[l...] x x
	B	17	uš <sub>7</sub> kaš-e de <sub>2</sub> -a eme-ĝar ḫul [.....] <i>ru-uh-tim ši-ka-rum 'id'-di-ma lem-ni-iš [...]</i>
	C	9	[u]š <sub>7</sub> kaš-a 'de <sub>2</sub> -a' eme-ĝar ḫul 'ta' <sup>1088</sup> ga
	D	8	[u]š <sub>7</sub> kaš uš-ri-a // 'eme'-[ĝa]r 'ḫul' [...]-ga <i>She poured spittle into (his) beer, (putting him) in a hostile mood.</i>

<sup>1084</sup> Geller 1989, 201: 8.

<sup>1085</sup> Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993a, 91-92; note however that the Meturan texts have the complete Marduk-Ea formula, see Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993b, 179-180, Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995a, 23, Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995b, 170-171, 186, 196.

<sup>1086</sup> Cf. Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995b, 175-176 and lines 9-10 above.

<sup>1087</sup> According to Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993b, 186, in the Meturan texts, the association of KU and DIB with the meanings 'to pass' and 'to seize' is the reverse of the Nippur tradition, whereas in KUB 30 1 \*dib has the correct meaning 'to pass'. In this case, however, it is difficult to state whether in KUB 30 1 the meaning 'to seize' was intended, as in the Nippur manuscript, where dab<sub>5</sub> is attested, although \*dib was written according to the Meturan tradition, or whether 'to pass' was actually intended, written with the phonetic rendering of dib.

<sup>1088</sup> For this reading see Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995b, 175.

Scholars have interpreted the sign UŠ differently. Falkenstein<sup>1089</sup> reads -nita- as a scribal mistake probably due to dictation from the verbal form *i-nita-ta-aq-qa* ~ *i<sub>3</sub>-ni-ta<sub>3</sub>-ta<sub>3</sub>-ga*, which he refers to the preceding line. Geller,<sup>1090</sup> following Falkenstein in referring this verbal form to the preceding line, regards UŠ as a miswriting for -ta- and reads *i-ta'-ta-aq-qa* as equivalent to *ĝa<sub>2</sub>-ĝa<sub>2</sub>* in C and D corresponding to Akkadian *nadû*. However, H 97 IV, 13-14 may provide a different explanation:<sup>1091</sup>

H 97	13	uš ta-ka ka-ša de <sub>2</sub> -a
	14	e-me-ĝar ħul-lu ta-qa

The Boğazköy text may contain a traditional variant if we regard uš as a phonetic writing for uš<sub>7</sub>, as in the Meturan tablet, and i- as either an additional vowel or a scribal mistake possibly copied from the following line. Therefore, ta-aq-qa and ta-ka would be phonetic writings for taka<sub>4</sub>.

The other monolingual Sumerian incantations are preserved on fragments:

**KUB 30 2** is a fragment from the lower edge of a two-column tablet preserving, on the obverse, thirteen lines on the left column and twelve on the right; the reverse is broken away. The incantation is similar to KUB 30 1 as shown by the word *ħa-ab-ru-ud-da* (KUB 30 2 I, 10).<sup>1092</sup>

**KUB 30 3** is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving eleven lines on one side only, probably the reverse. This fragment contains the beginning of a complete Marduk-Ea formula.

**KUB 30 4** is a fragment from the central part of a two-column tablet. Only one side survived, preserving eleven lines on the left column and fourteen on the right. The right column contains a complete Marduk-Ea formula.

**KBo 36 13** is a large fragment from a two-column tablet discovered in Building K in a secondary context on a Phrygian level. Only one side, probably the reverse, is preserved with circa eighteen lines per column. The left column quotes Asalluĥi (l. 3)<sup>1093</sup> whereas the right column contains an incantation against witchcraft, *ni-ĝa<sub>2</sub>-ak-ka* (l. 5), and mentions Gilgameš, *gi-il-ga-m[i-iš]* (l. 15).<sup>1094</sup>

**KBo 36 15** is a fragment discovered in Building M in a secondary context on a Phrygian level; the right column is preserved on both sides. The reverse contains an abbreviated Marduk-Ea formula.

**KBo 36 16** is a fragment from the central part of its tablet discovered in Building D in a secondary context on a Phrygian level. Only ten lines are preserved on one side; the other is broken away.

**KUB 37 108 + KUB 37 110** is a fragment from the upper edge of a two-column tablet discovered in Building A. The evil eye is referred to in the left column: *'i-gi'-ħu-la* (l. 2).

**KBo 40 103** is a fragment from the left edge of its tablet preserving an abbreviated Marduk-Ea formula on the reverse. The obverse is broken away.

**CTH 800** comprises monolingual unorthographic incantations inscribed on multicolumn tablets that are probably all part of the same collection, as the common concern with witchcraft and the presence

<sup>1089</sup> Falkenstein 1939, 28.

<sup>1090</sup> Geller 1989, 201.

<sup>1091</sup> Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995b translate as «La salive avec laquelle on est entré en contact (la salive qu'on a laissé tomber?), qui a été versée dans la bière».

<sup>1092</sup> See above l. 3.

<sup>1093</sup> [a-sa-al-l]u-uĥ-ĥi.

<sup>1094</sup> On Gilgameš in the series *Maqlû* see fn. 1066.

of Gilgameš would suggest. Similar orthographic conventions and tablet formats<sup>1095</sup> are attested in the texts from Meturan, but the incantations discovered in the Hittite capital use phonetic writings more extensively. The Marduk-Ea formula is attested in CTH 800 in both the complete<sup>1096</sup> and the abbreviated<sup>1097</sup> form.

As illustrated in Chapter 4, orthographic conventions adopted in CTH 800 are here considered a valuable indication of a Northern Babylonian textual tradition that recalls the unorthographic incantations from Meturan. Sumerian incantations completely written in phonetic orthography are in fact unattested at Nippur either in the contemporaneous Middle Babylonian documentation<sup>1098</sup> or in the Old Babylonian period. The few examples of texts drafted in phonetic orthography that are known from the Middle Babylonian period stem from Northern Babylonia.<sup>1099</sup> As both groups of sources, CTH 800 and the Meturan texts, were written by Babylonian (or Babylonized) scribes and are practical texts to be performed by exorcists, phonetic orthography likely served as a pronunciation aid.

The paleography of CTH 800 is indicated as Middle Babylonian in S. Košak's Konkordanz. Under the Kassites some signs developed shapes only attested in tablets from this period. The only diagnostic sign for the Kassite period, KUR,<sup>1100</sup> is unfortunately not attested in any of the CTH 800 fragments, and other distinctive signs<sup>1101</sup> do not provide conclusive evidence. The signs NE, only attested in KBo 36 19, 9, and RU<sup>1102</sup> show shapes different from the typical Kassite forms.<sup>1103</sup> The sign LI,<sup>1104</sup> with five *Winkelhaken* before the upright wedge, also differs from the MB shape as attested in Sumerian literary texts inscribed in Babylonian script tablets discovered at Ugarit.<sup>1105</sup> Only the presence of such sign shapes could provide evidence for dating. On the contrary, their absence does not exclude that the manuscript in question dates to the Kassite period, as many MB tablets containing Sumerian literary texts do not show the typical Kassite sign shapes.<sup>1106</sup> Falkenstein<sup>1107</sup> had already noticed that KUB 30 1 shows later forms for AḤ and the OB shape for TE. It is well known that distinguishing between LOB and MB tablets is very complicated.<sup>1108</sup> The manner of incision and spacing between signs is reminiscent of CBS 563, one of the copies of *Incantation to Utu* dated to the Late Old Babylonian period. Similarities with the incantations from Meturan and paleographical features that distinguish this group of tablets from typical MB manuscripts lead me to suggest that

1095 See the photographs in Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993b.

1096 KUB 30, 3, KUB 30 4.

1097 KUB 30 1; KBo 36 15 Rev. 3-4: [a-sa-a]l-lu-ḫi i-gi im-[ma-an-si] // [gi-in-na] du-mu-gu a-s[a-al-lu-ḫi]; KBo 40 103, 3-4: a-sa-al-lu-ḫi i-gi im-ma-[an-si] // gi-in-na dumu-mu a-s[a-al-lu-ḫi].

1098 See § 1.1.10.1.

1099 Cf. *Incantation to Utu*, § 1.1.10.2.

1100 Veldhuis 2000a, 70.

1101 See Rutz 2006, 72 and n. 49.

1102 KUB 30 1 I, 1, KBo 36 19, 5, KUB 37 108 + KUB 37 110, 1.

1103 For Kassite NE see for instance N 6286 (§ 1.1.1.6) and CBS 13509 (§ 1.1.3.1). It is worth noting that the Kassite shape of NE is attested at Ḥattuša in the small fragment KUB 4 36 (diḡir-gal-gal-e-ne), a copy of a royal inscription in monumental script. Further examples of a Kassite royal inscription of an unknown king attested at Ḥattuša are the fragments KUB 37 123-125; it is not excluded that KUB 4 36 belongs to the same tablet, cf. Sommerfeld 1985. For RU see BE 14, No. 196, first variant; cf. PBS 10/4 12 Rev. Col. I, 1, 2, 7.

1104 KUB 30 1 I, 5, KUB 30 2 II, 9, KBo 36 19, 7.

1105 Cf. manuscripts from Ugarit of *The Ballad of Early Rulers*, § 6.2.1 and fn. 1631. The shape of LI in CTH 800 is also attested in the possible MB tablet CBS 10457 Obv. II, 11, Rev. III, 19, see § 1.1.4.1.

1106 For the sign KUR in MB Sumerian literary texts see UM 29-15-393 (Rutz 2006) and CBS 10475; for the sign RU see for instance N 6286, Cooper 1978, ll. 137, 146.

1107 Falkenstein 1939, 9.

1108 In this regard the shape of RU with one *Winkelhaken* is different from that attested in the LOB tablets of *Atraḫasis* dated to Amišaduqa (Hunger 1968, 26-27), CT 46 1 Tab. IV, 40, 54; CT 46 3 ii, 54.55. Yet, it is similar to the shape attested in BM 78375 Obv. 3 (Geller 1985, Pl. 18), an incantation tablet probably from Sippar dated, according to Geller 2006, 51, to the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

the CTH 800 sources could be very Late Old Babylonian tablets.<sup>1109</sup> I would speculate that these tablets arrived at the Hittite capital as a result of the military campaign of Muršili I in Babylonia; they would have been brought to Ḫattuša as booty, probably together with *āšipū* priests.<sup>1110</sup> As explained below, the archival storage of these tablets suggests an early reception.<sup>1111</sup> Obviously, transmission of such material via the peaceful dispatch of Babylonian specialists to the Hittite court, as is well known from the 13<sup>th</sup> century documentation, is also possible.<sup>1112</sup> In my opinion, this group of texts represents a very late product of the same scribal milieu that produced the Meturan incantations. However, on the basis of the presently available evidence, a later date is not precluded.

#### 5.1.2 KBo 36 19 (CTH 812)

**KBo 36 19** is a fragment from the central part of a two-column tablet discovered in Building M in a secondary context on a Phrygian level. This tablet originally contained several different incantations as is clear from the Akkadian subscript [*a-na*] *pa-ša-a-ri*, ‘in order to release’,<sup>1113</sup> inscribed between two horizontal rulings (l. 4). Unfortunately, lines 1-3 are too badly preserved to determine whether they contained either a Sumerian or an Akkadian text. The following lines are instead inscribed with a monolingual Sumerian incantation in phonetic writing similar to those listed under CTH 800. The evil eye is quoted in R. Col. 6, *i-gi-ḫu-ul*.<sup>1114</sup> On paleographical grounds KBo 36 19 probably has the same origin as CTH 800, for they share the same script and ductus. However, it could belong to a different collection of tablets as none of the incantations listed under CTH 800 preserve Akkadian subscripts.

#### 5.1.3 KBo 36 21 (CTH 801)

**KBo 36 21** (CTH 801) is a tiny fragment from the lower edge of its tablet discovered in Building D under the first Phrygian layer. Six lines are preserved on the obverse and only one is partially preserved on the reverse. According to Wilhelm,<sup>1115</sup> it contains a bilingual text, probably an incantation,<sup>1116</sup> in interlinear format but in my opinion there is no evidence for the presence of an Akkadian translation: possibly Obv. 4-5 have only a Sumerian text: [...]-e-ne / [...]-gal-gal.<sup>1117</sup> Hence this fragment may belong to the same group as CTH 800 but is too badly preserved to ascertain whether or not it shares the same script.

#### 5.1.4 KBo 13 37 (CTH 813)

**KBo 13 37** is a fragment from the central part of its tablet discovered in the Haus am Hang in a post-Hittite layer. The obverse<sup>?</sup> seems to be inscribed with an Akkadian magical-ritual text while the reverse<sup>?</sup> has a Sumerian incantation quoting Asalluḫi (Rev.<sup>?</sup> 12) with perhaps an Akkadian

<sup>1109</sup> For some OB features see Klingler 2012, 81 n. 8, 82 n. 10.

<sup>1110</sup> This scenario recalls the later looting of Babylonian scholarly texts by the Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta I.

<sup>1111</sup> See § 8.5.

<sup>1112</sup> Cf. Heeßel 2009.

<sup>1113</sup> See CAD P, 238.

<sup>1114</sup> For this evil demon in Sumerian incantations see Cunningham 1997, 104-105.

<sup>1115</sup> KBo 36, iv.

<sup>1116</sup> Schwemer 1998, 6 n. 27.

<sup>1117</sup> Note also that Obv. 3, which should contain the Akkadian translation, has [x]-u<sub>2</sub>(-)-DU-zu mu-[-...]; mu- is perhaps the beginning of a Sumerian verbal form.

translation arranged in interlinear format.<sup>1118</sup> Due to the fragmentary nature of KBo 13 37 the orthography of the Sumerian text is not clear but it is possibly written in standard orthography with some phonetic writings. The name of Asalluḫi is written in standard orthography, [ˈasa]r-lu<sub>2</sub>-ḫi, and clearly differs from the variants attested in the monolingual incantations CTH 800.<sup>1119</sup> KBo 13 37 also diverges from CTH 800 incantations in terms of paleography<sup>1120</sup> and especially ductus.<sup>1121</sup> However, a paleographic categorization of this fragment is not possible, beyond a general Babylonian origin.

### 5.1.5 KBo 14 51 (CTH 813)

**KBo 14 51** (A) is a ten-line fragment from the left edge of its tablet discovered at Büyükkale in a debris layer preserving two incantations separated by a single ruling. Paleographic analysis clearly points to a Babylonian origin on the basis of the signs RU (l. 7),<sup>1122</sup> UŠ (l. 3), SAĜ (l. 6) and ḪAR (l. 6).

The first incantation (ll. 1-4) preserves the injunction to the demon and the self-legitimation of the *āšipu* as Enki's priest. The second incantation turns out to be a forerunner of Tablet VI of the series *Saĝ-geg*<sup>1123</sup> known from first-millennium sources from Nineveh, CT 17 23, 192ff. (N), and Uruk, SpTU II 2, 148ff. (U). It is relevant that this incantation is also preserved in a copy from Ugarit in phonetic writing, RS 17.155 = AuOrS 23 21 (Ug).<sup>1124</sup>

A	1	[x] ˈnu <sup>?</sup> -m[u-x]-ˈx
A	2	[asi]l <sub>x</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> igi-mu-ta [...] <i>Stay away from my eyes(?)</i>
A	3	[asi]l <sub>x</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> an-ta UŠ [...] <i>stay away from the heaven</i>
A	4	[ĝ]a <sub>2</sub> -e lu <sub>2</sub> -mu <sub>7</sub> -mu <sub>7</sub> saĝ[ĝa <sub>2</sub> -maḫ ˈen-ki-ga-me-en] <sup>1125</sup> <i>I am the exorcist and the Sanga-priest of Enki.</i>
A	5	en <sub>2</sub> -e <sub>2</sub> -[nu-ru]
A	6	saĝ-ki-dib ḫur-saĝ-ĝa <sub>2</sub> [.....]
N	192	en <sub>2</sub> saĝ-ki-dib-ba ḫur-saĝ-ĝa <sub>2</sub> lu <sub>2</sub> nu-ub-da nu-ub-zu
U	148	en <sub>2</sub> saĝ-ki-dim <sub>2</sub> <sup>!</sup> ḫur-saĝ-gen <sub>7</sub> lu <sub>2</sub> -nu-ub-da nu-ub-zu
Ug	79a	saĝ-ki-dib ḫur-saĝ-ĝa <sub>2</sub> <gu>-u <sub>2</sub> -ru-ud-ta ne-zu <sup>1126</sup> <i>Incantation. The headache, like a mountain, no man can approach and know.</i>
A	7	aš-ĝar aš-ru u <sub>18</sub> -lu-bi [.....]
N	193	aš-ĝar aš-ru lu <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>18</sub> -lu-gen <sub>7</sub> ba-an-dul-dul
U	149a	aš-ĝar aš-ru u <sub>18</sub> -lu-gen <sub>7</sub> ba-an-dul-la
Ug	79b+80a	aš-gar <sub>3</sub> aš-[ru] // lu-<ul-lu>-ug-gen <sub>7</sub> mu-un-du-du <i>The Ašgar disease and the tremble cover (the victim) like an Alu-demon,</i>
A	8	lu <sub>2</sub> diĝir nu-tuku-ra lu <sub>2</sub> -bi [.....]

<sup>1118</sup> It is unclear whether the text was fully bilingual, note Rev. 4, *e-pu-uš*.

<sup>1119</sup> Cf. KUB 30 1, I, 20, a-sa-a[l-lu-ḫi]; KUB 30 4, R. Col. 4, [a-sa-a]l-lu-ḫi; KBo 36 13, L. Col. 3, [a-sa-al-l]u-uḫ-ḫi.

<sup>1120</sup> 'Sumerisch-akkadischer Text in nicht Boğazköy-Duktus', KBo 13, v. Middle Assyrian script is not excluded.

<sup>1121</sup> The space between signs is smaller than in CTH 800 incantations.

<sup>1122</sup> See BE 14, No. 196.

<sup>1123</sup> For the tablets of this series see Falkenstein 1931, 13-14, Finkel 1991, 94.

<sup>1124</sup> AuOrS 23 21, 79ff., see § 7.3.7. The series *Saĝ-geg* is also preserved in a fragment from Emar, E 732, see § 6.2.9.

<sup>1125</sup> Cf. UH III: 100, VI: 28.

<sup>1126</sup> Cf. CT 17 14, 1, en<sub>2</sub> saĝ-geg mul-an-gen, an-edin-na gurud-da nu-ub-zu.



N	194	lu <sub>2</sub> diġir nu-tuku-ra sila-a gub si-sa <sub>2</sub> -e
U	149b	lu <sub>2</sub> diġir nu-tuku-ra sila-a-še <sub>3</sub> ? si-sa <sub>2</sub> -e
Ug	80b+81a	lu-u <sub>2</sub> ti-kar lu-u <sub>2</sub> -tu-ku-ra // ku <sup>1</sup> -u <sub>2</sub> -ba-ni mu-ud-ta-ša-a (they) stand(?) on the street in front of the man who has no personal god
A	9	[.....](-)a DU:DU DU:DU [.....]
N	195	alam sila-a šu-du <sub>7</sub> keše <sub>2</sub> -da nu-keše <sub>2</sub> -da
U	150	alam nu alam? du?? x-da nu-keše <sub>2</sub> -da
Ug	81b	a-lim si-la-si-si an-nu-k[e-še-(da)] making perfect(?) a statue (of him?) on the street; nobody can bind him(?) <sup>1127</sup>
A	10	[.....] x tab <sup>1128</sup> [.....]

The relation of KBo 14 51 to the first-millennium recension is unclear because the tablet is too badly preserved and all sources present several variants.<sup>1129</sup> However, one may note that KBo 14 51 is the only source preserving the complete rubric en<sub>2</sub>-e<sub>2</sub>-nu-ru instead of the abbreviated en<sub>2</sub> typical of the canonical recension. It is unknown whether the tablet contained an Akkadian translation. The Sumerian text is fairly good and no phonetic writings are attested.<sup>1130</sup> This source, the duplicate from Ugarit and a fragment from Emar (E 732) represent the oldest attestations of the series *Saġ-geg*.

## 5.2 Assyro-Mitannian Script Tablets

All the Assyrio-Mitannian Sumerian texts were found in the citadel of Büyükkale chiefly within Building A and only include bilingual incantations.

CTH	Publication	Composition	Find-spot Area	Language
805.1	KBo 36 11 (KUB 37 100a + 103 + 106 L. col. + 144) + KUB 37 100a Rev. + KUB 37 106 R. col. + ABOT 2 255	Collection of Incantations	Bk. A	SA
805.2	KUB 37 143	Incantation	Bk. C	S (A)
805.2	KUB 37 101	Incantation	Bk. D	SA
805.2	KUB 37 102	Incantation	Bk. D	SA
805.3	KUB 37 107	Incantation	Bk. A	(S) A
812	KUB 4 16	Incantation	?	(S) A
794	KBo 7 1 + KUB 37 115 (+) KBo 7 2	Collection of Incantations	Bk. D	SA
813	KUB 34 3	Incantation	Bk. A	SA
819	KUB 37 127	Incantation	Bk. A	SA
806.3	KUB 37 95	Incantation	Bk. A	S (A?)

<sup>1127</sup> The line is unclear.

<sup>1128</sup> U 151 has lu<sub>2</sub> niġ-tab-ba-bi, see comment to SpTU II 2, 151.

<sup>1129</sup> Cf. CT 17 14, 1ff. and CT 17 20, 52ff., Campbell Thomson 1903, Vol. II, 52-53, 68, 80-83.

<sup>1130</sup> Note the good Sumerian DU:DU DU:DU.

## 5.2.1 Collection of Udug-ḥul Incantations – CTH 805.1

**KBo 36 11+** is a bilingual tablet in parallel column format discovered in Building A. Both columns are preserved on the obverse, whereas the Akkadian column is lost on the reverse. Four incantations are inscribed on the tablet, one on the obverse and three on the reverse.<sup>1131</sup>

**a)** The first text, **KBo 36 11+ Obv. 1-42 (F)**,<sup>1132</sup> is an uncommon Marduk-Ea incantation<sup>1133</sup> belonging to the corpus of texts labeled as *nam-erim<sub>2</sub>-bur<sub>2</sub>-ru-da*<sup>1134</sup> that were not collected in a canonical series. Duplicates are known from the Old Babylonian until the Neo Babylonian period. In the first millennium this incantation became Tablet VI of the series *Muššu'u*, a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian incantations that also includes texts already attested in other series.<sup>1135</sup> In the intercolumn space on the obverse KBo 36 11+ bears the additional subscript *[ini]m-inim-ma udug-ḥul-a-kam*<sup>1136</sup> that identifies the incantation as *Udug-ḥul*, although it did not enter into the canonical series.

The incantation comprises two parts: the first (ll. 1-34) is a long catalogue of the patient's afflictions whereas the second (ll. 35-71) includes a description of Enki's mighty powers, and ends, *ex abrupto*, with the formula *<sup>d</sup>asar-lu<sub>10</sub>-ḥi nam-šub ba-an-šum<sub>2</sub>*, 'Marduk has cast the spell'. The first part of the incantation is missing in KBo 36 11+ but it cannot be excluded that it was inscribed on another tablet. According to Falkenstein,<sup>1137</sup> the text preserved in the OB and first-millennium manuscripts is an abbreviated form. Indeed, the dialogue between Enki and Asalluḥi, typical of Marduk-Ea incantations, is not attested. An unorthodox Marduk-Ea formula is only preserved in the first lines of KBo 36 11+,<sup>1138</sup> which therefore represents the full-length version of the incantation. This clearly indicates that KBo 36 11+ reflects a different textual tradition from the other manuscripts.

The section of the incantation preserved on KBo 36 11+ is known from four duplicates.<sup>1139</sup> Bu 88-5-12, 6 = CT 4 3 (D) is an OB tablet of unknown provenance probably from Sippar.<sup>1140</sup> This tablet is characterized by confusion between human and non-human possessive pronouns<sup>1141</sup> and by rare words.<sup>1142</sup> K 5111 + Sm 28+83+1298+1580<sup>1143</sup> (A) and BM 128027 = CT 51 182 (C) are two NA bilingual tablets from Nineveh. UET 6 393, 9-11 (G) is a NB tablet from Ur containing extracts from different incantations.

The Sumerian text shows fairly good stability from the Old Babylonian period until the first millennium. Indeed most of the variants are purely orthographic:

1131 The second incantation begins on the obverse and ends on the reverse.

1132 Lineation and manuscripts according to Böck 2007.

1133 Falkenstein 1931 classified this text as 'Nebenbildung der Marduk-Ea Typ.'

1134 See the subscript of the manuscripts in Böck 2007, 233, cf. 237.

1135 Böck 2007, 23. Forerunners of this series are also attested at Emar and Ugarit, Böck 2007, 42-43; see §§ 6.2.8, 6.2.9, 7.3.7.

1136 KUB 37 106.

1137 Falkenstein 1939, 73.

1138 Cooper 1971, 18, Böck 2007, 227.

1139 For the full list of manuscripts see Böck 2007, 221.

1140 See entry P355751 in CDLI.

1141 Cooper 1971, 19; -bi- is written instead of -ani-, see ll. 18, 19, 21, 24, 33, 35, 37.

1142 See l. 19, Cooper 1971, 20; l. 28, Cooper 1971, 21.

1143 For the handcopy see Böck 2007, Pl. XXVIII-XXIX.

Line	KBo 36 11+ (F)	CT 4 3 (D)	K 5111+ (A)
36	nam-še <sup>1</sup>	nam-igi	x
38	libiš-a	libiš	x
40	[š]a <sub>3</sub>	ša <sub>3</sub> -ga	x
42	diġir-e <sup>2</sup> -ne	diġir-re-e-ne	niġ <sub>2</sub> -nam- <sup>ˆ</sup> diġir- <sup>ˆ</sup> [re-e-ne-ke <sub>4</sub> ] niġ <sub>2</sub> -nam-diġir-re-e-ne-ke <sub>4</sub> (G)
44	an-na	an-na-a	an-na an-na (G)
45	ki-a	ki-a-a	ki-a
45	k[...]	ka-a	ki-[-...]
46	igi-b[i-š]e <sub>3</sub>	igi-e-še <sub>3</sub>	igi-bi-še <sub>3</sub>
46	x-luġ <sup>1</sup> -e-de <sub>3</sub>	ġu-luġ-e-da	x
47	igi-[du <sub>8</sub> -d]u <sub>8</sub> -bi-še <sub>3</sub>	igi-du <sub>8</sub> -du <sub>8</sub> -bi-še <sub>3</sub>	igi-du <sub>8</sub> -du <sub>8</sub> -bi-e-ne
48	[...]-e-ne	diġir-re-ne-ke <sub>4</sub>	x
49	kiġ <sub>2</sub> -b[ur <sub>2</sub> ]-ru <sup>1</sup> -t[a]	kiġ <sub>2</sub> -bur <sub>2</sub> -ru-da	kiġ <sub>2</sub> -bur <sub>2</sub> - <sup>ˆ</sup> ru <sup>ˆ</sup> -[-...]
50	nam-til <sub>3</sub>	nam-til <sub>3</sub>	nam-til <sub>3</sub> -la
50	zi-ki-[ġal <sub>2</sub> ] <sup>2</sup>	zi-ša <sub>3</sub> -ġal <sub>2</sub>	x
51	ša <sub>3</sub> a[rġ]uš <sub>2</sub>	arġuš <sub>2</sub>	arġuš <sub>2</sub>
52	s[a]ġ <sub>10</sub> -ga-g[en <sub>7</sub> ]	sa <sub>6</sub> -ga-gen <sub>7</sub>	sa <sub>6</sub> -ga
54	nam-r[i]-ma <sup>3</sup>	nam-erim <sub>2</sub> -e	nam-erim <sub>2</sub> -ma
56	in-tub <sub>2</sub> -tub <sub>2</sub> -be <sub>2</sub>	mu-un-ta <sub>3</sub> -ta <sub>3</sub> -[ga]	x
57	niġ <sub>2</sub> -geg niġ <sub>2</sub> -geg-ga-a	niġ <sub>2</sub> im-geg-ga	<sup>ˆ</sup> niġ <sub>2</sub> im <sup>ˆ</sup> -g[eg-ga]
58	dadag	da-da	<i>Omitted</i>
58	za-za	za <sub>3</sub> -ki-a	<sup>ˆ</sup> za <sub>3</sub> -ki <sup>ˆ</sup> -[a]
59	nam-ri-m[a]	nam-erim <sub>2</sub> -e	x
59	[...]-x <sup>ˆ</sup> -ta-[b]e <sub>2</sub>	lu <sub>2</sub> -ku <sub>5</sub> -ru-da-be <sub>2</sub>	x
60	in-[-...]	im-ġen-ġen-e	x
60	in-dal-[-...]	im-[dal]-e	x
64	ba-an-ši-in- <sup>ˆ</sup> gi <sup>ˆ</sup> -[gi]	in-ši-in-g[i <sub>4</sub> -gi <sub>4</sub> ]	mu-un-ši-in-gi <sub>4</sub> -gi <sub>4</sub>
65	sa-a	sa	sa
65	ba-an-ši-in-dub-[-...]	in-ši-in-[-...]	mu-un-ši-dub <sub>2</sub> -dub <sub>2</sub> -bu
66	saġ-še	za <sub>3</sub> -še <sub>3</sub>	du <sub>10</sub> -du <sub>10</sub>
67	šu im-[-...]	šu in-ši-ri-e	mu-un-ši-ib-ġar-ra
68	ka-a-ni	ka-ka-ni	ka-ka-na
68	[...-i]n-taka <sub>4</sub> -[-...]	in-ši-in-tuku <sub>4</sub> -tuku <sub>4</sub>	ši-en-taka <sub>4</sub>

1 For this variant see below.

2 For this variant see below.

3 This writing is already attested in the Ur III texts from Nippur, see Cooper 1971, 21.

As is clear from the list of variants the text of KBo 36 11+ does not fully correspond to any of the other manuscripts: several variants are shared by the OB text while others are found in the first-millennium recension. Variants in lines 51<sup>1144</sup> 56<sup>1145</sup> and probably 57 are possibly scribal mistakes. Line 52 has instead a lexical variant different from both OB and first-millennium manuscripts. In lines 66 and 67 the NA tablet presents recensional variants against the ̒attuša and OB sources. Phonetic writings are limited and likely they mostly depend on copying. Only a few phonetic alterations are documented.

1144 This is a case of dittography from arġuš<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>3</sub>-la attested in manuscripts A and D.

1145 For this variant see below.

Further recensional variants are attested in KBo 36 11+:

- In line 62 KBo 36 11+ seems closer to the Nineveh manuscript than to the OB recension:

62 F Obv. 33 su-gu<sub>2</sub> [.....] ba-an-ši-in-[.....]  
*ri-šu-tum*<sup>1146</sup> *ša zu-[um-ri-šu .....*]  
 D Rev. 25 du<sub>10</sub>-ge-eš su-bi-a im-ši-sa<sub>6</sub>-[ge]  
 A iv 1 [.....]-in-sag<sub>3</sub>-sag<sub>3</sub>-[ge]  
*r[i-.....] zu-um-ra u<sub>2</sub>-pa-aš<sub>2</sub>-[šaḥ]*  
 F: *The Rišutu-illness (covering) his body [...]*  
 D: *He will make this body feel better*

- In line 63 KBo 36 11+ has the verbal form šu im-[...] instead of si-sa<sub>2</sub> attested in both OB and NA manuscripts:

63 F Obv. 34 ulutim<sub>2</sub><sup>!</sup> x[.....] šu im-[.....]  
*bu-un-na-ni-[šu<sub>2</sub> .....*]  
 D Rev. 26 ulutim<sub>2</sub>-ulutim<sub>2</sub>-bi si in-sa<sub>2</sub>-sa<sub>2</sub>  
 A iv 4 ulutim<sub>2</sub>-bi ḥe<sub>2</sub>-ni-ib-si-sa<sub>2</sub>-e-[de<sub>3</sub>]  
*bu-un-na-ni-šu uš-te-šir*  
*He restored his appearance to normal*

- Line KBo 36 11+ Obv. 38 is not attested in the other manuscripts.

F Obv. 38 a-ga-bi-[še<sub>3</sub><sup>?</sup> .....]  
*a-na ar-[ka-ti-šu .....*]  
*to his back [.....]*

- In line 67 (KBo 36 11+ Obv. 39) a<sub>2</sub> šu-šu may represent a variant to a<sub>2</sub>-bi-še<sub>3</sub> a<sub>2</sub> su<sub>3</sub>-su<sub>3</sub> (CT 4 3) as the Akkadian translation of the Ḫattuša manuscript diverges from the first-millennium recension. However, an error of homeoteleuton cannot be excluded.

F Obv. 39 a<sub>2</sub> šu-šu [.....] šu im-[.....]  
*mi-n[a-ti-šu<sub>2</sub>.....]*<sup>1147</sup>  
 D Rev. 30 a<sub>2</sub>-bi-še<sub>3</sub> a<sub>2</sub> su<sub>3</sub>-su<sub>3</sub> šu in-ši-ri-e  
 A a<sub>2</sub>-bi-še<sub>3</sub> su<sub>3</sub>-ge<sup>˘</sup>-eš mu-un-ši-ib-ḡar-ra  
*a-na i-di-šu ša<sub>2</sub>-da-ḥa i-šak-kan*

The Akkadian version often diverges from the Sumerian.<sup>1148</sup> Case endings are normally correct with only a few exceptions<sup>1149</sup> and no Assyrianisms are attested,<sup>1150</sup> whereas Babylonian forms are common: *el-le-ti* (l. 49) VS Ass *ellāti*; *re-me-nu-u<sub>2</sub>* (l. 51) VS Ass *rēmānu*.<sup>1151</sup> The Akkadian translation was composed in Babylonia<sup>1152</sup> and later a bilingual version was transmitted to the

<sup>1146</sup> *rišūtu* is a type of skin illness (CAD R, 381-382) and translates su-gu<sub>2</sub> which is a phonetic writing for su-gu<sub>2</sub>.

<sup>1147</sup> *mināti* in KBo 36 11+, 35, translates ḡeš-gi-en-gi.

<sup>1148</sup> See ll. 51, 52, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 67. Cooper 1971, 20, suggested that the Akkadian version was composed by a Hittite scribe on the basis of the lack of a distinction between voiced and voiceless consonants in Sumerian, but this view is clearly outdated, see § 4.3.1.

<sup>1149</sup> AN-u<sub>2</sub> (l. 44) for the genitive; for further observations on the Akkadian version see Klinger 2010, 335-336.

<sup>1150</sup> Assyrianisms are rare in other Assyro-Mitannian tablets, see Schwemer 1998, 49-50.

<sup>1151</sup> Late (l. 31 [š]u-ti<sub>4</sub>-ni) and peripheral forms are attested, see Cooper 1971, 19, cf. Jucquois 1966, 60-71.

<sup>1152</sup> Klinger 2010, 335, also regards the Akkadian version as a Babylonian work.

Assyro-Mitannian scribal schools, regardless of where they were located. The Akkadian version also significantly differs from the first-millennium recension.<sup>1153</sup>

The Ḫattuša recension represents an intermediate stage between the OB and first-millennium recensions, but as the variants show, it reflects a different textual tradition from the extant earlier and later manuscripts. It is impossible to identify when and where this recension was created, but taking into consideration that Assyro-Mitannian texts are the product of Northern Mesopotamian/Babylonian scribal circles,<sup>1154</sup> KBo 36 11+ likely reflects a local/independent(?) variant.

**b)** The second text, **KBo 36 11+ Obv. 43 - Rev. 24**, is a Marduk-Ea incantation with an abbreviated formula. The text is badly preserved and no duplicates are known so far. I attempt here to provide an edition:

#### KBo 36 11+ Obv.

- 43 udug-ḫul lu<sub>2</sub> 'x'-a(-)an-na 'diġir'(-)[...]  
*The evil Udug, the man [...] in the(?)sky, the god(?) [...]*
- 44 a-la<sub>2</sub>-ḫul diġir im-gen<sub>7</sub> u[gu' nam-lu<sub>2</sub>-u<sub>18</sub>-lu]  
*the evil Alla and the god like a storm over(?) [mankind]*
- 45 ḫuš-a(-)aš KA m[u-u]n-na-an-[...]  
*terribly(?) [...]*
- 46 gidim-ḫul lu<sub>2</sub> im-g[e]n<sub>7</sub> ġiri<sub>3</sub>-saġ-ġa<sub>2</sub> [...]  
*The evil Ghost, the man like a storm over (his) feet and head [...]*
- 47 ugu nam-lu<sub>2</sub>-[u<sub>18</sub>]-lu-ta [...]  
*over mankind [...]*
- 48 gal<sub>5</sub>-la<sub>2</sub>-ḫul lu<sub>2</sub>-uš<sub>2</sub>-gen<sub>7</sub> sul-'nin<sup>2</sup>-bi<sup>2</sup>'-[da ...]<sup>1155</sup>  
*The evil Galla like a dead man, the young man together with the lady (?) [...]*
- 49 nam-lu<sub>2</sub>-u<sub>18</sub>-lu [...]  
*mankind [...]*
- 50 diġir-ḫul siškur<sub>2</sub> nu-m[u]-un-zu-a arina<sub>x</sub> (RI<sub>8</sub>) nam-lu<sub>2</sub>-[u<sub>18</sub>-lu ...]  
*the evil God who does not know the prayer, the Arina-plant, mankind [...]*
- 51 [(x)](-)ġeš-gen<sub>7</sub> x bi<sub>2</sub>-ib<sub>2</sub>-[...]  
*[...] like wood(?) [...]*

#### KBo 36 11+ Rev.

- 1 [.....iz]i-gen<sub>7</sub> [...] (x) nam-lu<sub>2</sub>-u<sub>18</sub>-lu-ke<sub>4</sub>  
[x]-ib<sub>2</sub>-gu<sub>7</sub>-gu<sub>7</sub>  
*[...] like fire [...] of mankind [...] / [...] eats*
- 2 'diġir-x-x' izi-gen<sub>7</sub> u[g]u nam-lu<sub>2</sub>-u<sub>18</sub>-lu ri x (x)  
*the god [...] like fire(?) spread(?) over mankind*

1153 See Böck 2007, 223-233 ll. 42, 43, 48, 50-56, 66, 67; variants are orthographic, lexical, syntactic and morphological.

1154 Schwemer 1998, 50.

1155 This line may also be read as šul 'dam-nu'-[tuku-a].

3	su-ni-še <i>to his body the (evil) Alla</i>	a <sub>2</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> -[(hul)]
4	imin-bi-e-ne gal <sub>5</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> -hul siškur <sub>2</sub> nu-mu-un-zu-a <i>the Seven ones and the evil Ghost who do not know prayers,</i>	
5	ka-ba-a-ni <i>his mouth is not healthy.</i>	nu-silim-ma
6	<sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> usu-e-ne <i>May Enlil make their power run away(?)</i>	'šu' (x)-[(x)-d]ag <sup>1156</sup>
7	<sup>d</sup> en-ki ḡalga-maḥ e <sub>2</sub> -engur-ta ḥ[a-.....]am <sup>?</sup> <i>May Enki the mighty instruction from the Engur [...]</i>	
8	diḡir-ḥuš us <sub>2</sub> -sa-ne-ne [...]	
9	ḥa-ba-ni-in-gaz <i>may (he) kill the furious god and his followers(?)</i>	
10	igi-a-ni-še <sub>3</sub> [...] <i>to his face,</i>	
11	sul diḡir nu-tuku ḥa-ba-an-teḡ <sub>3</sub> -[ḡe <sub>26</sub> -de <sub>3</sub> ] <i>(He) approached the young man who has no personal god,</i>	
12	ki-kur <sub>2</sub> -še <sub>3</sub> [ ḥa-ba-ra-ab-...] <i>to a hostile place, may [...]</i>	
13	<sup>d</sup> asar-lu <sub>2</sub> -ḥi [igi im-ma-an-šum <sub>2</sub> ] <i>Asalluḥi saw it.</i>	
14	ḡen-na <i>Go my son!</i>	dumu-mu
15	a-pe-el-l[a ...] <i>dirty water (?) [...]</i>	
16	lu <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>18</sub> -lu x-a-ni x[...] <i>the man, his [...]</i>	
17	a-ga-n[a g]i-izi-la <sub>2</sub> x [...] <i>at his back, the torch [...]</i>	
18	tu <sub>6</sub> -d[u <sub>11</sub> -ga] DI-ga <sup>1157</sup> [...] <i>the incantation formula [...]</i>	
19	du <sub>11</sub> -ga <sup>d</sup> en-ki <sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub> -le [...] <i>by order of Enki and Enlil [...]</i>	

1156 For šu--dag see Karahashi 2000, 152-154; an alternative reading may be 'ḡa<sub>2</sub>-la'[(x) d]ag, cf. UH I: 141, XII: 63, 105.

1157 This is perhaps a non-finite form from du<sub>11</sub>.

20	šu-nam-tar <sup>?</sup> <ra>-ga-a-ni ħe <sub>2</sub> -am <sup>1158</sup> [...] <i>may (he) be the 'his hand of Namtar' [...]</i>
21	en-na u <sub>4</sub> til <sub>3</sub> -la ša <sub>3</sub> -zu tab nu-ši-bi[l <sup>?</sup> ...] <i>Until you will live, the fever will not burn your heart.</i>
22	lu <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>18</sub> -lu-bi ka-tar-zu ka-an-s[i-il] <i>May that patient recite your praises.</i>
23	ĝa <sub>2</sub> lu <sub>2</sub> -mu <sub>7</sub> -mu <sub>7</sub> [arad-zu] <i>I, the āšipu, your servant,</i>
24	ka-tar-zu [ga-an-si-il] <i>may I recite your praises.</i>

22. On the basis of UH III: 196-197 ka-an-s[i-il] is here regarded as a 3sg. precativ form:

UH <sup>III</sup> 196	lu <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>18</sub> -lu-bi ka-tar-zu ħe <sub>2</sub> -en-si-il-e LÜ <sub>2</sub> šu-u <sub>2</sub> da-li-li-ka lid-lul
197	u <sub>3</sub> ĝe <sub>26</sub> -e lu <sub>2</sub> -mu <sub>7</sub> -mu <sub>7</sub> arad-zu ka-tar-zu ga-an-si-il u <sub>3</sub> a-na-ku a-ši-pu a-rad-ka da-li-li-ka lud-lul

As noted above<sup>1159</sup> the same form is attested in a MB Emesal text from Sippar; on the basis of the explanations given above it seems that ka- was likely a common writing for the precativ in Northern Babylonian scribal practice. This is a further piece of evidence for placing this text within the Northern Babylonian textual tradition.

The final prayer containing the thanksgiving formula (Rev. 22-24) is known from *Incantation to Utu* (ll. 244-249),<sup>1160</sup> the series *Udug-ĥul*<sup>1161</sup> and *Kiutu* incantations of the series *Bīt rimki*.<sup>1162</sup> Unorthographic writings are limited to a few cases.

c) The second incantation on the reverse, **KBo 36 11+ Rev. 26-38**, has no preserved duplicate. I present here an attempt at an interpretation:

26	lu <sub>2</sub> -ĥul lu <sub>2</sub> -bi KA <sup>?</sup> [...]
27	lu <sub>2</sub> -ĥul lu <sub>2</sub> -bi si <sup>?</sup> -a [...]
28	si-taraĥ-maš dur <sub>11</sub> -ra-a-ni-ta te-ge-ta-'a x'
29	šu-bil <sup>?</sup> -[bil] (x) šu-na ba-an-ĝar-re
30	ĝiri <sub>3</sub> -bil-[bi] ĝiri <sub>3</sub> -na ba-an-ĝar-re
31	ki-si <sub>3</sub> -g[a (x)]-ni-na-(a) ki-še ĥa-ba-an-ku <sub>4</sub> -ru
32	saĝ-ki-[(x)-r]a ta-na-ta
33	e <sub>2</sub> en-[x]-ta ta-na-ta (x)
34	igi maš-š[a] igi-gul-gul-la-ta
35	DU-[...] MA.RA ħe <sub>2</sub>
36	sul-[x]-bi-še <sub>3</sub> GABA-ta-bi-še <sub>3</sub>

**1158** Cf. UHF 714: lu<sub>2</sub>-ulu<sub>3</sub>-be<sub>2</sub> šu nam-tar-ra-ka-na ĥul-lu-be<sub>2</sub> mu-un-kuš<sub>2</sub>-u<sub>2</sub>, 'That man suffers horribly from fate (lit. the hand of 'Namtar')'.

**1159** § 1.1.9.1.

**1160** Geller 1995, 102 n. 6.

**1161** UH II: 60, III: 196-197, X: 78.

**1162** Laessøe 1955, Pl. III n. IX: 6'; this is also similar to Pl. II no. V Rev: 5'; see also Kunstmann 1932, 52.

37	na a[dʔ] [...] x-bi-še <sub>3</sub> GABA-ta-bi-še
38	na a[dʔ] ġa <sub>2</sub> -a-b[i-(še <sub>3</sub> )] zi-ga

26-27. These lines describe an evil man, lu<sub>2</sub>-ḫul, assaulting the patient, lu<sub>2</sub>-bi.

28. si-taraḫ-maš, 'gazelle's horn', is attested in UH IX: 46.

29-30. Cf. UHF 537-538; these two lines may be translated as 'the burning hands touched his hand / the burning foot touched his foot.'

31. ki-si<sub>3</sub>-ga are funerary offerings, see UHF 63'; the line can be translated as 'May the funerary offerings return to their place(?).'

32. On the basis of UHF 540, the first word is perhaps saġ-ki-sumur-ra, 'hot-headedness', but there seems to be no room for sumur. ta in ta-na-ta may be a phonetic writing for da 'side'; lines 32-33 may be rendered as 'forehead (...) from/at his side (?) // from the temple of (?) from/at his side.'

35. MA.RA is unclear; may one read ma-ra-saga<sub>7</sub>, 'to scatter'?

37-38. na is perhaps 'incense'; cf. UH VII: 111, IX: 44.

**d)** The last incantation on the reverse, **KUB 37 100a 39-46**, is a forerunner of *Udug-ḫul* Tablet V.<sup>1163</sup> The only OB source preserving lines inscribed on the Assyro-Mitannian manuscript is a tablet from Nippur, Ni 631 (B). This incantation remains quite unvaried from the Old Babylonian period up to the first millennium, even though a few variants are documented in the manuscripts:

Line	KUB 37 100a, 39-46	Ni 631	Line	UHV
377	niġ <sub>2</sub> -nam-mu	niġ <sub>2</sub> -nam	142	niġ <sub>2</sub> -nam-ma
377	us <sub>2</sub> -bi	uš <sub>2</sub> -bi	142	us <sub>2</sub> -su <sub>13</sub>
378	'dim <sub>2</sub> '-bi	[...-b]i	143	dim <sub>2</sub> -ma-bi
378	e <sub>2</sub>	a <sup>1</sup>	143	a
379	za-lim <sup>2</sup>	[ulutim <sub>2</sub> (SIG <sub>7</sub> ,ALAN)-bi] <sup>3</sup>	144	ulutim <sub>2</sub> -bi
380	gul-gul-[e]	gul-gul	145	gul-gul
380	zi-'ir-zi'-ir <sup>4</sup>	'zi <sub>2</sub> '-ir-zi <sub>2</sub> -re-da	146	zi-ir-zi-re-da
381	u-gug <sub>2</sub> <sup>5</sup>	udug	147	udug

1 Contrary to Geller, I read e<sub>2</sub> instead of u<sub>2</sub>.

2 See § 4.4.

3 Restored on the basis of CT 16 Pl. 15, iv 42 and BAM V 508, IV, 20, ulutim<sub>2</sub>-bi niġ<sub>2</sub> an-gen<sub>7</sub> šu nu-teġ<sub>3</sub>-ġe<sub>26</sub>.

4 Note that this writing is shared by the first-millennium recension, see UH V: 145.

5 Contrary to Geller, I read u-gug<sub>2</sub>(LU<sub>3</sub>) instead of udug<sup>1</sup>.

Variants are mostly purely orthographic or consist of phonetic writings. The only attested recensional variant is us<sub>2</sub>-bi (M), uš<sub>2</sub>-bi (B) and us<sub>2</sub>-su<sub>13</sub> in the canonical recension.

To sum up, this tablet contains a collection of different *Udug-ḫul* incantations that with only one exception were not incorporated in the canonical recension. Nevertheless, the first incantation became part of the *Muššu'u* series.

## 5.2.2 CTH 805.2-3

The entry CTH 805.2 includes three fragments that probably belong to the same tablet even though they do not physically join.

**KUB 37 143** is a tiny fragment from the central part of its tablet discovered in Building C under the Phrygian level. Only four lines are preserved on one side, whereas the other side is broken

<sup>1163</sup> Geller 1985 source M = UHF 377-382; UH V: 142ff. (CT 16 Pl. 15 iv 40ff.; cf. BAM V 508, IV, 18-25).



away. The text is a forerunner of *Udug-ḫul* Tablet VII<sup>1164</sup> (UHF 674-682) corresponding to canonical UH VII: 14ff.<sup>1165</sup> Only the Sumerian text is preserved, but an Akkadian translation was arranged in a parallel column. Three OB tablets preserve this passage: Ni 631 (B) from Nippur, CBS 591 (E) likely from Sippar<sup>1166</sup> and BM 78375 = CT 44 29 (J) also perhaps from Sippar.<sup>1167</sup> Another duplicate of Tablet VII is the possibly MB tablet Ni 2676 + Ni 2997 + Ni 4017 + Ni 4018 (C) in which these lines are almost completely broken away.<sup>1168</sup> As see above, the Old Babylonian manuscripts, regardless of their provenance, are close to one another. An exhaustive comparison with older and late duplicates is precluded as only a few signs are preserved on KUB 37 143 but one may note that the Assyro-Mitannian tablet omits line UHF 677 = UH VII: 17.

**KUB 37 101** is a tiny fragment of a two-column tablet discovered in Building D above the Hittite level. The fragment contains a bilingual incantation in parallel column format. Only a few signs to the left and right of the intercolumn space are preserved.<sup>1169</sup>

**KUB 37 102** is a fragment from the central part of a two-column tablet discovered in Building D above the Hittite stratum, inscribed with a bilingual text in parallel column format that is a forerunner of the series *Udug-ḫul*. The text, enumerating a list of demons, duplicates UH III: 138ff. and UH VI: 58ff. and it is also attested in *Biṭ rimki* III: 49ff.<sup>1170</sup> Unfortunately, the first two lines which provide the context of the incantation only preserve the end of verbal forms that are unparalleled in the canonical series. The OB forerunner of *Biṭ rimki* III, CBS 1529, a single-column tablet likely from Sippar,<sup>1171</sup> does not preserve any lines of KUB 37 102.<sup>1172</sup> Compared to the first-millennium recension, KUB 37 102 is characterized by the writings <sup>d</sup>dim<sub>3</sub>-ma-me<sup>?</sup> instead of <sup>d</sup>dim<sub>3</sub>-me-lagab (l. 4) and -ḡar-ra for -kar-ra (l. 5). The OB recension does not preserve this section in either Tablet III or VI, but considering that the gap in Tablet III is only four lines, whereas in Tablet VI it is longer,<sup>1173</sup> the text of KUB 37 102 probably belongs to the latter. The Hattuša manuscript shows close similarity to the canonical recension.

1	[.....](-)il <sub>2</sub> -la <sub>2</sub>
2	[.....](-)il <sub>2</sub> -la <sub>2</sub>
3	[(udug-ḫul a-la <sub>2</sub> -ḫul gidim-ḫul gal <sub>5</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> -ḫul diḡir)] ḫul maškim-ḫul u <sub>2</sub> -tuk-[...]
4	[( <sup>d</sup> dim <sub>3</sub> -me dim <sub>3</sub> -me-a)] <sup>d</sup> dim <sub>3</sub> -ma-me <sup>?</sup> la-maš-[tu ...]
5	[(lu <sub>2</sub> -lil-la <sub>2</sub> ki-sikil-lil <sub>2</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> ki-sikil-u <sub>4</sub> -da)]-ḡar-ra uz-[...]
6	[(nam-tar-ḫul-ḡal <sub>2</sub> a <sub>2</sub> -saḡ <sub>3</sub> niḡ-geg-ga niḡ-dur <sub>11</sub> )-r]u nu-du <sub>10</sub> -ga na[m-tar ...]
7	[(niḡ-geg niḡ-ak-a niḡ <sub>2</sub> )-ḫu]l-dim <sub>2</sub> -ma
8	[(aš-ḡar aš-ru a-ḫa-an-tum <sub>3</sub> u <sub>4</sub> )]-š <sub>u2</sub> -uš-ru
9	[(diḫ dim <sub>2</sub> -ma bar)]-ḡeš-ra
10	[(lu <sub>2</sub> -ḫul igi-ḫul ka-ḫul eme)]-ḫul

1164 Manuscript N in Geller 1985.

1165 Cf. Cooper 1978, 150-154.

1166 It belongs to the Khabaza collection. For Ni 631 and CBS 591 see § 1.1.10.1.

1167 See fn. 1108.

1168 See § 1.1.10.1.

1169 Cooper 1971 suggests that KUB 37 101-102 belong to the first two incantations of KBo 36 11+, but no line can be restored on the basis of the signs inscribed on these two fragments.

1170 Borger 1967.

1171 For this tablet see § 1.1.10.3.

1172 Geller 1995, 117-118.

1173 Geller 1985, 93; for Tablet VI see Geller 1995, 121-122.

11	[(uš-ḫul uš-zu)] uš-ra
12	[(niĝ <sub>2</sub> -ak-a niĝ <sub>2</sub> -ḫul-dim <sub>2</sub> )-m]a-ta
13	[.....keš <sub>2</sub> (?)]-ta <sup>1174</sup>
14	[.....] x

**KUB 37 107** (CTH 805.3), discovered in Building A, is a fragment from the intercolumn space of a two-column tablet. Only the left edge of the Akkadian column is preserved. The incantation is probably of the *Udug-ḫul* type.<sup>1175</sup>

### 5.2.3 KUB 4 16

**KUB 4 16** is a fragment from the lower right corner of a two-column tablet which has been recently published by Fincke (2009a) as a forerunner of *Udug-ḫul* Tablet VI. The fragment, originally part of a bilingual tablet in parallel column format, preserves only the Akkadian version on both obverse and reverse.<sup>1176</sup> Text lines are set off by horizontal rulings. The obverse<sup>1</sup> contains the end of an incantation with the *zi-pa<sub>3</sub>* formula<sup>1177</sup> (l. 1-4) followed by a prophylactic incantation<sup>1178</sup> which continues on the reverse. This fragment is identified as Assyro-Mitannian<sup>1179</sup> but its paleographic categorization is not beyond doubt<sup>1180</sup> and it is not excluded that it represents an example of a Hittite copy of an Assyro-Mitannian manuscript.<sup>1181</sup> The only OB manuscript preserving the segment of Tablet VI inscribed on KUB 4 16 is CBS 1532 (F), a tablet belonging to the Khabaza collection, hence probably from Sippar.

Fincke demonstrated the closeness of this fragment to the canonical recension, but some remarks are required. Although the line order is closer to the canonical recension than to the OB it is not identical:

KUB 4 16	UH VI	UHF VI
[Obv. <sup>1</sup> 1]	104	582
Obv. <sup>1</sup> 2	105	583
Obv. <sup>1</sup> 3-4	106	584
Obv. <sup>1</sup> 5	114	x
Obv. <sup>1</sup> 6	115	x
Obv. <sup>1</sup> 7	116	x
Obv. <sup>1</sup> 8	118	x
Rev. <sup>1</sup> 1	119	x
Rev. <sup>1</sup> 2	120/133a	515a
Rev. <sup>1</sup> 3	121/133b	515b
Rev. <sup>1</sup> 4	134	516
Rev. <sup>1</sup> 5	135	517
Rev. <sup>1</sup> 6-7	136	518
Rev. <sup>1</sup> 8-10	-	-
Rev. <sup>1</sup> 11	139	521

<sup>1174</sup> For this restoration see K 3462 Rev. 14, Borger 1967, 6 (C).

<sup>1175</sup> Schwemer 2013, 154.

<sup>1176</sup> Obverse and reverse are to be exchanged, see Fincke 2009a.

<sup>1177</sup> UH VI: 105-106; see l. 4 *ni-iš<sub>3</sub> AN-e* [...]. At Ḫattuša this formula is also attested in KUB 37 111 (§ 5.3.10) and in the Akkadian incantation KUB 37 85, *ni-iš DINGIR-lim-ia lu-u<sub>2</sub>* [...] (Rev. 5), whose script is not clearly identified, see Schwemer 1998, 5 n. 21.

<sup>1178</sup> For this typology see Falkenstein 1931, 35-44.

<sup>1179</sup> Schwemer 2013, 154.

<sup>1180</sup> Cf. Weeden 2012, 230 and n. 13.

<sup>1181</sup> Cf. KUB 37 111, § 5.3.10.

KUB 4 16 shows omissions (107-113,<sup>1182</sup> 117, 122-133,<sup>1183</sup> 137-138), additions (Rev.<sup>1</sup> 8-10) and variants<sup>1184</sup> to the canonical recension. The passage in KUB 4 16 Rev.<sup>1</sup> 8-10, which is an elaboration on the schema of Rev.<sup>1</sup> 6-7, replaces lines 519-520 of the OB recension and 137-138 of the first-millennium recension:

Rev. <sup>1</sup>	8	GID[IM] <i>lem-nu a-na</i> [...]
Rev. <sup>1</sup>	9	[ <i>gallû l[e[m]-'nu' a-na</i> [...]
Rev. <sup>1</sup>	10	[ <i>īlu lem-nu' a'-na</i> [...]
UHF	519	udug- <i>ḥul</i> e <sub>2</sub> -a til <sub>3</sub> -la šu [nu- <i>ĝar-ra-zu-še<sub>3</sub></i> ]
	520	di <i>ĝir</i> lu <sub>2</sub> -ulu <sub>3</sub> -[ke <sub>4</sub> ]
UH <sup>VI</sup>	137	udug- <i>ḥul</i> e <sub>2</sub> -a ti-la šu nu- <i>ĝar-ra-zu-še<sub>3</sub></i> di <i>ĝir-ḥul</i> lu <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>18</sub> -lu-ke <sub>4</sub> <i>u<sub>2</sub>-tuk-ku lem-nu ša<sub>2</sub> ina E<sub>2</sub> tuš-b[u-u] DIĜIR u LU<sub>2</sub> ana la ga-ma-li-ka</i>
UH <sup>VI</sup>	138	udug- <i>ḥul</i> a-la <sub>2</sub> - <i>ḥul</i> gedim-[ <i>ḥul</i> ] gal <sub>5</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> - <i>ḥul</i> di <i>ĝir-ḥul</i> maškim- <i>ḥul</i> [ <i>u<sub>2</sub>-tuk-ku lem-nu a-lu-u lem-nu e-ṭim-mu lem-nu gal-lu-u lem-nu i-lu lem-mu ra-bi-šu lem-nu</i> ]

KUB 4 16 deviates from the other manuscripts, reflecting an intermediate stage between the OB and the canonical recensions. It represents a product of the Middle Babylonian scribal schools and in light of the variants it likely relies on a different textual tradition from the extant sources.

#### 5.2.4 CTH 794

Fragments listed under CTH 794, **KBo 7 1 + KUB 37 115 (+) KBo 7 2**, were found in Building D and are part of a bilingual tablet in interlinear format written in Assyro-Mittanian script.<sup>1185</sup> Three columns are ruled on the manuscript but text lines oddly run continuously from left to right. Perhaps this layout was originally inscribed on the tablet with a different text in mind. The obverse<sup>1186</sup> contains a Marduk-Ea incantation, whereas the reverse has a *Kiutu* prayer.

Only a few unorthographic writings are documented:

ab-ba-si-il-le ~ a-ba-si-il-le - Obv. 1, 2, 4  
-dal ~ -dar - Obv. 3  
inim<sup>1</sup>-gal ~ inim-*ĝar* - Obv. 20  
mu-un-ni ~ mu-un-ne - Rev. 3  
nam-me-en ~ nam-en - Rev. 8

**a)** The Marduk-Ea incantation which reports the abbreviated form of the dialogue between Asalluḫi and Enki, as is typical in late texts, is poorly preserved and no duplicates are known. The Sumerian text shows some errors:

<sup>1182</sup> Note that these lines are fragmentary even in the first-millennium manuscripts.

<sup>1183</sup> In KUB 4 16 lines 120-121 are immediately followed by 134 as they are identical to line 133.

<sup>1184</sup> Text in Rev.<sup>1</sup> 4 is different from UH VI: 134.

<sup>1185</sup> Assyro-Mitannian signs are: LA with one horizontal: KUB 37 115 Rev. 4, KBo 7 2 10; NAM: KUB 37 115 Obv. 7, KBo 7 2, 20; EN: KUB 37 115 Obv. 7; IG: KBo 7 2, 17; AK: KBo 7 2, 17; GI: KBo 7 2 15.

<sup>1186</sup> Lineation according to Cooper 1972. Obverse and reverse of KBo 7 1 are to be exchanged, see Cooper 1971, 9; for the disposition of fragments see Cooper 1972, 62 n. 2, 69 n. 24; the web site <http://www.hetither.net> provides a drawing of the joins.

- The Akkadian translation of *si-il*, ‘to split apart’, with *i-sa<sub>3</sub>-al-la-lu* in *su ab-ba-si-il-le* (CTH 794 Obv. 1, 3, 5),<sup>1187</sup> is probably an error for *isallatū*.<sup>1188</sup>
- In *ninda du<sub>10</sub>-ga nu-mu-ra-an-gu<sub>7</sub>-e // a-du<sub>10</sub>-ga nu-mu-ra-an-naĝ-ab*, ‘He cannot eat good food, he cannot drink good water’ (CTH 794 Obv. 5-6), *-ab* at the end of the verbal form makes no sense and is probably a copying mistake.<sup>1189</sup> The infix *-ra-* (ablative?) is also unclear.
- The Sumerian verbal form in [.....] ĝešŠU<sub>2</sub>.[A ĝeš]šeneg // [.....] *ina l[i<sup>1</sup>-ti bi-ni] tu-še-ši-ib* (CTH 794 Obv. 17) seems to be omitted.

**b)** The *Kiutu* incantation<sup>1190</sup> on the reverse is known from two first-millennium recensions: one preserved on three manuscripts from Nineveh (N)<sup>1191</sup> belonging to the ‘second house’ of the series *Bīt rimki*, and the other inscribed on a bilingual tablet from Sultan-Tepe, STT 197 (St), containing the text in phonetic orthography.

The Ḫattuša manuscript has a different line order from the Nineveh and Sultan-Tepe sources, which are very close to each other.<sup>1192</sup> The Sumerian version in CTH 794 shows several anomalies:

- In [...] *ama<sup>4</sup> nin-gal* (CTH 794 Rev. 6), the genitive is omitted: cf. *dumu u<sub>3</sub>-du<sub>2</sub>-ud-da ama<sup>4</sup> nin-gal-la-ke<sub>4</sub>*, ‘Born son of mother Ningal’ (N).<sup>1193</sup> This omission is possibly due to the copyist.
- In [ħa]r-ra-an *kaskal si* [...]x *sa<sub>2</sub>*, (CTH 794 Rev. 7), the directive required by the compound verb is omitted; the Nineveh and Sultan-Tepe sources also omit the directive, *igi zalag<sub>2</sub>-ga kaskal ħar-ra-an si ba-ni-ib<sub>2</sub>-si-sa<sub>2</sub>-e*,<sup>1194</sup> ‘Bright eye that maintains the roads and highways’ (N). Omission of the directive with a compound verb resulting in two direct objects, not admitted in standard Sumerian, is a trait of late texts.
- The genitive is written with *-e* in [...] *en dili-[im<sub>2</sub>]-babbar<sub>2</sub>-re* (CTH 794 Rev. 5), cf. *a-ri-a ku<sub>3</sub>-ga-ta en dili-im<sub>2</sub>-babbar-ra*, ‘Pure offspring of lord Dilimbabbar’ (N); switching between *e* and *a* occurs since the Old Babylonian period.<sup>1195</sup>
- The sequence UD.UD is read as *babbar<sub>2</sub>*, ‘white’, in *tug<sub>2</sub>-maḥ gada babbar<sub>2</sub>-re a-ra-an-ĝar-ra // tu-maḥ-ħa-a ki-te<sup>1</sup>-i el-la u<sub>2</sub>-ma-aš-š<sup>2</sup>-ka*, ‘I have spread before you an ‘exalted garment’, a garment of white linen’ (CTH 794 Rev. 14), but it is translated as *ellu*, ‘pure’, in Akkadian;<sup>1196</sup> also the first-millennium manuscripts have *dadag = ellu*, *tu<sub>9</sub>-maḥ* [tu<sub>9</sub> gada dadag]-g[a...] (N). The lack of agreement between Sumerian and Akkadian in the Ḫattuša manuscript cannot be attributed to the Assyro-Mitannian scribe, but it must be considered as a variant already attested in the model: there is in fact no reason to assume that the scribe miscopied *-ga* as *-re*.

1187 The extra *-b-* is a binding from *a-ba-si-il-le*.

1188 Cooper 1972, 63-64: 1.

1189 *-ab* possibly refers to the absolutive incorrectly written after the verbal base. The verb *naĝ* ‘to drink’ usually has the reduplicated *marû* form, but it is frequently written *-naĝ-e* in the canonical *Udug-ħul*, possibly under the influence of *gu*, ‘to eat’ (*marû = -gu<sub>7</sub>-e*), cf. UH VI: 169, 181.

1190 For this genre see § 1.1.10.3.

1191 For the Nineveh manuscripts see Cooper 1972, 69.

1192 Cooper 1972, 67.

1193 The ergative is incorrect in a list of epithets as in this case, cf. Jagersma 2010, 160.

1194 The verbal form in the late sources is incorrect because it has the 3sg. human OO *-ni-* instead of the non-human (*-bi-*); also note the late form *si--si-sa<sub>2</sub>* instead of standard Sumerian *si-sa<sub>2</sub>*.

1195 Black, Zólyomi 2007, 18.

1196 Cooper 1972, 78: 14.

- The verbal form  $bi_2$ -in-zu in  ${}^dutu \hat{g}e\acute{s}gu$ -za  $ku_3$ -ga tuš-a-zu  $bi_2$ -in-zu //  ${}^dUTU ina \hat{r}ge\acute{s}'GU.ZA el-le-ti ti-ša-am-ma$ , 'Šamaš, sit on your holy throne!' (CTH 794 Rev. 26), is only attested in the Ḫattuša manuscript. It is very unlikely that this form was added by the copyist of CTH 794; it was probably attested in some variant version unknown to us. Since the Akkadian translation is substantially the same in all the manuscripts, one can speculate that the Sumerian of the Ḫattuša manuscript is the oldest version and later the verbal form  $bi_2$ -in-zu was left out because it was no longer understood. Indeed, it seems that the Akkadian version misunderstands the Sumerian by translating tuš-a-zu (tuš-zu in St), which was probably a pronominal form, 'when you sit', with an imperative.<sup>1197</sup> At a certain point in time the Sumerian version was perhaps rephrased on the basis of the Akkadian translation by skipping the Sumerian finite form.

With a few exceptions, most of the anomalies and variants cannot be attributed to the Assyro-Mitannian copyist but derive from the textual history of the composition and the Babylonian model(s). *Kiutu* incantations are typical of the post-Old Babylonian period, but it is not precluded that a (monolingual?) version of this text existed in earlier times as perhaps line CTH 794 Rev. 26 might suggest. Nevertheless the Ḫattuša manuscript represents the oldest surviving source for the bilingual version. After the Middle Babylonian period, this text was transmitted to first-millennium libraries and underwent further modifications. The Kassite tablet HS 1512<sup>1198</sup> is partially parallel to our *Kiutu* incantation<sup>1199</sup> but unfortunately the Assyro-Mitannian source is too badly preserved for comparison. One may only observe that HS 1512, as with late duplicates, has anše-kur-ra-ke<sub>4</sub><sup>1200</sup> while CTH 794 Rev. 11, has anše-kur-ra-zu. Šamaš prayers are mostly known from Northern Babylonia,<sup>1201</sup> hence the same provenance may be surmised for the *Kiutu* incantation inscribed on CTH 794.

The Akkadian version is usually correct,<sup>1202</sup> but a few mistakes are documented: *i-gar<sub>3</sub>-ra-šu* for *egirrašu* (CTH 794 Obv. 20) is a *hapax* in which the switch *e/i > a* is a trait of peripheral Akkadian;<sup>1203</sup> *i-da<sub>2</sub>-aš-ši-ku<sub>8</sub>*<sup>1204</sup> is an incorrect form for *udakkīšu* (CTH 794 Rev. 19).<sup>1204</sup> The Akkadian and Sumerian versions differ in some verbal forms: Rev. 17: mu-un-ġar (3sg.) VS *aš-tak<sub>2</sub>-ka-an'* (1sg.); Rev. 20: ġar-ra (non-finite form) VS *aš-ku-un-ku* (1sg. preterite).

The relation between the two compositions inscribed on CTH 794 is unclear. In particular, it is unknown whether the incantations were already inscribed on the same Babylonian model, or rather if the *Sammeltablet* was compiled by the Assyro-Mitannian scribes.

### 5.2.5 KUB 34 3

**KUB 34 3** is a seven-line bilingual fragment discovered in Building A containing the main theme of a prophylactic incantation. Only one side is preserved while the other is broken away. Sumerian and Akkadian versions are set off by *Glossenkeile* and lines are marked by rulings.

1	[.....] x [...]
2	[... nam-ba-t]eġ <sub>3</sub> -rġe <sub>26</sub> -de <sub>3</sub> : 'a-na mi-x [...] <i>May you not approach his</i> [...].
3	[... x]-ni-še <sub>3</sub> nam-ba-teġ <sub>3</sub> -rġe <sub>26</sub> -de <sub>3</sub> : a-na mi- x[...]

<sup>1197</sup> For *tišab* see GAG § 103 h.

<sup>1198</sup> See § 1.1.10.3.

<sup>1199</sup> H 1512, 7-9 is parallel to CTH 794 Rev. 11, 12, 16.

<sup>1200</sup> Note that the Akkadian version of St 177 has ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ-ka.

<sup>1201</sup> On this point see § 1.1.10.3 and fn. 422.

<sup>1202</sup> Cooper 1972, 68.

<sup>1203</sup> Cooper 1972, 64: 20.

<sup>1204</sup> Cooper 1972, 68 n. 21.

4	<i>May you not approach his [...].</i> [... n]am-ba-teĝ <sub>3</sub> -ĝe <sub>26</sub> -de <sub>3</sub> : a-na ra-pa <sub>2</sub> -a[š <sup>?</sup> -ti <sup>?</sup> -šu e ta-aṭ- hi]
5	<i>May you not approach his loins.</i> [... n]am-ba-teĝ <sub>3</sub> -ĝe <sub>26</sub> -de <sub>3</sub> : a-na GUBU <sub>3</sub> -li-š[u <sup>?</sup> e ta-aṭ- hi]
6	<i>May you not approach his left.</i> [... na]m-ba-teĝ <sub>3</sub> -ĝe <sub>26</sub> -de <sub>3</sub> : a-na kiš-ši <sub>x</sub> (IGI)-šu <sub>2</sub> [...]
7	<i>May you not approach his shins.</i> [.....] 'a-na' ĠIRI <sub>3</sub> -šu <sub>2</sub> x [...] <i>[May you not approach] his feet.</i>

This incantation did not enter the canonical *Udug-ḫul* series and no duplicates are known. As pointed out by Cooper,<sup>1205</sup> this text shows a late tradition for, as in first-millennium sources, the expected 2sg. suffix -en is omitted at the end of the verbal form.<sup>1206</sup>

The attribution of this fragment to the Assyro-Mitannian school is questionable as it is based on the shape of the sign NAM (ll. 3, 4, 5) only.<sup>1207</sup>

### 5.2.6 KUB 37 127

**KUB 37 127**, discovered in Building A, is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving eleven lines on one side, whereas the other side is broken away. The text is probably a prophylactic incantation (see l. 5 [...] *lu-u<sub>2</sub> ša*-[...]) in interlinear bilingual format. The attribution to the Assyro-Mitannian school is based on the shapes of the signs LU and ŠA.<sup>1208</sup>

### 5.2.7 KUB 37 95

**KUB 37 95**, discovered in Building A, is a fragment possibly from an Assyro-Mitannian tablet.<sup>1209</sup> The text, of which nine broken lines are preserved on one side only, is an incantation quoting Asalluḫi (l. 7). The preserved portion of the tablet seems to contain a monolingual Sumerian text but it is not excluded that an Akkadian translation was inscribed on a parallel column.

## 5.3 Hittite Script Tablets

This group includes tablets drafted by Hittite scribes mostly dated to the Late Hittite period.

CTH	Publication	Composition	Find-spot Area	Script	Language
314.1A	KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	?	NS	S PhS A H
314.2.B	KBo 12 72	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	HaH	NS	(S) (PhS) A H
314.2.C	KUB 4 4	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	(?)	NS	(S) (PhS) A H
314.2.A	KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	HaH	NS	(S) PhS H
315	KUB 4 2	The Message of Lu-diĝira to his Mother	?	NS	(S) PhS (A) (H)

<sup>1205</sup> Cooper 1971, 10.

<sup>1206</sup> In the OB incantations of this type demons are addressed in the second person singular. It is worth noting the use of the correct form -ĝe<sub>26</sub>-.

<sup>1207</sup> Note the two vertical wedges that intersect the first horizontal, cf. Schwemer 1998, 21. The sign LI (KUB 34 3, 5) may also be attributed to the Assyro-Mitannian school, but it is to be recalled that the same form was used in the Late Empire period.

<sup>1208</sup> ŠA has four horizontal wedges (l. 5), cf. KUB 37 106, 20 (it joins KBo 36 11+).

<sup>1209</sup> The signs LU<sub>2</sub> (l. 7) and KI (l. 8) seem to be Assyro-Mitannian, cf. Schwemer 1998, 30, 35.

CTH	Publication	Composition	Find-spot Area	Script	Language
315	KUB 4 97	The Message of Lu-diĝira to his Mother	?	NS	(S) (PhS) A H
315	RS 25.421 = AuOrS 23 50	The Message of Lu-diĝira to his Mother	Ugarit: Lamaštu Archive	NS	S PhS A H
807	KUB 57 126	Edubba E	?	NS	S PhS (A) (H?)
807	KUB 4 39 (RS 17.10; RS 17.80)	The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ	?	NS	S (A)
801.3	KUB 4 7	Nergal D	?	NS	S
819	KUB 4 41	Hymn to Nergal (?)	?	NS	S A
801	KUB 4 26 (+) HT 13 (+) KUB 37 112	a) <i>šulla</i> to Adad (Akk.) b) Hymn (?)	?	NS	PhS A
793	KUB 4 11	Incantation to Utu	?	NS	S A
806.2	KUB 4 24	Collection of Incantations	?	NS	S
801.4	KUB 37 111	Collection of Incantations	Bk. D	NS	S A
806.1	KBo 1 18	Collection of Incantations	?	NS	S
819	KUB 4 23	Collection of Incantations	?	MS/NS	S A
813	KUB 34 4	Incantation	Bk. A	NS	S A
806	KBo 36 20	Incantation	HaH	NS	S
806.4	ABoT 1 43	Incantation	?	NS	S (A?)
801	KBo 36 17	Incantation	T. I	NS	S A
819	KBo 19 98	Unidentified Text	T. I	MS	S A
819	KBo 36 24	Unidentified Text	?(Lower City)	NS	S (A)
819	KUB 4 10	Unidentified Text	?	NS(?)	S A(?)

### 5.3.1 The Hymn to Iškur-Adad – CTH 314

Under CTH 314 are listed six fragments containing a Sumerian hymn to Iškur-Adad: KUB 4 6 (A) (+) KUB 4 8 (B), KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73 (C), KBo 12 72 (D) and KUB 4 4 (E).<sup>1210</sup> Fragments C and D were discovered in the Haus am Hang. Also manuscripts A, B and E, whose find-spots were not recorded,<sup>1211</sup> probably stem from the same building.<sup>1212</sup>

**KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8 (A(+))B)** were possibly part of the same multicolumn tablet<sup>1213</sup> containing standard Sumerian, phonetic Sumerian, Akkadian and Hittite versions. Sections of all the versions are preserved on the obverse even though they do not overlap as the fragments do not physically join. The whole composition was divided into two tablets of which KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8 represents the first one as indicated in the colophon: DUB 1-kam *u<sub>2</sub>-ul qa-t[i]* ‘first tablet – not finished.’ The second tablet of the series is probably **KBo 12 72 (D)**,<sup>1214</sup> a fragment from the central part of its tablet that preserves only the Akkadian column on the obverse, while the reverse is broken away. For the sake of simplicity, this edition will be called quadrilingual (Edition A), even though phonetic Sumerian is not a different language. The fact that KBo 12 72, discovered in the Haus am Hang, belongs to the same edition as KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8 is evidence that all the fragments come from the same building.

Fragments **KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73 (C)** belong to a different edition (Edition B), here called trilingual, as they are part of a three-column tablet containing versions in standard orthography, phonetic

<sup>1210</sup> Manuscripts according to Schwemer 2001, 191-196.

<sup>1211</sup> On the provenance of fragments with unrecorded find-spots see § 8.5.

<sup>1212</sup> See Klingler 2010, 313.

<sup>1213</sup> It is unclear if fragments A and B belong to the same manuscript, as they do not physically join and do not contain any parallel passages, see remarks in Klingler 2010, 314.

<sup>1214</sup> Attribution of KBo 12 72 to the same edition as fragments A and B is uncertain because the sign LU in KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 6, has one initial upright wedge while in KBo 12 72 it is consistently written with three initial horizontal wedges.

orthography and Hittite, while the Akkadian column is lacking. It is worth noting that the Akkadian text of KBo 12 72 corresponds to the lines preserved in manuscript C. KUB 4 5+ represents the second tablet of the series, as is clear from the catch-line that reports the last two lines of the first tablet contained in KUB 4 8. These lines have only the Hittite text, but no variants are attested for the quadrilingual edition.

On paleographical grounds the manuscripts of Editions A and B date to the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>1215</sup>

**KUB 4 4** is a fragment from the central part of its tablet containing Tablet II of an additional quadrilingual edition, but only the Akkadian and Hittite columns are preserved on both sides. This fragment differs from the other manuscripts on paleographical grounds as the signs LI, IK and TA<sup>1216</sup> seem to show old shapes.<sup>1217</sup> The presence of the late form of ḪA throughout the tablet would suggest that KUB 4 4 is a late copy of an older tablet. However, van den Hout's remarks on the development of Hittite cuneiform<sup>1218</sup> may allow us to date it to a period earlier than the other fragments, possibly the early empire – or even earlier. In both cases KUB 4 4 clearly represents a further, older, edition. This suggests that the composition was received by Hittite scribes earlier than the late 13<sup>th</sup> century.

Three different editions of *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* are therefore attested at Ḫattuša and can be summarized as follows:

Edition A (Quadrilingual)	
Tablet I:	
KUB 4 6 (A)	SS-PhS-(A)-(H)
(+)	
KUB 4 8 (B)	(SS)-(PhS)-A-H
Tablet II:	
KBo 12 72 (D)	(SS)-(PhS)-A-(H)
Edition B (Trilingual)	
Tablet II:	
KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73 (C)	(SS)-PhS-H
Edition C (Quadrilingual)	
Tablet II:	
KUB 4 4 (E)	(SS)-(PhS)-A-H

The fragments from the Hittite capital are the only sources of this composition that have come down to us.<sup>1219</sup> Unfortunately, the standard orthography is only preserved for a few lines in KUB 4 6. Although no OB duplicates are known, some errors may shed light on when the recension of the text transmitted to the Hittite capital was composed:

- In *i<sub>7</sub>-da-gal-gal*, 'in the big rivers' (CTH 314 – KUB 4 6 Obv. I, 7), *-(d)a*, whatever function it had (probably locative),<sup>1220</sup> is misplaced because it is not at the end of the noun phrase. I tend to regard it as an error produced when the text was composed, the result of an inadequate

**1215** According to S. Košak's Konkordanz fragments of the quadrilingual edition, A+B and D, are 'junghethitisch' while the trilingual edition, manuscript C, is 'spätjunghethitisch', but note remarks in Klinger 2010, 313, where all fragments are dated to the same period. Furthermore, according to Klinger, manuscript D may be a late copy of an older tablet.

**1216** Old and late sign shapes are here referred to the Hittite script, cf. de Martino 1992, 84.

**1217** Even though the tablet surface is eroded the photograph seems to agree with the hand-copy.

**1218** van den Hout 2012b, 166-167. Klinger 2010, 313, also identifies late EN, AL and RA, but see again van den Hout's remarks on EN and AL.

**1219** A Hittite translation of an Akkadian hymn to Adad is preserved on a MS tablet (KUB 3 21), Archi 1983; even this composition is unknown in Mesopotamian originals.

**1220** The function of *-a* cannot be ascertained because the rest of the line is not preserved.



knowledge of Sumerian grammar. It seems improbable that the Hittite copyist autonomously inserted the sign DA.

- The expression  $\text{šu-du}_7 \text{ni}_2\text{-<gal>-a-ni}$  (CTH 314 - KUB 4 6 Obv. I, 3) is problematic because the verb is not placed at the end of the sentence. Two explanations can be advanced:
  1. As  $*\text{ni}_2\text{-<gal>-a-ni} \text{šu-du}_7$ , 'his awe-inspiring radiance is perfect',<sup>1221</sup> would be expected, the actual form is possibly influenced by an Akkadian expression with a participle in *status constructus* like *mušaklil namririšu*, 'it makes perfect his awe-inspiring radiance.'
  2. The expression may be a faulty representation of a genitive compound:  $*\text{šu-du}_7 \text{ni}_2\text{-<gal>-a-na}$ .<sup>1222</sup>

As in the preceding case this mistake was likely produced when the text was composed.

These errors can hardly be attributed to the Hittite scribes because they imply an active role in producing the text and a level of knowledge of Sumerian that, although still insufficient, the Hittites were unlikely to possess. It seems that these mistakes could have not been introduced by someone copying the tablet. As a hypothesis I would tend to regard them as hints of a late date for the composition or reworking of the text. A further hint that this was a late composition is the fact that Iškur, with the exception of the Emesal liturgies and the Larsa literature,<sup>1223</sup> had a marginal role in Sumerian literary texts.<sup>1224</sup> Schwemer<sup>1225</sup> pointed out that some themes incorporated in this composition are known from Mesopotamian literature, while other passages have no parallels. No phonetic writings seem to be attested in the standard orthography version contrary to other texts from Hattuša.<sup>1226</sup>

The phonetic Sumerian version, only preserved in KUB 4 6 and KUB 4 5+ - with no parallel lines between the two manuscripts - was composed at Hattuša by local scribes.<sup>1227</sup> Likely it served as a school exercise<sup>1228</sup> for advanced students. It is not excluded that the tablets were copied under the supervision of a Babylonian teacher. Signs that rarely occur in the Hittite syllabary are used, as for instance the sign GUR that was adopted by Hittites only as a logogram for the word 'other'.<sup>1229</sup> The presence of this sign is evidence that this composition was probably copied for educational purposes in the Hittite scribal school. It is worth noting that the phonetic writing a-ia renders the correct pronunciation of the Sumerian word for 'father', aia (A.A),<sup>1230</sup> and is traditionally attested in OB unorthographic texts.<sup>1231</sup> This knowledge was transmitted by means of lexical lists and by Babylonian teachers working in the Hittite capital. A further indication that this text was adopted in the Hittite scribal school is the writing  $\text{šu-}^{\text{du}}\text{du}_7$ , because glosses are rarely attested in Sumerian

1221 See the translation in Schwemer 2001, 192: «vollkommen ist sein Schreckensglanz».

1222 Cf. Thomsen 1984, 262.

1223 Brisch 2007, 44-48.

1224 Schwemer 2001, 175. There are only three compositions addressed to Iškur, *Iškur A* (ETCSL 4.9.1, STVC 57, Schwemer 2001, 190), *Ur-Ninurta F* (ETCSL 2.5.6.6) and *Sîn-iddinam E* (ETCSL 2.6.6.5), to which a temple hymn is to be added (TCS III No. 27).

1225 Schwemer 2001, 195-196.

1226 Cf. § 5.3.3.

1227 Cf. § 4.5.

1228 'Exercise' here must not be equated with daily assignments in the OB Edubba.

1229 The sign gur with value kur<sub>3</sub> (CTH 314 - KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 1) is used instead of the plain kur, Klinger 2010, 316. The sign GUR is used in the Hittite texts with the meaning 'other', instead of the Mesopotamian KUR<sub>2</sub>, see Weeden 2011b, 239-240. The Hittite word for 'other' *tamai-* was regularly written syllabically up to the 13<sup>th</sup> century when the logogram GUR, which in Mesopotamia did not have any association with the meaning 'other', was adopted by means of lexical lists, Weeden 2011a, 609.

1230 *pace* Klinger 2010, 316; cf. aBZL No. 470.

1231 H 97 I, 33-34; III, 24-25; IV, 19-20; V, 14-15, Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993b, 179, Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995a, 23, Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1995b, 170, 186, see § 4.2.8.

texts from Ḫattuša. As pointed out by Klinger,<sup>1232</sup> the preserved unorthographic versions were not created anew on the basis of the standard orthography written on the same tablet because it is unlikely that a scribe would have restored gal in ni-gal-a-ni (KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 4) which is omitted in the standard orthography version, ni<sub>2</sub>-<gal>-a-ni.<sup>1233</sup> This implies that phonetic versions of the preserved manuscripts depend on an older, relatively standardized model<sup>1234</sup> created by Hittite scribes and containing all the versions. Several errors are documented in the phonetic Sumerian version:

- nu-kal, a-ni and ri-ib-ba (KUB 4 6 Obv. II, 4-5) are errors respectively for abgal = NUN.ME, diġir-re-ne = AN-re-ne and kala read as rib.<sup>1235</sup>
- In ki-bi lu-na-me in-pa-a-da (KUB 4 5+, II, 9-10) a negative verbal form is expected<sup>1236</sup> on the basis of the Akkadian version, [a]-ša-ar-šu ma-am-ma-an u<sub>2</sub>-ul u<sub>2</sub>-wa-ad-da<sub>2</sub>, ‘his place that nobody knows’ (KBo 12 72).<sup>1237</sup> The Hittite version, U<sub>2</sub>-UL ku-iš-ki, adheres to the Akkadian text.<sup>1238</sup> Unfortunately, the standard orthography version is not preserved and it is therefore not possible to ascertain whether it was different from the phonetic version. However, since a negative verbal form would imply a totally different sequence of signs, it is reasonable to assume that the phonetic version does not substantially differ from the standard Sumerian. This has several implications:
  1. The Akkadian version differs from the Sumerian text.
  2. Since, on the basis of the context, the expected meaning is that expressed by the Akkadian version, the latter would be the primary version and the Sumerian text a mistranslation from Akkadian. This further supports the hypothesis that this text was composed or reworked in the post-Old Babylonian period.
  3. The Hittite version is based on the Akkadian text.

However, in the absence of the standard orthography version the question must remain open.

- In en(-)na du-uš-ka-ra / giri<sub>17</sub>-za-al iškur // be-lu ša i-na ħe-gal-li / aš-bu mu-te<sub>9</sub>-el-lu <sup>4</sup>10, ‘The lord who seats (Akk: in plenty), the noble Iškur’ (CTH 314 – KUB 4 5+, II, 11-12; KBo 12 72, 11-12), one may observe the following errors:
  1. The scribe reads the sign KU as tuš instead of dur<sub>2</sub><sup>1239</sup> but \*\*tuš--ġar is an unattested form in Sumerian, whereas dur<sub>2</sub>--ġar corresponds to Akkadian *wašābu*.
  2. The Sumerian for *ina ħegalli* is apparently omitted<sup>1240</sup> but a possible explanation is that the scribe only omitted the sign ħe<sub>2</sub> from the word nam-ħe<sub>2</sub>, ‘abundance’, a synonym of ħe<sub>2</sub>-ġal<sub>2</sub><sup>1241</sup> and wrote nam as na. nam-ħe<sub>2</sub> is associated with Iškur in the following instances: en nam-ħe<sub>2</sub> giri<sub>17</sub>-zal lu-lu-lu, ‘Lord of prosperity who makes glory abundant’;<sup>1242</sup> <sup>4</sup>iškur en-nam-ħe<sub>2</sub> kalam-e/ma zi šum<sub>2</sub>-mu, ‘Iškur the lord of prosperity who gives life to the land’;<sup>1243</sup> a similar passage is also <sup>4</sup>iškur en dim-gal / nita<sup>2</sup>-saġ dumu-an-na / e<sub>2</sub>-ħe<sub>2</sub>-ġal<sub>2</sub>-la tuš, ‘Iškur, lord of the stack, the foremost

1232 Klinger 2010, 316.

1233 A similar phenomenon is attested at Emar for *The Ballad of Early Rulers*, see § 6.2.1.

1234 Perhaps KUB 4 4?

1235 Schwemer 2001, 192 n. 1318.

1236 Laroche 1964, 77: 9-10.

1237 For pa<sub>3</sub> = *wadû* see AhW 1455: ki-pa<sub>3</sub>-da-na-me-en = *a-šar la ud-di-i*.

1238 Even though the pronoun is correct, the Hittite version misunderstands the text, see Klinger 2010, 321 n. 42.

1239 The readings tuš and dur<sub>2</sub>, originally belonging to different signs, were merged in KU during the second millennium.

1240 For a different explanation see Laroche 1964, 70: 11-12, cf. also Seminara 2001, 434.

1241 Cf. Wagensonner 2011a, 26.

1242 *Sîn-iddinam E*, 25 (RIME 4.2.9.15 – ETCSL 2.6.6.5).

1243 Schwemer 2001, 386.

one, son of An, the one dwelling in the temple of abundance'.<sup>1244</sup> Perhaps, then, this passage can be restored as en na-<ḫe> du-uš-ka-ra / giri<sub>17</sub>-za-al iškur, with correspondence between the Sumerian and Akkadian.

The difference between the use of giri<sub>17</sub>-zal in *Sîn-iddinam E* where it has the meaning of 'splendor, glory', and in KUB 4 5+ where it is translated with *muttallu/muttellu*, 'noble',<sup>1245</sup> is a possible further hint that this hymn was composed or reworked in the post-Old Babylonian period. Middle Babylonian scribes probably drew passages from OB Sumerian sources where giri<sub>17</sub>-zal is associated with Iškur and used them with a different nuance<sup>1246</sup> probably taken from lexical lists where both meanings are attested. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that *muttallu* referring to Adad is only known from a royal inscription of the first millennium.<sup>1247</sup>

These observations strengthen the hypothesis that *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* was composed or reworked in the Middle Babylonian period likely on the basis of Old Babylonian texts.<sup>1248</sup> It is also possible that lexical lists were used as references.

Moving to the Akkadian version, KUB 4 4 shows some peculiarities: the Assyrian obl. pl. [a]ḫ-ḫe-e-šu (Obv. II, 15);<sup>1249</sup> the form *ta-ki-il* (Obv. II, 14) from *kullu* which is a mistake for *tukil*<sup>1250</sup> due to a non-Akkadian speaker; *ša-ma-a-mi* (Rev. II, 4), a poetic form for the genitive of *šamû*. Assyrianisms are attested at Ḫattuša to a limited extent<sup>1251</sup> and they are unknown in forms in *status constructus* such as *aḫḫēšu*.<sup>1252</sup> A single Assyrian form cannot be taken as evidence for Assyrian mediation in the process of transmission of this text, as Assyrianisms are common in peripheral Akkadian.<sup>1253</sup> The Akkadian of the other fragments does not show any peculiarities; case endings are usually correct with a few exceptions.<sup>1254</sup>

No parallel line of the Hittite translation is preserved across the manuscripts. It is therefore unclear whether a common translation was shared by the three editions. Tablet I in both Edition A and B ends at the same point and no variants are attested between the catch-line of Edition B and the end of Tablet I in Edition A. Moreover, the Akkadian text of the quadrilingual Edition A, preserved in source D, has the same lineation of the trilingual Edition B (manuscript C). These elements speak for a common model for the Hittite translation. Conversely, according to Klinger<sup>1255</sup> some hints suggest that the Hittite version of Edition B was prepared directly from the Sumerian as for instance in C-D 11-12 (KUB 4 5+, II, III, 11-12; KBo 12 72, 11-12).<sup>1256</sup>

C	en(-)na du-uš-ka-ra giri <sub>17</sub> -za-al iš-kur
D	be-lu ša i-na ḫe-gal-li aš-bu mu-te <sub>9</sub> -el-lu <sup>a</sup> 10

1244 Seal LSC 8 7, 1-3, Schwemer 2001, 440; note that this is a Kassite seal.

1245 Both meanings are known, Sjöberg 1962.

1246 The only possible attestation of giri<sub>17</sub>-zal with the meaning of 'noble' is in *Ur-Ninurta F*, 1 (ETCSL 2.5.6.6): ur-saḡ nam-ḫe<sub>2</sub>-a gu<sub>3</sub> ru-ru-gu<sub>2</sub> giri<sub>17</sub>-zal, 'Hero of abundance, the one who rumbles, noble(?)', but Schwemer 2001, 190, reads gu<sub>3</sub>-ni and translates «Held, der im Überfluß seine Stimme brüllen läßt!».

1247 RIMB 2 S.0.1002.11, 2.

1248 See for instance an-ta ḫe-in-gal me-ta-a-ši-im-ši-im (KUB 4 5+, II, 13-14) which is attested in *Enlil A* (ETCSL 4.5.1), Falkenstein 1959, 18: 145.

1249 See Mayer 1971, 48-49.

1250 See Schwemer 2001, 195 n. 1328.

1251 Durham 1976, 502-503.

1252 Durham 1976, 514-515.

1253 For Assyrianisms in peripheral Akkadian see von Soden 1979 and van Huyssteen 1991. Note the Babylonian form *ajaru* 'rosette, flower' (KUB 4 4 Obv. II, 8) VS Assyrian *jaru*, AhW A, 24.

1254 KUB 4 8 Obv. 4: *ša-m`u-u* for genitive; KBo 12 72 Obv. 15: *ḫe-gal-li* for accusative. In KUB 4 4 Obv. 13-14, LUGAL *ga-aš-ru e[n-b]u // ḫe-en-gal-li 'ta'-k[i]-'il*, 'Powerful king, you held fruit and abundance', *e[n-b]u* and *ḫe-en-gal-li* should be accusative.

1255 Klinger 2010, 321.

1256 The Hittite version is from Edition B, the Akkadian from Edition A.

C *The lord who sits in plenty, the noble Iškur.*  
 EN-aš li-li-wa-an-za d[am-me-da ku-iš(?)] me-ek-ki me-mi-iš-kat-t[a?]<sup>1257</sup>  
*The lord who fast moves promised (repeatedly) a lot of plenty.*

Klinger argues that the form *liliwant-* translates the value  $\hat{g}en = 'to go'$  of the sign DU which is part of the form *du-uš-ġar-ra*. The same would have occurred with the verb *mema-* (iter. *memisk-*) which translates the meaning 'to speak' ( $du_{11}$ ) of the sign KA instead of  $giri_{17}$ . Unfortunately, the lack of the Hittite version in Edition A prevents comparison. A further example of mistranslation of the Sumerian might be *LU<sub>2</sub>-tar-ši-i[t]*, 'his mankind' (KUB 4 5+, III, 9), translating *lu-na-me ~ lu<sub>2</sub>-na-me*, 'someone, anyone': here the Hittite scribe was probably misled by the logogram *LU<sub>2</sub>*.<sup>1258</sup> Hence, according to Klinger,<sup>1259</sup> there was no formalized Hittite translation. Many variants between the Akkadian and Hittite versions are also attested in KUB 4 4 (Edition C)<sup>1260</sup> and some of them may depend on a mistranslation of the unpreserved Sumerian version, as with Edition B.<sup>1261</sup> Because the various manuscripts do not preserve parallel passages of the Hittite version we cannot be certain that a common Hittite text did not exist. Nevertheless, it is clear from these examples that the Hittite version diverges from the Sumerian-Akkadian text and can be considered as a sort of free translation.<sup>1262</sup>

No performative rubric like those found in hymnic liturgies is associated with this text. But if the composition already existed in the Old Babylonian period it surely had a low degree of duplication and, therefore, it can be defined as a non-curricular text.<sup>1263</sup> Nevertheless, this composition was unlikely to have been connected with practical worship during the post-Old Babylonian period, especially if, as here suggested, it was composed in the Kassite period. It is even more improbable that this text was associated with liturgical contexts at *Ḫattuša*. It appears that a text perhaps originally composed with a liturgical purpose turned out to be used in the education of scribes at least in the Western periphery. This is suggested by several factors: multiple copies; the addition of phonetic orthography and Hittite versions; its discovery in the Haus am Hang, the venue of a scribal school. As a unique composition, this hymn could be the product of any local scribal circle and its tradition cannot be clearly identified on the basis of the present evidence. The manuscripts of Sumerian texts on *Iškur*<sup>1264</sup> are from Nippur (CBS 7055 = STVC 57) or of unknown provenance (VS 17, 40; YBC 4624). It appears, however, that as a unique composition and a possible product of the post-Old Babylonian period the text cannot be assigned to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition in the terms in which it has been defined here. To conclude, one or more bilingual manuscripts reached *Ḫattuša* from some Babylonian center and were copied there with the addition of the phonetic Sumerian and the Hittite versions. The existence of a probably earlier manuscript (KUB 4 4) suggests that this text was transmitted to the Hittite capital before the 13<sup>th</sup> century.

### 5.3.2 The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother – CTH 315

The composition titled *The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother (MLM)*<sup>1265</sup> is preserved on OB monolingual Sumerian manuscripts as well as on tablets from *Ḫattuša* (KUB 4 2 and KUB 4 97) and Ugarit (RS 25.421 = AuOrS 23 50). Tablets from the Western periphery contain the text in standard orthography, phonetic orthography, Akkadian and Hittite arranged in parallel columns.

1257 See Schwemer 2001, 194 n. 1324.

1258 For a slightly different explanation see Laroche 1964, 77: 9-10.

1259 Klinger 2010, 323.

1260 See Klinger 2010, 321-323.

1261 According to Laroche 1964, 78: 2-9, the Akkadian and Hittite versions independently translate the Sumerian text.

1262 For a mistake in the Hittite version see Klinger 2010, 318.

1263 Cf. Tinney 2011, 585-586.

1264 See fn. 1224.

1265 ETCSL 5.5.1.

**KUB 4 2 (H<sub>1</sub>)** is a fragment from the second column of its tablet preserving, on the reverse, lines 32-36 of the phonetic Sumerian version whereas the obverse is broken away. **KUB 4 97 (H<sub>2</sub>)** is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving lines 34-40 of the Akkadian and Hittite columns on the reverse, whereas the obverse is broken away. These fragments probably belong to two different tablets because at the point where they would physically join (l. 36) both preserve the intercolumn space: to the right of the second column in KUB 4 2 and to the left of the third column in KUB 4 97. If they were part of the same tablet this space would be much wider than that preserved in KUB 4 97 between the third and fourth columns.<sup>1266</sup> The find-spots are unrecorded but the use of the same tablet format chosen for *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* perhaps suggests that these fragments stem from the Haus am Hang where it is likely that *MLM* also served in the education of scribes.<sup>1267</sup>

**RS 25.421<sup>1268</sup> = Ugaritica V 169; AuOrS 23 50 (Ug)** is a large fragment of a four-column tablet preserving extensive portions of the text on both obverse and reverse. This tablet was found in the Lamaštu archive,<sup>1269</sup> but as already noticed by Nougayrol<sup>1270</sup> the sign shapes and the presence of the Hittite translation itself leave no doubt that this tablet was written by a Hittite scribe likely at Ḫattuša and then imported to Ugarit. This tablet shows the same paleography, ductus and *mise en tablette* – the text is case-ruled with two lines for each case – as the fragments from Ḫattuša. RS 25.421 probably served as a model for local copies like the one identified by Arnaud<sup>1271</sup> in the small fragment **RS 25?.135A** which preserves a few signs of lines 38-39 in bilingual interlinear format. On paleographical grounds the Ḫattuša and Ugarit manuscripts can be dated to the 13<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>1272</sup>

Five OB monolingual manuscripts are known: AO 6330 = TCL 15 39 (A), LB 2112 = TLB 2 5 (B), BM 17117 = CT 42 41 (C), CBS 1554 = JNES 23, 6<sup>1273</sup> (D), Ni 2759 = Belleten 40, 417-418 (E).<sup>1274</sup> Additionally, a lenticular tablet (Type IV) from Susa, MDP 27 107, contains a few line extract of *MLM*. Additionally, a lenticular tablet (Type IV) from Susa, MDP 27 107, contains a few line extract of *MLM*. This composition belongs to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition, mainly known from Nippur, as is clear from the fact that the city of the god Enlil is indicated as the residence of Lu-diġira's mother Šāt-Ištar. However, this composition was well known outside Nippur. Indeed, only manuscript E stems from Nippur while the other tablets are of unknown provenance. Manuscript D is probably from Sippar as it belongs to the Khabaza collection and according to Civil<sup>1275</sup> it joins C. The OB manuscripts show a high degree of variation. It appears that this composition existed in different textual variants in the the Old Babylonian period.

The relation among the three Hittite tablets is not clear as only a few lines overlap:

32	OB		ġešgem ama-ġu <sub>10</sub> 3-kam-ma ga-mu-ra-ab-šum <sub>2</sub>
			<i>Let me give you a third sign about my mother:</i>
	H <sub>1</sub>	PhS	[..... ga(?)]-mu-ra-an-šu
	Ug	PhS	[.....]
		A	[ĜEŠ]GEM AMA-mi-ia ša-lu-ul-ta lu-ud-din-ku

1266 Klinger 2010, 324 also believes that these fragments do not belong to the same tablet.

1267 Cf. § 8.1.

1268 According to RSO 5, 324, the unpublished fragments RS 25.527 A+B belong to the same tablet.

1269 For this archive see van Soldt 1995, 178-180 and § 9.5.2.

1270 Nougayrol 1968, 310.

1271 Arnaud 2007, 184.

1272 See Klinger 2010, 325.

1273 Civil 1964.

1274 Çiğ, Kramer 1976.

1275 Civil 1964, 1 n. 4.

- 33 OB ama-ĝu<sub>10</sub> šeĝ<sub>14</sub>-an-na (var. B-E: im-a u<sub>4</sub> a<sub>2</sub>-ba) a-numun-saĝ-ĝa<sub>2</sub>-ke<sub>4</sub>  
*My mother is like the heavenly rain, water for the choicest seeds.*
- H<sub>1</sub> PhS [.....] im-u-a-ab-ba // [.....š]a-ag-ga-ak-ke  
 Ug PhS [am-m]a-an-ku e-m[u (?) x x] // a-ni-ma-za-an-qa-ak-ke  
 A AMA-mi ša-mu-ut ši-ma-an me-e NUMUN maḥ-ru-u
- 34 OB A buru<sub>14</sub> ħe-nun še guru<sub>5</sub>-g[u<sub>2</sub> x] x an-na  
 B [bur]u<sub>14</sub> ħe<sub>2</sub>-nun buluĝ<sub>3</sub><sup>1</sup> ba-til-la gu-nu diri  
 D buru<sub>14</sub> ħe<sub>2</sub>-nun še gu-nu mu<sub>2</sub>-a  
 E buru<sub>14</sub> ħe<sub>2</sub>-nun bu-lu-ug ba-til gu<sub>2</sub>-[guru<sub>5</sub>]  
*(She is) a bountiful harvest which grows fine barley.*
- H<sub>1</sub> PhS [..... z]ar-tab-ba // [.....] us<sub>2</sub>-sa-a  
 H<sub>2</sub> A [.....] x x [.....]-tum [.....]  
 Ug PhS e-bu-ur za-ar-tap-pa // še a-ag-na us<sub>2</sub>-sa-a  
 A BURU<sub>14</sub> nu-uḥ-šu ḥu-un-tu // šal-tu<sub>3</sub>  
 H BURU<sub>14</sub>-an-za-ma-aš dam-me-tar-wa-a[n-za] //  
 še-ep-pi<sub>2</sub>-it-ta-aš-ma-aš mar-ra- [...]
- 35 OB A ĝeš<sub>6</sub>kiri<sub>6</sub> me-a i-si-iš la<sub>2</sub>-la<sub>2</sub>-e  
 B [(ĝeš)ki]ri<sub>6</sub> me-a i-si-iš la<sub>2</sub>-la<sub>2</sub>-e  
 D ĝeš<sub>6</sub>kiri<sub>6</sub> la-la asila<sup>la2</sup> diri  
 E kiri<sub>6</sub> 'me-a' [i-si-iš] 'la<sub>2</sub>-la<sub>2</sub>'  
*(She is) a garden of delight, overflowing with joy.*
- H<sub>1</sub> PhS [..... la]-la-me-en // [...] ša-a  
 H<sub>2</sub> A [ki-ra]-a la-a-le-e // [š]a<sup>1</sup> a-[ši-la-l]i<sup>7</sup> ša-ši ma-[lu-u<sub>2</sub>]<sup>1276</sup>  
 Ug PhS ki-ri la-li-me-a a-ši-la [š]a-a  
 A KIRI<sub>6</sub> la-le-e ša r[i]-ša-ti ma-lu-u  
 H KIRI<sub>6</sub>-aš-ma-aš GEN<sub>7</sub>-an // še-eš-šu-ra-aš na-aš a-aš-šu-i-it //  
 šu-u-wa-an-za
- 36 OB ĝeš<sub>3</sub>-suḥ<sub>5</sub> a-de<sub>2</sub>-a ĝeš<sub>6</sub>še u<sub>3</sub>-suḥ<sub>5</sub> (var. A-B : (ĝeš)li) šu ta<sub>3</sub>-ga  
*(She is) a well-irrigated pine tree, (var: an adorned juniper) adorned with pine-cones.*
- H<sub>1</sub> PhS [..... d]a<sup>2</sup>-a<sup>1277</sup> // [.....]-x-ku  
 H<sub>2</sub> A ĝeš<sub>3</sub>U<sub>3</sub><sup>1?</sup>.SUḥ<sub>5</sub> še-eq-qa<sub>2</sub>-tum // ša te-ri-in-na-ta zu-[u-na-at]  
 Ug PhS a-šu-uḥ ši-da-a še-nu // a-šu-uḥ ši-da-qa  
 A ĝeš<sub>3</sub>U<sub>3</sub><sup>1?</sup>.SUḥ<sub>5</sub> ši-iq-qa-ti // ša te-re-en-na-ti zu-'na-at  
 H ĝeš<sub>3</sub>šu-i-ni-la-aš-ma-aš GEN<sub>7</sub>-an // še-eš-šu-ra-aš na-aš a-aš-šu-i-it //  
 šu-u-wa-an-za
- 37 OB A gurun za<sub>3</sub>-mu-a ĜEŠ.U<sub>2</sub>-SAR(=u<sub>2</sub>-ĝeš<sub>6</sub>kiri<sub>6</sub>) nisaĝ-ĝa<sub>2</sub>  
 B gurun za<sub>3</sub>-mu-am<sub>3</sub> niĝ<sub>2</sub>-tu-ḥu-um nisaĝ-ĝa<sub>2</sub>  
 D gurun za<sub>3</sub>-mu u<sub>2</sub>-ĝeš<sub>6</sub>kiri<sub>6</sub> nisaĝ-ĝa<sub>2</sub>

1276 This is a hypothetical restoration based on the photograph.

1277 For this reading see Klinger 2010, 327.

- E [gurun]-za<sub>3</sub>-[m]u-a niĝ<sub>2</sub>-tuĥ-mu-um nisaĝ-ĝa<sub>2</sub>  
*(She is) a new-year flower, a fruit of the first-month.*
- H<sub>2</sub> A *in-bu pa-an ša-at-ti mu-ut-ĥu-mu ni-is-sa<sub>3</sub>-a-[ni]*  
 H x-[.....] // ar.<sup>1278</sup>[.....]  
 Ug SS [gurun-za<sub>3</sub>]-mu ḡurun<sup>ḡeš</sup>kiri<sub>6</sub><sup>1279</sup> // [iti] para<sub>10</sub>-za<sub>3</sub>-ĝar  
 PhS ku-ru-um-za-an-ku mu-ut-ĥu // pa-ra-za-an-kar  
 A *in-bu ša pa-na MU.KAM-ti // mu-ut-ĥu-mi ni-is-sa<sub>3</sub>-ni*  
 H MU.KAM-ti-ia-aš ḥa-an-te-ez-z[i-iš] // še-ša-aš IGI-zi-ia-aš-ma  
 IT[I].KAM-a[š] // ḡeš<sup>la-aḥ-ḥur-nu-uz-zi</sup>
- 38 OB pa<sub>5</sub>-šitan mu<sub>2</sub>-sar-re a ḥi-li-a de<sub>6</sub>-a  
*(She is) an irrigation ditch carrying water to the garden plot.*
- H<sub>2</sub> A *ra-a-tum ša a-na m[u-u]š-ša-a-ri // me-e ku-uz-ba<sub>2</sub> ub-b[a<sub>2</sub>-lu]*  
 H PA<sub>5</sub>-aš-ma-aš ḡEN<sub>7</sub>-a[n...] // dam-me-tar-wa-an-ti [...]  
 Ug SS [pa]<sub>5</sub> mu<sub>2</sub>-sar-ra a ḥi-li de<sub>6</sub>-[x]-a  
 PhS pa-a [m]a-[š]a-ra a ḥi-li ḡ<sup>ti</sup>-a  
 A *ra-a-tum ša a-na mu-ša-ri // me-e ku-uz-ba<sub>2</sub> ub<sup>1</sup>-ba<sub>2</sub>-lu*  
 H PA<sub>5</sub>-aš-ma-aš GEN<sub>7</sub>-an [...] // na-aš-kan<sub>2</sub> ta<sup>2</sup>-lu-up-pi<sub>2</sub>-ia-aš  
 dam-me-tar-wa-an-t[i-i]t // A.MEŠ-ar an-da pid<sub>2</sub>-da-an-zi
- 39 OB zu<sub>2</sub>-lum delmun-na ku<sub>7</sub>-ku<sub>7</sub> zu<sub>2</sub>-lum saĝ kiĝ<sub>2</sub>-kiĝ<sub>2</sub>-e  
*(She is) a very sweet date from Dilmun, the choicest date sought after.*
- H<sub>2</sub> A *as-sa<sub>3</sub>-an-nu-u<sub>2</sub> du-[uš-šu-pu] ša i-[n]a Z[U<sub>2</sub>-LUM x x]x še-ti-e-u<sub>2</sub>*  
 H DELMUN(SAL.ḤUB<sub>2</sub><sup>NU<sup>N</sup></sup>).N[A...] // na-aš-kan<sub>2</sub> [...]  
 Ug SS [zu<sub>2</sub>-l]um-delmun(SAL.ḤUB<sub>2</sub><sup>nun</sup>)-na<sup>1280</sup> ku<sub>7</sub>-ku<sub>7</sub> // [zu<sub>2</sub>-lu]m šen kiĝ<sub>2</sub>-kiĝ<sub>2</sub>-e  
 PhS zu-lum te-el-mu-na-ku-[u]k-ku // [z]u-lum za-an ki-ki-ne  
 A *a-sa<sub>3</sub>-an-nu du-uš-šu-pu // ša i-[n]a ZU<sub>2</sub>-[LU]M<sup>ḡ</sup> sa<sub>3</sub>-an-qe<sub>2</sub>-e // ša-ki-in<sup>1281</sup>*  
 H <sup>uru</sup>tal-mu-na-aš-ma-aš mi-li-it<sup>1282</sup> // ZU<sub>2</sub>.LUM-PI<sub>2</sub> na-aš-kan<sub>2</sub> ḡeš<sup>ḡeš</sup>gur<sup>ḡ</sup>-ša-  
 wa-[na-ti] // an-da a-ri
- 40 OB ḡešgem ama-ĝu<sub>10</sub> 4-kam-ma ga-mu-ra-ab-šum<sub>2</sub>  
*Let me give you a fourth sign about my mother.*
- H<sub>2</sub> A *it-tum AMA-i[a .....] // ku-x [.....]*  
 Ug PhS n[a-aš-ki-m]a-am-ma-an-ku // lam-ma-q[a-m]a [g]a-m[u-ra]-an-šum<sub>2</sub>  
 A ḠEŠGEM AMA-mi-ia ru-bu-ta // lu-ud-din-ku  
 H 4-an-na-za nam-ma am-me-el // AMA-an ḠEŠGEM me-ma-aḥ-ḥi

1278 For *arma* = ITI see Kümmel 1969, 163.1279 Arnaud 2007, 184: 37: gurun-kiri<sub>6</sub>.

1280 For this spelling of Dilmun see RGTC 1, 157-158, Wiggermann 1988, 233 n. 33; the same writing is attested in KUB 37 138, 2, 8.

1281 Cf. CAD S, 148.

1282 For *milit* = KU<sub>7</sub> see CHD L-N, 251-252.

The phonetic Sumerian version seems to be common to all the LBA manuscripts:

- L. 34. The writing [z]ar-tab-ba / za-ar-tap-pa is common to H<sub>1</sub> and Ug. According to Nougayrol,<sup>1283</sup> 𒀵E-NUN, which is attested in TCL 15 39 (A) in place of the 𒀵<sub>2</sub>-nun of the other OB manuscripts, was misread as sar<sub>2</sub>-daba<sub>x</sub>.
- L. 34. us<sub>2</sub>-sa-a is attested in both H<sub>1</sub> and Ug but is unknown in the OB manuscripts.<sup>1284</sup>
- L. 35. -me-en/-me-a in [la]la-me-en/la-li-me-a are not documented in the OB manuscripts, but they cannot be an interpolation of the Hittite scribe. They may be forms from the enclitic copula,<sup>1285</sup> but another hypothesis can be advanced on the basis of the OB variants. Both variants me(-a) (A and B) and la-la (D) correspond to Akkadian *lalû*. Hence, it is not precluded that the LBA manuscripts rely on a model where both variants were attested with a pleonastic nuance or that the Hittite scribes had different models.

Nevertheless, differences between the phonetic versions in the two LBA manuscripts are attested, notably in the choice of signs:

- L. 33. im-u-a-ab-ba (H<sub>1</sub>) VS e-m[u (?) x x] (Ug); according to Arnaud<sup>1286</sup> e-m[u (?) x x] could be a term for 'water' not translated into Akkadian where we have *šamûtu*, 'rain', which goes back to the OB manuscripts. However, it seems more probable that e-m[u (?) x x] is a different rendering of im-u-a-ab-ba documented in H<sub>1</sub>: these two phonetic writings render im-a u<sub>4</sub> a<sub>2</sub>-ba in manuscript B which corresponds to the Akkadian translation *ša-mu-ut ši-ma-an*.<sup>1287</sup> This is further evidence that the phonetic version in both tablets is based on the same standard orthography text.
- L. 33. [...-š]a-ag-ga-ak-ke (H<sub>1</sub>) VS a-ni-ma-za-an-qa-ak-ke (Ug)
- L. 36. [.....]-x-ku (H<sub>1</sub>) VS ši-da-q-qa (Ug)

The closeness between phonetic versions suggests that manuscripts Ug and H<sub>1</sub> are closely related. Possibly they rely on the same model, likely a tablet drafted at 𒀵attuša on the basis of a Mesopotamian *Vorlage* to which a Hittite scribe added the unorthographic version. This version was then copied with slight differences in the surviving manuscripts.

The standard orthography version is only partially preserved in manuscript Ug for lines 37-39. Nevertheless, one may notice that the text of the Hittite recension diverges from the known OB manuscripts, as for instance in the above quoted line 37.<sup>1288</sup> The phonetic version provides further evidence that the LBA recension diverges from the OB manuscripts.<sup>1289</sup>

- L. 36. According to Arnaud,<sup>1290</sup> ši in ši-da-a (Ug) VS a-de<sub>2</sub>-a (OB), 'watered', is a reading for šeġ<sub>3</sub> 'rain'; if this holds true the Hittite source diverges from the preserved OB manuscripts.
- L. 36. še-nu (Ug) VS 𒀵ešli (A) / 𒀵ešše (D); all three variants refer to plants.<sup>1291</sup>

<sup>1283</sup> Nougayrol 1968, 317: 34.

<sup>1284</sup> See Arnaud 2007, 184: 34, Gadotti 2010, 124.

<sup>1285</sup> Klinger 2010, 326.

<sup>1286</sup> Arnaud 2007, 183-184: 33.

<sup>1287</sup> Per *š/simānu* = u<sub>4</sub>-a<sub>2</sub>-bi see CAD S, 269.

<sup>1288</sup> Note that in line 39 the word saġ is phonetically written as šen, see Arnaud 2007, 185: 39 and § 4.1.1.3.1.

<sup>1289</sup> See also the examples quoted above, ll. 33, 34, 35.

<sup>1290</sup> Arnaud 2007, 184: 36.

<sup>1291</sup> See Klinger 2010, 326.



- L. 43. ni-in-ni-bu (Ug) VS lu-li-gu<sub>2</sub>-na (A), lu-lu-gu-na (B), lu-l[u-b]u-na (E); ša-ḥu-la (Ug) VS i-lu (OB).

43	OB	A	lu-li-gu <sub>2</sub> -na dumu-munus-lugal i-lu ḥe <sub>2</sub> -ḡal <sub>2</sub> -la-kam
		B	lu-lu-gu-na dumu-lugal-la i-lu ḥe <sub>2</sub> -ḡal <sub>2</sub> -la
		E	lu-l[u-b]u-na dumu-lugal-la i-lu ḥe <sub>2</sub> -ḡal <sub>2</sub> -la-kam

*The offspring, royal progeny, a song of abundance.*

Ug	PhS	ni-in-ni-bu [d]u-um-im-[me]-lu-gal ša-ḥu-la ḥe <sub>2</sub> -in-[gal-la]
	A	na-[na-a]b DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL ḥu-ud lib <sub>3</sub> -bi ša ḥe <sub>2</sub> -en-gal-li

*The offspring, royal progeny, joy of abundance.*

For the writing ni-in-ni-bu two explanations can be advanced: (1) if NI was read as li<sub>2</sub> the sequence li<sub>2</sub>-in-li<sub>2</sub>-bu would be a phonetic writing for li-li-a, another synonym of ‘offspring’ in addition to those attested in the OB manuscripts;<sup>1292</sup> (2) the scribe wrote ni-in-ni-bu on the basis of the Akkadian *nannābu* ‘offspring.’ In the first hypothesis, manuscript Ug would depend on a variant attested in an unpreserved tablet, while in the second the writing is due to the Hittite scribe.

- L. 45 ki-en-te-me-en VS ki-aḡ<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>3</sub>-ki-aḡ<sub>2</sub>:

45	OB	ki-aḡ <sub>2</sub> ša <sub>3</sub> -ki-aḡ <sub>2</sub> la-la nu-gi <sub>4</sub> -gi <sub>4</sub> -da
----	----	--

*A lover, a loving heart whose delight never changes.*

Ug	PhS	ki-en-te-me-en la-la-bi nu-ki-ki-it-ti
	A	ra-a-am mu-ur-ta <sub>2</sub> -mi-tu <sub>3</sub> ša la-a-lu-šu la i-ša-bu-u

It is difficult to ascertain whether the phonetic writing misreads the standard Sumerian or whether the archetype contained a variant. It is to be noted that Akkadian *ra-a-am mu-ur-ta<sub>2</sub>-mi-tu<sub>3</sub>*, ‘love of the lovers’, only partially translates the Sumerian text of the preserved OB manuscripts. Perhaps ki-en is a writing for ki-eḡ<sub>3</sub>(Aḡ<sub>2</sub>), TE is a paleographic confusion for ša<sub>3</sub> and the final -en is a further writing for -eḡ<sub>3</sub>(Aḡ<sub>2</sub>);<sup>1293</sup> however -me- remains difficult.

Arnaud<sup>1294</sup> suggested that the Hittite scribes copied from several Mesopotamian models on the basis of the variations occurring among the versions (i.e. Sumerian, Akkadian and Hittite) in line 37 of manuscript Ug.<sup>1295</sup> The standard Sumerian gurun-ḡes<sup>3</sup>kiri<sub>6</sub>, which is not documented in any of the OB manuscripts, is rendered in the unorthographic version as mu-ut-ḥu and translated into Akkadian as *mutḥummu* in both H<sub>2</sub> and Ug.<sup>1296</sup> An alternative to Arnaud’s hypothesis assumes that in order to write the phonetic version the Hittite scribe, dealing with an unfamiliar Sumerogram, referred to the Akkadian text and by means of lexical lists he found equivalences to *mutḥummu* similar to those quoted here:<sup>1297</sup>

Urra XVII 120: [u<sub>2</sub>] ‘mut-ḥu’-um ḡEŠ.SAR = *mut-ḥu-mu*  
 LTBA II 1 v. 35: *mit-ḥu-mu* (var. *mut-ḥu-mu*) = GURUN.ḡEŠ.SAR  
*malku-šarru* (K 4375 = CT 18 2): [*mut*]-ḥu-um-mu = *in-bu* ḡes<sup>3</sup>KIRI<sub>6</sub>

<sup>1292</sup> Arnaud 2007, 185: 43, suggests that li<sub>2</sub>-li<sub>2</sub>-a was attested in the orthographic version but this seems improbable.

<sup>1293</sup> Uri Gabbay’s suggestion.

<sup>1294</sup> Arnaud 2007, 184: 37.

<sup>1295</sup> See above for this line.

<sup>1296</sup> The Hittite version is based on the Akkadian translation.

<sup>1297</sup> CAD M/2, 298.

The Sumerian word for the Akkadian *muthummu*, ‘fruit’, is attested in several forms including those documented in the OB manuscripts. According to Civil<sup>1298</sup> both the Sumerian and the Akkadian are loan-words from a third language. Hence, the Hittite scribe went back to the sequence mud-ḥum/mud-ḥu-um, equivalent to *muthummu*,<sup>1299</sup> and wrote it phonetically as mu-ut-ḥu.

As noted above, the OB manuscripts do not present a uniform text and are characterized by many variants. The lack of uniformity in the OB manuscripts is clear in line 29:

29	OB	A	ĝeš <sup>1</sup> PU <sub>2</sub> ʿEʿ NI niĝ <sub>2</sub> <sup>1</sup> -zi pa-an <sup>aĝ2</sup> -pa-an <sup>aĝ2</sup>
		B	[niĝ <sub>2</sub> ]-zi-ĝal <sub>2</sub> niĝ <sub>2</sub> -zi pa-e <sub>3</sub> zi bur <sub>2</sub> ḪAR-ḪAR
		E	[..... N]Ē ki [.....]
		A	..... <i>who breaths (?)</i>
		B	<i>a breathing living creature, who emits breath...</i>
	Ug	A	<i>šur-ḥu-ul-lu ši<sub>2</sub>-ip-pa-tu<sub>4</sub> // ša i-na nap-ša-ti i-ḥal-lu-lu</i>
		H	GI <sup>1</sup> .DURU <sub>5</sub> -aš-ma-aš ḥu-uḥ-ḥur-ta-al-la-a[š] // u <sup>zu</sup> GU <sub>2</sub> .ḪAL-iš-ša-an ku-i-e-eš kal-[ka]l-[i-i]š-[...]
			<i>A šippatu necklace worn around the neck</i>

The Akkadian translation in the Ugarit manuscript seems preferable<sup>1300</sup> as it better fits the context of the passage, in which Lu-diĝira’s mother is compared to jewels. The OB manuscripts are problematic because they contain words out of context: ĝeš<sup>1</sup>PU<sub>2</sub> with the reading ĝeš<sup>1</sup>gigir<sub>2</sub> means ‘chariot’, while [niĝ<sub>2</sub>]-zi-ĝal<sub>2</sub> signifies ‘living creature.’<sup>1301</sup> A possible explanation involves the term *šurḥulu*, a type of metal necklace or bracelet which is attested in lexical lists as Akkadian for urudu<sup>1302</sup>niĝ<sub>2</sub>-gul-(šu)-ma.<sup>1302</sup> The sequence ĜEŠ PU<sub>2</sub> in A, following Van Dijk’s collation,<sup>1303</sup> may be read urudu,<sup>1304</sup> ‘bronze’, which partially corresponds to the Akkadian version.<sup>1305</sup> Even though Sumerian and Akkadian versions cannot be harmonized a sort of correlation probably existed. The Hittite version is based on the Akkadian text. The rare term *šippatu* was probably unknown to the Hittite scribe, who translated it with GI<sup>1</sup>.DURU<sub>5</sub>-aš which does not correspond to any metal object but to a homonymous word *šippatu* meaning a type of reed.<sup>1306</sup>

1298 Civil 1964, 8-9.

1299 Cf. Arnaud 2007, 184: 37.

1300 The Sumerian version is not preserved in manuscript Ug. Gadotti 2010, 123, also regards the Akkadian version as the correct one.

1301 The rest of the Sumerian sentence is possibly connected to *napšatu*, ‘life, throat, neck’, CAD N/1, 296; for zi-pa-aĝ<sub>2</sub>/an = ‘throat’ see CAD N/1, 303, *Inana and Ebiḥ* 55 (Attinger 1998, 170).

1302 *Urra* XI 358, Hunger, von Weiher 1976/1988 No. 123 Rev. 6, cf. CAD Š/2, 315.

1303 TLB 2, Pl. XI.

1304 urudu with inscribed *Winkelhaken* is normally used from the Middle Babylonian period and is also attested in the Old Babylonian period, see Labat No. 132; this may indicate a late date for A.

1305 The sign NI is probably to be read zal: urudu<sup>1302</sup>niĝ<sub>2</sub>-zal-la<sub>2</sub>-da is attested in *Urra* XI (ll. 354, 356) as Sumerian for *puḥru*, a type of metal object, CAD P, 493.

1306 *šippatu* D, CAD Š, 203; in *Urra* VIII 12 a-b *šippatu* translates gi-duru<sub>5</sub>.

Further evidence for the divergence of the LBA recension from the surviving OB manuscripts is provided by line 26 where the Akkadian and Hittite versions (the only ones preserved) differ from the OB tablets which, however, present several variants as well:<sup>1307</sup>

26	OB	A	gil <sup>na4</sup> gug-am <sub>3</sub> bibra ħe <sub>2</sub> -du <sub>7</sub> -ġu <sub>10</sub> <i>A carnelian treasure, my ornamental vessel</i>
		B	<sup>na4</sup> [g]il <sup>na4</sup> gug <sup>na4</sup> za-gin <sub>2</sub> ħe <sub>2</sub> -du <sub>7</sub> -a <sup>1308</sup> <i>A stone treasure, a carnelian, an ornamental lapis lazuli</i>
		D	<sup>na4</sup> kišib-nir <sub>2</sub> -a <sup>du</sup> tu-gen <sub>7</sub> ħe <sub>2</sub> -du <sub>7</sub> -a <i>A seal made of Nir-stone, an ornament like the sun</i>
		E	gil-gil-s[a <sup>na4</sup> gug-a]m <sub>3</sub> bibra si <sub>12</sub> -ga-a <i>A carnelian treasure, a pale green vessel</i>
	Ug	A	<i>ki-ši<sub>2</sub>-ir<sup>1309</sup> ħu-la-li // bi-ib-ru ħu-uš-šu-u</i>
		H	NA <sub>4</sub> .NIR <sub>2</sub> -aš-ma-aš ħa-am-m[i-...] // ħa-li-wa-ni-iš-ma-aš SA[GA <sub>10</sub> <sup>?</sup> -an-za]
		A	<i>A piece of ħulālu-stone, a reddish rhyton</i>
		H	<i>A ħulālu-stone (...) a great (?) rhyton</i>

It is clear that the LBA manuscripts do not directly depend on any of the preserved OB tablets. The closeness between the manuscripts from Ҳattuša and Ugarit shows that they represent a common recension that was likely created in the Middle Babylonian period when *MLM* was modified with the addition of the Akkadian translation and transmitted to the Western periphery. Some grammatical features and mistakes in comparison with the OB tablets could be further hints of the late re-working of the LBA manuscripts. The directive, attested in the OB manuscripts, is replaced by the locative: mu<sub>2</sub>-sar-re VS mu<sub>2</sub>-sar-ra (l.38). The 3sg. human pronominal prefix -n- is used as an object in cohortative forms instead of the expected non-human -b- attested in the OB manuscripts: 32, [ga]-mu-ra-an-šu (H<sub>1</sub>);<sup>1310</sup> 39, [g]a-m[u-ra]-an-šum<sub>2</sub> (Ug); 47, qa-mu-ra-an-šum<sub>2</sub> (Ug). The use of different models, as suggested by Arnaud, can perhaps be attributed to Middle Babylonian scribes who had different tablets at their disposal containing several variants, as shown by the preserved OB manuscripts.

The Akkadian versions preserved in H<sub>2</sub> and Ug only show purely orthographic variants:

Lines	H <sub>2</sub>	Ug
35	[ki-ra]-a	KIRI <sub>6</sub>
35	la-a-le-e	la-le-e
36	še-eq-qa <sub>2</sub> -tum	ši-iq-qa-ti
36	te-ri-in-na-ta	te-re-en-na-ti
37	pa-an	ša pa-na
37	ša-at-ti	MU.KAM-ti
37	mu-ut-ħu-mu	mu-ut-ħu-mi
38	ra-a-tum	ra-a-tum
38	m[u-u]š-ša-a-ri	mu-ša-ri
39	as-sa <sub>3</sub> -an-nu-u <sub>2</sub>	a-sa <sub>3</sub> -an-nu
39	še-ti-e-u <sub>2</sub>	ša-ki-in
40	it-tum	ĜEŠGEM

**1307** The Hittite version seems to diverge from Akkadian but the restoration of SAGA<sub>10</sub> is hypothetical, cf. Laroche 1968, 776: 19-20.

**1308** For this line see Gadotti 2010, 123.

**1309** *kišru* has different meanings and here it may be translated as either 'piece' or 'stone', see CAD K, 437, 441.

**1310** KUB 4 2, 2.

Even though only a few examples are available, source H<sub>2</sub> shows the tendency to replace Sumerograms attested in manuscript Ug with syllabic writings (ll. 35, 37, 40). The only textual variant occurs on line 39 where H<sub>2</sub> correctly translates the Sumerian verb *kiĝ<sub>2</sub>*, ‘to seek’, with *šite’u* whereas Ug has *šākin*.<sup>1311</sup>

The Akkadian mostly agrees with the Sumerian text.<sup>1312</sup> The omission of *kigallu* ‘pedestal’ in Ug, 30 must be regarded as a copying mistake of the Hittite scribe because the term occurs in the Hittite translation (*palzaska-*) and in the OB manuscripts (*ki-gal*):

30	OB	<sup>d</sup> lamma <sup>na4</sup> ĝeš-nu <sub>11</sub> -gal ki-gal <sup>na4</sup> za-gin <sub>3</sub> -na gub-ba-am <sub>3</sub>
		<i>An alabaster statuette, set on a lapis-lazuli pedestal</i>
	Ug	<sup>d</sup> LAMMA <sup>NA4</sup> AŠ.NU <sub>11</sub> .GAL // [š]a ina uq-ni-i i-za-az H <i>ḥu-bi-iš-na-aš-ma-aš</i> <sup>NA4</sup> aš še-e-na-aš // na-aš-kan <sub>2</sub> <sup>NA4</sup> ZA.GIN <sub>3</sub> -aš pal- za-aš-ḥi DU-ri

It is worth noting that the term ‘alabaster’ in the Akkadian version is written with <sup>NA4</sup>AŠ.NU<sub>11</sub>.GAL, which is a variant attested exclusively at Ḥattuša of the Babylonian <sup>NA4</sup>ĜEŠ.NU<sub>11</sub>.GAL = *ĝešnugallu*.<sup>1313</sup>

The language is Babylonian but in manuscript Ug the Assyrian form *iḥallulū* (l. 29) occurs for the Babylonian *iḥallalū*.<sup>1314</sup> As noted in regard to other compositions an isolated Assyrianism is not evidence of Assyrian mediation, but must be regarded as a feature of peripheral Akkadian.<sup>1315</sup>

At some points the Hittite translation diverges from the Sumero-Akkadian text:<sup>1316</sup>

- L. 24. Hittite <sup>na4</sup>ZA.GIN<sub>3</sub>-aš-ma-aš [...] <sup>uru</sup>KA<sub>2</sub>.DIĜIR.RA-aš-m[a-aš ...], ‘She is lapis lazuli [...], of Babylon’, seems to differ from Akkadian [<sup>na4</sup>GU]G a-qar<sub>2</sub>-tu<sub>3</sub> [<sup>na4</sup>DU<sub>8</sub>].ŠI.A ba<sub>2</sub>-ra-[aḥ-šu], ‘She is precious cornelian, *dušū*-stone from Baraḥsu’, which adheres to the Sumerian version.
- L. 36. The second part of the Hittite line has *na-aš a-aš-šu-i-it šu-u-wa-an-za*, ‘full of goods’; the term *aššu*, ‘good, treasure’, does not occur in the Sumerian and Akkadian versions.<sup>1317</sup>
- L. 39. The Hittite version, ‘She is the honey and the date of Dilmun; she comes from the island’,<sup>1318</sup> differs from the Akkadian, ‘(she is) a very sweet date from Dilmun that is taken among the choicest<sup>1319</sup> dates.’ Moreover ‘honey’ is added in the Hittite version. It is also worth noting that Dilmun is written phonetically as <sup>uru</sup>tal-mu-na-aš-ma-aš in manuscript Ug and with the logogram in source H<sub>2</sub>.
- L. 46. The term *u<sub>2</sub>-um-ma-aš* of unknown meaning has no parallel in the Sumerian and Akkadian versions.<sup>1320</sup> The Hittite version translates the second part of the line differently:

46	Ug	PhS i-ni-im-‘mu’ lu-na-‘am’-ra // am-ma-an-ni-[š]e ku-u-[r]a
----	----	--

<sup>1311</sup> See Arnaud 2007, 184-185: 39.

<sup>1312</sup> See for instance Arnaud 2007, 183: 23, 24, 25.

<sup>1313</sup> CAD G, 104; see Weeden 2011b, 161-162.

<sup>1314</sup> (*h*)*alālu* II, AhW I, 34.

<sup>1315</sup> A different explanation assumes that the spelling *i-ḥal-lu-lu* is a case of dittography because the scribe repeated the sign LU under the influence of the last sign of the sequence.

<sup>1316</sup> For lines 36 and 39 see transliteration above.

<sup>1317</sup> Laroche 1968, 778: 38-40.

<sup>1318</sup> Starke 1990, 535-536.

<sup>1319</sup> *sanqū*, CAD S, 148, note that this word is a *hapax* and its meaning is based on the Sumerian manuscripts.

<sup>1320</sup> Laroche 1968, 779: 64-66.

A	<i>bu-us-su<sub>2</sub>-ra-at šal-li [š]a &lt;a-na&gt; AMA-šu<sub>2</sub> i-ta<sup>1</sup>-a-ra</i>
H	<i>aš-šu-la-aš me-mi-ia-na-aš-ma-aš [...] GEN<sub>7</sub>-[an] // u<sub>2</sub>-um-ma-aš NAM.RA-az DUMU-aš // AMA-ši EGIR-pa u<sub>2</sub>-iz-zi</i>
A	<i>(She is like) tidings of a captive who returns to his mother</i>
H	<i>(She is) like a good word ... when a son comes back to his mother from the prison</i>

To sum up, it seems that there are sufficient grounds to consider the Hittite manuscripts of *MLM* as based on a bilingual model, probably created during the Middle Babylonian period with adaptation and modification of the OB text. This source was later transmitted to Ḫattuša where local scribes added the phonetic Sumerian version and the Hittite translation. Thereafter, a copy was imported to Ugarit where a local copy was drafted. This composition reflects the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition, but it is unknown where the MB bilingual text was created and from where it was transmitted to the Western periphery. As with *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* this text likely served in scribal education at Ḫattuša, as suggested by the tablet format. On the basis of the present evidence it is unknown whether the Hittite translations depend on a common model or were composed independently.

### 5.3.3 Edubba E – KUB 57 126

**KUB 57 126** is a fragment from a multicolumn tablet preserving on both obverse and reverse standard Sumerian and phonetic orthography versions of the text. The tablet originally contained an Akkadian translation and possibly a Hittite version. The find-spot is unknown but the fact that it shares the same tablet format as CTH 314 and CTH 315 suggests that it may come from the Haus am Hang. The *mise en tablette*, with the case-ruled text, recalls that of *MLM*. Despite Civil's remark<sup>1321</sup> that the sign TU has a MB shape, the tablet is written in 13<sup>th</sup> century Hittite script.<sup>1322</sup>

This fragment contains the *Edubba*-text *Edubba E*,<sup>1323</sup> which consists mostly of extracts from other compositions. The text is known from three OB tablets. UET 6 165 (A) is a single-column tablet from Ur containing the whole composition; UET 6 166 (B) is a pillow-shaped extract tablet from Ur containing the first nineteen lines; LB 2125 = TLB 2 7 (C) is a four-sided prism possibly from Nippur,<sup>1324</sup> containing *Edubba A* on the first two sides and *Edubba E* on sides iii-iv. The reverse of KUB 57 126 includes a riddle known from SP 25<sup>1325</sup> and several other compositions,<sup>1326</sup> among them *The Instructions of Šuruppak*.<sup>1327</sup>

As pointed out by Civil,<sup>1328</sup> KUB 57 126 (H) shows several variants to the OB text, in particular the addition of passages copied from *Dialogue III*.<sup>1329</sup>

1321 Civil 1987, 25.

1322 The obverse and reverse of the hand-copy are to be exchanged; see LUGAL (Rev.<sup>1</sup> I, 4), ŠA (Rev.<sup>1</sup> II, 7), TA (*passim*), TAR (Obv.<sup>1</sup> I, 2), KI with only one initial *Winkelhaken* (Obv.<sup>1</sup> I, 2; II, 2). Note, however, that the tablet is badly preserved.

1323 ETCSL 5.1.5.

1324 See entry P345846 in CDLI.

1325 ETCSL 6.1.25.12:

31. an-ku<sub>4</sub>-ku<sub>4</sub> nu-si-si

32. ib<sub>2</sub>-ta-e<sub>3</sub> nu-silig-ge

33. niĝ<sub>2</sub>-gur<sub>11</sub> lugal-la-ke<sub>4</sub>

34. igi-zu na-an-il<sub>2</sub>-en

See Alster 1997, Vol. I, 277, Vol. II, 452-453.

1326 See Alster 1991b, 152-153, Alster 1997, Vol. II, 453.

1327 Civil 1984b, 287, 293.

1328 Civil 1987, 26.

1329 *Dialogue between Enki-manšum and Ĝirini-isag* (ETCSL 5.4.3); note that this composition has the same incipit as *Edubba E*.

## KUB 57 126 Obverse

	H	Obv. <sup>1</sup> 2	[gan <sub>2</sub> -n]a u <sub>4</sub> -šakar uš saĝ kut-ta ga-na uš-kar [...]
	A	26	gana <sub>2</sub> u <sub>4</sub> -šakar saĝ-ki-gud-da-gen <sub>7</sub>
	C	III 23a	[x x] saĝ-ki-gud-da-gen <sub>7</sub>
	H	Obv. <sup>1</sup> 3	[saĝ]-ki-kut-ta ħa-la-ba a-uš ša-an-ki-ku-ut-[ta ...]
	A	27	us <sub>2</sub> teš <sub>2</sub> i <sub>3</sub> -gu <sub>7</sub> -e-en ħa-la-bi i <sub>3</sub> -zu
	C	III 23b	i <sub>3</sub> -gu <sub>7</sub> !(KA) ħa-la-ba i <sub>3</sub> -e-zu
	H	Obv. <sup>1</sup> 4	[ga]n <sub>2</sub> -na pana du-uš-te-li ga-na pa-a-na d[u-...]
	H	Obv. <sup>1</sup> 5	[sa]ĝ-mu-še <sub>3</sub> a-ša <sub>3</sub> a-gar <sub>3</sub> na <sup>2</sup> -[...] ša-an-ku-uš-ši [...]
	H	Obv. <sup>1</sup> 6	ˊ2ˊ [m]u <sup>2</sup> -un-ta-ˊak-ke <sub>4</sub> ˊ [...] ˊ1ˊ mu-un-t[a- ...]
Cf.	A	28	ĝeš <sup>6</sup> dim-zu-uš dili a-ša <sub>3</sub> -kiri <sub>6</sub> eš <sub>2</sub> -gana <sub>2</sub> gi-ninda-1 u <sub>4</sub> a-ša <sub>3</sub> -ga BU
	C	III 24	[ĝeš <sup>6</sup> dim-zu]-uš dili a-ša <sub>3</sub> eš <sub>2</sub> -gana <sub>2</sub> gi 2 <sup>2</sup> ninda <sup>1</sup> (ĜAR) a-ša <sub>3</sub> -ga-ni BU.BU
	H	Obv. <sup>1</sup> 7	im-ˊdu <sub>3</sub> ˊ-a uš kar <sub>2</sub> -kar <sub>2</sub> [...]
	A	32	m-du <sub>3</sub> -a guru <sub>3</sub> -guru <sub>3</sub> <sup>ru</sup> agar <sub>4</sub> kar <sub>2</sub> za <sub>3</sub> niĝ <sub>2</sub> -du <sub>3</sub> -a
	H	Obv. <sup>1</sup> 8	e <sub>2</sub> du <sub>3</sub> -ˊra <sup>2</sup> ˊ šeg <sub>12</sub> -gur ad-gen <sub>7</sub> e-du[r ...]
	A	35	e <sub>2</sub> -du <sub>3</sub> -a e <sub>2</sub> -UŠ <sup>1</sup> .GID <sub>2</sub> .DA šeg <sub>12</sub> anše
		36	i <sub>7</sub> ba-al eš <sub>2</sub> gu <sub>2</sub> ĝar-ra

## KUB 57 126 Reverse

	H	Rev. <sup>1</sup> 2	niĝ <sub>2</sub> gur <sub>11</sub> ku <sub>4</sub> -ku <sub>4</sub> [nu-si-sa <sub>2</sub> ] [...]
	A	58a	[...] nu-x
	C	IV 11a	[a]n <sup>2</sup> -ku <sub>4</sub> -ku <sub>4</sub> nu-si-si-[x (...)]
	H	Rev. <sup>1</sup> 3	ib <sub>2</sub> -ta-e <sub>3</sub> nu-si[lig-ge] [...]
	A	58b	ni <sub>2</sub> -a <sub>2</sub> <sup>!?</sup> nu-silig-ge <sub>4</sub>
	C	IV 11b	[...]
	H	Rev. <sup>1</sup> 4	niĝ <sub>2</sub> -gur <sub>11</sub> lugal-ak-ke <sub>4</sub> [...]
	A	59	[.....] lugal-la-kam
	C	IV 12a	niĝ <sub>2</sub> -gur <sub>11</sub> lugal-<la>-kam
	H	Rev. <sup>1</sup> 5	niĝ <sub>2</sub> ħul dim <sub>2</sub> -ma [...]
	A		<i>Omitted (?)</i>
	C	IV 12b	[...]

H	Rev. <sup>1</sup> 6	KA-zu ḫul dim <sub>2</sub> -ma [...]
A	60a	[..... du <sub>11</sub> ]-du <sub>11</sub> ka-ḫul dim <sub>2</sub> -ma ka-ḫul il <sub>2</sub> -en?
C	IV 13a	KA-zu du <sub>3</sub> -du <sub>3</sub> <sup>1330</sup> ka-ḫul dim <sub>2</sub> -ma ka ḫu[- ...]
H	Rev. <sup>1</sup> 7	ˁsaĝˁ ze <sub>2</sub> ˁx xˁ ka-a-ni ša-an [...]
H	Rev. <sup>1</sup> 8	keš <sub>2</sub> -da [...]

It appears that KUB 57 126 does not duplicate any of the OB manuscripts, but was probably reworked by the Middle Babylonian scribal schools. The most likely scenario is that in the Kassite period *Edubba E* was modified and an Akkadian translation was added. At Ḫattuša a phonetic Sumerian version, and possibly a Hittite translation, were created by local scribes upon a Babylonian bilingual model. This composition belongs to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition as its presence on the same source (TLB 2 7) as *Edubba A*, a text included in the House F Fourteen, indicates. It is to be recalled that TLB 2 7 is possibly from Nippur. Moreover, the incipit of *Edubba E* is quoted in literary catalogues, but it is not certain that the entries refer to this composition.<sup>1331</sup> *Edubba E*, as was typical for *Edubba*-texts, served in scribal education. This is confirmed by its association with *Edubba A* and by its presence on a prism, a tablet format that was often associated with schooling.<sup>1332</sup>

The replacement of S-signs with the Š series in the unorthographic version was perhaps influenced by Hittite scribal practices:<sup>1333</sup>

ša-an-ki-ku-ut-ta ~ saĝ-ki-gud-da (Obv.<sup>1</sup> II, 3)  
ša-an-ku-uš-ši ~ saĝ-mu-še<sub>3</sub> (Obv.<sup>1</sup> II, 5)  
ša-an ~ saĝ (Rev.<sup>1</sup> II, 7)

Several phonetic writings are also documented in the standard orthography version:

uš saĝ kut-ta ~ uš saĝ gu<sub>7</sub>-da (Obv.<sup>1</sup> I, 2)  
[saĝ]-ki-kut-ta ~ saĝ-ki-gud-da (Obv.<sup>1</sup> I, 3)  
a-uš ~ i<sub>3</sub>-(e)-zu (Obv.<sup>1</sup> I, 3)  
ad- ~ i<sub>7</sub>.(d) (Obv.<sup>1</sup> I, 8)

In the case of Obv.<sup>1</sup> 3, the standard orthography version, [saĝ]-ki-kut-ta, is very close to the phonetic spelling ša-an-ki-ku-ut-[ta]. These writings are likely to be attributed to the Hittite scribe. However, it is worth noting that the OB manuscripts also contain unorthographic writings.<sup>1334</sup>

#### 5.3.4 The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ

*The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ (LI-LN)*<sup>1335</sup> is a rephrased version of the *The Letter of Inim-Inana to Lugal-ibila* that belongs to the Sumerian Epistolary Miscellany (=SEpM 22).<sup>1336</sup> According

**1330** Is du<sub>3</sub>-du<sub>3</sub> a phonetic writing for du<sub>11</sub>-du<sub>11</sub>?

**1331** See § 8.1.

**1332** On prisms used in the OB scribal schools see Tinney 1999, 160; further prisms discovered at Ḫattuša containing Sumerian texts are KBo 1 18 (§ 5.3.10), KBo 19 98 (§ 5.3.17), KUB 4 41 (§ 5.3.6).

**1333** On this point see § 4.3.1.4.

**1334** See UET 6 165, 32: im-du<sub>3</sub>-a ~ im-du<sub>8</sub>-a; UET 6 165, 58: ni<sub>2</sub>-a<sub>2</sub> ~ niĝ<sub>2</sub>-e<sub>3</sub>.

**1335** ETCSL 3.3.17.

**1336** ETCSL 3.3.12. For this letter see Civil 2000a, 107-109, Kleinerman 2011, 181-182.

to Civil,<sup>1337</sup> this composition, which is only known from post-Old Babylonian sources, was drafted in the Late Old Babylonian period, after the reign of Samsu-iluna, perhaps already in bilingual format.<sup>1338</sup> An OB catalogue of literary letters from Uruk<sup>1339</sup> quotes *lugal nesaĝ<sup>2</sup>-ĝ[e<sub>26</sub>? ...]* (Rev. 30) which may correspond to the incipit of either *LI-LN* or of *Dedication of a Dog to Nintinuga* (SEpM 20).<sup>1340</sup> Because the Uruk tablet is broken this title cannot be assigned with full confidence to either composition. However, if it referred to *LI-LN* Civil's statement would have to be dismissed because the Uruk tablet dates to Rīm-Sîn's rule over the city (1792-1781).<sup>1341</sup>

The oldest manuscripts so far known are a tablet from Ḫattuša (KUB 4 39) and two fragments from Ugarit (RS 17.10, RS 17.80). *LI-LN* is also preserved in first-millennium duplicates, on two NA tablets from Assur, VAT 10365 (= LKA 65) + VAT 11777 (Ass<sub>1</sub>) and CBS 1642<sup>1342</sup> (Ass<sub>2</sub>), and two NB manuscripts from Babylon, BM 32330 (Bab) and from Ur, BM 130460 (Ur). Contrary to *LI-LN* which was transmitted to the first-millennium library, its model, *The Letter of Inim-Inana to Lugal-ibila*, was no longer copied.

**KUB 4 39** (H)<sup>1343</sup> is a fragment from the upper left corner of a four-sided prism with two columns on each side containing a bilingual version of the text in parallel column format. The fragment only preserves the beginning of the first column, inscribed with the Sumerian version. The find-spot is unknown but the tablet format suggests that this manuscript was possibly associated with a scribal school.

**RS 17.10** (UgA) and **RS 17.80** (UgB) (= Ugaritica V 15; AuOrS 23 54-55) are two fragments discovered in the *Bibliothèque du Lettré*<sup>1344</sup> at Ugarit. The first one contains the phonetic Sumerian version and the second the Akkadian translation. According to Nougayrol, they belong to different tablets even though they were probably written by the same scribe.<sup>1345</sup> However, the fact that these fragments report the same segment of the text might suggest that they were part of a single two-column tablet inscribed with the phonetic Sumerian version in the left column and the Akkadian translation in the right. Moreover, both fragments present the same *mise en tablette* with paragraphs of one to four lines set off by horizontal rulings. A standard orthography version has not been recovered at Ugarit but it was probably inscribed on a different tablet.

Several features reveal the late stage of the Ḫattuša-Ugarit manuscripts in the standardization process. Because these traits are shared by later manuscripts, the LBA and first-millennium recensions likely reflect closely related stages in the transmission process of the composition.

- L. 3. In the Ḫattuša, Ugarit, Babylon and possibly Assur manuscripts the pronominal suffix appended to the verbal form indicates the dative.

H	inim-mu-un-še <sub>3</sub> <sup>1346</sup> gi-na-zu // gal-eš gu <sub>2</sub> -zu na-an-šub-[...]
UgA	[.....]-an-zu // [.....na-a]n <sup>2</sup> -šub-ba
UgB	[a-na a-mat] aš <sub>2</sub> -pu-ra-ku ra-biš aḫ-ka // [la-a ta]-na-an-di <sub>3</sub>
Ass <sub>1</sub>	[.....] kin-n[a.....]
	[a-na a]-mat aš-pu-ra[k-ka.....]
Bab	inim-mu-še <sub>3</sub> <sup>še</sup> kiĝ <sub>2</sub> -gi <sub>4</sub> -a-zu gal-le-eš [.....]

1337 Civil 2000a, 113.

1338 See Kleinerman 2011, 99.

1339 W 17259an, 30, Cavigneaux 1996a, 57-59, cf. van Dijk 1989.

1340 Kleinerman 2011, 174-177.

1341 See Cavigneaux 1996a, 3, Robson 2002, 329.

1342 The provenience of this fragment from Assur is hypothetical; only Face B duplicates *LI-LN* whereas Face A has a different text, see Cavigneaux 1996b, 11-13.

1343 Lineation follows Civil 2000a and Arnaud 2007, 189 ff.

1344 Nougayrol 1968, 23 ff.

1345 Nougayrol 1968, 24.

1346 The insertion of -un- is incorrect and likely due to a copying mistake.



*a-na a-mat aš<sub>2</sub>-pu-rak-ka ra-biš* [.....]  
*Do not neglect so much my message sent to you!*

-zu at the end of the verbal form gi-na/kiĝ<sub>2</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>-a expresses the 2sg. dative; this form is incorrect in Sumerian and is likely based on the Akkadian -ku(m)<sup>1347</sup> of aš<sub>2</sub>-pu-ra-ku. gu<sub>2</sub>-zu na-an-šub-[...] and [... na-a]n<sup>2</sup>-šub-ba are incorrect forms of na-ab-šub-be<sub>2</sub>-en:<sup>1348</sup> the 3sg. non-human pronominal prefix -b- is replaced by the human -n-.<sup>1349</sup> This is evident by comparison with SEpM 22, 3:

SePM 22      eme-gir<sub>15</sub>-še<sub>3</sub> gu<sub>2</sub>-zu na-ab-šub-be-en  
*Do not neglect Sumerian*

It is worth noting that the word *ašpura(k)ku* is written with the sign AŠ<sub>2</sub> in the Ugarit manuscript and in the Assur and Babylon duplicates, even though the value aš<sub>2</sub> rarely occurs at Ugarit.<sup>1350</sup>

- L. 5. In the manuscripts from Ḫattuša, Assur and Babylon<sup>1351</sup> the Sumerian text is corrupt as ki has been added before niĝ-galam-galam-ma-bi on analogy with ki-bur<sub>2</sub>-bur<sub>2</sub> and ki-dul-dul in lines 6-7.<sup>1352</sup>

H	nam-dub-sar <sup>1353</sup> ki niĝ <sub>2</sub> -galam-galam-[(ma)-bi] // mu-un-na-pa <sub>3</sub> -pa <sub>3</sub>
Ass <sub>1</sub>	[nam-dub-sa]r-ra ki-niĝ <sub>2</sub> galam-bi <i>ṭup-šar-ru-t[u ...]</i>
Ass <sub>2</sub>	nam-d[ub-sar ...] <i>ṭup-[šar-ru-tu ...]</i>
Bab	[na]m-dub-sar ki niĝ <sub>2</sub> -galam-galam-ma <sup>1</sup> -bi // mu-ri-i[n ...] <i>[ṭu]p-šar-u<sub>2</sub>-tu e-ma 'nik'-la-ti-šu [...]</i>

These three lines are attested in *Edubba A* 60-62:

Ed A 60	nam-dub-sar-ra niĝ <sub>2</sub> -galam-galam-ma-bi mu-ni-in-pa <sub>3</sub> -pa <sub>3</sub> -de <sub>3</sub> -en
61	ša <sub>3</sub> -dub-ba šid niĝ <sub>2</sub> -kas <sub>7</sub> ki-bur <sub>2</sub> -bur <sub>2</sub> -ra-bi igi mu-un-na-si-ga-aš
62	gu-šum <sub>2</sub> -ma ki-dul-dul-a-bi dal mu-na-an-e <sub>3</sub>

*I kept explaining to him all the fine points of the scribal art.  
 To show him the solutions of the tablets with calculations and accounts,  
 I clarified for him all the secrets of the cuneiform signs.*

In some cases, manuscripts from Ḫattuša and Ugarit agree against the first-millennium duplicates:<sup>1354</sup>

- L. 4. al-tuš (H), al-du-uš-ša<sub>2</sub>-a (UgA) VS na-an-tuš-en; in this case the Ḫattuša and Ugarit manuscripts adhere to the text of SEpM 22, 5:

<sup>1347</sup> Krecher 1969, 153, assumes that -zu is an unorthographic writing for še<sub>3</sub>, but this is to be rejected in light of the NB duplicate.

<sup>1348</sup> Krecher 1969, 153.

<sup>1349</sup> Civil 2000a, 114: 3-4.

<sup>1350</sup> Arnaud 2007, 191: "La 'valoeur' aš<sub>2</sub> de AŠ<sub>2</sub> n'est pas 'occidental'"; see Huehnergard 1989, 385.

<sup>1351</sup> The Ugarit manuscript is broken at this point.

<sup>1352</sup> Civil 2000a, 114.

<sup>1353</sup> Note the omission of the genitive -ra in the manuscripts from Ḫattuša and Babylon, as often occurs in late texts.

<sup>1354</sup> For further variants see Civil 2000a, 114: 10-11.

SEpM 22	lu <sub>2</sub> tur igi-zu-še <sub>3</sub> al-durun <sup>un</sup> -na <i>The child(ren) who sit(s) before you</i>
H	lu <sub>2</sub> -tur-ra igi-zu-še <sub>3</sub> al-tuš // gu <sub>2</sub> -zu na-an-šub
UgA	[.....]-uš-še al-du-uš-ša <sub>2</sub> -a // [...n]a-an-šub-ba
UgB	[.....i]-na <sup>1</sup> IGI-ka a-ši-ib [aḥ-k]a la-a ta-na-an-di <sub>3</sub>
Ass <sub>1</sub>	[x lu <sub>2</sub> ]-tur igi-zu-še <sub>3</sub> n[a...] ʾu <sub>3</sub> a-na ši-iḥ-ri ša <sub>2</sub> ina ʾx [...]
Bab	u <sub>3</sub> lu <sub>2</sub> -tur igi-zu-še <sub>3</sub> na-an tuš-en ʾgu <sub>2</sub> [...] u <sub>3</sub> a-na ša-aḥ-ri ša <sub>2</sub> i-na maḥ-ri-ka aš <sub>2</sub> -bu a[ḥ-...]

The phonetic Sumerian version is only attested in RS 17.10 which was probably written as an exercise by a local scribe.<sup>1355</sup>

RS 17.80 and the first-millennium duplicates usually agree in the Akkadian version and only orthographic variants are documented:<sup>1356</sup>

Line	RS 17.80	NA – NB Manuscripts
1	<i>n-pu-ri-ia</i>	<i>ni-ip-pu-ri-i</i> (Bab)
2	<i>[i-b]i-i-la</i>	MIN (Bab)
2	<i><sup>uru</sup>u-ru-ma-ak-ku</i>	<i>u<sub>2</sub>-ru-</i> (Bab)
3	<i>aš<sub>2</sub>-pu-ra-ku</i>	<i>aš<sub>2</sub>-pu-rak-k[a]</i> (Bab)
4	IGI-ka	<i>maḥ-ri-ka</i> (Bab)
4	<i>a-ši-ib</i>	<i>aš<sub>2</sub>-bu</i> (Bab)
5	<i>ʾe<sup>2</sup>-ia-am</i>	<i>e-ma</i> (Bab)
5	<i>ki-it-me<sub>2</sub>-ti-šu</i>	<i>ʾnik<sup>2</sup>-la-ti-šu</i> (Bab)
6	NIG <sub>2</sub> ŠID <sup>me</sup>	<i>nik-ka<sub>3</sub>[s-si]</i> (Ass <sub>1</sub> )
8	<i>[di]-i-ku</i>	<i>de-e-ku</i> (Ass <sub>1</sub> ) <sup>1</sup>
8	KUŠ	<i>maš-ku</i> (Ass <sub>1</sub> – Ur)
9	<i>še<sub>20</sub>-eb-&lt;ru&gt;<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>šeb-ru</i> (Ass <sub>1</sub> ) <i>še-eb-ru</i> (Ur)
9	<i>ma<sup>1</sup>-aš-lum</i>	-
9	<i>šu-ul-ʾlu<sup>2</sup>-š[u</i>	<i>šu-l[u-]</i> (Ur)

1 Cf. E: *di-i-ku*.  
2 See Krecher 1969, 154.

The only recensional variants are *kitimtu*<sup>1357</sup> VS *nikiltu* (l. 5) and *ma<sup>1</sup>-aš-lum*<sup>1358</sup> (l. 9), which is not documented in the other manuscripts. The language is Babylonian with haphazard local coloring.<sup>1359</sup> One may notice a tendency towards ideograms in RS 17.80 as opposed to their first-millennium duplicates.

Closeness between manuscripts suggests that they directly or indirectly rely on a common model, likely a MB recension that was transmitted on the one hand to the Syro-Anatolian scribal centers

**1355** Note that the use of a Sumerogram for another partial homophone, kalam for galam, is uncommon in the unorthographic writings from Ugarit and requires a good level of proficiency in Sumerian, cf. Nougayrol 1968, 27-28. A phonetic writing is also attested in KUB 4 39, 11: ša<sub>3</sub>-dub-pa ~ ša<sub>3</sub>-dub-ba.

**1356** See also Civil 2000a for lines 5, 8, and Arnaud 2007, 191-192, for lines 5, 8, 9.

**1357** For this unique form see Nougayrol 1968, 28: 7; Huehnergard 1989, 107, cf. CAD K, 465.

**1358** For this word see Krecher 1969, 154, Arnaud 2007, 192: 9.

**1359** Incorrect doubling in *šu-up-pi<sub>2</sub>-šu* (Huehnergard 1989, 49); nasalization *dd > nd* in *la ta-na-an-di<sub>3</sub>*, (Huehnergard 1989, 114); for the form *ti-i-de<sub>4</sub>-e* (l. 10) see Huehnergard 1989, 50-54.

and on the other hand to the first-millennium libraries. *LI-LN*, like the entire Sumerian Epistolary Miscellany (SEpM), is a product of the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition, notably of the Nippur scribal milieu. Indeed the majority of the tablets containing literary letters stem from Nippur.<sup>1360</sup> Additionally, manuscripts of SEpM 22 were only found in Nippur with the exception of an unprovenanced prism containing *The Letter of Sîn-iddinam to Utu*, which is attested at Emar and, as shown below,<sup>1361</sup> is a Nippur composition. Moreover, connections to Nippur are also evident in the protagonist of the letter: the rare name Lugal-ibila is mostly attested in Nippur, and Lugal-nesaĝ, who appears in several other letters, is specifically identified as a citizen of Nippur.<sup>1362</sup> However, this does not imply that a MB *Vorlage* was transmitted to the Western periphery direct from Nippur. As with CTH 315 the Ugarit recension is probably based on a Hittite source. As explained in detail below,<sup>1363</sup> literary letters were used in the Intermediary Phase of the OB curriculum,<sup>1364</sup> thus *LI-LN* likely served the same function in the Western periphery. An association with schooling is also clear for the phonetic version, which was composed with an educational purpose.

### 5.3.5 Nergal D – KUB 4 7

**KUB 4 7** is a fragment from the upper left corner of a two-column tablet containing a bilingual version of the hymn *Nergal D*.<sup>1365</sup> The fragment only preserves the first lines of the Sumerian column on the obverse whereas the reverse is broken away. This composition is known from an OB tablet probably from Sippar, CT 58 46, and from a first-millennium bilingual duplicate from Nineveh, K 4809 + K 4925.<sup>1366</sup> KUB 4 7 was drafted by a Hittite<sup>1367</sup> scribe and can be dated to the imperial age, but several paleographic oddities can be found. The sign AN has the OB shape in lines 5 and 11 whereas it shows the late form with only two horizontal wedges in the rest of the tablet; the sign tarah<sub>3</sub> (DAR<sub>3</sub>) (l. 10) has a very archaic shape similar to the third-millennium form,<sup>1368</sup> but unknown to the Hittite scribal school.<sup>1369</sup> Likely, the Hittite scribe who copied the tablet was influenced by sign shapes of the Babylonian model.<sup>1370</sup> The odd mixture of older and later signs, however, could have been a trait of the model, as similar mixing is attested in other Kassite tablets.<sup>1371</sup>

The text inscribed in KUB 4 7 shows several peculiarities and anomalies that go back to the Babylonian *Vorlage* and reflect a late stage in the standardization process:

- L. 6. The verbal form at the end of the line is abbreviated as u<sub>3</sub>-; this writing is mostly documented in late texts and is typical of the Emesal liturgies.<sup>1372</sup>

**1360** See Kleinerman 2011, 22-23, 84; note that only a very limited number of tablets stem from the North, either Kiš or Mari.

**1361** See § 6.2.4.

**1362** Kleinerman 2011, 43-45, 47-48.

**1363** §§ 8.1, 9.1.

**1364** Cf. Kleinerman 2011, 75-94.

**1365** I refer here to my edition in Viano 2012b.

**1366** Böllenrücher 1904, 24-30, Borger 1973, 47-50.

**1367** Klinger 2010, 337; see the shapes of the signs LA (l. 3), NAM (l. 4) and TA (l. 4).

**1368** See Fossey, 240-242.

**1369** HZL No. 71.

**1370** The OB shape of AN is documented at Ḫattuša in KUB 37 124, a copy of a Kassite royal inscription, see fn. 1103.

**1371** See N 2431, § 1.1.1.2 and fn. 108.

**1372** Examples in main dialect compositions are provided by the MB and MA recensions of Angim (ll. 130-146), Cooper 1978, Viano 2012a, see §§ 1.1.1.6, 2.1.1.2. Possibly also KUB 4 7, 3 contains an abbreviation, Viano 2012b, 233-234.

- L. 11. The value  $me_5$  of A in  $me_5$ - $lim_4$ - $maḥ$  is not Hittite<sup>1373</sup> and is a late and rare value which was likely attested in the Babylonian model.<sup>1374</sup>
- L. 14. As is typical in late texts the compound verb  $gu_2$ - $e_3$  has the nominal element placed before the verbal base:  $mu$ - $ra$ - $gu_2$ - $e_3$ .

Other features are instead probably due to the Hittite copyist:

- Ll. 1, 3. The phonetic writing  $ni_3$ - $ḥuṣ$  for  $ni_2$ - $ḥuṣ$
- L. 4. The phonetic writing  $-da_2$  in  $u_3$ - $du_2$ - $ud$ - $da_2$
- L. 5. The dittography AN AN in  $dumu$ - $maḥ$  «AN»  $ḏkur$ - $gal$ - $la$ .
- L. 8. The omission of  $ki$  in  $ḏen$ - $\langle ki \rangle$ - $ke_4$ .
- L. 9. The writing  $ḏnun$ - $dim_2$ - $mud$  for  $ḏnu$ - $dim_2$ - $mud$ <sup>1375</sup> that is attested in the NA manuscript.<sup>1376</sup>

Besides the presence of archaic non-Hittite sign forms, some signs were miswritten by the copyist.<sup>1377</sup>

Nergal is mentioned in another bilingual composition from the Hittite capital, but the tablet, KUB 4 41, is too badly preserved to ascertain whether the text was dedicated to the same deity.<sup>1378</sup>

Comparison with the OB and first-millennium recensions shows that KUB 4 7 is closer to the NA duplicate, not only because of its bilingual format, but also because of the line order. The LBA and first-millennium recensions strongly differ from the OB manuscript as they contain passages not attested in CT 58 46 whereas others are omitted. Notably, only the first four lines of the OB recension are duplicated in the other two tablets.<sup>1379</sup> The LBA and first-millennium recensions clearly result from the reworking of the OB text by Middle Babylonian scribes who also added the Akkadian translation.

The function of *Nergal D* in the Old Babylonian period is unclear. The reverse of CT 58 46 ends with the  $za_3$ - $mi_2$  doxology which is curiously addressed to Enlil, [k]ur-gal aia en-lil<sub>2</sub>  $za_3$ - $mi_2$ -zu  $maḥ$ -a[m<sub>3</sub>] (CT 58 46 Rev. 11). However, the text on the reverse appears to belong to the same composition because Nergal is mentioned (Rev. 4) and seems to be the addressee of the hymn. Therefore the  $za_3$ - $mi_2$  doxology that is typical of mythological texts is to be referred to the whole tablet. Given that it is known from only a single OB manuscript, this composition is perhaps to be regarded as an isolated hymn that was not used in the curriculum. On the account of this and the Sippar provenance of the OB tablet, one may argue that this hymn did not belong to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition although it cannot be assigned to any specific tradition.

This text is included in the NA 'Catalogue of Texts and Authors',<sup>1380</sup> which lists some of the most popular compositions of Mesopotamian scholarship including *Lugal-e*, *Angim*, the Babylonian epic of Gilgameš and the astrological series *Enūma Anu Enlil*. Therefore it is reasonably certain that *Nergal D* did not survive by chance but was selected as worthy of preservation and of receiving a standardized form. The closeness of the LBA and first-millennium recensions can be understood within the context of the process of the canonization of this composition, which was already in an advanced phase in the Kassite period. The catalogue attributes the authorship of *Nergal D* to a certain Pappa-

1373 See HZL No. 364, Durham 1976, 117.

1374 This value is attested in Old Akkadian texts as well as in the post-Old Babylonian period, see Labat No. 579 and MesZL No. 839. In lexical lists  $me_5$  is attested in *Aa* I/1 115 (MSL 14, 205).

1375 For this name see RIA 9, 607; in line 7  $ḏnu$ - $nam$ - $nir$  is correct, cf. RIA 9, 614.

1376 Borger 1973, 48: 1.

1377 See the shapes of  $-ke_4$  (l. 8),  $engur$  (l. 10; see comment in Viano 2012b),  $mul$  (l. 11).

1378 See § 5.3.6.

1379 On this point see Viano 2012b, 231-232.

1380 Lambert 1962, 64: IV 3-4.

tum (IV 5) who is otherwise unknown. Through the catalogue the hymn *Nergal D* can be connected with other compositions found in the Western periphery, because of the mention of Sidu, the compiler of a series that includes *The Ballad of Early Rulers* and *The Fowler*.<sup>1381</sup> This is important evidence that the presence of these compositions in the Western periphery results from a conscious process of selection, adaptation and transmission that occurred in the Kassite scribal schools.

### 5.3.6 KUB 4 41

**KUB 4 41** is a fragment of unknown find-spot written in NS, from a four-sided prism that only partially preserves two columns with paragraphs set off by double rulings. The composition, a bilingual text in interlinear format,<sup>1382</sup> seems to be a hymn to Nergal who is quoted in Col. II, 5, [d<sup>n</sup>]e<sub>3</sub>-eri<sub>11</sub>-gal. The name of Enlil is also mentioned in Col. I, 8 as well as his byname [d<sup>nu</sup>]-nam-nir in Col. II, 8.

### 5.3.7 KUB 4 26 (+) HT 13 (+) KUB 37 112

Under **KUB 4 26** are published two fragments, A and B, which do not physically join. Fragment A contains an Akkadian šu-il<sub>2</sub>-la<sub>2</sub> to the god Adad known from first-millennium duplicates from Assur, LKA 53, and Nineveh, BMS 20 (+) BMS 49.<sup>1383</sup> Klinger<sup>1384</sup> has recently demonstrated that the fragment **HT 13** joins KUB 4 26A and contains the end of the incantation-prayer. After double rulings, HT 13 continues with an unorthographic Sumerian text to which the fragment **KUB 4 26B** belongs even though the two pieces do not physically join. HT 13 seems to be the left part of the tablet while KUB 4 26B is probably the right side, but text lines cannot be harmonized between the two fragments. The text seems to be a hymn or a prayer to an unknown deity addressed in the second person (za-e, *passim*). Some words seem to refer to Enki such as lu-u-gal ab-zu-ta, 'king of Abzu' (HT 13, 5), and ki-iš-tu-ud-ku, ki-iš-tu-ug (KUB 4 26B, 3, 13), which are perhaps phonetic writings for ĝeštug, 'wise', a typical epithet of Enki. Interesting are the writings ti-en-kar ~ diĝir (KUB 4 26B, 10-11) and ti-in-qa-ri-ni probably for diĝir-ra-ni.

**KUB 37 112**,<sup>1385</sup> a tiny fragment of six lines from the left edge of its tablet, perhaps belongs to the same tablet.<sup>1386</sup> This piece has a Sumerian monolingual text in phonetic orthography with some elements similar to KUB 4 26+, such as the use of the second person za-e-me-en to address the deity (KUB 37 112, 1), and the words lugal, written lu-gal and lu-u-gal (KUB 37 112, 3),<sup>1387</sup> and nam-til<sub>3</sub>-(la).<sup>1388</sup> This fragment also preserves the divine name d<sup>nin</sup>-ZU (KUB 37 112, 3-4), which may be a writing for Ninanzu or Ninzu'anna.<sup>1389</sup>

All these fragments were written by Hittite scribes and can be dated to the 13<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>1390</sup> Unfortunately, the composition is too fragmentary to be understood, but it is worth noting that this is the only monolingual Sumerian text in phonetic writing copied by a Hittite scribe. Its relation to the Akkadian *Šuilla* cannot be explained. The origin of the text is unknown and it is not precluded that

1381 See §§ 6.2.1, 6.2.3.

1382 See *an-nu-ti[m]*, Col. II, 3.

1383 Schwemer 2001, 671-674.

1384 Klinger 2010, 336.

1385 Cooper 1971, 4 n. 20.

1386 Perhaps KUB 37 112 is to be placed under the fragment HT 13 or was part of the reverse.

1387 The word lugal is spelled as lu-u-gal in KUB 4 26B, 4, 8, 9; HT 13, 4, 5, 9, 14.

1388 KUB 4 26B 4, 5; KUB 37 112, 1.

1389 RIA 9, 489-490.

1390 Klinger 2010, 337; see the shape of LA.

the Hittite fragments depend on a Mesopotamian manuscript already written in phonetic Sumerian.<sup>1391</sup> This would possibly suggest a Northern Babylonian tradition for the *Vorlage*, but no conclusive evidence can be drawn.

### 5.3.8 Incantation to Utu – KUB 4 11

**KUB 4 11**<sup>1392</sup> is a fragment from the central part of its tablet containing a bilingual version<sup>1393</sup> in interlinear format of *Incantation to Utu*, which as seen above is a composition preserved in copies from the Old Babylonian period up to the first millennium.<sup>1394</sup> The tablet originally had several columns, as the remainder of a vertical ruling at the left-hand edge of the reverse<sup>1</sup> indicates. The obverse<sup>1</sup> contains a series of epithets addressed to Šamaš in the second person, whereas the reverse lists the viziers of the god.

KUB 4 11 is a further example of a tablet written in Hittite NS that displays the influence of a Babylonian model because the sign ŠA shows both the Hittite and the Babylonian shape. Additionally, the sign LI is written with both the old and the late Hittite variants.<sup>1395</sup>

KUB 4 11 is the sole preserved bilingual source of *Incantation to Utu* which in Mesopotamia is known from monolingual manuscripts only. The Ḫattuša tablet presents many variants compared to the other sources. However, a high degree of variation is also attested among the Mesopotamian manuscripts.<sup>1396</sup> None of the lines on the obverse<sup>1</sup> exactly duplicates the text preserved in the other tablets whereas the reverse<sup>1</sup> reports lines 79-86 even though a few variants are documented.<sup>1397</sup> The text inscribed on KUB 4 11 reflects therefore a MB recension composed by the Kassite scribes who also added the Akkadian translation. The Sumerian version does not contain phonetic writings, a fact that locates KUB 4 11 closer to the textual tradition represented by the OB manuscript CBS 563 (A) and the possible MB tablet CBS 1686 + CBS 1533 (F). The Akkadian version shows Babylonian forms.<sup>1398</sup> The list of the viziers of Šamaš is also quoted in the MB tablet HS 1512.<sup>1399</sup>

As already noted for several texts and in particular for *Incantation to Utu*, compositions centered on the Sun-god originate in Northern Babylonia and are usually unknown in the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. The mix of older and later sign forms and the possible influence of *Incantation to Utu* on the *Prayers to the Sun-God* (CTH 372-374),<sup>1400</sup> which are preserved on MS tablets,<sup>1401</sup> suggest that this composition was received by Hittites before the 13<sup>th</sup> century, perhaps during the Middle Hittite period.<sup>1402</sup>

1391 Phonetic Sumerian texts written by Hittite scribes are usually limited to the unorthographic versions of standard orthography compositions.

1392 Against the copy, obverse and reverse must be exchanged.

1393 Schwemer 2007: 'bilingual abgefaßten Variantenduplikat'.

1394 For this composition see § 1.1.10.2.

1395 Schwemer 2007, Klinger 2010, 329, cf. § 5.3.5.

1396 Some manuscripts contain a shorter version whereas others are written in phonetic writing.

1397 Klinger 2010, 330.

1398 Note the Babylonian form *te-ne<sub>2</sub>-še-ti*, 'people' (Obv<sup>1</sup> 3).

1399 See § 1.1.10.3.

1400 Alaura, Bonechi 2012, 54-55.

1401 See Schwemer *forthcoming*.

1402 Klinger 2010, 329.

## 5.3.9 KUB 4 24

**KUB 4 24** is a fragment from the lower left corner of its tablet preserving fifteen lines on the obverse and twelve on the reverse; it contains a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian incantations. The only preserved Sumerian incantation, Rev. 8-12, turned out to be a forerunner of *Udug-ḫul* Tablet II (UH II: 24-30). The text is in monolingual Sumerian:

8	en <sub>2</sub> -e <sub>2</sub> <sup>1</sup> -nu-ru maš-maš nu-u[n-gal-e-ne a <sub>2</sub> -ḡal <sub>2</sub> a-nu-un-na-ke <sub>4</sub> -e-ne] <i>Incantation. The exorcist of the Igigi, the support of the Anunna (is he).</i>
9	<sup>d</sup> asar-lu <sub>2</sub> -ḫi ušum-gal an-k[i-bi-da-ke <sub>4</sub> ] <i>Asalluḫi, dragon of heaven and earth,</i>
10	[tu <sub>6</sub> ]-a-ga-a-ni li-u[ḫ <sup>2</sup> -a ti-la] <i>through whose spoken incantation a dead man can turn back to life.</i>
11	[ <sup>d</sup> asar(?)-nu]n-na dumu-saḡ [ab-zu-ki ...] <i>Asalluḫi, foremost son of the Abzu ...</i>
12	[.....] x nu x[.....]

This manuscript is relevant because Tablet II of the series *Udug-ḫul* is poorly known before the first millennium.<sup>1403</sup> It is worth noting that KUB 4 24 together with KBo 14 51 are the only monolingual texts from the Hittite capital containing identified forerunners of first-millennium incantation series.<sup>1404</sup> The others are bilingual.

KUB 4 24 shows several differences from the canonical recension. It presents the full rubric en<sub>2</sub>-e<sub>2</sub><sup>1</sup>-nu-ru contrary to the abbreviated form of late duplicates. The beginning of the incantation in the canonical recension, which contains a three-line introduction in Akkadian followed by two Sumerian lines, is omitted in KUB 4 24. Further omission in KUB 4 24 are lines UH II: 26, 28-29. KUB 4 24 contains a substantially abbreviated text. A few phonetic writings are attested: nu-u[n] ~ nun, [tu<sub>6</sub>]-a-ga-a-ni ~ tu<sub>6</sub>-du<sub>11</sub>-ga-a-ni, li-u[ḫ<sup>2</sup>-a] ~ lu<sub>2</sub>-ug<sub>7</sub>-a. A further peculiarity is the rarely attested writing ušum-gal (BUR<sub>2</sub>.GAL) for ušumgal (GAL.BUR<sub>2</sub>).<sup>1405</sup>

Sign shapes suggest that KUB 4 24 is a late copy of an older manuscript: the tablet presents the old form<sup>1406</sup> of LI<sup>1407</sup> and the late shape of AG<sup>1408</sup> and IG.<sup>1409</sup>

## 5.3.10 KUB 37 111

**KUB 37 111** is a large fragment from a two-column tablet discovered in Building D. The obverse preserves part of the right column and a few signs on the left column. Only the right column is preserved on the reverse. The tablet contains Sumerian incantations of the *Udug-ḫul* type in interlinear bilingual format.<sup>1410</sup> The obverse comprises the introductory theme of a prophylactic incantation<sup>1411</sup>

<sup>1403</sup> Geller 1985, 3.

<sup>1404</sup> See § 8.2.

<sup>1405</sup> MesZL, 362 No. 553.

<sup>1406</sup> Old and late sign shapes are here referred to the Hittite script.

<sup>1407</sup> Obv. 9, Rev. 10.

<sup>1408</sup> Rev. 4.

<sup>1409</sup> Rev. 9.

<sup>1410</sup> Occasionally Sumerian and Akkadian are written on the same line set off by a *Glossenkeil*.

<sup>1411</sup> For this typology see fn. 1178.

while the reverse preserves the end of the main theme of another prophylactic incantation with an elaborated *zi-pa<sub>3</sub>* formula.<sup>1412</sup> The text of KUB 37 111 is not duplicated in either the OB or the canonical recension of the series *Udug-ḥul* but it presents some similarities with Tablet IV.<sup>1413</sup>

**Obv. Right Col.**<sup>1414</sup>

1	[.....] x ṣa' x (x) [.....]
2	[.....]-ta
3	[lu <sub>2</sub> .....] 'zi te-le' ḥe <sub>2</sub> -me-en
4	[lu-u <sub>2</sub> ] 'ZI-šū?' i <sub>q</sub> -tu <sub>3</sub> -ma <sup>1415</sup> i-na šu-u-mi i-mu-[tu <sub>3</sub> at-ta] <i>Whether you are a man who perished and died in thirst,</i>
5	[lu <sub>2</sub> zi-i]g-'pa' pa <sub>x</sub> (GAM)-ta izi [š]ub-ba ḥe <sub>2</sub> -me-en
6	lu-u <sub>2</sub> ta <sub>2</sub> -mu-u ša i-na i-ša-ti na-ad-u at-[ta] <i>or whether you are an accursed man who is thrown into the fire,</i>
7	lu <sub>2</sub> zi-ig-pa pa <sub>x</sub> (GAM)-ta ḥu-u-la-a <sup>1416</sup> ḥe <sub>2</sub> -me-en
8	lu-u <sub>2</sub> ša ma-mi <sub>3</sub> -ti iṭ-bu-ma i-mu-tu at-ta <i>or whether you are a man who drowned because of a broken oath<sup>1417</sup> and died,</i>
9	lu <sub>2</sub> i <sub>7</sub> -ti bi-id-ta ḥe <sub>2</sub> -me-en : lu-u <sub>2</sub> ša ID <sub>2</sub> iṭ-bu-u [at-ta] <i>or whether you are a man who drowned in the river,</i>
10	lu <sub>2</sub> ma <sub>2</sub> -a ba-su <sub>2</sub> -šū-ud-ta ba-uš <sub>2</sub> ḥe <sub>2</sub> -me-en
11	lu-u <sub>2</sub> ša i-na Ĝ[IS.MA <sub>2</sub> ] iṭ-bu-u i-mu-tu at-ta <i>or whether you are a man who drowned with his boat and died,</i>
UHF 325	'lu <sub>2</sub> ḡeš <sub>2</sub> ma <sub>2</sub> -ni i <sub>3</sub> -su <sub>3</sub> '-a ḥe-me-en <i>whether you are the one whose ship sank</i>
UH IV 144	lu <sub>2</sub> ḡeš <sub>2</sub> ma <sub>2</sub> a-su <sub>3</sub> -ga ḥe-me-en <i>lu-u<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub> ina e-lip-pi ina me-e iṭ-bu-u at-ta.</i>
12	lu <sub>2</sub> ma <sub>2</sub> -a ab-ba-ke <sub>4</sub> ' ab'-ba'-a <sup>1418</sup> u <sub>2</sub> -za-ag-ga ḥe <sub>2</sub> -me-en
13	lu-u <sub>2</sub> ša i-na ĜEŠ.MA <sub>2</sub> qe-reb A.AB.BA iṭ-bu-u [at-ta] <i>or whether you are a man who drowned in a boat in the midst of the sea and died,</i>
14	lu <sub>2</sub> ad-da nu-tuku-'a' ḥe <sub>2</sub> -me-en : lu-u <sub>2</sub> ša a-ba la'-a i-šū[-u at-ta] <i>or whether you are a man with no father,</i>

<sup>1412</sup> Cooper 1971, 11, for this formula see Falkenstein 1931, 34-35.

<sup>1413</sup> See UH IV: 118 ff. = UHF 298 ff.

<sup>1414</sup> The left column only preserves five broken lines ending with *at-ta*; this indicates that the left column contained the same theme as the right column.

<sup>1415</sup> Y. Cohen's insight.

<sup>1416</sup> ḥu-u-la-a seems to be a phonetic writing for ḥul, but its relationship with the Akkadian *mātu* is unclear.

<sup>1417</sup> For saḡ-ba = *māmītu* see Schramm 1997, 3-8.

<sup>1418</sup> Cf. CAD T, 153: lu<sub>2</sub> ma<sub>2</sub>-a ab-ba ša<sub>3</sub>(?) ab-ba-a.



- 15 lu<sub>2</sub> ama nu-tuku-a ħe<sub>2</sub>-me-en : lu-u<sub>2</sub> ša AMA NU.TUKU at-ta  
or whether you are a man with no mother,
- 16 [l]u<sub>2</sub> dam nu-tuku-a ħe<sub>2</sub>-me-en : lu-u<sub>2</sub> ša DAM-ti NU.TUKU at-[ta]  
or whether you are a man with no wife,
- 17 [lu<sub>2</sub> dumu dumu nu-tuk]u ħe<sup>1</sup>-m[e-en :] ħe<sup>1</sup>-u<sub>2</sub> ša DUMU-tu<sub>3</sub><sup>?</sup> NU.TUK[U at-ta]  
or whether you are a man with no children,

## Rev. Right Col.

- 1 [...] ħ<sup>1</sup>x<sup>1</sup> [.....] ħ<sup>1</sup>x<sup>1</sup> [.....]
- 2 [l]u<sub>2</sub>-še<sub>3</sub> nam-ba-teĝ<sub>3</sub>-ĝe<sub>26</sub>-de<sub>3</sub> : a-na [.....]  
Do not approach the man,
- 3 [na]-an-gub-ba na-an-tu-uš-[t]a-a : la-a [ta-za-az la-a tu-ša-ab]  
do not stand, do not sit,
- 4 nam-ba-ku<sub>4</sub>-ku<sub>4</sub>-NE na[m]-ħ<sup>1</sup>ba<sup>1</sup>-ki-ki-ti [...]  
5 la-a ta-tu<sub>2</sub>-ra la-a [t]a-sa<sub>3</sub>-ħu-ra  
do not cover (?) him, do not go around
- UH VI 74  
na-an-gub-ba na-an-dur<sub>2</sub>-r[u] nam-ba-gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>-e-de<sub>3</sub> nam-ba-niĝen-n[a]  
la ta-za-az la tu-š[ab] la t[a-ta]-nu-ra la ta-sa-na-ħur
- 6 IZI diĝir-gal-gal-e-ne-ke<sub>4</sub> e<sup>1</sup>-ri-pa<sub>2</sub> ħa-[ba-ra-du-un]  
7 ni-iš<sub>3</sub> DIĜIR.MEŠ.GAL.ĤI.A ta<sub>2</sub>-ma-ta lu-u<sub>2</sub> DU-a[k]  
You are adjured by the life of the great gods, so you may go off!
- UH IV 116  
zi diĝir-gal-la-e-ne-ke<sub>4</sub> i-ri-pa<sub>3</sub> ħa-ba-ra-du-un  
niš DIĜIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ u<sub>2</sub>-tam-me-ka lu-u ta-at-tal-lak
- 8 zi an<sup>1</sup>-na e-ri-ip-pa<sub>2</sub> ħa-ba-ra-an-[du-un]  
9 ni-iš<sub>3</sub> ša-me-e ta<sub>2</sub>-ma-ta lu-u<sub>2</sub> DU-[ak]  
You are adjured by the life of the heavens, so you may go off!
- 10 zi ki-a e-ri-ip-pa<sub>2</sub> ħa-ba-ra-an-[du-un]  
11 ni-iš<sub>3</sub> er-še-ta ta<sub>2</sub>-ma-ta lu-u<sub>2</sub> DU-[ak]  
You are adjured by the life of the earth, so you may go off!
- 12 zi an-na an-ki-a A.NA ME BI KI NUN<sup>?</sup> x [.....]  
13 ni-iš<sub>3</sub> DIĜIR-lim ša<sub>2</sub> AN.KI ta<sub>2</sub>-ma-ta [x ...]  
You are adjured by the life of the heavens and the earth [...]
- 14 [...] ħ<sup>1</sup>x<sup>1</sup> (x) x<sup>1</sup> za-ag-pa ħ<sup>1</sup>diĝir<sup>1?</sup>-diĝir-gal-gal-[e-ne (ħe-pa<sub>3</sub>)]<sup>1419</sup>  
15 [.....] ħ<sup>1</sup>x<sup>1</sup> ma-mi-ti ša<sub>2</sub> DIĜIR.MEŠ [GAL.MEŠ ta<sub>2</sub>-ma-ta]  
[.....] the curse of the gods [.....]
- 16 [.....] ħ<sup>1</sup>x<sup>1</sup> x<sup>1</sup> [.....]

1419 Cf. UH VII: 54.

The OB text of Tablet IV of the series *Udug-ḫul*, which is known from a single manuscript, BM 78185 (H), a tablet probably from Sippar, is very close to the first-millennium recension. KUB 37 111 reflects therefore a different textual tradition that did not become part of the canonical recension.

The Sumerian version has several unorthographic writings that present phonetic alterations,<sup>1420</sup> some of which clearly resulted from copying:

- pa<sub>x</sub>(GAM)-ta (Obv. R. Col. 5, 7) is probably a writing for pa<sub>3</sub>-da.<sup>1421</sup>
- bi-id-ta (Obv. R. Col. 9) is unclear but on the basis of the Akkadian *ṭebû* it was probably intended to represent bi-<su<sub>(3)</sub>-su<sub>(3)</sub>>id-ta.<sup>1422</sup>
- IZI (Rev. R. Col. 6) instead of zi is probably a mistake due to phonetic similarities between the two signs.
- The Sumerian in Rev. R. Col. 12 is corrupt; even this case is to be regarded as a copying mistake.

Unorthographic writings in KUB 37 111 have no consistent nature and can be mostly attributed to scribal mistakes. Such odd writings are unlikely to have appeared in the Mesopotamian model unless it was corrupt. Mistakes are limited to the Sumerian version whereas the Akkadian translation is correct. This is a further piece of evidence that the errors result from the inadequate understanding of Sumerian by the Hittite scribe. On paleographical grounds this tablet can be defined as an example of mixed ductus because it shows both Hittite and Assyro-Mitannian sign shapes:<sup>1423</sup> the sign LA occurs both with one initial horizontal wedge<sup>1424</sup> (Rev. 5) and with two (the common NS form); ŠA<sup>1425</sup> is written with the typical Assyro-Mitannian shape<sup>1426</sup> throughout the text.<sup>1427</sup> At the present state of research it is unclear whether the mixed ductus results from Hittite copies of Assyro-Mitannian manuscripts<sup>1428</sup> or from the work of Hittite scribes who mastered different scripts<sup>1429</sup> or whether it is a script developed within the Hittite scribal tradition comprising earlier and later forms.<sup>1430</sup> Taking into consideration that texts from the Mesopotamian tradition, unlike diplomatic texts, were not produced by the Hittite chancellery but were likely copies of foreign tablets, it seems to me more probable that the Hittite scribes were influenced by the script of the models. Moreover, the parallel examples of NS tablets offering Babylonian paleographic features (KUB 4 7 and KUB 4 11) further strengthen this hypothesis.

1420 For a complete list of phonetic writings and alterations see § 4.1.1.1.1.

1421 Cf. CAD M, 190.

1422 The verb su<sub>(3)</sub> is written phonetically in the following line.

1423 For an overview of the mixed ductus see Devecchi 2012.

1424 LA/2 in Devecchi's list.

1425 ŠA/3 in Devecchi's list.

1426 See Schwemer 1998, 31, 36.

1427 For these signs see Devecchi 2012, 51-52.

1428 The hypothesis that the mixed ductus resulted from Hittite scribes copying tablets in foreign script was argued by Klinger 2003.

1429 Schwemer 2013, 12. With Klinger 2012, 80 n. 4, I find it unlikely that scribes were able to manage different scripts.

1430 Devecchi 2012.

## 5.3.11 KBo 1 18

**KBo 1 18** is a four-sided prism with a central longitudinal hole.<sup>1431</sup> Only the left side of Column I, the right side of Column III and a great part of Column IV are preserved. This prism contains a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian magical texts<sup>1432</sup> including incantations against snakes, *ši-pa-at ša MUŠ* [...] (Col. I, 21), and scorpions (Col. IV, 14-20).<sup>1433</sup> According to the Akkadian subscript, *šipat zubbi*,<sup>1434</sup> Col. IV, 9-13 might be a rare example of a Sumerian incantation<sup>1435</sup> against flies which, to my knowledge, are known from Akkadian sources only.<sup>1436</sup> This incantation quotes Asalluḫi and Ea, <sup>4</sup>BAḪAR'<sub>2</sub> (Col. IV, 12), who is also attested in the two following incantations (Col. IV, 19, 22).

The catch-line reads LUGAL ŠU<sub>2</sub> = *šar kiššati*,<sup>1437</sup> 'king of the universe', which may refer to the legends of the kings of Akkad which are known at Ḫattuša in Akkadian and Hittite versions.<sup>1438</sup> Unfortunately, the relation between this collection of incantations and the Sargonic tales is unclear. The colophon reports the date ITI *ša re-ši*.<sup>1439</sup>

The tablet is written in NS<sup>1440</sup> but with a mixture of old and late sign shapes.<sup>1441</sup> The sign LI is consistently written with the old form;<sup>1442</sup> IG and GI also have archaic shapes but they are only attested once.<sup>1443</sup> Conversely, AG and ḪA show late forms<sup>1444</sup> typical of the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. These features suggest that KBo 1 18 is a late copy of an older manuscript. Based on the tablet format, KBo 1.18 was perhaps used in schooling like the other prisms containing Sumerian texts.<sup>1445</sup>

## 5.3.12 KUB 4 23

**KUB 4 23** is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving ten lines on one side whereas the other side is broken away. The tablet originally contained a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian incantations<sup>1446</sup> set off by rulings. Lines 7-10 include the remainder of a bilingual incantation in interlinear format: niĝ<sub>2</sub>-ḫul-ak-ka<sub>3</sub>-zu nu-me-a, 'your evil witchcraft will disappear' (l. 7).

Signs LI (l. 3) and AK (ll. 6, 7) show old shapes that may date to the 14<sup>th</sup> century.

1431 Schwemer 2013, 154.

1432 Some are possibly Sumerian-Akkadian mixed texts. The Sumerian incantations seem to be Col. I, 11-18 (note the Akkadian subscript *ši-pa-at u<sub>2</sub>-ul-i-ia-a*, l. 16), Col. I, 19-21, Col. I, 22-24, Col. I, 25-28, the entire Col. III, Col. IV, 9-13.

1433 Cf. CAD Q, 137.

1434 CAD Z, 154-155.

1435 For the Sumerian nature of this text see the verbal form im-ma-ta-e<sub>3</sub>.

1436 YOS 11 5-6, see Cunningham 1997, 105-106 cf. 154. YBC 4616 = YOS 11 5 is an example of *Sammel tafeln* from the OB period containing Sumerian and Akkadian incantations against scorpions and flies.

1437 Schwemer 2013, 154.

1438 Westenholz 1997, 280-293.

1439 Schwemer 2013, 154. I thank Prof. Daniel Schwemer for drawing my attention to this point.

1440 See Schwemer 2013, 154.

1441 Old and late sign shapes are here referred to the Hittite script.

1442 KBo 1 18 I, 5, 7, 8, 9, IV, 3, 7.

1443 IG: KBo 1 18 Col. IV, 16; GI: KBo 1 18 Col. IV, 14.

1444 AG: KBo 1 18 Col. III, 23; ḪA: KBo 1 18 Col. IV, 24.

1445 See § 5.3.4 and fn. 1332.

1446 Cooper 1971, 4 n. 16, 11.

## 5.3.13 KUB 34 4

**KUB 34 4** is a fragment from the central part of its tablet discovered in Building A preserving ten broken lines on the obverse, whereas the reverse is broken away. The fragment probably contains the ritual theme of a bilingual Marduk-Ea incantation:<sup>1447</sup> [ḏasa]l-lu<sub>2</sub>-ḫi u-mi-ni-in-šu<sub>2</sub>: x [...] // ša ḏmarduk (ll. 6-7). The Akkadian translation is set off from the Sumerian text by *Glossenkeile*. This recension displays the coexistence of late and conservative tendencies as shown by the presence of both u- and u<sub>3</sub>- as prefixes of preformative forms.<sup>1448</sup> The shapes of the signs LU<sub>2</sub> (ll. 2, 6) and ŠA (ll. 1, 7) indicate that the tablet was written by a Hittite scribe during the 13<sup>th</sup> century.

## 5.3.14 KBo 36 20

**KBo 36 20** is a tiny fragment preserving six broken lines from a possible Sumerian incantation:<sup>1449</sup> in line 3 Asalluḫi, [ḏasa]r-lu<sub>2</sub>-ḫi, is quoted. The script of the fragment cannot be classified with certainty as too few signs are preserved, but its discovery in the Haus am Hang makes it probable that this fragment was written by a Hittite scribe.<sup>1450</sup> This is the only Sumerian incantation found in an archaeological layer surely associated with the Haus am Hang;<sup>1451</sup> thus its presence there indicates that this text type was copied within the building.

## 5.3.15 ABoT 1 43

Two fragments, A and B, originally part of a multicolumn tablet, are published as **ABoT 1 43**. Only traces of the Sumerian text are preserved but an Akkadian translation was possibly arranged in a parallel column. The fragment B quotes ḏnin-maḫ (B, 1) and Asalluḫi, [ḏas]ar-<sup>1</sup>lu<sub>2</sub>-ḫi zi nam-ti<sub>3</sub>-la (B, 4). The shapes of the signs TI and LA (B, 4) suggest that the tablet was written by a Hittite scribe.

## 5.3.16 KBo 36 17

**KBo 36 17** is a tiny fragment from the central part of its tablet discovered in Temple I which preserves seven lines of a bilingual text in interlinear format on one side whereas the other side is broken away. The text seems to be an incantation.<sup>1452</sup>

## 5.3.17 KBo 19 98

**KBo 19 98** is a six-sided prism discovered in Temple I and inscribed with the *Cuthean Legend of Naram-Sîn*.<sup>1453</sup> The tablet is written in MS and was possibly drafted by Ḫanikkuili,<sup>1454</sup> the scribe of the prism KBo 19 99,<sup>1455</sup> which probably contains a further Naram-Sîn text.<sup>1456</sup> Ḫanikkuili the son

<sup>1447</sup> For the ritual section of Marduk-Ea incantations see Falkenstein 1931, 58-62.

<sup>1448</sup> L. 3: u-me-ni-in-e; l. 4: u-me-ni-in-e; l. 5: u<sub>3</sub>-me-ni-in-e.

<sup>1449</sup> Probably there is no room for an Akkadian column because this fragment seems to be from the right edge of the tablet.

<sup>1450</sup> On the tablets stemming from the Haus am Hang, see. § 8.5.

<sup>1451</sup> Note that KBo 13 37 comes from a post-Hittite layer, see § 5.1.4.

<sup>1452</sup> Schwemer 1998, 6 n. 27.

<sup>1453</sup> Westenholz 1997, 280-293.

<sup>1454</sup> For this scribe see Gordin 2013, 67-69.

<sup>1455</sup> For the identification of the scribe see Rüster, Wilhelm 2012, 70.

<sup>1456</sup> See the remarks in Beckman 1983, 102 n. 26.

of Anu-šar-ilāni, a Mesopotamian scribe working at the Hittite court, is also the author of several *Landschenkungsurkunden* dated to the time of the king Ḫantili II. Hence, the Naram-Sîn prisms can be dated to the middle of the 15<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>1457</sup> Side A of KBo 19 98 preserves eleven fragmentary lines inscribed with a bilingual text in interlinear format,<sup>1458</sup> but its relationship to the Naram-Sîn legend inscribed on the rest of the prism is unclear. As the *Cuthean Legend of Naram-Sîn* is only known from Akkadian sources, it is not excluded that Side A contained a different text, but too little is preserved for this composition to be identified. The most interesting aspect of this tablet is the attestation of a bilingual text in the Middle Hittite period. The Akkadian text on the rest of the prism presents orthographic conventions common in Northern Babylonia.<sup>1459</sup>

#### 5.3.18 KBo 36 24

**KBo 36 24** is a fragment of unclear provenance<sup>1460</sup> preserving six lines of a Sumerian text. A parallel column, possibly containing an Akkadian translation, was arranged to the right of the preserved lines as is clear from the traces of a vertical ruling. The script seems to be Hittite on the basis of the sign IL.<sup>1461</sup>

#### 5.3.19 KUB 4 10

**KUB 4 10** is a tiny fragment of unknown find-spot preserving a few signs on one side; the other side is broken away. The tablet originally contained a bilingual text in parallel column format.<sup>1462</sup> Based on the manner of incision and the sign shapes, I would tend to regard the script as NS, with the caveat only a few signs are preserved.

### 5.4 Unplaceable Fragments

The following fragments cannot be attributed on paleographical grounds to any of the aforementioned scripts.

CTH	Publication	Composition	Find-spot	Script	Language
795	KUB 37 41	Dumuzi Composition (?)	Bk. A	(?)	SA
813	KUB 37 92	Collection of Incantations	Bk. A	(?)	S
819	KBo 36 14	Incantation	Bk. D	(?)	S
819	KBo 36 18	Unidentified Text	Bk. A	(?)	SA

#### 5.4.1 KUB 37 41

**KUB 37 41** is a fragment from a multicolumn tablet discovered in Building A. The signs exhibit non-Hittite shapes, but they cannot be confidently assigned to a specific script. The tablet preserves ten lines on one side whereas the other side is broken away. It may be suggested that the text, which is arranged in an interlinear bilingual format, is a Dumuzi composition. No Sumerian word can be read with certainty, but phonetic writings seem to be attested and it is not precluded that the text was entirely written in phonetic orthography.

<sup>1457</sup> van den Hout 2009, 82, see also Beckman 1983, 102-106, Westenholz 1997, 281.

<sup>1458</sup> Westenholz 1997, 284-285.

<sup>1459</sup> Westenholz 1997, 282.

<sup>1460</sup> According to S. Košak's Konkordanz the fragment was found in the lower city.

<sup>1461</sup> See HZL No. 117.

<sup>1462</sup> See [...]a-ni-ta (Col. I, 2) and i-n[a] (Col. II, 3-4).

1	[.....] x me-na [...]
2	[.....] x <i>hal-pa(-)at</i> -[...]
3	[.....] x(-)ub(-)nu-u <sub>2</sub> x [...]
4	[.....] x a-ma-TU/še-ku [...]
5	[.....] x mu-un-na-[...]
6	[i-n]a su-pu-ri x [...]
7	i-na <i>te-eh-ḫi-šu</i> [...]
8	a-ma-ze <sub>2</sub> -er-ra e <sup>2</sup> -[...]
9	su <sub>2</sub> -pur <sup>d</sup> dumu-zi
10	x x ḫe <sub>2</sub> -en-s[i <sup>2</sup> ...]

A possible parallel to the lines above can be found in the closing lines of the love song *Dumuzi-Inana R (D-I R)*. The composition is known from three OB tablets from Nippur, UM 55-21-309 (A), CBS 6898 = STVC 134 (B) and CBS 8534 Rev. (C):<sup>1463</sup>

A	26	<sup>u2</sup> rib-ba ki-ḫalba <sub>2</sub> -še <sub>3</sub> ga-ḡu <sub>10</sub> <ga-ga-mu> di-di du <sub>5</sub> -mu-u <sub>5</sub> -zu
C	13	<sup>u2</sup> rib-ba ki-ḫal-bi-še <sub>3</sub> ga-ḡu <sub>10</sub> un-di-di-x <i>Oh that I might know the way to the meadow, the freezing place, (to) my milk &lt;my cream&gt;!</i>
A	27	amaš-ku <sub>3</sub> -ga amaš-mu-ti-in-na-ma <sub>3</sub> -še <sub>3</sub> di-di du <sub>5</sub> -mu-u <sub>5</sub> -zu
C	15	amaš-ku <sub>3</sub> -ge amaš-mu-ud-na-ma <sub>3</sub> -[...] <i>Oh that I might know the way to the pure sheepfold, my bridegroom's sheepfold!</i>
A	28	amaš-ku <sub>3</sub> -ge amaš- <sup>d</sup> dumu- <sup>r</sup> zi-ma <sub>3</sub> -še <sub>3</sub> di-di du <sub>5</sub> -mu <sup>r</sup> -u <sub>5</sub> -zu
C	16	amaš-ku <sub>3</sub> -ge amaš- <sup>d</sup> du[mu-zi .....] / di-[...] <i>Oh that I might know the way to the pure sheepfold, my Dumuzi's sheepfold!</i>

2. *ḫal-pa* from *ḫalpû*, 'frost, freezing', translates the Sumerian ki-ḫalba<sub>2</sub>/ḫal-bi of line 26; *-at*-[...] perhaps belongs to the same word in the form *ḫalpātānû*, probably related to *ḫalpû*, otherwise known only from Ḫattuša in the medical text KUB 37 2.<sup>1464</sup>

4-7. The sign after *-ma-* in line 4 is clearly TU but if one may read *-še(!)-ku-* this could be a phonetic writing for amaš-ku<sub>3</sub>. However, this reading is problematic because we have to assume that the Ḫattuša fragment adds a segment before a-ma-še-ku-[...] unattested in the OB text. On the other hand, the presence of amaš in line 4 is assured by the Akkadian translation *ina supûri*. In line 5, mu-un-na-[...] is either a verbal form (not attested in the OB manuscripts) or a phonetic writing for mu-ud-na (cf. C 15). In line 7 *ina teḫḫiṣu* can be translated as 'in its proximity', likely referring to the sheepfold in the preceding line.

8-9. a-ma-ze<sub>2</sub>-er-ra could be a phonetic writing for amaš 'sheepfold'.<sup>1465</sup> It seems that the beginning of line A 28 is omitted in the Ḫattuša manuscript.

10. This line has no parallel in the OB recension.

<sup>1463</sup> ETCSL 4.8.18; for this composition see Sefati 1998, 236-246.

<sup>1464</sup> See AhW, 313.

<sup>1465</sup> Cf. CAD S, 397.

Unfortunately, because KUB 37 41 is too badly preserved one cannot conclusively state whether this fragment contains a bilingual version of *D-I R*. Moreover, it is not fully clear whether the text was entirely written in unorthographic Sumerian, or whether phonetic writings are an idiosyncrasy perhaps due to the scribe. No unorthographic versions of *D-I R* are known but other Dumuzi texts written in phonetic orthography are attested in the Old Babylonian period.

It is worth noting that this is one of the merely two Sumerian literary texts in interlinear bilingual format from the Hittite capital.<sup>1466</sup> Moreover KUB 37 41 can be identified as the only source of a composition partially written in Emesal dialect<sup>1467</sup> that appears in the Syro-Anatolian documentation.

As demonstrated, there are sufficient grounds to consider KUB 37 41 as belonging to the Dumuzi-Inana corpus. However, presently, due to the fragmentary nature of the text, it cannot be assigned with all confidence to *D-I R*. This fragment is even more important because, with the exception of an unpublished MB extract tablet,<sup>1468</sup> it is the only attestation of a Dumuzi text in the Late Bronze Age. In addition, no composition related to Dumuzi has been found in a first-millennium library so far. The corpus of Dumuzi-Inana texts belongs to the body of hymnic liturgies that served cultic functions and were not part of the curriculum.<sup>1469</sup> The vast majority of sources for Dumuzi-Inana hymns stem from Nippur, and it is likely that they were associated with the Nippur tradition; however, the fragment KUB 37 41 cannot be confidently assigned to a specific tradition.

#### 5.4.2 KUB 37 92

**KUB 37 92** is a fragment from the central part of its tablet discovered in Building A which preserves a few lines on one side only. The tablet contained a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian incantations. Lines 4-7 are inscribed with an Akkadian incantation<sup>1470</sup> but the preceding lines probably contained a Sumerian text:  $\text{he}_2\text{-si}[\text{kil}^?]$  (l. 2).<sup>1471</sup> Because there seems to be no place for an Akkadian translation the text was probably monolingual. According to S. Kořak's Konkordanz this fragment does not show a Hittite ductus.

#### 5.4.3 KBo 36 14

The fragment **KBo 36 14** only preserves four signs on two lines,  $[\dots]\text{-e}_3\text{-de}_3 // [\dots]\text{-e}_3\text{-de}_3$ , which may refer to an incantation.

#### 5.4.4 KBo 36 18

**KBo 36 18** is a fragment discovered in Building A preserving five lines of a bilingual text in interlinear format on one side; the other side is broken away. On line 5 the Akkadian text is set off from the Sumerian version by a *Glossenkeil*. The surface of the fragment is badly preserved, but the sign shapes show quite clearly that the tablet was not written in Hittite ductus even though there is no clear clue leading to an attribution. However, the sign forms and the manner of incision remind me of the Assyro-Mitannian tablets.

<sup>1466</sup> The only other literary text in bilingual format is the unidentified composition inscribed on KBo 19 98 (§ 5.3.17).

<sup>1467</sup> On the Emesal of the Dumuzi texts see Sefati 1998, 53-55.

<sup>1468</sup> See § 1.1.8.18.

<sup>1469</sup> Tinney 2011, 585.

<sup>1470</sup> Note the full rubric  $[\text{en}_2\text{-e}]_2\text{-nu}\text{-ru}$ .

<sup>1471</sup> See l. 3  $[\dots]\text{-gi}\text{-NE x}[\dots]$ .

