

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

6 Sumerian Literary and Magical Texts from Emar

Texts from Emar will be presented according to their scribal tradition, Syrian and Syro-Hittite. Texts with duplicates from Emar and Ugarit will be treated in the present chapter as the Emar sources are usually better preserved.

6.1 Syrian School Texts

The only known Sumerian literary text written in Syrian school style is E 775, *A Prayer for a King*. The rest of the Syrian school documentation consists of lexical lists, omnia and incantations.¹⁴⁷²

6.1.1 A Prayer for a King – E 775 - RS 79.25

The composition *A Prayer for a King* (PfK) is a prayer to the god Enlil on behalf of an unnamed king. This text is unknown from the Old Babylonian literature and is only attested in a bilingual recension preserved on two tablets from Emar and Ugarit.

E 775 is a single-column tablet from Emar containing a bilingual version of the text in interlinear format. **RS 79.25** is the left edge of a tablet discovered at Ugarit in Maison A containing the phonetic Sumerian version of the text.¹⁴⁷³ A parallel column likely containing the Akkadian translation was arranged to the right of the Sumerian version as shown by double vertical rulings on line 11 of the obverse.¹⁴⁷⁴ An additional Akkadian version is attested at Ugarit on a small fragment, **RS 79.25C**,¹⁴⁷⁵ which, according to Arnaud,¹⁴⁷⁶ does not belong to the same tablet as RS 79.25 on the basis of clay and sign shapes. According to the hand-copy, which shows the margin of the tablet to the left of the phonetic Sumerian column, RS 79.25 did not contain a version in standard orthography; such a version was probably inscribed on a different tablet as attested for other Sumerian texts from Ugarit.

The Emar manuscript is a beautiful tablet entirely preserved¹⁴⁷⁷ and drafted, according to the colophon, by the scribe Tuku-^dE₂-ḫur-saĝ, priest of the god Dagan.¹⁴⁷⁸ This name is otherwise unknown at Emar and in the Mesopotamian onomasticon. Recently Rutz proposed the reading Raši-ili, <title of> Eḫursaĝ, shrine of Dagan.¹⁴⁷⁹ Whatever the correct reading is, the association with Dagan, the principal deity of the Middle Euphrates region, makes it clear that the scribe was Syrian.

The tablet is dated to the month of *Urda*.¹⁴⁸⁰ This is possible evidence for an early date because at Emar only the oldest texts contain a dating formula. Indeed, most of the dated ephemeral documents go back to the first dynasty while only seven dated tablets date to the second dynasty and

1472 Lexical lists: *Urra* I, *Urra* III-V_a, SAG-tablet; omnia: sipa compendium, KAK.TI compendium; *manna lušpur* incantation. Note that the Syrian recension of *Urra* is in monolingual Sumerian, Cohen 2009, 132-135.

1473 This tablet was drafted by a local scribe as shown by the shape of TI and LI (*passim*).

1474 Dietrich 1998, 156.

1475 Arnaud 1982a, 213.

1476 Arnaud 1982a, 209.

1477 Photo available in Arnaud 1985-1987.

1478 Cohen 2009, 135-136.

1479 Rutz 2013, 296-298.

1480 For this god see Fleming 2000, 28-29.

mostly to the first kings.¹⁴⁸¹ Consequently, this tablet may be dated to a period between the second half of the 14th century and the first half of the 13th. The tablet was probably a library copy, as no other duplicates are known from Emar.

Most of the Ugarit scholarly texts date to the last fifty years before the destruction of the city (second half of the 13th century),¹⁴⁸² but some tablets may be earlier and have been preserved as library copies. Tablets discovered in Maison A are from a secondary context going back to a phase earlier than the building itself. If this group of tablets is actually older than the rest of the scholarly texts discovered at Ugarit, the Emar and Ugarit sources of *PfK* might be contemporary.¹⁴⁸³

PfK is a royal hymn containing a prayer asking the gods to bestow blessings and gifts on the king, who is addressed in the second person as is typical in the Sumerian royal hymns. M. Dietrich's study¹⁴⁸⁴ dedicated to this composition will be the starting point for the present analysis. According to Dietrich,¹⁴⁸⁵ the Ugarit text is based on the Emar model, and some passages were expanded as a result of adaptation to the local cultural and theological milieu. Dietrich evidenced the text's reliance on the Mesopotamian tradition but also suggested connections with Ugaritic and biblical literature. In addition to the Sumero-Akkadian bilingual format,¹⁴⁸⁶ links to Mesopotamian literature include the deities mentioned in the text, the list of divine gifts and the role of the king as conqueror of his enemies and as defender of his land. These elements can be found in the royal inscriptions and royal hymns of the second and first millennium.¹⁴⁸⁷ Dietrich pointed out that contrary to the Mesopotamian tradition, where kings are blessed with both material (weapons, scepter, throne etc.) and immaterial gifts, only abstract gifts are attested in *PfK*. The single material gift is a weapon given by Nergal in a line that is only preserved in the Emar text (*PfK* 13). Western Semitic elements in *PfK* include the encomiastic incipit wishing life upon the king, expressed by the formula *ti-la lugal-mu / buluṭ bēlī*, 'Live!, my king',¹⁴⁸⁸ and the divine granting of life to the king, which follows a *topos* known from the Ugaritic epic texts.¹⁴⁸⁹ The list of divine gifts is unknown in the Ugaritic literature, but some biblical passages on the enthronement of kings describe abstract gifts similar to those attested in *PfK*,¹⁴⁹⁰ such as wisdom, integrity and a long-lasting and prosperous reign.¹⁴⁹¹

Dietrich regards *PfK* as a *Krönungshymnus* that may have been sung during the enthronement of the king at Emar and Ugarit.¹⁴⁹² This hypothesis is based on the connection between the Sumerian royal praise poems and enthronement.¹⁴⁹³ According to Dietrich *PfK* is thus a literary work that originated in Mesopotamia but was adapted to Syrian culture.¹⁴⁹⁴ On the assumption that the diffusion of the Mesopotamian texts followed an east-west route, Dietrich also states that the Ugarit text depends on an Emar source and identifies that city as the place where the composition was reworked.¹⁴⁹⁵

1481 Fleming 2000, 198-204.

1482 van Soldt 1995, 174.

1483 For the chronology of the Ugarit tablets see § 9.4.

1484 Dietrich 1998; lineation follows Dietrich's edition.

1485 Dietrich 1998, 170, 195.

1486 Dietrich 1998., 171.

1487 Dietrich 1998, 171-181.

1488 Dietrich 1998, 181-184.

1489 Dietrich 1998, 185-189.

1490 Dietrich 1998, 195.

1491 Dietrich 1998, 190-194.

1492 Dietrich 1998, 196.

1493 Dietrich 1998, 174, 179.

1494 Dietrich 1998, 197.

1495 Dietrich 1998, 195.

The textual analysis presented here will show that *PfK* relies entirely on the Mesopotamian tradition.

The postulated function of *PfK* as an enthronement hymn is in contrast with its presumed reworking at Emar. The social and political structures of Emar and Ugarit were so far removed from one another that it is inconceivable that the same literary composition was used in the enthronement of the king in both cities. The Emarite kingship was defined by Fleming¹⁴⁹⁶ as a *Limited Kingship* as its authority was restricted by collective powers, such as the Elders, typical of the entire Middle Euphrates region. These features render Emar's society and political framework completely different, even from an economic point of view, from the palatial and centralized structures of Ugarit.¹⁴⁹⁷

The local religious and cultic traditions of Emar are encoded in several Akkadian rituals that display, on the one hand, the importance of the god Dagan, and on the other hand the limited role of the king in religious ceremonies.¹⁴⁹⁸ The creation of a royal hymn with a cultic function similar to the Sumerian praise poems¹⁴⁹⁹ seems unlikely in a society in which the king had a limited religious role. Moreover, Dietrich has only evidenced connections between *PfK* and Ugaritic and biblical literature but not with the local cultural setting of Emar that is expressed in the ritual texts, even on the linguistic level.¹⁵⁰⁰ The social and cultural milieu that yielded this composition is therefore removed from that of the city of Emar. Even though an effective use of *PfK* during enthronement ceremonies at Ugarit is to be dismissed, the ideology behind this composition would better fits the Ugaritic court.¹⁵⁰¹

Contrary to Dietrich's claim, the elements assumed to be typical of Western Semitic culture can be traced in the Mesopotamian literature, remarkably the introductory petition for the life of the king:¹⁵⁰²

PfK	1	E	til ₃ -la lugal-ĝu ₁₀ u ₄ -gid ₂ -da ħe ₂ -am
			<i>bu-luṭ be-li</i> U ₄ .MEŠ-ka ₃ li-ri-ku
		U	ti-il-la lu-ga-la-g[u]

This incipit appears in NBC 5452, an unpublished tablet containing the hymn *Sîn-iddinam D*,¹⁵⁰³ which consists of four prayers beginning with til₃-la lugal-ĝu₁₀.¹⁵⁰⁴ Three of these prayers end with the formula ^d*sin-i-din-nam* lugal-ĝu₁₀.¹⁵⁰⁵ The rubric RN lugal-ĝu₁₀ is documented in the royal hymns of Rīm-Sîn, Ḫammu-rābi and Samsu-ilūna¹⁵⁰⁶ and according to van Dijk¹⁵⁰⁷ it might indicate a distinctive literary genre tied to the cult. It is worth noting that only a single manuscript containing this rubric is known from Nippur.¹⁵⁰⁸ As NBC 5452 is unpublished, the relation, if any, between *Sîn-iddinam D* and *PfK* cannot be ascertained.

1496 Fleming 1992.

1497 For an overview on the social and economic structures at Emar and on the Middle Euphrates as opposed to those from the Levant, see Viano 2010; on Ugarit see Liverani 1974.

1498 See Fleming 1996, Beckman 2008, 13.

1499 RIA 4, 543.

1500 Seminara 1998, 24-25.

1501 The Ugaritic kingship was related to the epic and ritual texts in Ugaritic, Liverani 1974, 338-341, Del Olmo Lete 2008; for the divinization of the king see 121-132; the local gods who appear in these texts were the only ones to be worshipped at Ugarit, Kämmerer 1998, 64-66; for the religious role of the king at Ugarit see Wyatt 2007.

1502 Cf. Hallo 1992, 86.

1503 Hallo 1967, 96 (*Sîn-iddinam C!*), cf. Brisch 2007, 47, 265.

1504 This incipit is possibly attested in N 1316 (ETCSL 2.99a), a tablet containing a hymn to an anonymous king which on the basis of the expression nam-lugal-u₄-sud-ra₂ bala ħe₂-ĝal₂-la ziⁱ] x x x seems to contain a petition for a long-lasting reign (Sjöberg 1982, 75-76); the first line could be restored as [til₃]-la lugal-ĝu₁₀ ĝeš-gu-za [...], see Sjöberg 1982, 75 n. 8.

1505 One prayer ends ^d*sin-i-din-nam* lugal nam-nam-ma [an]⁷-ra <diri-ga>, Hallo 1967, 96.

1506 ETCSL 2.6.9.3, 2.6.9.4, 2.6.9.5, 2.6.9.6, 2.6.9.7, 2.8.2.2, 2.8.3.2, 2.8.3.3, 2.8.3.5.

1507 van Dijk 1966, 63.

1508 3N-T 230 + 3N-T 236 = *Samsu-ilūna E* (ETCSL 2.8.3.5), see Brisch 2007, 47.

The expression *ti-la lugal-ĝu₁₀* is not limited to this text but is also attested in *Hymn to Marduk for a King* (HM),¹⁵⁰⁹ a praise poem on behalf of an anonymous king¹⁵¹⁰ inscribed on OB *Sammeltafel* from Sippar, which, as we will see below, also contain the monolingual recension of *The Ballad of Early Rulers*. Even though in the *Hymn to Marduk for a King* this expression does not occur as the incipit, it is placed at the beginning of the second section of the composition after a dividing ruling found in both manuscripts that preserve the text:¹⁵¹¹

HM 14 *til₃-la lugal-ĝu igi an-ne₂ aia-diĝir-re-e-ne-ke₄ sa₆-ga¹⁵¹²*
May the life of my king be pleasant in the eyes of An, father of the gods!

The *Hymn to Marduk for a King* also represents a close parallel to *PfK* even though it does not duplicate any line. Both texts contain the theme of a long life granted to the king:

PfK 1 E *til₃-la lugal-ĝu₁₀ u₄-gid₂-da ħe₂-am*
bu-luṭ be-li UD.MEŠ-ka₃ li-ri-ku
 U *ti-il-la lu-ga-la-g[u]*

2 E *mu-mu-zu ħe₂-mu₂-me-en-na-an-da ħe₂-am₃*
MU.MEŠ-ka li-te-ed-di-ša
 U *u₂-mi-za-aḥ-bi-lu ḥa-a*

Life, my king! May your days be long,
may your days be renewed

HM 4 *nam-til₃-la-zu ħe₂-ri-ib-su₃-dam*
 5 *[ud d]u-ru-še₃ ħe₂-ri-ib-tuku-a*
 6 *ħe₂-til₃-la*

May he (Marduk) prolong your life,
may he let you keep it for everlasting days!
May you live!

The *Hymn to Marduk for a King* only mentions abstract gifts, which were considered by Dietrich one of the principal connections to biblical literature.¹⁵¹³

HM 3 *nam-til₃-zu ^dmarduk ħe₂-eb₂-be₂*
May Marduk decree life for you!

7 *ħe₂-silim-ma*
 8 *gi₁₆-sa-aš ħe₂-a*
 9 *ĝeš-šub-ba-zu nam-til₃-la ħe₂-a*
 10 *nam-til₃ ša₃ du₁₀-ga ḥa-la-zu ħe₂-a*
May you have peace!

1509 ETCSL 2.8.5.b, Alster, Jeyes 1986, Alster 1990.

1510 It is not precluded that the unnamed king is Abi-ešuh who is the addressee of another hymn inscribed on the same *Sammeltafel*; this praise poem follows the *Hymn to Marduk for a King*, Alster 1990, 1-2.

1511 BM 80091, CBS 1208.

1512 Note that the incipit of the first prayer of *Sîn-iddinam D*, *til₃-la lugal-ĝu₁₀ igi x [...]*, recalls this line of the *Hymn to Marduk for a King*.

1513 An expression similar to the *PfK* incipit is known from the Ur III version of the Sumerian King list: *^dšul-gi lugal-ĝu₁₀ u₄-sud-še₃ ḥa'-ti-il*, 'May Šulgi, my king live a life of long days', Steinkeller 2003, 284.

*May it last forever!
May life be your lot.
May a life of a good heart be your share.*

If the *Hymn to Marduk for a King* was not composed on behalf of a specific king, the absence of the king's name is perhaps a further connection with *PfK*. The theme of bestowing a long life on the king is also contained in *The Letter of Šin-iddinam to Utu* of which a duplicate is attested at Emar:¹⁵¹⁴

SI-Utu	45	u ₃ ĝa ₂ -e ni ₂ -teĝ ₃ -ĝa ₂ -mu-uš nam-ti šum ₂ -mu-na-ab <i>And to me give life because of my reverence!</i>
	46	zi su ₃ -ud ĝal ₂ niĝ ₂ -ba-e-eš ₂ ba-mu-na-ab <i>A long-lasting life bestow upon me as a present.</i> ¹⁵¹⁵

The portrayal of An bestowing life and plenty (*PfK* 17-18), which according to Dietrich reflects the nature of the Ugaritic god El,¹⁵¹⁶ is already known in Mesopotamian literature. In the hymn *Lipit-Ištar C* the god An is addressed as numun i-i, 'the one who makes the seeds sprout'.¹⁵¹⁷ Moreover in the praise poem *Ur-Ninurta E (UrN E)* the god An grants the king 'years of plenty':¹⁵¹⁸

UrN E	24	mu ħe ₂ -ĝal ₂ bala u ₄ sud-da
	25	^d ur-< ^d nin-urta>-ra mu-na-an-šum ₂ <i>(An) gave to Ur-Ninurta years of plenty, and a reign of long days</i>

The life-giving power of the water connected to the god An, which according to Dietrich¹⁵¹⁹ reflects the role of El in the Ugaritic theology, is attested in *Rim-Šin C (RS C)*.¹⁵²⁰ It is worth noting that this composition is one of the RN lugal-ĝu₁₀ hymns. Here An grants rain bringing life and plenty:

PfK 18	U 32	a-ia-i- ^r gu-la-gin ₃ '
	U 33	du-ga a[n-nu za-e-me-in] <i>Like the water of great rivers may you be in accordance with the orders of An</i>
PfK 19	E	a-na ħe ₂ -ĝal ₂ -la an-ta-ĝal ₂ ga-a-ni-šur-ra-ke ₄ <i>ša-mu-ut ħe₂-gal-li iš-tu ša-me-e li-iz-nu-<un>-ka</i> <i>May a rain of plenty rain over you from the sky.</i>
RS C	23	ubur an sud-aĝ ₂ ĝal ₂ ħu-mu-ra-ab-taka ₄ im-a an-na ħu-mu-ra-ab-šeĝ ₃
	24	mu ma-da u ₄ nam-ħe ₂ an-ša ₃ -ta za ₃ ħu-mu-ra-ab-keše ₂
	25	iti ₆ niĝ ₂ giri ₁₇ -zal ša ₃ ħul ₂ -la u ₄ -zu-še ₃ ħu-mu-ra-ab-ĝar
	26	bala niĝ ₂ du ₁₀ niĝ ₂ -si-su si-a šu-zu-še ₃ ħu-mu-ra-ab-ĝar

1514 § 6.2.4.

1515 Brisch 2007, 45-46.

1516 Dietrich 1998, 159 n. 24, 169, 180-181. Marduk playing the role of Enki as lord of the underground water (*PfK* 7), cited by Dietrich (Dietrich 1998, 159 n. 21) as a further example of the difference between this text and the Mesopotamian tradition, is probably part of the process of Marduk's rising to the head of the pantheon and of the syncretism between Babylon and Eridu accomplished in *Enūma-eliš*.

1517 Römer 1965, 10; for the role of An as creator see Tallqvist 1938, 254.

1518 ETCSL 2.5.6.5.

1519 Dietrich 1998, 169.

1520 ETCSL 2.6.9.3; Brisch 2007, 61-64, 200-202.

- 23 *May he open for you the breasts of the shining heavens,
so that the rain of heaven rains for you.*
- 24 *Years of prosperity and days of plenty
may he assemble for you from the heart of heaven.*
- 25 *Months of splendor and a joyful heart may he establish for your lifetime.*
- 26 *A reign filled with excellence and justice may he give to you.*

The same portrayal of An is found in *Ur-Namma C*:¹⁵²¹



- 20 an-e ka ku₃-ga-ni mu-un-ba im-a ma-u₃-du₂
An opens his holy mouth, and for me rain is produced.

As pointed out by Dietrich *PfK* is not only connected to the Sumerian literary texts but also to the Akkadian literature. Arnaud¹⁵²² noticed the close relationship of the Akkadian version to the inscription of the Kassite king Agum-kakrime, although the latter is only preserved in first-millennium sources.¹⁵²³

I was able to identify a further parallel to *PfK* in a composition titled *Bénédictio sur le roi à son entrée dans le nouveau palais* published in Arnaud's volume on the literary texts from Ugarit (RS 25.431A = AuOrS 23 37). A line of this text strongly resembles the second part of the *PfK* incipit:

- | | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| AuOrS 23 37 | 2 | U ₄ .MEŠ-ka li-ri-ku ba-la-ṭa liš-r[ik ₂]
<i>May your days be long, may (the god) grant life to you.</i> |
| PfK | 2 | bu-luṭ be-li U ₄ .MEŠ-ka ₃ li-ri-ku |

Arnaud regards this tablet as imported from Assyria on the basis of the ductus and the presence of a few Assyrianisms and dates it to Tukulti-Ninurta's reign. A paleographic analysis, however, shows that this tablet was not drafted in 13th century Assyria.

- The sign ŠA with two inscribed *Winkelhaken* (l. 6) , has a Middle Babylonian shape;¹⁵²⁴ the same form is attested in the 14th century MA texts,¹⁵²⁵ but it is different from that known from the texts of Tukulti-Ninurta's period, , as shown for instance in KAR 128 (*Prayer to Assur for Tukulti-Ninurta*)¹⁵²⁶ and KAJ 310.
- The shape of the sign LI (ll. 1, 2)¹⁵²⁷ is typically Middle Babylonian;¹⁵²⁸ it diverges from both the 14th century Assyrian variant,¹⁵²⁹ and from the ŠE+ŠA variant (with four horizontal wedges) of the 13th century.¹⁵³⁰ This variant is also different from the late Ugarit script form¹⁵³¹ attested in other literary texts.¹⁵³²

1521 ETCSL 2.4.1.3.

1522 Arnaud 1982a, 216.

1523 See for instance K 4149+ = 5R 33, VII, 11-12, ša LUGAL a-gu-um // U₄.MEŠ-šu₂ lu-u'ar-ku'.

1524 BA 14, No. 167.

1525 See Weeden 2012, 237 and n. 48.

1526 See § 2.1.5.1.

1527 In line 5 the sign transliterated as LI looks like TE.



1528 BE 14, No. 211; the Syrian school shape attested at Emar derives from the MB variant, Wilcke 1992, 128-131.

1529 Weeden 2012, 239-240.

1530 See Weidner 1952-53, 201, van Soldt 2001.

1531 van Soldt 2001; this variant corresponds to that attested at Emar in the Syro-Hittite scholarly texts.

1532 Cf. RS 79.25 (Arnaud 1982a, 210-212), RS 17.80 (Nougayrol 1968, 376).

- The sign KA shows a MB shape,¹⁵³³ , which is different from the 13th century MA variant¹⁵³⁴ attested for instance in KAR 128 ; this form is also different from the 14th century MA variant.¹⁵³⁵

Paleographic analysis thus invalidates the hypothesis that AuOrS 23 37 is a 13th MA tablet. Linguistic traits taken by Arnaud as clues to an Assyrian origin are limited to the adverb [*ha-ra-a*]*m-ma* (l. 10) and to the 3sg. precativative [*l*]*u-ka-an-ni-ka* (l. 11).¹⁵³⁶ Arnaud himself admits that the only certain Assyrianism is the precativative form since the adverb is in a broken context and its restoration is speculative. Even the precativative might be a Babylonian form¹⁵³⁷ if it were a 1sg. form. Notwithstanding Arnaud's claim that the context requires a 3sg. form,¹⁵³⁸ the use of the second person to address the king does not exclude that the precativative could be a 1sg. form.

A further hint toward the origin of the tablet is provided by its find-spot. AuOrS 23 37 was found in the Lamaštu archive where several Babylonian tablets were unearthed.¹⁵³⁹ Therefore, by regarding the precativative as a 1sg. form¹⁵⁴⁰ the script of the tablet can be classified as Babylonian.¹⁵⁴¹

The influence of Akkadian literature is further suggested by the epithet of Iškur, *lu[-ga]l ḫi-gal* 'king of plenty'.¹⁵⁴² *PfK* is the only Sumerian text where such an epithet is attested, but it is known from several Akkadian compositions and the list *An=Anum*.¹⁵⁴³

It is clear that *PfK* was not reworked in Syria¹⁵⁴⁴ but rather originated in the Mesopotamian stream of tradition. All the elements supposed by Dietrich to be influenced by West Semitic culture are already attested in the Sumerian-Akkadian documentation. In this context, these traits, which later appear in biblical literature, must be considered as dependent on the Mesopotamian tradition.

Compared to the text of the Emar tablet the Ugarit manuscript expands some sections: Enki and Asalluḫi are added to the list of invoked gods (*PfK*, 7);¹⁵⁴⁵ Anu/El is mentioned in a passage equating the king to the power of the waters (*PfK*, 17-18). On the contrary RS 79.25 makes no mention of Nergal providing the king with a mighty weapon (*PfK* 13). Furthermore, the Ugarit manuscript ends with a four-line reference to Iškur's gifts, which is lacking in the Emar tablet. Some textual variants are also attested:¹⁵⁴⁶

1533 BE 14, No. 84.

1534 For the 13th century MA shape see van Soldt 2001.

1535 Weeden 2012, 238-239, 247.

1536 Arnaud 2007, 15, 123-124.

1537 For the Babylonian and Assyrian variants in the D stem see GAG § 81c.

1538 The line is broken and this is the only word preserved.

1539 For this archive see § 9.5.2.

1540 Is it possible reading [*u*]₂ instead of [*l*]*u*? By reading [*u*]₂-*ka-an-ni-ka* the presence of Assyrianisms would be excluded.

1541 Note also the use of the value /aš/ of the sign AŠ₂ that, as seen in RS 17.80 (see § 5.3.4), is rare at Ugarit (Huehnergard 1989, 385), and the value pi which is only known from texts of Mesopotamian origin, Huehnergard 1989, 23. On the other hand, if any Assyrianism is attested, this manuscript might be a Syrian copy of either a MB tablet or a 14th century MA tablet. In the first case the Assyrianisms are due to the Syrian scribe, for at Ugarit and Karkemiš the precativative presents both Babylonian and Assyrian forms, Huehnergard 1979, 232-233.

1542 RS 79.25, 44.

1543 Schwemer 2001, 65.

1544 Kämmerer 1998, 118-119, supporting the Syrian reworking of *PfK*, defines the process as *Induktion*.

1545 Dietrich 1998, 168.

1546 Orthographic variants due to phonetic writings in the Ugarit recension are not listed here.

Line	E 775	RS 79.25
2	mu-mu-zu $\text{h}_2\text{-mu}_2\text{-me-en-na-an-da}$	$\text{u}_2\text{-mi-za-a}\text{ḫ-bi-lu}$
3	nu-bala-ta	ṣu-nam-ba-le-e
3	nam-tar-zu $\text{h}_2\text{-ne-tar-re}$	$\text{ṣu-nam-tar-ta-re-e-ni}$
5	diġir-meš	ti-ga-ar^1
6	ereš gal	$\text{e-re-eš ma-a}\text{ḫ}$
6	še-er-ga-an-zu $\text{h}_2\text{-li h}_2\text{-am}_3$	$\text{h}_2\text{-li-du-u}\text{ḫ-tu}$
8	ši-meš	la-le-e
8	an-na	an-nu-ga-al
8	$\text{h}_2\text{-ri-ib}_2\text{-si}$	in-na-zu
9	ši-meš	la-li-a-ni
9	nam-til ₃ -la	ta-a-bi
10	giz-zu ne-ne	$\text{h}_2\text{-za-la-qa}$
11	$\text{u}_4\text{-gid}_2\text{-zu h}_2\text{-ne-ib}_2\text{-tar-re}$	$\text{nam-tar-gi-da ta-r[i ...]}$
14	$\text{d}^{\text{nin}}\text{inana}$	$[\text{in-n}]a\text{-na e-re-eš m[a-a}\text{ḫ}]$
16	$\text{h}_2\text{-en-na-an-šum}_2$	$\text{i[n-...]-gal}^?$
17	$\text{i}_7\text{-da-gen}_7$	a-ia-i-du-ki-im
18	a	a-ia-i-du-ki-im
18	$\text{h}_2\text{-me-en-gen}_7$	za-e-me-in
22	$\text{mu-un-ra}_2\text{-a-de}_6$	in-na-an-ba

1 Singular instead of plural.

Now that the dependence of *PfK* on the Mesopotamian tradition has been substantiated, it is time to determine how the text received the form in which it came down to us.

The Sumerian text shows many errors and is often obscure and artificial. In the following section, I try to distinguish errors typologically, in order to identify their origin.

Traditional-Type Errors

Here are listed errors documented in any segment of the Sumerian literary tradition:

- Ergative indicated with -a; this writing is known from the Old Babylonian period:¹⁵⁴⁷
 - ši-meš nam-til₃-la an-na $\text{h}_2\text{-ri-ib}_2\text{-si}$, ‘Let An fill you with the plenty of life’ (E 775, 8).
 - $\text{d}^{\text{ak}}\text{lugal gi-dub-ba-a u}_4\text{-gid}_2\text{-zu h}_2\text{-ne-ib}_2\text{-tar-re}$, ‘Let Nabu the king of the stylus decree long days for you’ (E 775, 11); the expected form would be: * $\text{d}^{\text{ak}}\text{lugal gi-dub-ba-ke}_4$.
 - According to the Akkadian translation, *še-e-ru pu-luḫ-ta-šu li-din-<ku>*, ‘Let the steppe provide you with its awesomeness’, the ergative is perhaps indicated by -a in $\text{edin-na ni}_2\text{-bi h}_2\text{-en-na-an-šum}_2$ (E 775, 16). The same use of -a seems to be attested at Ugarit: *a-te-na* (RS 79.25, 28). However, $\text{edin-na ni}_2\text{-bi}$ can also be an anticipatory genitive, ‘The awesomeness of the steppe’.

¹⁵⁴⁷ For attestations and bibliography see Attinger 1993, 214; although it rarely occurs, the writing of the ergative with -a is also documented in the Decad, see Delnero 2006, 412. This phenomenon derives from the confusion between -a and -e in the dative and directive which extended to other cases, see Black, Zólyomi 2007, 18. An example in a MB tablet is attested in N 3455, § 1.1.1.1.

- u_2 -du su-pa-kur-ku-ra-ak-ka [u]₄-za-la-qa-ka he_2 -za-la-qa, 'Let Utu, shepherd of the lands, light you up like a bright day' (RS 79.25, 19-20); in this case the use of -a is probably to be considered a result of the assimilation $e > a$ in the phonetic writing.
- Genitive indicated by /ke/:¹⁵⁴⁸
 - In u_2 -ša₃-ḫul-ke gu-la-kam₂, 'The plant of heart-joy is big' (E 775, 20), the presence of the ergative is incorrect because it is a nominal sentence with copula.
- A further error typical of late texts is the transfer of the nominal element of a compound verb directly before the verbal base; this error is attested in both manuscripts for the verb gal_2 --taka₄:

Pfk 7	E	^d asal umun-ḫal ḫal-bi mu-un- gal_2 -taka ₄ -a ^d AMAR.UTU <i>be-el na-ag-bi na-ga</i> ₁₄ -ab-šū lip-te-ku
	U	a-ša-a-li-ni ₂ -te ni ₂ -te ma-an-a-gal-ta-qa-a
	E	<i>Marduk the lord of the underground water opened his underground water.</i>
	U	<i>Asalluḫi (lord) of fear, opened the fear.</i>

- An error going back to the post-Old Babylonian tradition¹⁵⁴⁹ is the use of -meš as a plural marker under the influence of Akkadian: diḡir-meš (E 775, 5), ši-meš (E 775, 8) i₇-da-meš (E 775, 22); note the same use in the MA tablet BM 98496.¹⁵⁵⁰
- The precativ of the verb šum_2 is formed with the *ḫamṭu* stem in two-participant clauses. Such constructions are sporadically known from the Old Babylonian period.¹⁵⁵¹

E 9	ši-meš nam-til ₃ -la ḡeš-nu ₁₁ šu he_2 -en-na-an-šum ₂ ¹⁵⁵²
E 13	^d i-šum nir- gal_2 diḡir-gal-gal-e-ne ^{ḡeš} tukul kala-ga-me ₈ -en he_2 -en-ti-an-šum ₂ ¹⁵⁵³
E 15	ḡe ₆ me-lim ₄ he_2 -en-na-an-šum ₂
E 16	edin-na ni ₂ -bi he_2 -en-na-an-šum ₂ ¹⁵⁵⁴

- Some substantives that are usually nominal elements of compound verbs are used as independent verbs in non-finite forms where the Akkadian has finite verbal forms. Such forms are usually found in late texts:
 - šudu_3 is rarely attested as a verbal form after the post-Old Babylonian period.¹⁵⁵⁵

E 4	^d nin-lil ₂ -la ₂ inim-du ₁₀ -ga-ni šudu_3 -šudu ₃ -a-zu ^d NIN.LIL ₂ <i>i-na pi₂-ša ṭa₃-a-bi li-ik-ru-bu-ka</i> <i>(May) Ninlil bless you with her good words.</i>
-----	--

1548 See Attinger 1993, 259, Edzard 2000, 64, Huber Vulliet 2001, 176-177.

1549 A similar use is already attested in the royal inscriptions of Rim-Sîn but limited to person class nouns, see Kärki 1967, 41.

1550 § 2.1.5.2; see also § 6.2.2.

1551 Black, Zólyomi 2007, 21-22.

1552 The 3sg. IO (-na-) occurs instead of the Akkadian 2msg. dative (-ku).

1553 -en-ti- is unclear and *ḫa-ra-ab-šum₂-mu would be expected.

1554 This sentence is two-participant only if edin-na is the subject, see above.

1555 Attinger 1993, 727 § 864.

E 5 diġir-meš kalam-ma šudu₃-šudu₃-a-zu
 DIĠIR.MEŠ KALAM.MA *ša ma-ti li-ik-ru-ba-ak-ku*¹⁵⁵⁶
May the gods of the land bless you.

- In [a-š]a-lu-uḫ-ḫe₂ e-kur nam-til₃-[la] // [še-er-k]a-an-zu, '(May) Asalluḫi from the Ekur adorn you with life' (RS 79.25, 10-11), še-er-ka-an, 'ornament', which is usually part of the verb še-er-ka-an-du₁₁, is used as a verbal form (= *za'ānu*).¹⁵⁵⁷

In both cases the possessive -zu with an apparent object function is appended to a non-finite verbal form. Even though the possessive can assume the function of objective genitive,¹⁵⁵⁸ in these cases -zu seems to be the direct object, probably under the influence of Akkadian,¹⁵⁵⁹ a similar form is found at Meturan, mu-ši-bar-ra-zu.¹⁵⁶⁰ Note that the Akkadian accusative pronominal suffix is attested in the Emar version.

Copying Mistakes

The following mistakes are likely to be attributed to Syrian copyists:

- The insertion of šu in šu-nam-tar-ta-re-e-ni (RS 79.25, 5) is probably the result of miscopying from the preceding line: il-li-il šu-nam-ba-le-e, 'Enlil the one who does not change'¹⁵⁶¹ (RS 79.25, 4).
- The morpheme -ke₄, which is attested in the phonetic version from Ugarit as -ka, is omitted and the verbal form is miscopied in the following lines:

E 10 ^dutu sipa-kur-kur-ra u₄-zalag₂-giz-zu ne-ne
^dutu *re-i ma-ta-ti ki-ma u₄-mi ša nam-ri / li-na-me-er-ka*
 U 19-20 u₂-du su-pa-kur-ku-ra-ak-ka // [u]₄-za-la-qa-ka ḫe₂-za-la-qa
Let Utu, shepherd of the lands, light you up like a bright day.

- In i₇-da-meš-tum (E 775, 22), -tum is miscopied from the Akkadian version, I₇.MEŠ-tum.

Other Errors

This section groups errors that cannot be clearly explained:

- -me₈-en is unclear in ^di-šum nir-ġal₂ diġir-gal-gal-e-ne ^ġes^{es}tukul kala-ga-me₈-en ḫe₂-en-ti-an-šum₂ // ^dNE₃.ERI₁₁.GAL *e-tel* DIĠIR^{mes} *ra-bu-ti ka-ak-ka₃ dan₅-na li-din-ku*, 'May Nergal prince of the great gods give a mighty weapon to you' (E 775, 13).
- In a-na-ḫe₂-ġal-la an-ta-ġal₂ ga-a-ni-šur-ra-ke₄ // *ša-mu-ut ḫe₂-gal-li iš-tu ša-me-e li-iz-nu-<un>-ka*, 'May a plenty rain¹⁵⁶² fall over him from the sky' (E 775, 19), an-ta-ġal₂ 'exalted' (see ePSD) is a mistake for an-ta = *iš-tu ša-me-e*. The verbal form is perhaps a writing for ga-ni-šur-ra ak: as seen above, the cohortative form ga- for the expected precativ is attested elsewhere

1556 Note that in line 4 the verb is plural but the singular form is expected whereas in line 5 it is singular but the subject is plural; the scribe probably reversed the position of the signs BA (l. 5) and BU (l. 5).

1557 As a verbal form šerkan is only attested in lexical lists, see Attinger 1993, 684 § 777, 685 § 781.

1558 In this case -zu would refer to the whole sentence.

1559 Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993b, 201.

1560 Cavigneaux, Al-Rawi 1993b, 198.

1561 The translation is based upon the Akkadian *lā mušpelû*.

1562 a-na is a writing for šeġ₃ (A.AN).

in the LBA documentation but how it developed remains unclear;¹⁵⁶³ -ke₄ is perhaps a form from the verb AK used as a verbalizer.¹⁵⁶⁴

- The expression nam-tar-tar in ^den-lil₂-e nu-bala-ta¹⁵⁶⁵ nam-tar-zu ħe₂-ne-tar-re, 'May Enlil, the one who does not change, decree your fate' (E 775, 3), is not attested elsewhere and is probably a calque on the Akkadian *ši-im-ka li-ši-im* in which nam-tar corresponds to *ši-im-ka*.
- In ħur-saġ gu₂-un-bi gur₃ zi-ga-zu // *ša-du-u₂ bi-la-as-su liš-ši-ku*, 'May the mountain bring its tribute to you' (E 775, 21), it is unclear why two synonymous verbal forms guru₃ and zi are used for the Akkadian verb *našû*, 'to bring, to lift.'¹⁵⁶⁶
- The morphemes following -mu₂¹⁵⁶⁷ are unclear; perhaps they result from copying:

E 2 mu-mu-zu ħe₂-mu₂(-)me-en-na-an-da ħe₂-am
 MU.MEŠ-ka *li-te-ed-di-ša*
May your years renew.

A sequence of two precatives¹⁵⁶⁸ is perhaps attested also in the Ugarit manuscript according to Arnaud's interpretation of u₂-mi-za-aĥ-bi-lu ħa-a (RS 79.25, 2) as *mu-mu-za ħe₂-gibil ħa-a.¹⁵⁶⁹ A similar series of precatives is attested, once again, in a passage of the *Hymn to Marduk for a King*:

HM 23 ħe₂-til₃-la ħe₂-silim-ma gi₁₆-sa-aš ħe₂-a
May you live! May you have peace! May it last forever!

It appears that the majority of mistakes are not unknown in Sumerian literature, especially in late sources. This perhaps indicates that *PfK* was composed or deeply reworked during the Middle Babylonian period.

As already noticed, the Sumerian and Akkadian diverge in several passages. Here follows the list of variants:

2 E U	ħe ₂ -mu ₂ -me-en-na-an-da ħe ₂ -am VS <i>li-te-ed-di-ša</i> -aĥ-bi-lu ħe-a
3 E U	ħe ₂ -ne-tar-re VS <i>li-ši-im</i> šu-nam-tar-ta-re-e-ni
4 E U	šudu ₃ -šudu ₃ -a-zu VS <i>li-ik-ru-bu-ka</i> šu-da-ia-ku
5 E U	šudu ₃ -šudu ₃ -a-zu VS <i>li-ik-ru-ba-ak-ku₈</i> šu-da-ia-ak-...]

1563 See §§ 1.1.9.1, 5.2.1.

1564 Cf. § 2.1.5.1.

1565 This form probably derives from *nu-bala-e-da.

1566 CAD N/2, 80-81.

1567 For mu₂ = *edēšu* see CT 51 168 ii 43.

1568 Two precatives are usually documented with the same verb with an emphatic function. A series of epistemic ħe₂-clauses are found to indicate disjunction, see Civil 2000b, 34-35.

1569 Arnaud 1982a, 213; according to Arnaud the phonetic writing aĥ-bi-lu renders gibil with the shift *g > ĥ*, see § 4.3.1.1.2.

6 E	še-er-ga-an-zu ɥi-li ɥe ₂ -am ₃ VS <i>li-ze-en-ka</i> ₃
U	ɥi-li du-uṭ-ṭu
7 E	mu-un-ḡal ₂ -taka ₄ -a VS <i>lip-te-ku</i>
8 E	ɥe ₂ -ri-ib ₂ -si VS <i>li-še-eb-be</i> ₂ -ka
U	in-na-zu
10 E	NE.NE VS <i>li-na-me-er-ka</i>
U	ɥe ₂ -za-la-qa
11 E	ɥe ₂ -ne-ib ₂ -tar-re VS <i>liš-ṭur</i>
U	ta-r[i...]
12 E	kala-ga-me-en VS <i>lid-din-nin</i>
U	[ka-l]a-qa-e-ni
14 E	(a-)ri-a VS <i>li-ir-mi-ku</i>
19 E	ga-a-ni-šur-ra-ke ₄ VS <i>li-iz-nu-<un>-ka</i>
20 E	gu-la-kam ₂ VS <i>li-ir-bi-ku</i>
21 E	guru ₃ zi-ga-zu VS <i>liš-ši-ku</i>
22 E	mu-un-DU-a-DU VS <i>lu-ub-la-ku</i>
U	in-na-an-ba
23 E	ḡa ₂ -ra VS <i>li-ip-qi</i> ₂ -id-ka

These occurrences may be grouped according to the following typologies:¹⁵⁷⁰

- Akkadian precativè VS Sumerian non-finite form (Emar: ll. 4-5, 10(?), 12, 14, 20, 21, 23; Ugarit: ll. 3, 4-5, 6, 11, 12)
- Sumerian precatives formed with an additional form of the verb 'to be' (Emar: ll. 2, 6; Ugarit: l. 2)
- Akkadian precativè VS Sumerian non-precative verbal forms beginning with the prefix mu- or in- (Emar: ll. 7, 22; Ugarit: ll. 8, 22)
- Sumerian cohortative VS Akkadian precativè (Emar: l. 19)¹⁵⁷¹

A few lines (ll. 3, 8, 10)¹⁵⁷² offer examples of precatives in both Akkadian and Sumerian. Another attestation is the above-quoted ɥe-en-na-an-šum₂ in E 775, 9, 15, 16 that corresponds to the Akkadian precativè *li-din-ku*.¹⁵⁷³ In E 775, 11, the opposition between the Sumerian tar 'to decree' in ɥe₂-ne-ib₂-tar-re and the Akkadian *šaṭāru* 'to write' is semantic. None of the verbal forms in the Sumerian

¹⁵⁷⁰ For the precativè in the Ugarit version see Arnaud 2007, 22.

¹⁵⁷¹ For this line see above.

¹⁵⁷² Note that ɥe₂-za-la-qa (l. 10) in the Ugarit text is more correct than the Emar text.

¹⁵⁷³ Cf. fn. 1552.

version correctly correspond to the Akkadian precatives that are the expected forms on the basis of both the context and the parallels cited by Dietrich.

The Akkadian version, fully preserved only in the Emar tablet, shows a higher degree of accuracy compared to the Emar documentation. The Gtn conjugation, which is rare and usually incorrect at Emar,¹⁵⁷⁴ appears in the morphologically correct form *li-te-ed-di-ša* (E 775, 2).¹⁵⁷⁵ The Akkadian version presents old and late forms.¹⁵⁷⁶ Archaic forms typical of the Syrian school tradition are the sign su_2 (ZU) in *bi-la-as-su_2* (E 775, 21)¹⁵⁷⁷ and the preservation of š before a dental in *na-pu-uš-ti* (E 775, 18) and *liš-ṭur* (E 775, 11). Later traits emerge in the shift $w > m$ in *li-na-me-er-ka* and *nam-ri* (E 775, 10).¹⁵⁷⁸ Moreover CvC signs are frequently used and voiced and emphatic consonants are incorrectly distinguished as is common in peripheral Akkadian.¹⁵⁷⁹ Such late features are not unusual in the Emar Syrian school texts.¹⁵⁸⁰ Isolated Assyrianisms are the form *lu-ub-la-ku*¹⁵⁸¹ and the value \dot{t}_2 of the sign 𐎢 (E 775, 23).¹⁵⁸² As with other texts such forms are to be considered common features of peripheral Akkadian. The few traces of the Akkadian version in the Ugarit manuscript seem to agree with the text of the Emar source.

According to Arnaud,¹⁵⁸³ the Sumerian text is not the primary version, but a translation from Akkadian prepared 'à coup de listes lexicographiques'. The dependence of *PfK* on Sumerian literature indicates that the whole Sumerian text cannot be considered as a translation from Akkadian. A further example of such a connection is the expression $\dot{h}i-li-du-ud-du_5 \sim \dot{h}i-li du_8-du_8$ (RS 79.25, 9)¹⁵⁸⁴ which is known in the Sumerian literature and especially in praise poems.¹⁵⁸⁵ Nevertheless the relevant influence of Akkadian makes it possible that lexical lists were used as a reference for composing the text. Lexical material was also employed by Syrian scribes to create the phonetic version, as pointed out by Arnaud.¹⁵⁸⁶

Three features of the text have emerged so far: (1) the high number of mistakes in the Sumerian version; (2) the difference between the Sumerian and Akkadian versions; (3) the accuracy of the Akkadian translation. The primary result of this analysis is that there is no evidence supporting a Syrian adaptation of *PfK*. Indeed, the majority of mistakes are common to the diachronic development of Sumerian grammar whereas only copying mistakes may be attributed to local scribes. The Sumerian appears to be artificial and strongly influenced by Akkadian and shows many late traits. Such features along with the lack of any Old Babylonian duplicates suggest that this text was composed or reworked in the Middle Babylonian period, perhaps on the basis of older texts such as the *Hymn to Marduk for a King*. The presence of Emesal forms – *mu-li-li* \sim ${}^a\mu\text{-}lil_2$ (l. 4), *umun*, *e-re-eš* \sim *ereš* (l. 6) – in a main dialect text is further evidence for a late date of composition.

Lacking any OB exemplar the setting of this royal hymn cannot be understood. It is unknown whether it was composed with a cultic intent and was actually performed in ceremonies praising the

1574 Seminara 1998, 412-413 and n. 141.

1575 Note that the use of the feminine is normally correct in the scholarly texts, Seminara 1998, 358 n. 62.

1576 Note the gloss in DIGIR.MEŠ KALAM.MA *ša ma-ti* (E 775, 5) which represents one of the rare cases in the Emar documentation, Seminara 1998, 70.

1577 See Seminara 1998, 72-76 and n. 62.

1578 Seminara 1998, 164-165.

1579 See *ku_8* (E 775, 5); *ga_14* (E 775, 7); Seminara 1998, 176-177; see also the use of the signs *tu_3* (E 775, 6) and *-ka_4* (QA) in *U_4.MEŠ-ka_4*, Seminara 1998, 256.

1580 Seminara 1998, 216-217.

1581 See Seminara 1998, 403.

1582 Seminara 1998, 212.

1583 Arnaud 1982a, 209.

1584 Arnaud 1982, 214: 8-9.

1585 Sjöberg 1966, 292.

1586 Arnaud 1982a, 213: 1-2: the writing $u_2\text{-}mu$ for $u_4\text{-}d$ (RS 79.25, 2) is attested in an Ugarit recension of *Urra*; here it is clearly due to the influence of Akkadian.

king.¹⁵⁸⁷ If *PfK* already existed in the Old Babylonian period it was most likely a non-curricular text. On the contrary if this composition was composed during the post-Old Babylonian period a cultic setting is unlikely. Whatever its original function, it seems that *PfK* was copied in a scholastic context during the LBA at least in the Western periphery. On the basis of the present evidence the tradition of *PfK* cannot be ascertained. However, one may note that RN *lugal-ĝu₁₀* hymns are rare in Nippur. Moreover, connections with the *Hymn to Marduk for a King*, a composition that lies outside of the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition, likely originating in Northern Babylonia,¹⁵⁸⁸ perhaps suggest that *PfK* derives from the same scribal milieu. Differences between the Emar and Ugarit manuscripts suggest that different *Vorlagen* circulated in Syria.

6.2 Syro-Hittite School Texts

Syro-Hittite school texts include wisdom compositions, a literary letter and incantations.

6.2.1 The Ballad of Early Rulers

*The Ballad of Early Rulers (BeR)*¹⁵⁸⁹ is preserved on three Old Babylonian tablets as well as in copies from Emar and Ugarit. This composition features the so-called vanity theme that reflects upon the shortness and futility of human life. The Emar fragments, **E 767+**, belong to a three-column tablet containing versions in standard Sumerian, phonetic Sumerian and Akkadian. A second manuscript is the tiny fragment Msk 74159j (E 767B) which contains lines 6-8 of the phonetic Sumerian version. On the basis of the fragment Msk 74153, which preserves a cryptographic colophon, the scribe of this tablet has been identified as Šaggar-abu¹⁵⁹⁰ the eldest son of Ba'al-qarrād, diviner of Zu-Ba'la's family. Šaggar-abu is also known as the author of letters¹⁵⁹¹ and scholarly texts:¹⁵⁹² two manuscripts of the *Paleographic Syllabary A*, the *S^a Vocabulary*, *Urra Tablets V_b-VII* and *XIII*, the lexical list *Lu*, one omen probably belonging to the series *iqqur-īpuš*, one astronomic omen concerning a lunar eclipse and the Sumerian wisdom text *The Fowler*.¹⁵⁹³

Three bilingual fragments of *BeR*, published by Nougayrol in *Ugaritica V* 164-166, have come down to us from the Ugarit documentation. **RS 25.130 = Ugaritica V 164** (Ua), discovered in the Lamaštu archive, is a single-column tablet containing the standard orthography version with inter-linear Akkadian translation. The tablet has a circular disposition of text lines: the beginning of the composition is duplicated in lines 18-23 on the obverse and on lines 40-44 on the reverse.¹⁵⁹⁴ The text continues on the obverse (ll. 1-17) with a line order different from the Emar manuscript.¹⁵⁹⁵ The remainder of the reverse (ll. 24-39) contains a collection of sayings called *Proverbs from Ugarit*.¹⁵⁹⁶ Fragments **RS 23.34 (+) 23.484 + 23.363 = Ugaritica V 165** (Ub), found in the proximity of the *Maison-aux-tablettes*,¹⁵⁹⁷ belong to a two-column tablet containing the phonetic Sumerian version

¹⁵⁸⁷ For the context of the royal hymns see Ludwig 1990, 41-65.

¹⁵⁸⁸ The text is unknown in Nippur and was likely composed under Abī-ešuḫ when most of the Nippur scholars left the city; in addition all the manuscripts stem from Sippar.

¹⁵⁸⁹ ETCSL 5.2.5; the unilingual Old Babylonian recension is indicated as OB, and the Syrian as Syr. A new hand-copy of the Emar tablet is provided by George apud Cohen 2012c, 148-149.

¹⁵⁹⁰ Cohen 2006.

¹⁵⁹¹ Cohen 2009, 165.

¹⁵⁹² Cohen 2009, 166-170.

¹⁵⁹³ § 6.2.3.

¹⁵⁹⁴ These lines are separated from the preceding lines by a double ruling containing the sign BAD.

¹⁵⁹⁵ For the reconstruction of line order see Dietrich 1992, 13.

¹⁵⁹⁶ For this composition see § 7.1.1.

¹⁵⁹⁷ van Soldt 1991, 187.

on the left and the Akkadian translation on the right.¹⁵⁹⁸ No standard Sumerian was inscribed on this tablet. At the end of 'Face A' a portion of the colophon is preserved identifying the scribe as an apprentice.¹⁵⁹⁹ This clearly indicates that this tablet is the product of schooling activities. The third manuscript **RS 25.424 = Ugaritica V 166** (Uc) discovered, like Ua, in the Lamaštu archive only preserves a few lines of the Akkadian version and traces of the Sumerian text. On the basis of Obv. 7 (Syr. 6) which preserves [... -g]a-an-ni, it seems that the Sumerian version was probably written in phonetic orthography and was separated from the Akkadian translation by *Glossenkeile*.

The Old Babylonian recension is inscribed on three *Sammeltafeln* probably stemming from Sippar, BM 80091 (A), BM 80184 = CT 44 18 (B) and CBS 1208 (D). In addition to *BeR* these tablets contain three other monolingual compositions¹⁶⁰⁰ that are thematically related.¹⁶⁰¹ No sources so far stem from Nippur even though it is not precluded that *BeR* was known in the city of the god Enlil.¹⁶⁰² The Nippur OB tablet CBS 13777, which preserves two literary texts that feature the vanity theme,¹⁶⁰³ the OB recension of *Proverbs from Ugarit* and niĝ₂-nam nu-kal, *Nothing is of Value* (NV),¹⁶⁰⁴ perhaps also contained *BeR*.¹⁶⁰⁵ The Sippar tablets reflect a late textual tradition as shown by the use of the person class interrogative pronoun a-ba-am₃ in reference to a non-person class noun.¹⁶⁰⁶

BeR is also known from the NA bilingual fragments K 6917 + K 13679 discovered in the library of Aššurbanipal at Nineveh. These fragments only preserve the beginning of the composition in a format similar to Ua: a proverb collection reminiscent of *Proverbs from Ugarit* is inscribed between the three-line introductory prologue repeated twice. *BeR* is also quoted in the NA catalogue of the series of Sidu.¹⁶⁰⁷

A number of studies¹⁶⁰⁸ have been dedicated to this composition and often very diverse interpretations have been advanced.¹⁶⁰⁹ For the present study it will suffice to recall the different hypotheses on *BeR*'s textual history and the relation between the Old Babylonian and Syrian recensions.

The Syrian recension diverges from the monolingual version as it presents a different line order and some additional passages.¹⁶¹⁰ Lines 16-18 of the monolingual recension correspond to lines 7-9 of the Syrian text, which follow a six-line introductory theme unpreserved in the OB manuscripts. The Syrian recension ends differently with a *carpe diem* theme: lines 21-22 are replaced with a passage dedicated to the beer goddess Siraš (Syr. 23) and a couplet (Syr. 20-21) is added. Finally, in the Syrian recension the names of Bazi and Zizi are added to the list of ancient rulers (Syr. 16).

Two different hypotheses on the origin of the Syrian recension have been put forward: some scholars (Dietrich, Klein, Kämmerer) assume that the Emar-Ugarit text results from reworking by local scribes; on the other hand, some (Lambert, Alster, Y. Cohen) consider the Syrian recension to be dependent on Mesopotamian models.

1598 Against the hand-copy (Nougayrol 1968, 438) obverse and reverse are to be exchanged as the text begins on 'Face B' and continues on 'Face A'.

1599 For a translation see Dietrich 1992, 20; at the bottom of the tablet a ruling separates the colophon from some badly preserved signs which may be part of either the same colophon or of another composition.

1600 1. *Hymn to Marduk for a King* (ETCSL 2.8.5.b); 2. *Abī-ešuh B* (ETCSL 2.8.5.a); 3. *Nothing is of Value*; 4. *The Ballad of Early Rulers* (ETCSL 5.2.5).

1601 See Alster 1990, 8-9, Alster 2005, 297.

1602 See §§ 9.1, 9.4.

1603 CBS 13777 probably contained extracts from vanity theme compositions.

1604 Alster 2005, 282.

1605 Alster 1999, 89.

1606 Cf. Syr 19 below. For the differences among the manuscripts see Alster 2005, 318-319.

1607 ki^aen-ki ĝeš-ḫur-ḫur-ra, Finkel 1986. The same catalogue lists *The Song of the Plowing Oxen* (§ 1.1.5.1) and possibly *The Fowler* (§ 6.2.3).

1608 Nougayrol 1968, 291-300, Civil 1969, Arnaud 1982b, 51, Alster, Jeyes 1986, Arnaud 1985-1987, Vol. 4 359-365, Wilcke 1988, Alster 1990, Dietrich 1992, Lambert 1995, Kämmerer 1998, 103-104, Klein 2000, Alster 2005, 288-322, Arnaud 2007, 142-148, Cohen 2012c.

1609 For an overview on the different interpretations see Alster 2005, 290-292.

1610 See Alster 2005, 292-293 for more details on the differences between the two recensions.

Dietrich regards the Emar text as an independent composition resulting from adaptation to the local environment. He also underlines differences between the Syrian manuscripts and describes the Emar text of *BeR* as «eine in sich geschlossene Komposition mit sechs Abschnitten» but «Das ist aber bei den Ugarit-Texten nicht der Fall» since only Ub and Uc reflect the Emar text, whereas Ua has a different structure.¹⁶¹¹ According to Dietrich the Syrian recension of *BeR* was composed at Emar on the basis of Mesopotamian models and then was transmitted to Ugarit where it was further modified.¹⁶¹² It became a very popular composition in the Syrian scribal schools as «Lernstoff Sumerisch und Babylonisch». According to Dietrich, the Mesopotamian tradition can be seen in the themes of ancient rulers and the *carpe diem* motif that he related to the Siduri episode of the Old Babylonian Gilgameš epic. The idea of adaptation is followed by Kämmerer who defined the Syrian recension as an example of «Reception mit Adaption».¹⁶¹³

A totally different view was proposed by Lambert who found no evidence that the Emar and Ugarit recensions reflected a text independent from the Mesopotamian tradition because «The differences ... are less than recensional differences between variant editions of Akkadian texts from southern Mesopotamia in the Old Babylonian Period, e.g. the Gilgameš Epic, and there is of course no proof that the Ugarit and Emar copies of the texts under discussion offer editions created in the west».¹⁶¹⁴ He also presented evidence supporting a connection between *BeR* and the book of *Qoheleth*,¹⁶¹⁵ which, according to him, was therefore inspired by the Mesopotamian tradition.¹⁶¹⁶ On the addition of the Siraš theme, he states that «The Emar recension and the Ugarit copies ... obviously are based on something very like the unilingual Sumerian version and have inserted into it a second, more specific, idea of how to find happiness».

In a later study Klein (2000), following Dietrich, emphasized the independent character of the Syrian recension, listing additional parallels with *Qoheleth*. According to him the monolingual recension could have ended with a pessimistic tone as opposed to the *carpe diem* theme of the Syrian recension.¹⁶¹⁷

More recently Alster argued in favor of the dependence of the Syrian manuscripts upon Mesopotamian models, as «whenever the Syro-Mesopotamian versions differ from their presumed genuine Babylonian forerunners, there may have been Babylonian models for specific additions in the Syro-Mesopotamian texts, whether 'genuine' Babylonian models are presently known or not».¹⁶¹⁸ By restoring the conclusion of the monolingual text,¹⁶¹⁹ he was able to demonstrate that the Old Babylonian and Syrian recensions do not offer a thematically different ending. The *gaudeamus igitur* theme was attested in the monolingual version too:¹⁶²⁰

OB 21 niĝ₂-sa₆-ga diĝir-re-ene bi₂-in-šum₂-ma-am₃ u₂-gu₇-gu₇ nam-til₃ i₃-kiĝ₂-kiĝ₂
For him who gives the good things of the gods, the food provider, life is found.

According to Alster the Syrian manuscripts depend on an unpreserved MB model which modified the monolingual text: 'the structure of the OB version had become somewhat weakened, and some of its well-intentioned additions result in confusion rather than clarity.'¹⁶²¹ The differences of the Syr-

1611 Dietrich 1992, 26.

1612 Dietrich 1992, 27.

1613 Kämmerer 1998, 103-104.

1614 Lambert 1995, 42.

1615 *Qoheleth* 9, 7-9.

1616 *Qoheleth* was thought to be inspired by Greek culture, cf. Lambert 1995, 42.

1617 Klein 2000, 213.

1618 Alster 2005, 299.

1619 Alster 2005, 311.

1620 Alster 2005, 290, 296.

1621 Alster 2005, 292.

ian recension reflect therefore «a rephrasing or ‘update’ – perhaps but not necessarily, to suit local circumstances – of the underlying intent of the OB version».

Even the mention of Bazi and Zizi belongs to a Mesopotamian tradition, as these two rulers appear as kings of Mari in the Tell-Leilan recension of the Sumerian King List.¹⁶²² Y. Cohen¹⁶²³ has shown that the inclusion of the section dedicated to the kings of Mari mentioning Bazi and Zizi was not limited to the Tell-Leilan recension of the SKL but was part of a widespread Mesopotamian heritage.

In the following pages I will try to substantiate the dependence of the Syrian recension on Babylonian models with further evidence.

According to Alster the Emar and Ugarit sources belong to two different textual traditions: on the one hand the Ugarit manuscripts are closer to the Old Babylonian recension, and on the other hand the Emar tablet reflects a later tradition.¹⁶²⁴ Differently, Arnaud (2007) believes that the Ugarit manuscripts do not reflect one homogenous tradition: according to him manuscripts Ub and Uc were transmitted to Ugarit through Assyrian and Anatolia as they exhibit Hittite sign values and Assyrianisms in addition to some possible local features. Conversely, Ua does not show any Assyrianisms but has several Hittite traits which would indicate that this manuscript reached Ugarit from Babylonia via Anatolia.¹⁶²⁵

The analysis of the Ugarit manuscripts reveals that they cannot belong to a single textual tradition: Ua is closer to the Old Babylonian monolingual recension than the other manuscripts.¹⁶²⁶ A peculiarity of manuscript Ua that has so far escaped the attention of scholars is the sequence of lines: the line order of Ua on the obverse (ll. 1-16) follows the OB recension, not the Emar text:

	Ua	OB	E
Obv.	1-2	13	15
	3-4	14	17
	5-6	15	18
	7-8	16	7
	9-10	17	8
	11-12	18	9
	13-14	19	19
	15-17	20	22
	18-19	x	1
	20-21	x	2
	22-23	x	3
Rev.	24-39 = <i>Proverbs from Ugarit</i>		
	40-41	x	1
	42-43	x	2
	44-(45)	x	3

One of the major differences between the Syrian and OB sources, namely the line order, does not occur in manuscript Ua. Conversely, manuscripts Ub and Uc follow the line order of the Emar tablet. This strengthens Alster's criticism¹⁶²⁷ of Dietrich's hypothesis that *BeR* was transmitted along the East-West route and consequently the Emar text would have been the model of the Ugaritic manuscripts.

¹⁶²² See Alster 2005, 318: 16 with bibliography.

¹⁶²³ Cohen 2012c.

¹⁶²⁴ Alster 2005, 293.

¹⁶²⁵ Arnaud 2007, 12.

¹⁶²⁶ Partially this emerges from Alster 2005, 293, 318.

¹⁶²⁷ Alster 2005, 293.

Dietrich's suggestion that the list of ancient rulers and in particular line 16 mentioning Bazi and Zizi¹⁶²⁸ is missing in Ua because of the theological conception of the king in Ugarit as mortal in life but deified after death¹⁶²⁹ is also to be dismissed. As Arnaud's restoration of Ua 1-2, [me-e ^den-k] i-d[u₃] // [a-li] ^dEn-ki-du₃ š[a ...],¹⁶³⁰ shows, the mention of Enkidu indicates that this section was attested in this manuscript too, but it is not fully preserved. The list of ancient rulers is also inscribed in Ub as demonstrated by Cohen (2012c):

Ub B' 16	[me-e ^m a-lu]-lu mu šar ₂ -[10-am ₃ in-ak]
17	[me-e ^m en-ta-na lugal-e lu ₂] an-[š ₃ bi ₂ -in-e ₃ -de ₃]

The omission of Bazi and Zizi in Ua recalls the absence of this line in the monolingual version. Unfortunately, the other Ugarit manuscripts are too badly preserved to ascertain if they originally contained this line.

Ua further differs from the other Ugarit manuscripts in its origin. Paleographic analysis of the tablet clearly indicates that signs present MB shapes¹⁶³¹ and the syllabary is Babylonian.¹⁶³² The value *mam*₂ of the sign SAL,¹⁶³³ indicated by van Soldt¹⁶³⁴ as Ugaritic, is Babylonian¹⁶³⁵ and it is attested in colophons from the library of Aššurbanipal¹⁶³⁶ in the word *mam*₂-*ma*. Consequently a first-millennium Assyrian scribe could not have learned this value from the peripheral regions. At Ugarit *mam*₂ occurs elsewhere only in Ugaritica V 4, 3, a legal text from the Rašap-abu archive;¹⁶³⁷ the context is, however, unclear and Berger¹⁶³⁸ reads *mim-ma* instead of *mam*₂-*ma*. The value *mam*₂ cannot therefore be considered as typical of Ugarit. Indeed Uc, which was drafted by a local scribe,¹⁶³⁹ has *ma-am-ma* (Obv. 9 = Syr. 7). To sum up, Ua is a Babylonian tablet¹⁶⁴⁰ containing a recension of *BeR* very close to the OB manuscripts, but apparently lacking the final lines of the monolingual recension.¹⁶⁴¹ Nevertheless, Ua seems to offer a different ending from the other Syrian manuscripts, E, Ub and Uc (Syr. 23-24), as it ends with line 20 which is the last line shared by all manuscripts (i.e. OB and Syrian). Unlike Ub, which has a parallel column format, the Akkadian translation in Ua is arranged in interlinear format. All these differences exclude that Ua is the model of Ub and Uc.

Even though Ua is very close to the monolingual recension, its text reflects the modifications and adaptations occurring in the Middle Babylonian period as is evident from the presence of the Akkadian translation. Indeed, Ua does not entirely adhere to the monolingual recension as lines 15-16 (= Sir. 22) make clear:

1628 This line should have been placed between lines 1-2 and 3-4.

1629 Dietrich 1992, 26.

1630 Arnaud 2007, 142: 4, see also Cohen 2012c, 140.

1631 See the shapes of the signs TI (ll. 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 27, 29, 31, 41), LI (ll. 4, 16, 17), RU (l. 8) and TAR (l. 37).

1632 See the use of the signs qum/qu (ll. 8, 16), qa (ll. 21, 37), su (l. 37) and the sign KI with the value *qe*₂, see Aro 1955, 19-20. Also note the lack of Assyrianisms, Arnaud 2007, 12.

1633 Ua, 10 (Syr. 8), 31 (*Proverbs from Ugarit*); in both cases the sign is used in the word *mam*₂-*ma*; however Alster 2005, 314, reads *mim-ma* in line 10.

1634 van Soldt 2012, 176.

1635 Jucquois 1966, 71.

1636 MesZL, 450; AkkS no. 298.

1637 Huehnergard 1989, 407.

1638 Berger 1969, 121.

1639 Ub and Uc present Ugarit sign shapes, see TI (Ub A', 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15; Ub B', 11, copy in Arnaud 2007, 256; Uc Rev. 2, 6), LI (Ub A', 6, 13), RU (Ub A', 11; Uc Obv. 8).

1640 Based on the present evidence it is not possible to state with all confidence whether Ua was an imported tablet or whether it was written by a Babylonian scribe working at Ugarit; only a physical analysis of the clay would allow us to understand its origin.

1641 OB 21-22 in Alster 2005, 305.

OB	20	niĝ ₂ -saĝ-il ₂ -la u ₄ ša ₃ -ĥul ₂ -la ₂ 1-am ₃ niĝ ₂ -me-ĝar mu 36000x10-am ₃ in-ak <i>Instead of one day of joy, 36000 years of silence.</i>
E	22	za-[...]´il ₂ u ₄ ´ ša ₃ -ĥul ₂ -la ₂ // [lu-u]-bi u ₃ -ser ₃ -ser ₃ ĥe ₂ -en-du za-an-ki-el-la u ₂ ša-ĥu-la-al // lu-ul-bi u ₃ -šar-šar ĥe ₂ -en-du <i>di-na-nu [ša ĥu-u]d lib₃-b[i] // 1-en u₄-m[u...]</i> ¹⁶⁴²
Ua	15 16	niĝ ₂ -saĝ-il ₂ -la ša ₃ -ĥul ₂ -la // ´u ₄ 1´-kam u ₄ -im-ba-kam mu-10-šar ₂ ĥul in-na-ak <i>a-na di-na-an ĥu-ud lib₃-bi u₄-um-ak-kal u₄-um qu-li // 10 ŠAR₂.[MEŠ]</i> MU.MEŠ lil-li-ka
Ub A ¹	8 9	saĝ-ki-il-la [...] ĥu-ul-la // u ₂ -l[u]-ul-bi [...] ĥi-in-du <i>a-[n]a ´di₃´-na-ni u₄-mi ĥu-ud [.....] // 1 U₄ qu₂¹⁷-[i] ´e´-še-re-et ša-a-r[u...]</i>

E S: *Instead of a single day of joy, let there come silence for 36000 (years).*

E A: *Instead of [one day] of joy, one day of [silence (?)] for 36000 (years).*

Ua: *Instead of the joy of the heart for one day, let one day of silence for 36000 years come.*

Ub: *Instead of a day of joy, let a day of 36000 years of silence come.*

This line shows some degree of variation among the Syrian manuscripts¹⁶⁴³ and the Sumerian of Ua differs from all the sources. As pointed out by Alster,¹⁶⁴⁴ there are two Sumerian variants, ´u₄ 1´-kam and u₄-im-ba-kam, for the Akkadian u₄-um-ak-kal, ‘for the length of one day’; thus he states: ‘the text seems to have expanded by the inclusion of both variants, instead of the plain OB u₄ ša₃-ĥul₂-la diš-am₃’. Sumerian and Akkadian diverge from one another in Ua: *qulu*, ‘silence’, seems to translate ĥul, ‘bad’; Sumerian in-na-ak adheres to the OB recension whereas the Akkadian *lillika* translates the Sumerian of E and Ub.¹⁶⁴⁵

Syrian manuscripts offer different texts also in Syr. 19: the Emar text is closer to the monolingual version rather than to Ua which includes a variant:

OB	19	A [nam-til ₃ n]u-zalag-ga [ugu nam-uš ₂ -a-kam] // [a]-ba-am ₃ bi ₂ -[in-diri-ga] B [nam-til ₃ nu-zalag-ga] ugu nam-uš ₂ -a-kam // [a]-ba-am ₃ bi ₂ -in-diri-ga D [...] x ĜEŠ.KA-am ₃
E	19	[na]m-ti[l ₃ nu-zal]ag-ga // [ugu]-nam-u[š ₂ t]a-am ₃ me-diri nam-til ₃ nu-za-la-aq-qa // u-ga-na-ma-uš-ša ta-am ₃ me-d[a-ri] [ba-la]-ṭu ša la-a na-ma-ri // [a-na-m]u-ti mi ₃ -na-a ut-ti-i[r]
Ua	13 14	nam-til ₃ -la niĝ ₂ -zalag-ga nu-me-a ugu-[n]a nam-uš ₂ -a a-na-am ₃ mi-ni-diri <i>ba-la-ṭa ša la na-ma-ri a-na mi-ti mi-na-a ut-ter</i>
Ub A ¹	10 11	na[m]-til ₃ nu-za[lag-.....] na[m-u]š ¹ ta-a // mi-x-ru? [.....] x x x : <i>ba-la-ṭu₃ ša la-a na-ma-[ri] // UGU ´mu´-ti mi-na [ut-ter]</i>
Uc Rev.	1-2	[...] [.....š]a la-a na-´ma´-[ri] // [.....]-ti mi-na-am ut-´ter´

Life on which no light is shed, how can it be more valuable than death?

¹⁶⁴² Reading based on George’s copy *apud* Cohen 2012c. Scholars have read this line differently: Arnaud 1985-1987: *di-na-nu [ĥ]u-ud lib₃-b[i] 1-en U₄ n[a-am-ri] 10 ša-r[i ni-is-sa-ti]*; Wilcke 1988 and Alster 2005: *di-na-nu [ša ĥ]u-ud lib₃-b[i] // 1-en u₄-m[u] 10 ša-r[u...]*; Dietrich 1992: *di-na-nu [ĥ]u-ud lib₃-b[i] u₄-mu-[ak-kal] 10 ša-r[u...]*.

¹⁶⁴³ See Alster 2005, 311.

¹⁶⁴⁴ Alster 2005, 319.

¹⁶⁴⁵ Cf. the OB manuscripts: BM 80091: [niĝ₂-saĝ-i]l₂-la u₄ ša₃-ĥul₂-la ‘x’ // niĝ₂-me-ĝar mu 3600 x 10-am₃ in-ak; BM 80184: [...]a u₄ ša₃-ĥul₂-la 1-am₃ // [ni]ĝ₂-me-ĝar mu 3600 x 10-am₃ in-ak; CBS 1208: [...] 3600 x 10-am₃ in²-ak.

Ua has niĝ₂-zalag-ga nu-me-a, 'without light',¹⁶⁴⁶ instead of nu-zalag-ga attested in the OB manuscripts, E and Ub. Moreover, Ua is the only manuscript to report the correct non-human interrogative pronoun a-na-am₃ instead of the incorrect a-ba-am₃ attested in the OB recension. It is worth noting that the Akkadian versions of all the Syrian manuscripts are nearly identical.

The extant sources seem to diverge from one another in line 3 and thus some remarks are required:

E	3	[u ₄ -da(?) igi-da-ta inim] ni ĝal ₂ -la u-du i-gi-du-ud-du ₅ i-nim ni-ig-gal-[a] [i]š-tu u ₄ -mi pa-na-a 'ib'-[.....]
Ua	22	[u ₄]-'da'-ta im al-ĝal ₂ '-la
	23	[.....] x x i-ba-a[š ₂]-ša-'a an-ni'-[a-t]u ¹⁶⁴⁷
Ua	44	'u ₄ -da-ta' im [.....]
	45	[...]
Ub B'	5	u ₂ -tu 'i ² -ki'-[tu?.....] [...]
Uc Obv.	2	[...] [.....] u ₄ -mi pa-na-nu ib-ba ₂ -a[š ₂]

The text of E, Ub and Uc also agrees with the NA recension against Ua:

NA [x] igi-du-ta ne-e al-ĝal₂-[la(?)]

According to Alster¹⁶⁴⁸ i-gi-du-ud-du₅ in E, which renders the reading igi-du of IGI.DU, replaces the expected palil because the scribe mistakenly copied from the following line. However, the restoration proposed here in Ub B' 5, u₂-tu 'i²-ki'-[tu?...], allows harmonizing the text of Ub with manuscript E and with [x] igi-du-ta¹⁶⁴⁹ in the NA fragment. This suggests that the Emar variant is not due to a scribal mistake but that E, Ub, Uc and NA rely on the same textual tradition that ensued from adaptation and modification that occurred in the Middle Babylonian period. Alster restored im al-ĝal₂-la, 'there has been wind', in the OB recension¹⁶⁵⁰ on the basis of Ua and regarded the Emar manuscript as corrupted.¹⁶⁵¹ Assuming agreement between the Mesopotamian sources (OB and NA), Alster states: 'these lines¹⁶⁵² do not confirm the expected reading im al-ĝal₂-la = [ša]-ru found in Ua 22-23, but have NE instead of im.'¹⁶⁵³ As far as the relationship among the Syrian manuscripts is concerned, two possible explanations may be advanced:

1646 This expression is grammatically incorrect as -da is omitted; for the expression -da nu-me-a 'without' see Jagersma 2010, 711.

1647 Different readings of Ua have been suggested by scholars: Dietrich 1992, 14, reads [.....]p[a²-na² i-ba-a[š₂]-ša-a an-n[i]-i'-[t]um; Arnaud 2007, 144, reads [i]š-tu U₄ pa-na a-w[a-a-tu₃ i-ba-a[š₂]-ša an-ni-[a]-tu₃, considering IM as a *lapsus* for i-ni-im ~ inim, but this seems improbable as im also appears in line 44; Wilcke 1988 followed by Alster 2005 reads [...] x x i-ba-a[š₂]-ša-a-an-n[i (x) ša]-ru. According to the hand-copy the last sign can be neither -tum nor -tu₃, but -ru (Alster) or -tu as here suggested.

1648 Alster 2005, 306: SS 3.

1649 For IGI.DU = *panû* see CAD P, 96.

1650 Syr. 1-6 are not preserved in the OB manuscripts.

1651 Alster 2005, 306-307: SS 3

1652 He refers to the NA text; this line is repeated in NA 2, 10.

1653 Alster 2005, 321: NA 2 and 10.

1. ne-e (NA) could be the demonstrative pronoun ne(n)¹⁶⁵⁴ written phonetically in E as ni; consequently one may regard IM in Ua with the reading ni₂ as a phonetic writing for ne-e that would fit Akkadian *anniātu*.¹⁶⁵⁵
2. ni (E) and ne-e (NA) could be phonetic writings for ni₂ which would be a misreading of IM. Consequently, the reading of the line Ua proposed by Wilcke and Alster is required. This would lead to two hypotheses: (a) the copying mistake was produced independently in Syria and at Nineveh; (b) the two recensions depend on the same corrupted MB source which instead of IM had a different sign, for instance NI.

Because the tablets are badly preserved a conclusive explanation cannot be arrived at; perhaps slightly different texts existed.

The phonetic Sumerian version occasionally differs from the standard orthography version:

- In line 8 the standard orthography version of the Emar text has me-na instead of the expected na-me attested in the phonetic version and in Ua.

E	8	[(ki) buru ₃ -da]-bi me-na 'nu'-u[n-zu-a] [..... n]a-me nu-un-zu-wa-a ¹⁶⁵⁶
Ua	9-10	ki buru ₃ -da-gen ₇ na-me nu-zu-[...] <i>A place which like the depth of the underworld nobody knows.</i>

- In E 21 the first column has mu-un-na-dim₂¹⁶⁵⁷ whereas the second has mu-un-na-ak-ki. This difference depends on the equivalence of dim₂, 'to create', and AK, 'to do', with the Akkadian *epēšu*.¹⁶⁵⁸ It is not precluded that the same holds true in line 11 in which the standard orthography version reports [...]-e-dim₂, whereas the OB recension has in-ak.¹⁶⁵⁹ Unfortunately, the second column of the Emar tablet is broken.

These examples may suggest that the phonetic Sumerian version of the Emar source is independent from the standard orthography version written on the same tablet. However, as this involves the way in which texts were copied it goes beyond the limits of the present work; the question remains open to further study.

The standard orthography Sumerian text usually agrees with the OB version, but variants are attested both between the Syrian and the monolingual sources, and between the Syrian manuscripts. The majority of variants are orthographic, but as pointed out above several textual variants are attested. Additionally, Syr. 20-22 is omitted in the manuscript Uc. This is further evidence that the final part of the composition was transmitted with several variants.

Line ¹	Standard Orthography		
	OB	E	Ua
2	x	ki 'nam'-sur-'sur-re'	ki-gal nam'-sur-sur-re
3	x	[inim] ni ĝal ₂ -la	im al-'ĝal ₂ '-la
7	šu-ĝu ₁₀	šu ti	šu-t[i']

¹⁶⁵⁴ Edzard 2003, 49-50, Jagersma 2010, 225-227.

¹⁶⁵⁵ Cohen 2013, 140-143: 3, also suggests the presence of a demonstrative pronoun, but he refers it to I.NIM, read as i-ni, in the phonetic version of E, while ni-ig would be a writing for niĝ₂. However, in the first column NI is clearly written before ĝal₂-la, hence if one takes I.NIM as a writing for the ne(n), the reading i₃-ĝal₂-la / i₃-ig-gal-l[a] is required. Consequently, ni-ig cannot be a writing for niĝ₂, unless one considers that /i/ is omitted after ni-ig, but taking into consideration that in Ua and NA the prefix is al-, I would tend to regard ĝal₂-la as a non-finite form.

¹⁶⁵⁶ Msk 74159j, 3 has the variant nu-mu-un-zu-wa-a.

¹⁶⁵⁷ Alster 2005 reads mu-un-na-ka but the sign seems to be gen₇ in E 767, I, 7 = Msk 74153 Obv. 10; for KA see E 767, III, 7, II, 15, III, 20, III, 23; Arnaud 1985-1987 and Dietrich 1992 transliterate -gim.

¹⁶⁵⁸ CAD E, 192.

¹⁶⁵⁹ See below for the list of variants.

Standard Orthography			
7	sa ₂ bi ₂ -in-du ₁₁ -ga	na[m-bi-in-zu]	[x]-zu AN
8	ki buru ₃ -da-gen ₇	[ki buru ₃ -da]-bi	ki buru ₃ -da-gen ₇
8	na-me	me-na	na-me
8	nu-mu-un-zu-a	nu-u[n-zu-a]	nu-zu-[...]
11	in-ak	[...]-e-dim ₂	x
12	bi ₂ -in-e ₃ -de ₃	[x-(x)-d]a -e-de ₃	x
13	nam-til ₃	nam-til ₃ -la	x
13	i ₃ -kiĝ ₂ -kiĝ ₂	kiĝ ₂ -[...]	x
14	[me-a]	[me]-e	m[e-e]n
17	∅	∅	i ₃ -ti ₂ -eš ²
17	dub-saĝ	∅	?
17	u ₄ -ul-li ₂ -a-ke ₄ -ne	[u ₄ -saĝ-ĝa ₂]-ta	x
17	∅	e-ne-e-še-ta	?
18	[(nu-un-peš ₄ -peš ₄)]-´a´	[nu-peš ₄ -men ₅]	nu-peš ₄ -peš ₄ -e-ne
18	nu-un-du ₂ -ud-da	nu-du ₂ -du ₂ -men ₅	nu-du ₂ -d[u ₂ -...]
19	nu-zalag-ga	[nu-zal]ag-ga	niĝ ₂ -zalag-ga
19	∅	∅	nu-me-a
19	ugu nam-uš ₂ -a-kam	[ugu]-nam-u[š ₂]	ugu nam-uš ₂ -a
19	a-ba-am ₃	[t]a-am ₃	a-na-am ₃
19	bi ₂ -in-diri-ga	me-diri	mi-ni-diri
22	niĝ ₂ -saĝ-il ₂ -la	za-[...]-´il ₂ ´	niĝ ₂ -saĝ-il ₂ -la
22	u ₄ ša ₃ -ĥul ₂ -la ₂	´u ₄ ´ ša ₃ -ĥul ₂ -la ₂	ša ₃ -ĥul ₂ -la ³
22	1-am ₃	∅	´u ₄ 1´-kam u ₄ -im-ba-kam
22	niĝ ₂ -me-ĝar	∅	∅
22	∅	[lu-u]l-bi	∅
22	mu 3600 x 10-am ₃	u ₃ -ser ₃ -ser ₃	mu-10-šar ₂ ĥul
22	in-ak	ĥe ₂ -en-du	in-na-ak

1 Lineation according to the Syrian recension.

2 This is an unorthographic writing for i₃-til₃-eš, cf. OBGT I, 655.

3 Note that u₄ = ūmu is also omitted in the Akkadian translation.

The phonetic Sumerian version is known from manuscripts E and Ub¹⁶⁶⁰ but only some lines are preserved. From the several variants attested it is clear that phonetic versions of these manuscripts are not derived from the same source; likely they were created independently at Emar and Ugarit as exercises.

Phonetic Orthography		
Line	E	Ub
3	u-du	u ₂ -tu
3	i-gi-du-ud-du ₅	´i ² -ki´-[tu...]
4	me-na-a	me-e-tum ¹
4	la-ba-an-tu-ka-a	lah ₃ -ba-an-[...]
5	[dir]i-ia-na-an-ni	diri-ni-in-ni
6	[an-ta e ₂ /e ² -u]r-ra-k[i]-´e´-en ²	[a]n-ta-e-ur-ra-ga-´an-ni´
7	an ša-ud-ta-ki-im	[a]n-šu ₂ ¹ -ud-ta-´ki´-im

1660 A few unorthographic writings are also attested in Ua.

Phonetic Orthography		
8	na-me	nam-e-e
10	nam-lu-x [...]	[na-a]m ² -lu-lu
10	ud-da-ri-iš	ud-da
10	nu-ni-x[...]	ni ₂ -ig-[...]
19	nu-za-la-aq-qa	nu-za[lag-...]
19	u-ga-na-ma-uš-ša	[...]-na[m-u]š ¹
19	ta-am ₃	ta-a
19	me-d[a-ri]	mi-x-ru ²
20	ku-ru-uš	gu- [˘] ru-uš [˘]
20	ti-kar-zu	di[ġir-...]
20	ga-r[a-zu]	ga-la-[...]
21	isiš ₂	a-li-im
22	za-an-ki-el-la	saġ-ki-il-la
22	u ₂ ša-ġu-la-al	[...]-ġu-ul-la
22	lu-ul-bi	u ₂ -l[u]-ul-bi
22	ġe ₂ -en-du	ġi-in-du
23	ni-in-ki	ni-[i]g-gu
24	[˘] e [˘] -[e]n-ni	[˘] en-na [˘]
24	ki-iš-ġu-ur	[˘] gi-eš [˘] -[...]
24	[nam]- [˘] lu-ul-lu [˘]	nam-u ₁₈ -lu- [˘] lu [˘]
24	gi-na	ki-i[n-na]

1 Cf. *Erimġuš* Bogh A r' 12: me-ta [...] = *im-ma-ti-ma = nu ku-uš-ša-an* (Hitt.); OBGT I 722: me-da-kam = *ma-ti-ma*.

2 [˘]e[˘]-en is in Msk 74159j.

The Akkadian translation presents a few variants between manuscripts:

Line	E	Ua	Ub	Uc
1	<i>u[š-...]</i>	<i>[u]š-šu-ra-tu₄</i>	<i>[...š]u²-re-[tu]</i>	x
2	<i>ṭe₄-em¹</i>	<i>ṭe₃-em / ṭe-em</i>	<i>ṭe₄-e-i-ī[m]</i>	x
2	DIĠIR- <i>'lim-ma'</i>	DIĠIR- <i>ma</i>	DIĠIR- <i>ma</i>	x
2	x	<i>us-qe₂-tu</i>	x	<i>us-qe₃-[...]</i>
3	<i>pa-na-a</i>	x	x	<i>pa-na-nu</i>
3	<i>'ib'-[...]</i>	<i>i-ba-a[š₂]-ša-¹a'</i>	x	<i>ib-ba₂-a[š₂...]</i>
4	<i>[te]š₂²-mi</i>	x	x	<i>[t]e-iš-mi</i>
5	<i>[elī]-ši-na ši-na-m[a]</i>	x	x	<i>[e-ī]i-šu-nu šu-nu-ma⁴</i>
5	<i>ša-an-nu-t[u₄-ma]</i>	x	x	<i>ša-nu-tu-ma</i>
7	<i>[ī]-ka-aš-šu-ud</i>	x	x	<i>i-kaš-ša[d]</i>
7	x	AN- <i>u₂</i>	x	<i>[š]a-mu-u₂</i>
7	x	ŠU	x	<i>qa-ta²</i>
15	<i>^mEn-ki-du</i>	<i>^dEn-ki-¹du₃</i>	x	x
17	<i>a-le-e šar-ra-nu</i>	<i>a-le šu-nu-ti LUGAL.MEŠ</i>	x	x
18	<i>[u]l</i>	<i>ul</i>	<i>[u₂-u]l</i>	x
18	<i>in-ne₂-ru-ma</i>	<i>in-ne₂-ru-u₂</i>	x	x
19	<i>[ba-la]-tu</i>	<i>ba-la-ṭa</i>	<i>ba-la-ṭu₃ ba-la-aṭ²</i>	x
19	<i>la-a</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>la-a</i>	<i>la-a</i>
19	x	<i>a-na</i>	UGU	x
19	<i>[m]u-ti</i>	<i>mi-ti</i>	<i>'mu'-ti</i>	x
19	<i>mi₃-na-a</i>	<i>mi-na-a</i>	<i>mi-na</i>	<i>mi-na-am</i>
19	<i>ut-ti-ī[r]</i>	<i>ut-ter</i>	x	<i>ut-¹ter¹</i>
21	<i>si₂-ki[p²]</i>	x	<i>si₂-[k]i-īp</i>	-
21	<i>qu-ī-[a-ti]</i>	x	<i>qu₂-ī-[a-t]i</i>	-
22	<i>di-na-nu</i>	<i>a-na di-na-an</i>	<i>a-[n]a¹di₃-na-ni¹</i>	x
22	<i>[ḥu-u]d lib₃-b[ī]</i>	<i>ḥu-ud lib₃-bi</i>	<i>u₄-mi ḥu-ud [...]</i>	x
22	<i>1-en u₄-m[u]</i>	<i>u₄-um-ak-kal u₄-um</i>	<i>1 U₄</i>	x
22	<i>10 ša-[ru ...]</i>	<i>qu-li // 10 ŠAR₂.[MEŠ] MU.MEŠ</i>	<i>qu₂¹²-l[ī] ¹e¹-še-re-et ša- a-r[u ...]</i>	x
23	<i>ki-i-ma ma-ri¹ [d¹zi-ra-aš]</i>	x	<i>'zi-ra¹'-[aš] ki-[...]</i>	<i>[...] ki-a[m]-ma ma-a-ri</i>
24	<i>an-nu-um</i>	x	<i>[an]-nu-um-ma</i>	<i>[an-nu-u]m</i>
24	<i>u₂-š[u-ur-tum]</i>	x	<i>i-š[u-ur-tum]</i>	<i>i-šu-ur-tum</i>

¹ Alster 2005, 307, regards the feminine form in E as a mistake, but see the reconstruction in Cohen 2013, 132, in which *elišina* refers to *anniātu* in l. 3. Dietrich 1992, 15, regards *-šina* as referring to an implied substantive *nišū*. For the use of 3fpl. possessive pronouns see Seminara 1998, 262-263.

² This line is duplicated in Ub A 10-11 and 3.

The majority of variants are purely orthographic and as expected the most significant ones are attested in Ua¹⁶⁶¹ which relies on a different textual tradition.¹⁶⁶²

¹⁶⁶¹ See Syr. 3, 5, 17, 22.

¹⁶⁶² Note the tendency towards the use of logograms for syllabic writings in the other manuscripts in ll. 7, 17, 22 and the writing *la* in line 19 as opposed to *la-a*.

As noted above the Akkadian diverges from the Sumerian text in Syr. 3, 22; a further instance is E 767, 17 which presents e-ne-e-še-ta, a phonetic writing for $i_3/i/e$ -ne-še₃-ta 'henceforth', instead of the expected $i_3/i/e$ -ne-še₃ = *inanna*,¹⁶⁶³ 'now, so far',¹⁶⁶⁴ as shown by the Akkadian *adi inanna*.

The Sumerian text presents errors of minor importance. Aberrations such as those observed in *PfK* are not attested in *BeR*.

- The genitive is omitted in the following passages of the Emar text:
 - In [ka lu₂]-igi-du-a-ni (E 767, I, 4) -k- is omitted: *ka lu₂-igi-du-ka-ne₂.
 - [ugu]-nam-u[š₂] (E 767, I, 19), cf. ugu-nam-uš₂-a-kam in BM 80184 (B); on the basis of the hand-copy there is no room for the -a attested in the phonetic version u-ga-na-ma-uš-ša.

Both cases may be due to the Emar copyist.

- The use of -bi with human class nouns is known since the Old Babylonian period:¹⁶⁶⁵ in lu-u₂-tur-ra-bi, 'her little child' (E 767, I-II, 23), -bi refers to a goddess.¹⁶⁶⁶
- In e₂-ur₃-ra-ke₄-e-n[e] (E 767, I, 6) -e-ne is a short-writing from -a-ne-ne = *e₂-ur₃-ra-ke₄-n[e].¹⁶⁶⁷
- E 767, 18 has the 1/2sg. copula instead of the expected 3pl. -me-eš; the copula is not present in the OB manuscripts:¹⁶⁶⁸

B [nu-un-peš₄-peš₄]-^ˈa^ˈ nu-un-du₂-ud-da

E 18 [nu-peš₄-men₅] nu-du₂-du₂-men₅
nu-peš-ša-me-en nu-da-da-am-m[e-en]

They are no longer engendered, they are not born.

- In Ub A¹ 6 (= Syr. 21) the scribe writes the sequence A.IGI for isiš₂ as a-li-im.¹⁶⁶⁹

As noticed above, the OB manuscripts also exhibit some errors that suggest a late textual tradition. A further example is til₃-a e₂ guruš-ke₄, '(men who) live in the house of the young man' (OB 22): according to Alster¹⁶⁷⁰ the syntactic order with the verb placed at the beginning of the sentence is influenced by Akkadian. However, a different explanation may apply: the sentence could be a genitive compound, in which case the error is not in the position of til₃-a,¹⁶⁷¹ but in the use of -ke₄ as a genitive case marker, a common practice since the Old Babylonian period,¹⁶⁷² instead of the expected -a-ka.

¹⁶⁶³ Cf. CAD I, 142.

¹⁶⁶⁴ Cf. OBGT Ia rev. i 5': i_3 -ne-še-ta = *iš-tu i-na-a[n-na]*; *Inana and An* (ETCSL 1.3.5) Segment D 43, i_3 -ne-eš₂-ta u₄-da šid-bi ba-da-tur u₄ ĝe₆-bi-a ba-da-bur₂, 'From today, when the day's watch is three units long, daylight is equal to night-time.'

¹⁶⁶⁵ Black, Zólyomi 2007, 13-15.

¹⁶⁶⁶ Alster 2005, 319.

¹⁶⁶⁷ See Alster 2005, 308.

¹⁶⁶⁸ See Alster 2005, 309-310.

¹⁶⁶⁹ See Alster 2005, 318.

¹⁶⁷⁰ Alster 2005, 311.

¹⁶⁷¹ til₃-a is a writing for til₃-la.

¹⁶⁷² Edzard 2000, 64.

Arnaud suggested that the text of Ub and Uc was received through Assyrian mediation on the basis of the form *išurtu* for the Babylonian *ušurtu* (Syr. 24).¹⁶⁷³ A further Assyrianism in the same line is *amiluttu*, documented in Ub, Uc and E. These Assyrian forms, however, must be considered common features of peripheral Akkadian. The use of the Assyrian suffix *-uttu* is typical of the Akkadian of Emar for abstract substantives.¹⁶⁷⁴ Peripheral forms are the adverb *panānu* in Uc Obv. 2 (Syr. 3), which in the second half of the second millennium is only attested in the Western periphery and earlier in the Old Babylonian and Old Akkadian dialects;¹⁶⁷⁵ the word *immatimē* in E (Syr. 4), which belongs to the peripheral lexicon;¹⁶⁷⁶ the form *ša-an-nu-t[u₄-ma]* in E (Syr. 5).

To sum up, two different textual traditions of *BeR* are reflected in the Syrian manuscripts, one represented by the Babylonian script tablet Ua, and the other by the manuscripts E, Ub and Uc which share the same line order¹⁶⁷⁷ and the mention of Siraš (Syr. 23-24). Whether the circulation of the Ua text in Syria was limited to Ugarit cannot be determined on the basis of the present evidence. Babylonian schools developed and transmitted two versions of *BeR*, one closer to the OB recension¹⁶⁷⁸ and another characterized by several variants. These two textual traditions probably took different paths of transmission: the text of Ua reached the Western periphery directly, whereas the Emar-Ugarit manuscripts (E, Ub, Uc) seem not to depend on the same Mesopotamian model. Different versions of the same composition are known at Ugarit for the Gilgameš epic as pointed out by Arnaud¹⁶⁷⁹ and George.¹⁶⁸⁰

Variants of the Emar-Ugarit manuscripts rely on the Mesopotamian tradition and do not result from reworking by local scribes but rather by the Middle Babylonian scribal schools. However, the distinction between variants due to Middle Babylonian scribes and those already attested in some unpreserved OB sources is unclear. The alteration of line order and the addition of Bazi and Zizi to the list of ancient rulers were likely accomplished in the Middle Babylonian period,¹⁶⁸¹ whereas the mention of Siraš might have been contained in an OB manuscript.¹⁶⁸²

BeR was used in the Syrian scribal schools as a tool for learning Sumerian and Akkadian as evidenced by the creation of the phonetic Sumerian version and by the recovery of manuscripts in two different scribal centers at Ugarit, the Maison-aux-tablettes (Ub) and the Lamaštu archive (Ua, Uc). Moreover the scribe of Ub is identified as an apprentice.

As better explained below,¹⁶⁸³ the relation of *BeR* to the vanity theme which was well known at Nippur suggests that it reflects the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition.

6.2.2 Enlil and Namzitarra

*Enlil and Namzitarra (EaN)*¹⁶⁸⁴ is another wisdom composition expounding the vanity theme discovered in the Syrian libraries.¹⁶⁸⁵ It is preserved in two manuscripts from Emar and Ugarit.

¹⁶⁷³ Arnaud 2007, 12, see also Arnaud 1977-78, 185-186.

¹⁶⁷⁴ Seminara 1998, 104; this form is also attested in *Enlil and Namzitarra*.

¹⁶⁷⁵ See Seminara 1998, 515 and AHw, 818.

¹⁶⁷⁶ Seminara 1998, 567-568.

¹⁶⁷⁷ Ub A' 3 = A' 10-11 (= Syr. 19); Uc omits Syr. 20-21.

¹⁶⁷⁸ Note also in Ua the preservation of *-ak*, Syr. 22 (= OB 20), as in the OB manuscripts, whereas the other Syrian manuscripts have *-du*, Alster 2005, 293.

¹⁶⁷⁹ Arnaud 2007, 36.

¹⁶⁸⁰ George 2007b.

¹⁶⁸¹ Indeed Ua does not report this line.

¹⁶⁸² See Alster 2005, 290.

¹⁶⁸³ See § 9.4.

¹⁶⁸⁴ ETCSL 5.7.1.

¹⁶⁸⁵ For the interpretation of the composition see Alster 2005, 327-334, Cohen 2010 with previous bibliography.

Fragments **E 771 (+) E 772 (+) E 773 (+) E 774 (+) E 592** are part of a two-column tablet containing the Sumerian version on the left and the Akkadian translation on the right. The Emar recension is expanded with an Akkadian wisdom text inscribed on the same tablet containing the speech of a father to his sons. This composition begins on line 29 without any dividing ruling from *EaN* and it is inscribed on both columns.

RS 22.341 + RS 28.053A = AuOrS 23 47 is a fragment from the right edge of its tablet discovered in the Maison-aux-tablettes preserving a few lines on the reverse whereas the obverse is broken away. Only the Akkadian version is preserved but the Sumerian text was probably arranged in a parallel column. The tablet format with lines enclosed in paragraphs set off by horizontal rulings is reminiscent of the Emar tablet. This manuscript is the work of a local scribe as is evident from the shapes of TI (§§ 2, 3, 4, 5) and LI (§ 5).

EaN is known from seven OB tablets from Nippur and was used in the education of scribes during the Intermediary Phase, as the tablet formats clearly indicate.¹⁶⁸⁶ As pointed out by Y. Cohen,¹⁶⁸⁷ the Ugarit recension duplicates the Emar text. This composition is quoted in a catalogue from the library of Aššurbanipal,¹⁶⁸⁸ but no first-millennium sources are so far known. This quotation, however, confirms that *EaN* was transmitted to the first-millennium libraries.

Compared to the OB monolingual text, the bilingual Syrian recension differs in line order and the addition of new sections.¹⁶⁸⁹ Indeed the three-line speech in the OB version (19-21) featuring the vanity theme is expanded into a larger section in the Emar text (E 771+, 13-26):

OB	19	ku ₃ ħe ₂ -tuku za ħe ₂ -tuku gud ħe ₂ -tuku udu ħe ₂ -tuku
	20	u ₄ nam-lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu al-ku-nu
	21	niġ ₂ -tuku-zu me-še ₃ e-tum ₃ -ma
	19	<i>You will have silver, you will have precious stones, you will have cattle, you will have sheep.</i>
	20	<i>The day of mankind is approaching (death),</i>
	21	<i>So where does your wealth lead?</i> ¹⁶⁹⁰
E	13	ʿen-na ku ₃ -babbar ħe ₂ -tuku [.....]
	14	na ⁴ za-gin ₃ ħe ₂ -tuku [.....]
	15	gud ħe ₂ -tuku [.....]
	16	[u]du ħe ₂ -tuku
	17	ku ₃ -babbar-zu na ⁴ za-gin ₃ -zu gud-zu udu-zu ʿKU ₃ .BABBAR-ka na ⁴ ZA.GIN ₃ -ka [GUD-ka UDU-ka]
	18	me-še ₃ al-tum ₃ ¹⁶⁹¹
	19	u ₄ -nam-lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu al-gurun-na U ₄ .MEŠ a-mi-lu-ut-ʿti lu qe ₃ -er-bu ¹⁶⁹²
	20	u ₄ -an-na ħa-ba-lal u ₄ -mi a-na u ₄ -mi li-im-ṭ[i]
	21	iti-an-na ħa-ba-lal ITI a-na ITI li-im-ṭi

1686 The OB sources of *EaN* are inscribed on either *Sammeltafeln* or exercise tablets, see Civil 1974-77, 67, and Vanstiphout 1980, 67 and n. 1. Type I: 3N-T 326 (IM 58427) + 3N-T 360 (A 30218), N 3097, UM 29-16-79A; Type III: CBS 4605 = PBS 12/1 31; Type II: N 5149, N 5909, CBS 7917 + N 4784, see also Kleinerman 2011, 65, Rutz 2013, 271 n. 235-236.

1687 Cohen 2010, 91-92.

1688 Lambert 1989.

1689 See Cohen 2010.

1690 Translation according to Cohen 2010, 92-93.

1691 The presence of al- is possibly due to an analogy with line 20 of the OB recension where this prefix was used.

1692 For this restoration see Cohen 2013, 159: 19; Arnaud 2007, 140 § 4 reads *ik-pu-pu*.

22	mu-mu-an-na ḥa-ba-lal ¹⁶⁹³ MU <i>a-na</i> MU <i>li-mi-ṭi</i>
23/24	mu ₂ šu-ši mu-meš nam-lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu niġ ₂ -geg-bi ḥe-a 2 šu-ši MU.MEŠ-u lu-u ₂ ik-ki- [˘] ib <i>a-mi-lu-[˘]ut-ti ba-la-x</i>
25	ki-u ₄ -ta-ta nam-lu ₂ -u ₁₈ -lu <i>iš-tu</i> U ₄ . [˘] DA [˘] <i>a-di[˘] i-na-an-na</i>
26	e [˘] -na i ₃ -in-eš ₂ til ₃ -la-e-ni <i>a-mi-lu-ut-tu₃ bal-ṭu</i>
13	<i>You will have silver,</i>
14	<i>You will have lapis lazuli gems,</i>
15	<i>You will have cattle,</i>
16	<i>You will have sheep.</i>
18	<i>[Whe]re will I have taken</i>
17	<i>Your silver, your lapis lazuli, your sheep?</i>
19	<i>The days of mankind are declining.</i>
20	<i>Day after day they are diminishing.</i>
21	<i>Month after month they are diminishing.</i>
22	<i>Year after year they are diminishing.</i>
	<i>[The days of mankind] – they are diminishing (Ugarit only),</i>
23/24	<i>120 years – that is the limit of mankind's life, its term,</i>
25	<i>from that day till now,</i>
26	<i>as long as mankind has existed.</i> ¹⁶⁹⁴

As with the other compositions found in the Western libraries, our main concern lies in the origin of the differences between the OB recension and the LBA manuscripts. Klein¹⁶⁹⁵ claimed a connection with the Western-Semitic tradition and in particular with Genesis 6:3 in which the limit of 120 years is imposed on mankind (E 771+, 23-24). Indeed, even though the divine imposition of a limit on human life is known from Atrahasis and the Gilgameš epic, the number of 120 years is nowhere else attested in Mesopotamian literature. On the contrary Alster¹⁶⁹⁶ emphasized the relation with the Mesopotamian tradition, advancing the hypothesis, here followed, that the Syrian recension stems from a MB model that was created on the basis of the tale of *EaN*. Moreover, according to Alster the Akkadian is the primary version while the Sumerian was added as a secondary translation.

The figure of 120 years which seems to be the principal connection with the Western-Semitic tradition is based on a sexagesimal system, which is common in Mesopotamia but unknown in the biblical literature as pointed out by Klein himself.¹⁶⁹⁷ Also the meaning 'bane' (as the consequence of a punishment) implied in the term niġ₂-geg (l. 24), which is only attested in the Emar manuscript, is known from *The Death of Gilgameš* as illustrated by Klein.¹⁶⁹⁸ The dependence of the Syrian manuscripts of *BeR*, which is thematically related to *EaN*, on the Mesopotamian tradition further supports Alster's hypothesis.

The Akkadian wisdom text inscribed on the same tablet as E 771+ was appended to *EaN* because it concerns the shortness of human life expressed in the vanity theme. Even though no Mesopotamian duplicates of this text are known, its thematic relation with *EaN*, and more generally with the vanity

¹⁶⁹³ Sumerian u₄/iti/mu -an-na is not equivalent to u₄-mi a-na u₄-mi, ITI a-na ITI, MU a-na MU, see Klein 1990, 63 n. 12, 14. For a similar expression see E 775, 24.

¹⁶⁹⁴ Translation according to Cohen 2010, 94.

¹⁶⁹⁵ Klein 1990, 60-62.

¹⁶⁹⁶ Alster 2005, 330-332; Alster's hypothesis that the Emar scribe copied from a damaged tablet on line 23 may be dismissed in light of Klein's reading *pa₂-la[˘]-ša[˘]* at the end of the Akkadian line, *apud* Cohen 2010, 94 n. 13. I consider ḥe-a here as a phonetic writing for ḥe₂-a.

¹⁶⁹⁷ Klein 1990, 69 n. 47.

¹⁶⁹⁸ Klein 1990, 64 n. 15.

theme, indicates that it relies on the Mesopotamian tradition.¹⁶⁹⁹ This composition is reminiscent of *Šimâ Milka*,¹⁷⁰⁰ attested at Emar, Ugarit and Ḥattuša. Although no OB or MB sources from Mesopotamia have yet been recovered its quotation in an OB catalogue¹⁷⁰¹ and the recent identification of a first-millennium manuscript from Nimrud¹⁷⁰² clearly evidence that *Šimâ Milka* is a Mesopotamian composition. The close relation between Sumerian and Akkadian wisdom texts is not surprising, given the aforementioned OB catalogue quoting *Šimâ Milka*¹⁷⁰³ which lists Akkadian texts in addition to Sumerian compositions. Moreover an OB Type II tablet is inscribed with an Akkadian Sargon letter and an extract from Proto-Lu₂.¹⁷⁰⁴ Therefore it is not precluded that *EaN* and the Akkadian wisdom text were already written together on the same Mesopotamian tablet that was transmitted to the Western periphery. The format of E 771+ recalls OB Type III tablets inscribed with different compositions on each side.¹⁷⁰⁵

That *EaN* is a composition belonging to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition¹⁷⁰⁶ is clear from its curricular setting and the provenance from Nippur of all the OB manuscripts. During the Middle Babylonian period *EaN* was rephrased and updated with the addition of the Akkadian translation.¹⁷⁰⁷ This bilingual version was then transmitted to the Western periphery.

6.2.3 The Fowler – E 768 - E 769 - E 770

A literary composition concerned with a fowler is preserved in several fragments at Emar. Two fragments are published under **E 768**. E 768A = Msk 7498b (+) Msk 7478b + Msk 74228b is a fragment from the upper left corner of its tablet preserving standard orthography and phonetic Sumerian versions arranged in parallel columns. E 768B = Msk 74137b is a fragment from the right edge of its tablet that only preserves the Akkadian version. According to Arnaud these two fragments were not part of the same tablet, but restoration of the colophon¹⁷⁰⁸ may suggest otherwise. According to the colophon the scribe is the same as that of *BeR*, Šaggar-abu son of Ba'al-qarrād. **E 769** is a fragment from the lower left corner preserving six lines on the obverse and five lines on the reverse in standard Sumerian. **E 770** is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving, on the obverse, unorthographic Sumerian and Akkadian versions in parallel column format, whereas the reverse is broken away. It is clear that these fragments belong to several three-column tablets, the same format as the manuscript of *BeR*.¹⁷⁰⁹

No other duplicates are known from either Syria or Mesopotamia, but this composition is very close to an Akkadian text preserved on Late Babylonian tablets.¹⁷¹⁰ Furthermore the catalogue of the series of Sidu quoted above cites an incipit which may refer to *The Fowler*. Probably related to our text is *The Fowler and his Wife* which, as seen above, is known from OB and MB manuscripts

1699 Differently Kämmerer 1998, 116-117.

1700 Klein 1990, 66 n. 25.

1701 Civil 1989; on the tradition of this text and the Akkadian wisdom literature see Sallaberger 2010.

1702 Nurullin 2014.

1703 Sallaberger 2010, 307-308.

1704 Veldhuis 1997, 66.

1705 Type III tablets are here taken as relevant examples because Type I are multicolumn tablets designed to be inscribed with more than two compositions, and Type II tablets, even though they only contain two texts on the obverse and reverse, comprise a copy written by the master. The closest parallels to E 771+ are therefore those Type III tablets that were occasionally inscribed with two compositions because the first was too short for the daily exercise.

1706 See § 9.4.

1707 Note that the use of -meš (E 771+, 23) as plural marker traces back to the Mesopotamian tradition of the post-Old Babylonian period.

1708 Cohen 2009, 169-170, 221.

1709 Civil 1989, 7, also quotes Msk 74238t = E 747 as a further possible fragment, see § 6.2.20.

1710 BM 53309 and BM 53555 = Lambert 1960, 221.

and is a part of proverb collections.¹⁷¹¹ These two compositions do not preserve any parallel lines and the fragmentary nature of all the manuscripts precludes any possibility of understanding their relationship to each other. It is possible that the text preserved at Emar is a LOB or MB reworking of *The Fowler and his Wife*¹⁷¹² or a different composition created in the Middle Babylonian period. Some errors that cannot be ascribed to the Emar copyist(s) are possible pieces of evidence that the text was composed or reworked in the Middle Babylonian period:

- In še-na bir-bir-re, ‘He scatters his grain’ (E 768A, I, 2), -ani=a (GEN/LOC) is written instead of the expected absolutive form -ani=Ø.¹⁷¹³ Perhaps the influence of the Akkadian accusative can be taken into account here.
- In mušen-ḫi-a (E 768A, I, 5) the typical Akkadian plural marker ḫi.A is used.
- In buru₃-mušen-e-ne¹⁷¹⁴ (E 768A, I, 7) the human plural marker -ene is used for a non-human noun.

An error possibly due to the Emar scribe is the order of prefixes in the verbal form ^dutu-ra in-ta-ba-an-ki, ‘He approached Utu’ (E 768A, I, 3) because the ablative -ta- cannot precede -ba-; the expected form would be: *im-ma-ta-an-gi₄.

Because *The Fowler and his Wife* was used as a school text,¹⁷¹⁵ the same function can probably be attributed to *The Fowler*. Taking into consideration that *The Fowler* and *BeR* were related by their possible mention in the same catalogue and were copied at Emar by the same scribe, they likely arrived in Syria at the same time and through the same route.

6.2.4 The Letter of Sîn-iddinam to Utu – TBR 101

*The Letter of Sîn-iddinam to Utu (SI-Utu)*¹⁷¹⁶ was the only composition from the Sumerian court literature of the Larsa dynasty to be transmitted to the Western periphery. It is preserved on a single tiny fragment from Emar, **TBR 101**. Since this source was found during illegal excavations its find-spot is unrecorded but it likely stems from Temple M₁. Six OB monolingual manuscripts of *SI-Utu* are known.¹⁷¹⁷ Three tablets stem from Nippur: CBS 7072 + N 3147 is a single-column tablet (Type III) containing *SI-Utu* on the reverse whereas the obverse is inscribed with another petition letter from the Larsa court literature, *Sîn-iddinam to Ninisina*; CBS 3829 = STVC 13 is a fragmentary tablet, probably an *imgidda*, preserving a few lines on the reverse;¹⁷¹⁸ CBS 4078 is a lentil-shaped tablet (Type IV) that contains only line 25 on each side. From Sippar stems the unpublished tablet Si 550. Two manuscripts are of unknown provenance:¹⁷¹⁹ AO 6718 = TCL 16 56 is a single-column tablet (Type III) containing the second half of the text; Ashm 1922-258 = OECT 4 25 is a four-sided prism containing four additional letters:¹⁷²⁰ *Pû-Inana to Lugal-ibila*,¹⁷²¹ *Ninšatapa to Rîm-Sîn*, a possible let-

1711 See § 1.1.6.5.

1712 A similar case is *LI-LN* that was created on the model of *The Letter of Inim-Inana to Lugal-ibila*, § 5.3.4.

1713 Cf. for instance *The Lament for Nibru* 4, me-bi a-ba-a in-bir-re, ‘who scattered its divine powers?’

1714 buru₃ ~ buru₄.

1715 See Alster 2005, 391-392.

1716 ETCSL 3.2.5; a new edition of all manuscripts is provided by Brisch 2007, 158-178.

1717 For the manuscripts see Brisch 2007, 170 with previous bibliography.

1718 This source is an extract tablet as lines 23-25 inscribed on the reverse are followed by a horizontal ruling and blank space.

1719 For the provenance of unrecorded tablets of the Larsa literature see Brisch 2007, 33-35.

1720 Brisch 2007, 78.

1721 Civil 2000a, 107-109.

ter from Nanna-manšum to Ninisina and an unknown letter from Sîn-iddinam to Ninisina. *SI-Utu* is one of the few Sumerian literary letters to survive into the first millennium and the only one found in the library of Aššurbanipal¹⁷²² where it was preserved on two bilingual tablets.¹⁷²³ In addition, this composition is quoted in an OB catalogue of literary letters from Uruk.¹⁷²⁴

The Emar fragment was originally part of a three-column tablet containing versions in standard orthography, phonetic orthography and Akkadian, but only the unorthographic version is preserved on both obverse and reverse. Y. Cohen¹⁷²⁵ attributes this manuscript to the Syro-Hittite school with some hesitation, as the tablet is too fragmentary and no colophon is preserved. Lines 23-27 of the composition are preserved on the obverse and lines 40-44 on the reverse. The fragmentary nature of the Emar tablet does not allow us to compare it with the OB manuscripts, especially in the absence of the standard orthography version. Also the relation of the Emar tablet to the late sources is impossible to estimate. Nevertheless, some differences from the other manuscripts can be detected. Line 26 in the Emar text diverges from the extant manuscripts:¹⁷²⁶

26	E	Obv. 7-8	za-lam-ĝar til ₃ -[la] al-du-uš nu [...]
	OB		za-lam-ĝar til ₃ -la ki-diĝir-re-e-ne-ke ₄ nu-mu-un-zu-a
	NA		ʾza-lam-ĝar til-l[a] ki-diĝir-re-e-ne[ke ₄] nu-un-zu-[a] [x (x)] a-šib k[u]š-ʾta-ru ša ₂ aš ₂ -rat DIGIR. [MEŠ l]a i-ʾdu-u ₂ <i>The one who lives in the tent, who knows no place of gods.</i>

Following Civil's restoration the reverse of TBR 101 exhibits a different line order from the other manuscripts as line 43 is placed between lines 40 and 41. The rest of the Emar text does not contain any relevant variants.

The Sumerian court literature of the Larsa dynasty strongly diverges in terms of form, style, content and language from the Ur III and Isin poetry.¹⁷²⁷ The Larsa literature represents an independent stream of tradition of Sumerian literature that was almost excluded from the Nippur scribal schools¹⁷²⁸ which made the Ur III and Isin compositions an essential part of their curriculum. On the contrary the Larsa literature flourished in Ur where most of the sources were recovered.¹⁷²⁹ However, within the corpus of Larsa literature a distinction between praise poems (hymns) and literary letters is required. The letters indeed show motifs very different from those found in the royal hymns of the kings of Larsa. In particular Sîn-iddinam's letters of petition depict the king in a such negative way that it is unthinkable that they were commissioned by him. It is more likely that they were composed after his death, probably at the behest of the rulers of Babylon who were interested in producing a defamatory portrait of Sîn-iddinam.¹⁷³⁰ Moreover, contrary to praise poems, three of the four Larsa letters are attested in Nippur. As pointed out by Brisch, literary letters of Larsa dynasty should be regarded as a product of the Nippur school.¹⁷³¹ This makes it understandable why *SI-Utu* was transmitted to the Western periphery and survived in the first millennium. It is not a coincidence that this is the only composition from the Larsa literature that survived after the Old Babylonian period.

1722 Cf. *LI-LN*, § 5.3.4.

1723 K 8937; K 4615+.

1724 W 17259an = AUWE 23 112 Obv. 13.

1725 Cohen 2009, 224.

1726 According to Civil 1996 the Emar manuscript depends on a different textual tradition.

1727 Brisch 2007, 70-74, 116-120.

1728 For an explanation of the exclusion of the Larsa literature from the Nippur curriculum see Brisch 2007, 73-74.

1729 Brisch 2007, 14.

1730 Brisch 2007, 80-81.

1731 Brisch 2007, 118.

The NA manuscripts replace the name of Larsa with Babylon¹⁷³² and use the Emesal form for ‘city’, *uru*, instead of the main dialect *iri*.¹⁷³³ According to Borger this change was accomplished under the king of the Second Dynasty of Isin, Adad-apla-iddinam, but he is not able to state whether the Akkadian translation was prepared during his reign or earlier. The presence of a surely bilingual recension at Emar clearly points out that the Akkadian translation was composed before the Second Dynasty of Isin. Unfortunately, we are not in a position to know whether the replacement of Larsa with Babylon had already occurred in the Emar manuscript as none of these lines are preserved. However, it is likely that the Emar text relied on the OB manuscript because such a replacement better fits the political ideology of the Second Dynasty of Isin. This could indicate that *SI-Utu* underwent further adaptation after the Kassite period. The NA recension basically follows the OB manuscripts even though variants are attested,¹⁷³⁴ some of which are to be considered as recensional and not only purely orthographic.¹⁷³⁵

The variants illustrated above might suggest that the Emar text depends on a different textual tradition from the extant OB manuscripts. Unfortunately the only known Northern Babylonian manuscript, Si 550, is very poorly preserved and no lines paralleling TBR 101 survive. One may however observe that Si 550 shows some variants.¹⁷³⁶ It can only be said that the Emar source depends on a bilingual MB model which was transmitted to Syria, where the phonetic version was composed.

For the present study it is relevant that one of the OB sources of *SI-Utu*, the prism from the Ashmolean Museum, contains *The Letter of Inim-Inana to Lugal-ibila*¹⁷³⁷ which is the model of *The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ* attested at Hattuša and Ugarit.¹⁷³⁸ Moreover, both *The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaĝ* and *SI-Utu* are perhaps quoted in the same catalogue from Uruk. It appears that it is not a coincidence that these related compositions are attested in the Western periphery and were transmitted to the first millennium. This clearly speaks for a conscious process of selection of the OB repertoire.

6.2.5 Unidentified Literary Text – E 776

E 776 is a tiny fragment apparently from the central part of its tablet preserving five lines from an unidentified Sumerian literary text. The first two lines are set off from the following three by a horizontal ruling. The text is written in phonetic Sumerian but likely the manuscript was originally a three-column tablet¹⁷³⁹ also containing standard Sumerian and Akkadian versions.

6.2.6 Udug-ĥul Tablet III – E 729

The best preserved magical text from Emar is **E 729**, a single-column tablet containing on the obverse three monolingual Sumerian incantations belonging to Tablet III of the series *Udug-ĥul*. The reverse is inscribed with an incantation that starts in Sumerian and ends in Akkadian. The incantations are separated by horizontal rulings.

1732 Borger 1991, 63.

1733 Ll. 12, 20, 34, 35, 37, 40.

1734 See the matrix in Brisch 2007, 171-178.

1735 In addition to the above mentioned lines see ll. 16, 21, 29, 30, 36, 39.

1736 See Brisch 2007, 170.

1737 Brisch 2007, 78.

1738 See § 5.3.4.

1739 The division into paragraphs of two or three lines each is reminiscent of the Emar manuscript of *BeR*.

a) The first paragraph (ll. 1-9) contains a *Legitimationstyp* incantation, forerunner of UH III: 165-177 (CT 16 Pl. 6-7, 230-258).¹⁷⁴⁰ The Emar tablet is the oldest preserved source for this incantation because the OB manuscripts are broken at this point but it was probably encompassed in the gap after UHF 119. Compared to the canonical recension, the Emar tablet presents several variants. Enki (UH III: 166 = CT 16 Pl. 6, 233) is replaced by ^den-sir₂-ra (E 729, 2) whom I was not able to identify. In place of Ningirrimma (UH III: 175 = CT 16 Pl. 7, 253) another god name is written that Arnaud reads as Ningirsu.¹⁷⁴¹ Line UH III: 167 (CT 16 Pl. 6, 235) describing the exorcist approaching the patient is omitted in E 729 as well as the mention of Asalluḫi.

b) The second incantation (ll. 10-23) is another *Legitimationstyp* that is known from first-millennium duplicates, UH III: 124-146 (CT 16 Pl. 5, 170-202),¹⁷⁴² and from an OB tablet from Nippur, Ni 623 + Ni 2320 (UHF 90-98). Unfortunately, the OB tablet is too badly preserved to be used for comparison. The Emar text omits some lines of the canonical recension and has a different line order.¹⁷⁴³ In this regard the line order of the OB tablet seems to correspond to the canonical recension:

E	15	nam-šub-ba-e-ri-du-ga šu-bu-da ₃ -mu-ni
	16	te-lu ₂ -dur ₁₁ -ra-še ₃ ra-ra-ta-mu- ⁿⁱ ^u gu-lu ₂ -tu ^{ra} -aš ₂ [ku di-m]u-ni
	17	[lu ₂]-dur ₁₁ -ra ḫu ^(AN) -luḫ-ḫa-mu-ni
UHF	95	lu ₂ -[dur ₁₁ -ra ḫu-luḫ-ḫa-mu-de ₃]
	96	t[e lu ₂ -dur ₁₁ -ra-še ₃ ra-ra-da-mu-de ₃]
	97	u[gu lu ₂ -dur ₁₁ -ra-ke ₄ gu ₃ -de ₂ -mu-de ₃]
UH ^{III}	136	^r nam ^u -šub eridu ^{ki} -ga šum ₂ -mu-da-mu-de ₃ ¹⁷⁴⁴

Furthermore the Emar recension ends with ka-ḫul-ḡal₂ bar-eš₂ ḫe₂^u-en^u-da-gub (E 729, 22) against niḡ₂-AK-a niḡ₂-ḫul-dim₂-ma sil₇-la₂ igi-mu-ta, ‘... depart from before me’, in the canonical recension (UH III: 144-145 = CT 16 Pl. 5, 201-202). The Emar text is also characterized by several unorthographic writings.

c) The last text on the obverse (ll. 24-35) is a further *Legitimationstyp* incantation. The first part (ll. 24-38) is parallel to the beginning of the OB recension of Tablet III (UHF 01-5) which is unfortunately completely restored on the basis of the first-millennium duplicates (UH III: 1-8).¹⁷⁴⁵ The Emar text expands the two-line legitimation theme of the OB and NA recensions, in which the *āšipu* declares himself the man of Enki and Damgalnunna,¹⁷⁴⁶ with a longer enumeration of deities that includes Sîn, Enki, Damgalnunna, Ninšuburra and Namma. Several recensional variants are attested between the Emar and first-millennium sources.¹⁷⁴⁷

1740 Campbell Thomson 1903, 24-27.

1741 The reading is unsure: ^dnin^u-gir₂-su^u.

1742 Campbell Thomson 1903, 18-23.

1743 UH III: 131, 132, 137, 142-143 (CT 16 Pl. 5, 183, 185, 194, 199-200). Notably E 729 omits the petition for the protection of the patient that is part of *Legitimationstyp* incantations (Falkenstein 1931, 30), udug-saga₁₀-ga ^dlamma sag₁₀-ga da-ḡa₂ ḫe₂-gub, ‘May the good Utukku and Lamma be at your side’ (UH III: 137).

1744 This line is not preserved in UHF. Note that in the Akkadian translation of the canonical recension, *ši-pat eri₄-du₁₀ ina na-de-e-a*, the verb *nadû* translates šub attested in the Emar text and not šum₂ = *nadānu* of the corresponding Sumerian version.

1745 CT 16 Pl. 1, 1-20 and UET 6 391, 1-7; UET 6 392, 1-7.

1746 The canonical recension also mentions Asalluḫi (UET 6 391, 4) who is omitted from the OB recension, see Geller 1985, 85.

1747 See Geller 1985, 85-87.

E 729	UH III
geg ta-na x-u ₂ -DU.DU (24)	a ₂ -sag ₃ mir-gen ₇ ki-a mu-un-du ₇ (2)
sila mu-un-dib-be ₂ (25)	sila mu-un-gur ₁₀ -gur ₁₀ (3)
mu-un-zi-ge-eš (26)	mu-un-da-ru-uš (5)
su ₂ -ġiri ₃ -ġen-na-bi (27)	sa niġen-na-bi-e (6)

The second part of the incantation (ll. 31-35) is badly preserved but it is clear that the Emar text completely diverges from the OB and NA sources. Indeed a much shorter text is contained in E 729; nevertheless it ends with a zi-pa₃ formula that is also attested in the duplicates.

As the following table shows, the Emar tablet completely reverses the sequence of the incantations as they appear in the OB and canonical recensions.

E 729	UHF	UH III
a) 1-9	gap after 119	165-177
b) 10-23	90-98	124-146
c) 24-30 31-35	00-5 -	1-8 -

Sentences in the Emar manuscript break off differently from earlier and later sources. E 729 is not as close to the canonical series as the Middle Assyrian texts are.¹⁷⁴⁸ The full rubric en₂-e₂-ne-nu-ru is unusually placed at the end of the incantations throughout E 729 contrary to the OB and NA sources where, as expected, the rubric is found at the beginning of each incantation.

It is clear that the OB tablet, which stems from Nippur, and the NA sources are close to each other. On the contrary, the Emar tablet depends on a different textual tradition. The unorthographic writings have an inconsistent nature but it is impossible to understand to what extent they are due to the Emar copyist.

6.2.7 Udug-ġul Tablet IV – E 790

E 790 is a tiny fragment from the left edge of its tablet preserving on one side five broken lines belonging to Tablet IV of the series *Udug-ġul*.¹⁷⁴⁹ The other side is broken away. The OB recension is only preserved on a manuscript probably from Sippar BM 78185 (H).

E 790	1	[gidi]m-ġul [...]
UHF	311	gidim kur-ta 'e ₃ -da' ġ[e ₂]-me-en
UH IV	130	gidim kur-ta e ₁₁ -de ₃ ġe ₂ -me-en
E 790	2	[x] edin [...]
UHF	312	lil ₂ -en-na ki-'na ₂ ' nu-tuku ġ[e ₂]-'me-en'
UH IV	131	lu ₂ -lil ₂ -la ₂ ki-na ₂ -a nu-tuku-a ġe ₂ -me-en
E 790	3	[ki]-sikil [...]
UHF	313	'ki-sikil' šu 'nu-du ₇ '-a ġe ₂ -[me-en]
UH IV	132	ki-sikil nu-un-zu-a ġe ₂ -me-en
E 790	4	[guru]š a ₂ nu- [...]
UHF	314	'guruš' a ₂ nu-la ₂ ġe ₂ -'me'-en

1748 See § 2.1.6.1.

1749 M. J. Geller *apud* Cohen 2009, 216 n. 242.

UH IV	133	guruš a ₂ nu-la ₂ -e ħe ₂ -me-en
E 790	5	[lu ₂] edin-na [...]
UHF	315	lu ₂ edin-na šub-ba-de ₃ ħe ₂ -me-en
UH IV	134	lu ₂ edin-na šub-ba ħe ₂ -me-en

The Emar text adds -hul in line 1. Line 2 cannot be harmonized with the extant manuscripts but it may contain a variant or refer to UHF 316 = UH IV: 135:

UHF	315	lu ₂ edin-na ba-ug ₅ -ga ħe ₂ -me-en
UH IV	135	lu ₂ edin-na ba-ug ₅ -ga ħe ₂ -me-en

It is clear that E 790 diverges on some points from the extant earlier and later sources.

6.2.8 Tsukimoto Incantation - E 730

One of the most beautiful manuscripts from Emar is a single-column tablet almost completely preserved found during illegal excavations and now housed in a private collection in Japan. This tablet published by Tsukimoto (1999) contains a collection of medical prescriptions and incantations divided into three sections according to the kind of sickness: fever (ll. 1-35), leprosy (ll. 37-93) and urinary tract disease.¹⁷⁵⁰ Each treatment is separated by horizontal rulings and the first two sections are set off by double rulings inscribed with the BAD sign. The tablet bears the scribe's name, Madi-Dagan son of Abī-kapi,¹⁷⁵¹ who is the author of another incantation published by Arnaud.¹⁷⁵² As pointed out by Y. Cohen¹⁷⁵³ these two tablets share the same sign shapes which differ from those typical of Emar, both Syrian and Syro-Hittite, but are reminiscent of the Assyro-Mitannian tablets discovered at Ḫattuša. Cohen regards the Assyro-Mitannian features as the result of external influence, due to the process of transmission of the text, on a tablet belonging to the Syro-Hittite school.¹⁷⁵⁴ The use of *ta-* as 3fsg. claimed by Tsukimoto¹⁷⁵⁵ as a form typical of the Upper Euphrates is not only a trait of Emar¹⁷⁵⁶ and Western periphery Akkadian, it is also characteristic of the Assyrian dialect.¹⁷⁵⁷ These features seem to indicate that also for Emar the Assyro-Mitannian scribal school played a role in the transmission of Mesopotamian culture. The Tsukimoto tablet includes two Sumerian incantations.

a) Lines 25-26 contain the incantation en₂ ka-ra-ra-tum which is written in Sumerian with elements of an unidentified language,¹⁷⁵⁸ probably simply an *abracadabra*. This incantation is here used against fever¹⁷⁵⁹ but has also been found in different contexts¹⁷⁶⁰ and in the first millennium was included in

1750 Tsukimoto 1999, 187.

1751 On this scribe see Cohen 2009, 189-194.

1752 Arnaud 1992, 225-227 = SMEA 30 27.

1753 Cohen 2009, 216-219.

1754 It is to note that the elements attributed by Cohen to the Syro-Hittite school are compatible with the Assyro-Mitannian texts: the shape of the sign LI and the use of a sign for aleph are also common to the Assyro-Mitannian school; for the signs LI and 'A see Schwemer 1998, 19, 33.

1755 Tsukimoto 1999, 188; Cohen 2009, 219, considers this form as 2msg.

1756 Seminara 1998, 346-350.

1757 GAG § 75h.

1758 See Böck 2007, 19.

1759 Finkel 1999a.

1760 Böck 2007, 61-63.

the series *Muššu'u* Tablet VIII/q.¹⁷⁶¹ Compared to late sources the Emar tablet presents a very different text. The incantation was probably also contained in a MA medical tablet, VAT 9587 = BAM II 194, even though it is not preserved on the manuscript. Indeed, both BAM II 194 II, 5-10 and the medical prescription preceding our incantation in the Tsukimoto text (ll. 21-24) mention the *kara-ratum* incantation as a magical treatment.¹⁷⁶² Our text is followed by another incantation (ll. 27-35) which ends the first section and is parallel to § 7 of the magical-ritual tablet from Ugarit RS 17.155 = AuOrS 23 21, 71-78.¹⁷⁶³

b) The second section begins with the Sumerian incantation en_2 me-še₃ ba-da-dal (ll. 37-40) which in the first millennium was incorporated into the series *Muššu'u* Tablet IX/b¹⁷⁶⁴ and *Udug-ḫul* Tablet I (ll. 31-37).¹⁷⁶⁵ Contrary to late sources the Emar text is written in phonetic orthography. Moreover, as shown by Finkel,¹⁷⁶⁶ it only duplicates the first line and partially the second line of late sources, whereas the remaining lines completely diverge. The Emar incantation continues with a list of demons followed by a zi-pa₃ formula.

A possible duplicate of this incantation is **E 730**. This is a tiny fragment from the lower edge of its tablet preserving on one side four broken lines while the other side is broken away. According to Arnaud the fragment may duplicate E 729, 18-23, but if this holds true then E 730 would bear a very different version because some lines are omitted. Consequently, I am inclined to present E 730 as a duplicate of the *Tsukimoto Incantation*, 37-40:

Tsk	37	me-še ₃ pa-da-dal i-ki-du ba-da-an-za-aḫ me-te gub-ba i-ki-du nu-gub-ba
UH I	31	en_2 me-še ₃ ba-da-dal ki-še ₃ ba-da-zaḫ ₂ me-še ₃ gub-ba igi-ḡu ₁₀ nu-gub
Tsk	38	an-nu u ₂ -min ₃ ki u ₂ -me-en bar-da i-ki u ₂ -me-en udug-ḫul a-la ₂ -ḫul
UH I	32	an imin ki imin im imin im-gal imin izi imin igi imin bar imin bar-ta igi imin
E 730	1	[.....]-x- ^{te} ? x-x-na(-)an- [...]
Tsk	39	gidim-ḫul gal ₅ -la ₂ -ḫul diḡir-ḫul maškim-ḫul eme-ḫul-ḡal ₂
E 730	2	[..... gedim-ḫu]l gal ₅ -la ₂ -ḫul diḡir-ḫul [...]
Tsk	40	bar-še ₃ ḫe ₂ -en-da-gu-ub zi-an-na ḫe ₂ -pa ₃ zi-ki-a ḫe ₂ -pa ₃ en_2
E 730	3	[..... bar-še ₃ ḫe ₂ -en-d]a-gub zi-an-na ḫe ₂ -[pa ₃]
	4	[zi-ki-a ḫe ₂ -pa ₃ en_2 e ₂ -nu]-ru

E 730 is written in standard orthography as shown by the writing -gub (l. 3) for -gu-ub in the *Tsukimoto Incantation* and the full rubric en_2 e₂-nu-ru. As noted earlier in the discussion of KUB 4 24,¹⁷⁶⁷ forerunners of *Udug-ḫul* Tablets I-II are poorly documented. Due to the fragmentary nature of E 730 and the difficulty of harmonizing line 1 with the extant sources, its attribution to the same text as the *Tsukimoto Incantation* is not assured. Indeed E 730 contains a very stereotyped passage common to several incantations. A further possibility, but in my opinion less probable, is that E 730 is parallel to a section of *Udug-ḫul* Tablet VII. In the OB recension this passage is preserved by two manuscripts

1761 Böck 2007, 295-296: 181-182. Forerunners to Tablet VIII/a are attested at Emar in E 735 and E 736 (Böck 2007, 42) with a MB duplicate from Nippur, Ni 178 = BAM IV 398 (Böck 2007, 36).

1762 Böck 2007, 61-63.

1763 See § 7.3.7.

1764 Böck 2007, 20-21, 26.

1765 Böck 2007, 24.

1766 Finkel 1999a with bibliography.

1767 § 5.3.9.

from Nippur which significantly diverge from one another. Only manuscript C (Ni 2676 + Ni 2997 + Ni 4017 + Ni 4018) is close to our text and also resembles the late recension.¹⁷⁶⁸

UHF	C 829	[udug-ḥul a-la ₂ -ḥul gidim-ḥul gal ₅ -la ₂ -ḥul e ₂ -ta ḥa-ba-ra-e ₃]
	C 830	[bar-ta-bi-še ₃ ḥa-ba-ra-an-gub-ba]
	C 831	u ₃ -b[i ₂ -zu/zi ḥul-dub ₂] zi-an-n[a ḥe ₂ -pa ₃ zi-ki-a ḥe ₂ -pa ₃]
UH VII	126	udug-ḥul a-la ₂ -ḥul gidim-ḥul gal ₅ -la ₂ -ḥul e ₂ -ta ḥa-ba-ra-e ₃ bar-ta-bi-še ḥa-ba-ra-an-gub
	127	u ₃ -bi ₂ -zi ḥul-dub ₂ zi-an-na ḥe ₂ -pa ₃ zi-ki-a ḥe ₂ -pa ₃

E 730 is quite different from *Udug-ḥul* Tablet VII, therefore it is more likely that this fragment duplicates the *Tsukimoto Incantation* and *Udug-ḥul* Tablet I.

6.2.9 Saĝ-geg Incantation – E 732

E 732 is a fragment from the upper left corner of its tablet preserving the opening lines of a monolingual *Saĝ-geg* incantation on the obverse, whereas the reverse is broken away. The incipit recalls the beginning of the first tablet of the canonical series which was also incorporated in *Muššu'u* Tablet I, but the subsequent lines are different.¹⁷⁶⁹ Forerunners of the series *Saĝ-geg* are also known from Ḥattuša and Ugarit.¹⁷⁷⁰ The text in the Emar manuscript is monolingual Sumerian in standard orthography.

6.2.10 Unidentified Udug-ḥul Incantation – E 731

E 731 is a fragment possibly from the lower edge of the reverse of its tablet, as a double horizontal ruling is drawn after the preserved lines and the space below is apparently uninscribed. It preserves five lines and the obverse is broken away. The text, written in standard orthography, is a *Udug-ḥul* style incantation quoting Namma in addition to Enki and Asalluḫi. No such passage citing Namma seems to be attested in either the forerunners or the canonical recensions of the series *Udug-ḥul*.

6.2.11 E 733 – Msk 74107q

E 733 is a large fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving 18 lines of a Sumerian monolingual incantation written in standard orthography. The fragment **Msk 74107q** possibly belongs to the same tablet. The incantation quotes Inana¹⁷⁷¹ and has a mythological character. Unfortunately no earlier or later duplicates are known.

6.2.12 E 740

E 740 is a fragment from the upper left edge of its tablet containing a collection of monolingual incantations written in standard orthography. The obverse preserves three incantations separated by horizontal rulings, whereas the reverse only preserves a few signs on the left-end corner. Unfor-

¹⁷⁶⁸ It is worth noting that the Emar manuscript resembles the OB version that entered the canonical series.

¹⁷⁶⁹ See Rutz 2013, 265.

¹⁷⁷⁰ §§ 5.1.5, 7.3.7.

¹⁷⁷¹ Note the presence of the Emesal form mu-gib (l. 8).

unately no earlier or later duplicates can be identified. The incantations mention Enki and An and two unidentified temples.¹⁷⁷²

6.2.13 E 743

E 743 is a fragment from the upper edge of its tablet preserving three broken lines on the obverse and a few signs on the reverse. The text on the obverse is in monolingual Sumerian in standard orthography and contains the injunction to the demons: [...-ḥu]l-ġal₂ bar-eš₂ ḥe₂-en-da-[gub] (Obv. 3).

6.2.14 E 744

Two fragments of monolingual incantations in standard orthography are listed under **E 744**: Msk 74107t and Msk 7499b. **Msk 74107t** is a tiny fragment from the upper edge of its tablet that only preserves [d]u₁₁-ga ^das[al-lu₂-ḥi]. **Msk 7499b** is another tiny fragment that only preserves four broken lines.

6.2.15 E 745

E 745 is a fragment from the lower right corner of its tablet preserving six lines on the obverse and eight lines on the reverse. Although the fragment is published as a magical text, one may note that it contains abbreviated verbal forms, ḥe₂- (ll. 11-12), which are more common in literary texts than in incantations. The text is monolingual Sumerian in standard orthography.

6.2.16 E 751 - E 752 - E 746

E 751 is a tiny fragment preserving six broken lines on one side whereas the other is broken away. This fragment seems to contain the instruction section of an incantation. It is interesting to note that the modal prefix in the verbal form u-me-ni[...] is written with the sign u, as is typical of late texts, instead of the OB u₃. The fragment, however, contains a monolingual Sumerian text in standard orthography.

Possibly belonging to the same tablet are two other fragments, **Msk 74107n** listed under **E 746** and **E 752**. The first is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving eight broken lines while the second one is a tiny fragment from the left edge of a tablet or a column. All three pieces contain the word 'purple' written in the late form siki₂-ḥe₂-me-da (E 751, 5; E 752, 3; Msk 74107n, 3).¹⁷⁷³ Moreover, E 752 presents the form šu u-me-[...] (l. 2).

Another fragment listed under E 746 is **Msk 74107m** which apparently does not share any words with the other pieces.

6.2.17 E 756

According to the hand-copy, the vertical ruling at the left edge of the fragment may indicate that **E 756** originally belonged to a multicolumn tablet of which it represents the right column. The fragment preserves six lines set off by horizontal rulings on the obverse and contains a monolingual incantation in standard orthography. The reverse is broken away. The preserved section

¹⁷⁷² e₂-ġeš¹-na₃-a (l. 11) and e₂-ge₆-še-er-da-ba (l. 12) are not attested in George 1993.

¹⁷⁷³ Note that both E 751 and E 752 write siki₂-ḥe₂-me-da²¹ with the sign DA resembling U₂ or TA.

contains the instructions for performing the ritual. As with E 751 the modal prefix u_3 is spelled as u in $u-me-ni-$.

6.2.18 Bilingual Incantations – E 757 - E 763 - E 764

E 757 is a fragment from the left edge of its tablet preserving thirteen lines on one side whereas the other side is broken away. **E 763** is a fragment from the upper right corner of its tablet preserving ten broken lines on one side, whereas the other side is broken away. **E 764** is a tiny fragment preserving five broken lines on one side only. These fragments contain bilingual incantations in interlinear format with couplets separated by horizontal rulings. Judging from the hand-copy of E 757 the tablet may extend to the left with an additional column. Taking into consideration that these fragments are the only manuscripts from Emar preserving bilingual incantations and show the same *mise en tablet*, they probably belong to the same tablet.

6.2.19 Phonetic Sumerian Incantations – E 734 - Msk 74148f

E 734 is a fragment from the right edge of its tablet preserving eleven lines on the obverse whereas the reverse is broken away. The fragment contains an incantation in phonetic writing quoting Enki. Lines are inscribed in paragraphs set off by horizontal rulings. The fragment **Msk 74148f** possibly belongs to the same tablet.

6.2.20 Fragments of Incantations

Several fragments contain monolingual Sumerian incantations in standard orthography: **E 747**, according to Civil, is not an incantation but possibly belongs to *The Fowler*;¹⁷⁷⁴ **E 748**; **E 749** mentions An;¹⁷⁷⁵ **E 753** ends with a $zi-pa_3$ formula and mentions Lamaštu (l. 7); **E 759**; **E 761**; **E 762**; **Msk 74122ar**.¹⁷⁷⁶

6.2.21 Unidentified Text – E 777

E 777 is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving six fragmentary lines from an unidentified Sumerian text, possibly an incantation.¹⁷⁷⁷ The lines are set off by horizontal rulings and no Akkadian translation is preserved but it is not excluded that it was arranged in a parallel column. The text is written in standard orthography.

¹⁷⁷⁴ See fn. 1709.

¹⁷⁷⁵ Note that the nature of this fragment is uncertain; Rutz 2013, 520, classifies it as a lexical list.

¹⁷⁷⁶ Rutz 2013, 541 lists this fragment as either an incantation or a lexical text.

¹⁷⁷⁷ See en_2 (l. 5).

