

## The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

### 7 Sumerian Literary and Magical Texts from Ugarit

Sumerian texts discovered at Ugarit will be treated in the present chapter. As several compositions have duplicates from Ḫattuša and Emar, only the texts that were not previously discussed will be presented here.<sup>1778</sup> Sources will be classified according to their script.

#### 7.1 Babylonian Script Tablets

Some Sumerian texts discovered at Ugarit are inscribed on tablets written in Babylonian script. As with tablets in non-Hittite script found in the Hittite capital, it is very difficult to establish whether these manuscripts were imported or whether they were copied at Ugarit by foreign scribes. With only one possible exception, AuOrS 23 61, all the Babylonian script tablets inscribed with Sumerian texts stem from the Lamaštu archive.

Excavation Number	Edition	Composition	Archive
RS 25.130	Ugaritica V 164	a) Ballad of Early Rulers b) Proverbs from Ugarit	Lamaštu
RS 26.141	AuOrS 23 28	Hymn to Enki	Lamaštu
RS 25.456B+	AuOrS 23 25	Incantation	Lamaštu
RS 25.418	AuOrS 23 27	Collection of Incantations	Lamaštu
RS 25.517	AuOrS 23 58	Unidentified Text	Lamaštu
RS 26.143	AuOrS 23 59	Unidentified Text	Lamaštu
RS 28.053C	AuOrS 23 61	Unidentified Text	Maison-aux-tablettes

##### 7.1.1 The Ballad of Early Rulers - Proverbs from Ugarit – RS 25.130

The tablet **RS 25.130 = Ugaritica V 164** contains, on the obverse, *BeR*<sup>1779</sup> and, on the reverse (lines 24-39), a collection of proverbs in interlinear bilingual format titled *Proverbs from Ugarit* as the Ugarit manuscript is the main source. A monolingual Sumerian forerunner of this composition is known from the obverse of the OB Nippur tablet CBS 13777.<sup>1780</sup> The NA fragment from Nineveh K 6917 + K 13679 which, as seen above, contains the first three lines of *BeR* and has a circular structure similar to RS 25.130, also reports a collection of sayings recalling *Proverbs from Ugarit*. These compositions are thematically related as they feature the vanity theme. The proverbs contained in these three tablets were probably part of a larger collection of sayings.<sup>1781</sup> The presence of *BeR* together with *Proverbs from Ugarit* on tablets with a very similar layout from both Ugarit and

<sup>1778</sup> The fragment RS 20.195f = AuOrS 23 62 is not treated here because there is no clear evidence that it contains a Sumerian text. The few preserved signs are from the lower edge of the reverse which contains the colophon (note the double ruling and the blank space below signs); restoration of the last line here proposed follows one of Arnaud's suggestions: [d]ub 1 kam-'x' til-l[a]. As the only sign preserved above the colophon line is NI, there is no clue to whether the text is written in Sumerian or Akkadian. However, taking into consideration that this would be the only Sumerian text discovered in the house of Rap'ānu, where only another literary text in Akkadian was found it is likely that this fragment was inscribed with an Akkadian text.

<sup>1779</sup> For *BeR* see § 6.2.1.

<sup>1780</sup> Alster 2005, 323-326.

<sup>1781</sup> Alster 2005, 324.

Nineveh presents important evidence that the process of serialization for these compositions had already begun in the Middle Babylonian period.<sup>1782</sup>

Although the obverse of CBS 13777 is badly preserved and only lines 16-17, duplicating RS 25.130, 32-35, can be safely read, the two manuscripts seem to have the same sequence of lines.<sup>1783</sup> Text analysis shows the following anomalies:

- In  $u_4$ - $da^1$   $\dot{\text{š}}u$ - $du_3$ - $a$ - $bi$   $gi_6$ - $\langle\dot{\text{š}}u(?)\rangle$ - $\dot{\text{r}}du_3$ - $\dot{\text{r}}a$ - $bi$  [ki]  $di\dot{g}ir$   $i_3$ - $in$ - $\dot{g}al_2$  // *te-em ur-ri-ša u<sub>3</sub> mu-ši-ša it-ti DIĜIR i-ba-aš<sub>2</sub>-ši*, ‘The plans for day and night rest with the god’ (RS 25.130, 26-27), the genitive after [ki]  $di\dot{g}ir$  is omitted.<sup>1784</sup>
- The genitive is indicated by  $-ke_4$ , a feature documented since the Early Old Babylonian period:<sup>1785</sup>
  - In  $a$ - $du_3$ - $nam$ - $lu_2$ - $u_{18}$ - $lu$ - $ke_4$   $na$ - $me$   $na$ - $na$ - $zu^1$  (RS 25.130, 28), ‘Nobody should make people’s working assignment known’,  $-ke_4$  alone indicates the genitive, as is clear from the Akkadian translation: *a-da a-wi-lu-ti mam<sub>2</sub>-ma la u<sub>2</sub>-’a-ad-da*; the infix  $-na-$  in the verbal form is probably a case of metathesis from  $na$ - $an$ - $zu$  due to a scribal mistake.
  - In  $dumu$ - $lu_2$ - $ad_4$ - $ad_4$ - $ke_4$   $dumu$ - $lu_2$ - $kaš_4$ - $e$   $dib$ - $ba$ , ‘A son of a lame man catches up with the son of a runner’ (RS 25.130, 34), the genitive is indicated by  $-ke_4$ ; the ergative would be incorrect because the verb is an intransitive non-finite form.
  - $\langle ne \rangle$ - $e$   $giš^1$ - $\dot{\text{š}}ub$ - $ba$   $lu_2$ - $silim$ - $ma_3$ - $ke_4$  // *an-nu-u<sub>2</sub> i-si-iq šal-m[i]*, ‘This is the lot of the healthy man’ (RS 25.130, 38).
  - Another use of  $-ke_4$  to indicate the genitive is possibly attested in  $\dot{\text{š}}u$ - $kur_2$   $nam$ - $lu_2$ - $u_{18}$ - $lu$ - $ke_4$   $na$ - $me$   $na$ - $an$ - $du_{11}$ - $ga$ , ‘Nobody should pronounce an insult against other people’ (RS 25.130, 30), if one regards this line as based on the Akkadian expression *ṭapilti* NOUN *qabû*, ‘to speak ill of someone/something’, which is formed with an objective genitive<sup>1786</sup> and is documented in the Akkadian translation, *ṭa-pil<sub>2</sub>-ti a-wi-lu-ti mam<sub>2</sub>-ma <la> i-qab-bi*. To my knowledge this is the only attestation of  $\dot{\text{š}}u$ - $kur_2$  ~  $\dot{\text{š}}u$ - $kar_2$  with the verb  $du_{11}$ .<sup>1787</sup> Alternatively  $-ke_4$  could indicate the directive only (referring to the direction of the insult), but in light of the Akkadian version this hypothesis seems less likely.
- The word order in  $igi$ - $tur$   $sig$ - $ga$   $na$ - $me$   $\langle na$ - $an \rangle$ - $gid_2$ - $i$  (RS 25.130, 32) is possibly based on the Akkadian version, *ši-ṭu-ut en-ši mam<sub>2</sub>-ma la i-leq<sub>2</sub>-qi<sub>3</sub>*, ‘Nobody should accept the deprecation of someone weak’<sup>1788</sup> because the nominal element  $igi$ - $tur$  in  $igi$ - $tur$ - $gid_2$ - $i$  is usually placed before the verbal base:  $lu_2$   $dili$   $gu_7$ - $u_3$ - $gen_7$   $igi$ - $tur$   $mu$ - $un$ - $gid_2$ - $i$ - $eš$ , ‘(They) look on with scorn as at a man who eats alone’ (ETCSL 3.3.2, 17);<sup>1789</sup>  $ukur_3$   $bu$ - $lu$ - $uḥ_2$   $si$ - $il$ - $’le^2$ ’  $lu_2$   $ni\dot{g}_2$ - $tuku$ - $e$   $igi$   $tur$   $nam$ - $ba$ - $e$ - $gid_2$ - $i$ , ‘The belching poor man should not look scornfully at the rich man’ (ETCSL 6.1.02, 31).<sup>1790</sup> However, Alster emends differently,  $igi$ - $tur$ - $sig$ - $ga$   $na$ - $me$   $\langle\dot{\text{š}}u$   $na$ \rangle- $gid_2$ - $i$ , ‘No

1782 See Heeßel 2011 for the canonization of omina.

1783 Alster 2005, 323.

1784 Alster 2005, 326: 26-27, according to Alster the text is corrupted.

1785 Attinger 1993, 259, Wilcke 1998, 459-464, Edzard 2000, 64, Huber Vulliet 2001, 176-177.

1786 Cf. CAD T, 50.

1787 For  $\dot{\text{š}}u$ - $kar_2$  see Karahashi 2000, 162-163, Attinger 2004 and Alster 2005, 271, 326. To my knowledge there are only two occurrences, both from *Enlil and Sud* (ETCSL 1.2.2, 67, 96), of  $\dot{\text{š}}u$ - $kar_2$  as a substantive but it is associated with  $gi_4$  and written immediately before the verbal form.

1788 For the equivalence  $igi$ - $tur$   $gid_2$ - $i$  = *ši-ṭu<sub>3</sub>-tum le-qu<sub>2</sub>-u<sub>2</sub>* see MSLSS1, 25, v 14.

1789 *The Letter from Lugal-nesaĝ to a King*.

1790 SP 2 + 6.

weak man should accept a deprecation', regarding the verbal form as šu--gid<sub>2</sub> from a hypothetical \*(lu<sub>2</sub>) sig-ga na-me <šū na>-gid<sub>2</sub>-i.<sup>1791</sup>

These examples show that RS 25.130 contains anomalies that are commonly attested in Sumerian literary texts from the Old Babylonian period onward. Moreover, it appears that Akkadian strongly influenced the Sumerian version. On the contrary, only a few mistakes can be attributed to the copyist. As a tablet drafted by a Babylonian scribe, this source represents a work of the Middle Babylonian scribal schools that modified the OB text and added the Akkadian translation.

As explained in more detail below,<sup>1792</sup> connections between *Proverbs from Ugarit* and the vanity theme indicate that the composition belongs to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. Unfortunately, the fragmentary nature of CBS 13777 precludes a full comparison of the two manuscripts. Hence, it is difficult to state with total confidence whether RS 25.130 reflects the same textual tradition as the OB tablet.

### 7.1.2 Hymn to Enki (?) – AuOrS 23 28

**RS 26.141 = AuOrS 23 28** is a fragment from a two-column tablet preserving a bilingual text in interlinear format on the obverse, whereas the reverse is broken away. According to Arnaud, the text is a hymn to Enki addressed as master of the scribal art and god of the waters, but as he himself admits<sup>1793</sup> this identification is uncertain because the name of the god is not preserved on the fragment. No line is fully preserved<sup>1794</sup> but no phonetic writings<sup>1795</sup> seem to be attested.<sup>1796</sup> The Babylonian origin of this tablet suggested by Arnaud seems to be confirmed by the shape of the signs RU (§§ 1, 17) and AH (§ 5).

Because this fragment is too badly preserved and no duplicates are known there are no indications of the provenance and tradition of the text.

### 7.1.3 Collection of Incantations – AuOrS 23 25

**RS 25.456B + RS 25.129 = AuOrS 23 25** is a single column tablet containing a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian medical and magical texts, some of which present a mixture of the two languages, but no bilingual texts are included. Incantations are set off by horizontal rulings, and are often followed by the subscript ka-inim-ma. Arnaud attributes this tablet to the group *assyrisé*; however, he admits that the shape of the sign TAR is Babylonian and that /qi/ is written with the sign KI, with the reading qi<sub>2</sub>, as is common in MB texts instead of the MA KIN/qi.<sup>1797</sup> Furthermore, the shape of the sign LI<sup>1798</sup> does not correspond to the MA forms, neither the 14<sup>th</sup><sup>1799</sup> nor the 13<sup>th</sup><sup>1800</sup> century variants, but is typically Middle Babylonian.<sup>1801</sup> Hence, AuOrS 23 25 is either a MB manuscript imported

<sup>1791</sup> Alster 2005, 326: 32-33.

<sup>1792</sup> § 9.4.

<sup>1793</sup> Arnaud 2007, 101: "on devine que cette hymne était adressée à Enki-Ea."

<sup>1794</sup> Only the right side of the left column and the left side of the right column on the obverse are preserved.

<sup>1795</sup> Note that Arnaud misreads some passages.

<sup>1796</sup> Note the nice form nu-mu-un-e-[x] = *ul ta*-[...].

<sup>1797</sup> Arnaud 2007, 9-10. The sign TAR has a Babylonian form not only in line 3, as pointed out by Arnaud; it is consistently written with an upright wedge underneath the two oblique ones (ll. 15, 30). For qi<sub>2</sub>/qi see Aro 1955, 19.

<sup>1798</sup> Ll. 11, 13, 25, 26, 59.

<sup>1799</sup> Cf. Schwemer 1998, 19, Weeden 2012, 247.

<sup>1800</sup> Cf. Weidner 1952-53, van Soldt 2001.

<sup>1801</sup> BE 14, No. 211.

to Ugarit<sup>1802</sup> or a tablet drafted by a Babylonian scribe in the Lamaštu archive.<sup>1803</sup> The tablet shows several incorrect writings.<sup>1804</sup>

Only two texts are fully written in Sumerian (a = ll. 1-2, d = ll. 34-52) while the other two incantations mix Sumerian and Akkadian (b = ll. 11-14, c = 22-29).<sup>1805</sup> A large use of Sumerograms is, however, documented throughout the tablet.

a) As the subscript makes clear, the first text (ll. 1-2) is a poorly understandable incantation against vomit mostly written in phonetic writing.<sup>1806</sup>

b) Another incantation against vomit is inscribed on lines 11-14, which begins with an Akkadian line followed by three lines in phonetic Sumerian.

c) Lines 22-24 contain a Sumerian *abracadabra*<sup>1807</sup> that is part of an Akkadian incantation against diarrhea.

d) The only fully understandable Sumerian text is a Marduk-Ea incantation against the *šimmatu*-disease<sup>1808</sup> (lines 34-52). The incantation, which begins with an abbreviated rubric  $en_2$ , reports the full Marduk-Ea formula typical of OB texts. According to Arnaud,<sup>1809</sup> the beginning of this incantation (ll. 34-37) is a translation into Sumerian from an Akkadian original. Some lines of the Marduk-Ea formula are written in phonetic orthography in another incantation from Ugarit (AuOrS 23 21 § 8).<sup>1810</sup>

Several anomalies and mistakes are attested in this incantation:

- The chiasmic structure of the first two lines,  $en_2 i_3\text{'-}ser_3 lu_2\text{'-}bi lu_2\text{'-}bi dib\text{'}$  //  $i_3\text{'-}ser_3 saĝ\text{'-}bi saĝ\text{'-}bi dib$ , 'Incantation. (The demon) bound this man, he seized this man. He bound his head, he seized his head' (AuOrS 23 25, 34-35), is perhaps a hint of the influence of Akkadian on the text. Note also the use of -bi as a human possessive.
- $en\text{'-}kal kal\text{'-}la nin\text{'-}na\text{'-}ke_4 ib_2\text{'}$  (AuOrS 23 25, 37) is translated by Arnaud as 'Le grand seigneur est en colère contre l'homme et sa soeur', by reading  $ib_2$  as a verbal form, 'to be angry', and  $kal\text{'-}la$  as a mistake for  $guruš$ . An alternative explanation would be to treat  $en\text{'-}kal kal\text{'-}la$  as a case of dittography:  $en\text{'-} <kal> \text{'-}kal\text{'-}la$ . It is clear, however, that the passage is corrupted.
- Arnaud's translation of  $i_3\text{'-}ser_3 lu_2\text{'-}bi\text{'-}dib igi mu\text{'-}un\text{'-}ši\text{'-}in\text{'-}bar$ , 'Il vit le lieu de l'homme saisi', (AuOrS 23 25, 38), suggests that a finite form  $i_3\text{'-}ser_3$  is used instead of either (1) a participle followed by a genitive,  $**ser_3\text{'-}lu_2\text{'-}dib.a\text{'-}bi.a(k)\text{'-}(še_3)$ , or (2) a nominalized dependent sentence,  $**lu_2\text{'-}dib.a\text{'-}bi=Ø i_3\text{'-}ser_3\text{'-}a(še_3)$ . The position of the verb at the beginning of the sentence is

1802 The value  $pir_6$  of the sign NAM (l. 4) indicated by Arnaud as MA is also attested in Babylonia, see MesZL, 277 No. 134.

1803 van Soldt 2012, 178.

1804 See commentary in Arnaud 2007, 94-96.

1805 Note that the first three lines of an Akkadian incantation against *samānu* (ll. 59-69) are duplicated in KAR 181 Rev. 6 ff. and K 2402+ Rev. 3, cf. CAD S, 112. Other incantations against *samānu* are contained in AuOrS 23 21 § 2 (§ 7.3.7) and in the MA text YOS 11 74 (§ 2.1.6.6); *samānu*-disease is also quoted in KUB 30 1, see fn. 1074.

1806 Arnaud 2007, 94-95.

1807 For this type of Sumerian see Veldhuis 1999, Arnaud 2007, 22.

1808 See the subscript  $ka\text{'-}inim\text{'-}ma šim\text{'-}ma\text{'-}tu_4$  (l. 53); for *šimmatu* = paralysis, see CAD Š/3, 7. Two *šimmatu* incantations are known from Emar, E 735 and E 736; in the first millennium they were incorporated into the series *Muššu'u* Tablet VIII/a (Böck 2007, 42), but they do not duplicate the Ugarit text.

1809 Arnaud 2007, 96: 34-37. I am not convinced by Arnaud's transliteration, but I am not able to provide a different one as the hand-copy is not very clear.

1810 See § 7.3.7.

probably influenced by the Akkadian participle which, in status constructus, is followed by its object. Moreover, it seems that there is no difference between the forms *dib* and *dib.a*.

- In <sup>d</sup>en-ki dumu<sup>1</sup>-ni <sup>d</sup>asal-lu-<sup>h</sup>i mu-un-na-ni-ib<sub>2</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub> (AuOrS 23 25, 42), -ke<sub>4</sub> is omitted, cf. PBS 1/2 127, 20-21, <sup>d</sup>en-ki-ke<sub>4</sub> dumu-ni <sup>d</sup>asal-lu<sub>2</sub>-<sup>h</sup>i mu-un-na-ib<sub>2</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>. This omission is probably to be attributed to the copyist.<sup>1811</sup>
- The verbal form a-ra-ab-da<sup>h</sup>-e (AuOrS 23 25, 43-44) omits the 1sg. suffix indicating the subject of the *marû* stem, as is typical in late texts.
- The genitive is indicated by -ke<sub>4</sub> in <sup>d</sup>nin-din-ug<sub>5</sub>-ga šatam<sup>am</sup>-di<sup>g</sup>ir-re-e-ne-ke<sub>4</sub> // <sup>d</sup>nin-din-ug<sub>5</sub>-ga tum<sub>3</sub>-di<sup>g</sup>ir-re-e-ne-ke<sub>4</sub> // <sup>d</sup>nin-din-ug<sub>5</sub>-ga sa<sup>g</sup>-kalag-di<sup>g</sup>ir-re-e-ne-ke<sub>4</sub> // aia <sup>d</sup>en-ki-ke<sub>4</sub> <sup>d</sup>asal-lu<sub>2</sub>-<sup>h</sup>i za<sub>3</sub>-mi<sub>2</sub>, ‘Nindinugga, the gods’ administrator, Nindinugga the *provider* of the gods, Nindinugga the mighty, foremost among the gods, the father Enki, Asallu<sup>h</sup>i, are praised’ (AuOrS 23 25, 47-50). All the divine names but Asallu<sup>h</sup>i are followed by -ke<sub>4</sub> although they function as absolutes because the verb is a non-finite passive form.
- -an-na- in nam-mu-un-da-an-na-tum<sub>3</sub><sup>?</sup> (AuOrS 23 25, 52) is a possible case of metathesis due to a copying mistake.

Several of these anomalies are common in the development of Sumerian. The influence of the Akkadian language is also evident, notably in less formulaic passages. This incantation is written in standard orthography while phonetic writings are limited to a few cases, perhaps to be attributed to the scribe.

The lack of duplicates suggests that the Sumerian incantations inscribed on this tablet represent a not very common tradition. The use of phonetic writings perhaps indicates that the scribe was educated in scribal conventions common in Northern Babylonia. However, it is worth noting that graphic and orthographic mistakes in this source are unusually frequent for a Babylonian tablet from the Western periphery.

#### 7.1.4 Collection of Incantations – AuOrS 23 27

**RS 25.418** is a fragment from the lower edge of its tablet, discovered in the Lamaštu archive, containing a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian incantations. This fragment is closely related to, or possibly belongs to the same tablet as RS 25.422 = AuOrS 23 16.<sup>1812</sup> Four incantations are partially preserved on this fragment: two are written in Akkadian (ll. 1-4, 11-13) and two in Sumerian (5-10, 14-16).

a) Lines 5-6 on the obverse contain a monolingual Sumerian incantation followed by a poorly preserved subscript.<sup>1813</sup> The incantation is badly preserved and it mentions the evil eye. The text seems to be written in standard orthography,<sup>1814</sup> but the name of the god Utu is spelled phonetically twice in the same line (7), <sup>d</sup>u<sub>2</sub>-ud-du.<sup>1815</sup>

<sup>1811</sup> Note, however, that in AuOrS 23 21, 85, in-ki dumu-mi<sub>2</sub>-a-ni <sup>d</sup>asal-lu<sub>2</sub>-<sup>h</sup>i mu-un-na-na-ib<sub>2</sub>-gi-g[i], -ke<sub>4</sub> is also omitted, see § 7.3.7.

<sup>1812</sup> Arnaud 2007, 10, 60.

<sup>1813</sup> Arnaud (Arnaud 2007, 99), reads ka-inim-ma <sup>g</sup>e<sub>6</sub>-a e<sub>2</sub>-nu<sub>2</sub>-da-a-kam<sub>2</sub>, “Incantation de la nuit dans la chambre”.

<sup>1814</sup> See igi-<sup>h</sup>uš (l. 5) and [e]n<sub>2</sub>-e<sub>2</sub>-nu-[ru] (l. 9).

<sup>1815</sup> Perhaps this writing is a gloss: <sup>u</sup>utu<sup>tu3</sup>. Note also the writing IGI.I.MA (l. 6) which Arnaud regards as a mistake for igi-tab-ba.

b) Lines 14-16 contain another monolingual Sumerian incantation of which only a few signs are preserved.

Arnaud includes this fragment among the group *assyrisé* that turned out to consist of Babylonian script tablets. Following van Soldt<sup>1816</sup> the fragment is here regarded as a Babylonian manuscript but its classification is not entirely clear.<sup>1817</sup> The presence of several Babylonian script tablets in the Lamaštu archive would suggest the same provenance for AuOrS 23 27, but I prefer to suspend judgment in the absence of clear evidence.

#### 7.1.5 AuOrS 23 58

**RS 25.517 = AuOrS 23 58** is a tiny fragment that only preserves a few signs on each side. The inscribed text is probably an unidentified literary composition. I tend to regard this fragment as a Babylonian manuscript based on the shape of the sign LI, only partially preserved on line 1, and DA with one upright only (l. 1).<sup>1818</sup>

#### 7.1.6 AuOrS 23 59

**RS 26.143 = AuOrS 23 59** is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving an unidentified monolingual Sumerian text on one side, whereas the other side is broken away. I here follow Arnaud<sup>1819</sup> and van Soldt<sup>1820</sup> who regard this fragment as Babylonian, but note that the sign 𒄩A (l. 2) shows only one *Winkelhaken* as is typical of the Ugarit script.<sup>1821</sup> The text seems to be written in standard orthography.<sup>1822</sup>

#### 7.1.7 AuOrS 23 61

**RS 28.053C = AuOrS 23 61** is a fragment discovered in the Maison-aux-tablettes, only preserving some signs at the end of a few lines of an unidentified Sumerian text. Following Arnaud<sup>1823</sup> this fragment is tentatively assigned to the group of Babylonian script tablets, but it could turn out differently. Against this classification, it is to be noted that this would be the only Babylonian script tablet inscribed with a Sumerian text recovered outside the Lamaštu archive. Unfortunately, no hand-copy has been published.

## 7.2 Hittite Script Tablets

The only Sumerian text in Hittite script stemming from Ugarit is a copy of *The Message of Lu-diğira to his Mother* imported from the Hittite capital and discovered in the Lamaštu archive.

<sup>1816</sup> van Soldt 2012, 180.

<sup>1817</sup> The sign TI (l. 13) seems to have the Babylonian shape; however, the sign SAĜ (ll. 2, 4) with a heavy impression of the top front wedge reminds me of the shape of the sign in Assyro-Mitannian texts (cf. Weeden 2012). AuOrS 23 16 shows the MB shapes of the signs LI (l. 8), TA (ll. 11, 18, 21) and KA (ll. 19, 20).

<sup>1818</sup> Cf. BE 14, No. 145. van Soldt 2012, 180, also regards this fragment as Babylonian.

<sup>1819</sup> Arnaud 2007, 8.

<sup>1820</sup> van Soldt 2012, 180.

<sup>1821</sup> See van Soldt 2012, 175.

<sup>1822</sup> Note that Arnaud's edition misreads a few lines.

<sup>1823</sup> Arnaud 2001, 8.

Excavation Number	Edition	Composition	Archive
RS 25.421 + RS 25.527 A+B	AuOrS 23 50	The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother	Lamaštu

### 7.2.1 The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother

See § 5.3.2.

## 7.3 Ugarit Script Tablets

The largest part of the Sumerian texts from Ugarit were written by local scribes.

Excavation Number	Edition	Composition	Archive
RS 79.25	Arnaud (1982a), 209-216	A Prayer for a King	Maison A
RS 79.25C	Arnaud (1982a), 209-216	A Prayer for a King	Maison A
RS 23.34+ RS 23.363 + RS 23.494 + RS 23.721 + RS 23.721B	AuOrS 23 48 Ugaritica V 165	The Ballad of Early Rulers (Ub)	Maison-aux-tablettes
RS 25.424	Ugaritica V 166	The Ballad of Early Rulers (Uc)	Lamaštu
RS 22.341 + RS 28.053A	AuOrS 23 47	Enlil and Namzitarra	Maison-aux-tablettes
RS 25 <sup>7</sup> .135A	AuOrS 23 50	The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother	Lamaštu ?
RS 17.10 RS 17.80	Ugaritica V 15	The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaġ	Bibliothèque du Lettré
RS 86.2210	Arnaud (2001)	The Fox and the Hyena	Maison d'Urtenu
RS 17.155	AuOrS 23 21 Ugaritica V 17	Collection of Incantations	Bibliothèque du Lettré
RS 15.152	Ugaritica V 17b	Collection of Incantations	Royal Palace
RS 16.416	AuOrS 23 13	Incantation	Royal Palace
RS 25.462	AuOrS 23 67	Unidentified Text	Lamaštu
RS 94.2372	AuOrS 23 68	Unidentified Text	Maison d'Urtenu

### 7.3.1 A Prayer for a King – RS 79.25

See § 6.1.1.

### 7.3.2 The Ballad of Early Rulers – RS 23.34+ - RS 25.424

See § 6.2.1.

### 7.3.3 Enlil and Namzitarra – AuOrS 23 47

See § 6.2.2.

## 7.3.4 The Message of Lu-diġira to his Mother

The small fragment **RS 25?.135A**, published by Arnaud<sup>1824</sup> and preserving a few traces on four lines, is the only remnant of a local edition of *MLM*, probably copied from the Hittite tablet as both manuscripts stem from the Lamaštu archive. However, contrary to the Hittite recension, which reports the text in standard Sumerian, phonetic Sumerian, Akkadian and Hittite in parallel columns, this fragment only has Sumerian and Akkadian in interlinear format. The Sumerian seems to be phonetic judging from the writing [m]u<sub>2</sub>-ša[r] for mu-šar.

## 7.3.5 The Letter of Lugal-ibila to Lugal-nesaġ

See § 5.3.4.

## 7.3.6 The Fox and the Hyena – RS 86.2210

Animal fables belong to the genre of wisdom literature. They include narrative episodes, jokes and humorous sayings involving animals who act and speak like humans.<sup>1825</sup> Several fragmentary texts are dedicated to the Fox, reflecting on its cunning and wit.<sup>1826</sup> The fragment **RS 86.2210** (Ug) published by Arnaud (2001) contains a text that, as I will try to demonstrate, shows many similarities with the composition *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant*, a humorous tale in which the Fox tries to deceive Enlil.<sup>1827</sup> The manuscript was originally a three-column tablet containing versions in standard Sumerian, phonetic Sumerian and Akkadian, but only the first two columns are preserved on both sides of the fragment.<sup>1828</sup>

The relation among the Fox-tales is unclear due the fragmentary nature of the OB manuscripts. The composition *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant*<sup>1829</sup> is known from an OB manuscript CBS 438 (A)<sup>1830</sup> of unknown provenance, but probably from Sippar<sup>1831</sup> as it belongs to the Khabaza collection. A partial duplicate is an OB school tablet from Uruk W 20248,3 (W).<sup>1832</sup> The OB manuscripts help to clarify that some lines of the Ugarit fragment duplicate passages of *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant*:

A	18	ur-gi <sub>7</sub> -re egir-bi-a in-us <sub>2</sub> -us <sub>2</sub> -a
W	ii 17	ur-gi <sub>7</sub> -re egir <sub>x</sub> (ib <sub>2</sub> )-be <sub>2</sub> im-us <sub>2</sub> -us <sub>2</sub>
Ug	§ 6 I	[ur-gi <sub>7</sub> -re e]gir-ba-a // [in]-du-du
II		ur-gi <sub>7</sub> -r[e] <sup>1?</sup> e-gi-i]r-ba-e // in-du-[du]
		<i>The Dog followed (the Fox).</i>

Arnaud reads ur-gu-la, 'lion', but the OB manuscripts make it clear that ur-gi<sub>7</sub>-re, 'dog', is implied.

A	19	i <sub>3</sub> -tar-tar-re-eš zi-ni ħabrud-da giri <sub>17</sub> -a / ba-ni-in-x'
W	ii 18	i <sub>3</sub> -tar-tar zi-bi ħi <sup>2</sup> -li <sup>2</sup> giri <sub>17</sub> ku <sub>4</sub> -ku <sub>4</sub> -de <sub>3</sub>

<sup>1824</sup> Arnaud 2007, 184.

<sup>1825</sup> For a general introduction to the genre of fables see Alster 2005, 342-345.

<sup>1826</sup> Alster 2005, 346-351.

<sup>1827</sup> ETCSL 5.9.4.

<sup>1828</sup> For the Ugarit script of the tablet see the shapes of the signs LI (§ 4 I) and ĤA (§ 7 II).

<sup>1829</sup> ETCSL 5.9.4.

<sup>1830</sup> Type III tablet.

<sup>1831</sup> Alster 2005, 346.

<sup>1832</sup> Type II tablet. See Cavigneaux 1982, 22-27, Cavigneaux 2003, 57-58.



Ug	§ 7 I	zi-an-ni ku-ku-du-ta // giri <sub>17</sub> ša <sub>3</sub> -ḥabrud-da-ni-eš // ba-an-ku <sub>4</sub>
	II	zi-an-ni-gu-gu-ut-ta // gi-ri ḥa-am-bu-ru-ud-da-//ni-iš ba-an-gu
		<i>(The Fox) entered into a Hyena's hole in order to save its life.</i> <sup>1833</sup>

On the OB manuscripts Alster states: ‘The expected expression is certainly some form of zi(-ni)--tum<sub>2</sub>, ‘he saved life’’,<sup>1834</sup> which is close to the Ugarit text. The verbal forms ku and gu in the Ugarit manuscript must be intended as phonetic writings for ku<sub>5</sub> (TAR). Contrary to Arnaud who translates ‘Pur sauver sa vie, l'hyène entra dans un terrier’, regarding ‘Hyena’ as subject of the sentence, I consider giri<sub>17</sub> as to be an anticipatory genitive from \*giri<sub>17</sub>-a ša<sub>3</sub>-ḥabrud-da-ne<sub>2</sub>-eš<sub>2</sub>.<sup>1835</sup>

A	20	giri <sub>17</sub> ka <sub>5</sub> <sup>a</sup> u <sub>3</sub> -bi <sub>2</sub> -in-du <sub>8</sub> en <sub>3</sub> ab-‘tar-tar-tar’-re
Ug	§ 8 I	giri <sub>17</sub> ka <sub>5</sub> <sup>a</sup> -e igi ba-an-da
	II	gi-ri ga-e i-ki ba-a[n-da]
		<i>Hyena saw Fox and (asked):</i>
A	21	ka <sub>5</sub> <sup>a</sup> ugu-ḡu <sub>10</sub> -še <sub>3</sub> nam-ḡu <sub>10</sub> ḡen-na-zu
Ug	§ 9 I	[k]a <sub>5</sub> <sup>a</sup> ugu-še <sub>3</sub> a-na-am <sub>3</sub> // mi-ḡen-na
	II	ga <sup>a</sup> u <sub>2</sub> -gu-uš-še a-[na-am(?)] // mi-ge-en-na
		<i>‘Fox, what does it matter to me that you have come to me?’</i>

The remaining lines of the Ugarit fragment are less well preserved and are not duplicated in the extant OB manuscripts, which are also fragmentary, but some parallel forms can be traced:

- In § 2 I, [i]b<sub>2</sub>-gi-gi may perhaps refer to line A 14: ‘ki x’-bar<sup>2</sup>-zu ḥe<sub>2</sub>-re-ib<sub>2</sub>-gi-gi, ‘Let (your boat) return to your ... place for your sake!’
- In § 2 II, Arnaud reads gem[e<sub>2</sub>] but a reading da[m] is perhaps possible; this would refer to dam-gar<sub>3</sub> in the OB manuscripts (A, W, *passim*).
- § 3 shows some similarities with A 15:

Ug	§ 3 I	[...] ‘ḥul’ <sup>?</sup> x-‘il <sub>2</sub> <sup>?’</sup> -gen <sub>7</sub> // [...] x ki-zu [x (x)-d]a <sup>?</sup> // [.....] bala-e šu-[x]-u <sub>4</sub> -da
	II	si-si-id [.....] // gi-ku-du-[.....] // ni-gi-na [...] // šu x x [.....]
A	15	si-sa <sub>2</sub> -bi ḥul <sup>?</sup> (text: IGI.IB)-le bi <sub>2</sub> -in-du <sub>8</sub> ḡge <sub>2</sub> -ma <sub>2</sub> / niḡ <sub>2</sub> mu-ra-dim <sub>2</sub> niḡ <sub>2</sub> -gi-na
		‘sa <sub>10</sub> <sup>?’</sup> -a / ḡešgim-ti mu-NE
W	ii 6-8	[x]-ba-a i-ib-le-e // [(x) e]n-‘ḡu <sub>10</sub> <sup>?’</sup> ḡeš-kiḡ <sub>2</sub> -ti [m]u-e-TUG <sub>2</sub>

- si-si-i[d] at the beginning of § 3 II may be a phonetic writing for si-sa<sub>2</sub>-(bi).
- gi-ku-du-[...] may be a writing for ḡge<sub>2</sub>-ma<sub>2</sub>-šu<sub>2</sub>-a; in W ii 11 ḡge<sub>2</sub>-ma<sub>2</sub>-[niḡen-n]a is attested.
- According to Alster<sup>1836</sup> i-ib-le-e (W) is a phonetic writing for ib<sub>2</sub>-bala-e that is similar to bala-e in Ug.
- ni-gi-na is a phonetic writing for niḡ<sub>2</sub>-gi-na

1833 See Arnaud 2001, 334.

1834 Alster 2005, 347: 19.

1835 For anticipatory genitive constructions see Zólyomi 1996, 39.

1836 Alster 2005, 349.

As restored here, the sequence of lines in the Ugarit tablet seems to correspond to manuscript A. Several phonetic writings are attested in the standard orthography column, but it is worth noting that some unorthographic writings are also documented in the OB manuscripts.

RS 86.2210 is not a duplicate of any of the OB sources, but it represents either a variant recension or a different composition very close to *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant*. Variation between the two extant OB manuscripts shows that this composition did not have a standardized form in the Old Babylonian period. The Ugarit text witnesses that fables involving the Fox survived in the Middle Babylonian period when the Akkadian version was added. Unfortunately, one cannot state whether the variants of RS 86.2210 depend on an unpreserved OB manuscript or whether they result from reworking by the Middle Babylonian scribal schools. As Sumerian fables of the Fox survived in the first millennium in proverb collections,<sup>1837</sup> it is possible that *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant* was transmitted to Neo Assyrian and Neo Babylonian libraries despite the lack of any preserved manuscript.

### 7.3.7 Collection of Incantations – AuOrs 23 21

**RS 17.155 = Ugaritica V 17 / AuOrS 23 21** is a large single column tablet discovered in the Bibliothèque du Lettré, containing a collection of Sumerian and Akkadian incantations.<sup>1838</sup> A total of eight or nine<sup>1839</sup> incantations set off by rulings are preserved on the tablet, of which two are in monolingual Sumerian in phonetic orthography (§§ 6, 8) and two in Akkadian, but strongly penetrated by phonetic Sumerian (§ 1, 3), while the remainder are in Akkadian (§ 2, 4, 5, 7).

The fragment **RS 15.152** discovered in the Royal Palace is a duplicate of RS 17.155. Only one side is preserved that duplicates AuOrS 23 21, 51-59<sup>1840</sup> whereas the other side is broken away.<sup>1841</sup>

AuOrS 23 21 includes incantations against very different illnesses, some of which are only partially understood. In all but § 7 Asalluḫi appears and three incantations, §§ 1, 2, 8, mention headache. The second incantation (§ 2) is against several illnesses among which are the group Lamaštu, Labašu and Aḫḫazu.<sup>1842</sup> Part of this incantation, AuOrS 23 21, 20-45,<sup>1843</sup> was incorporated into Tablet V/d of the series *Muššu'u*,<sup>1844</sup> whereas the first lines, AuOrS 23 21, 12-19,<sup>1845</sup> are not duplicated in the series. This entails that the Ugarit recension reflects an older stage than the first millennium sources. AuOrS 23 21, 71-78 (§ 7)<sup>1846</sup> is parallel to the *Tsukimoto Incantation*, 27-35,<sup>1847</sup> and is similar, even though it is not a duplicate, to lines 1-10 of another incantation discovered at Ugarit, RS 94.2178 = AuOrS 23 14.<sup>1848</sup> This text belongs to the genre of fire incantations and it is quoted in a first millennium medico-magical compendium.<sup>1849</sup>

<sup>1837</sup> SP 2.69, Alster 1997, 59, see also Lambert 1960, 262; there is also a bilingual fragment (now lost) of the Akkadian Fable of the Fox, Lambert 1960, 190.

<sup>1838</sup> For the poetic structure of this composition see Dietrich 1988, 81-87, Dietrich 1993, 48-51.

<sup>1839</sup> Nougayrol regards the Sumerian text at the end of the obverse, § 3, to be separate from the Sumero-Akkadian incantation on the beginning of the reverse, whereas Arnaud considers these two texts as part of the same incantation. For the sake of simplicity, I here follow Arnaud's partition and lineation.

<sup>1840</sup> RS 17.155 Rev. 1-12.

<sup>1841</sup> For the local script of these manuscripts, see the signs LI, TI, TAR and ŠA.

<sup>1842</sup> This incantation is also directed against *samānu*, Böck 2007, 216: 34, see also fn. 1805.

<sup>1843</sup> RS 17.155 Obv. 20-45.

<sup>1844</sup> Böck 2007, 181-220, Tablet V, 30-37, 39-68.

<sup>1845</sup> RS 17.155 Obv. 12-19.

<sup>1846</sup> RS 17.155 Rev. 20-27.

<sup>1847</sup> Tsukimoto 1999, 198, for this text see § 6.2.8. The first lines of the two incantations are different but line 27 of the *Tsukimoto Incantation* is parallel to the beginning of § 5 in the Ugarit tablet, AuOrS 23 21, 62 = RS 17.155 Rev. 13.

<sup>1848</sup> Cf. Arnaud 1995.

<sup>1849</sup> Lambert 1970, 44-45.

a) The first Sumerian incantation, AuOrS 23 21, 67-70 (§ 6),<sup>1850</sup> is a poorly understood series of formulae in phonetic orthography mentioning Enki and Asalluḫi.

b) AuOrS 23 21, 79-96<sup>1851</sup> (§ 8) contain a phonetic Sumerian forerunner to the series *Saĝ-geg* Tablet VI that has a duplicate in standard orthography from Ḫattuša in KBo 14 51, 5ff.<sup>1852</sup> This text is a Marduk-Ea incantation reporting the Marduk-Ea formula in full, contrary to the first millennium duplicates where it is abbreviated<sup>1853</sup> as is typical in late texts. The Ugarit text ends with a *zi-pa<sub>3</sub>* formula not attested in the late manuscripts. A comparison with first millennium sources is very complicated due to the use of phonetic writings in the Ugarit tablet, but the variants so far described show that it represents a very different recension.

The text is strongly penetrated to an extreme degree by phonetic orthography. The phonetic writings of AuOrS 23 21 represent almost 30% of all attestations from Ugarit and about 32% of all the effective alterations<sup>1854</sup> attested in the Ugarit script tablets. This and the presence of a standard orthography duplicate of *Saĝ-geg* Tablet VI from Ḫattuša suggest that the incantations contained in AuOrS 23 21 – or at least some of them – were transmitted to the Western periphery in standard orthography, whereas the phonetic writings should be attributed to the local copyists.

The relation between the two Ugarit manuscripts is not clear as RS 15.152 only preserves a few lines. Nevertheless, one may observe that the two copies only differ in a few purely orthographic variants:

AuOr S 23: 21	RS 15.152
<i>rab-ba</i> (56)	<i>rab-ba<sub>2</sub></i> (6)
<i>pa-ra-ši-i</i> (57)	<i>pa<sub>2</sub>-ra-ši-'i'</i> (7)
<i>ul-te-la-a</i> (61)	[...]- <i>la-a'</i> (ZA) (11)
U <sub>2</sub> .MEŠ (61)	U <sub>2</sub> '(E <sub>2</sub> ).[MEŠ] (11)

According to Arnaud,<sup>1855</sup> the collection of incantations inscribed on AuOrS 23 21 and RS 15.152 arrived at Ugarit by Hittite mediation, as shown by the presence of Hittite elements.<sup>1856</sup> The identification of KBo 14 51 as a duplicate of one of the incantations inscribed on AuOrS 23 21 may support this hypothesis. It is to be recalled that KBo 14 51 is a Babylonian tablet, so it perhaps represents the model of further Syro-Anatolian copies. It is unknown whether this collection was compiled in Babylonia or in Ḫattuša on the basis of Mesopotamian models, but the absence from AuOrS 23 21 of the first text preserved on KBo 14 51 does not exclude that several incantations were written down on a *Sammeltablet* in the Hittite capital and then transmitted to Ugarit. It is worth noting that the two Ugarit copies of *LI-LN*, which is also attested at Ḫattuša, were found in the Bibliothèque du Lettré.

The Akkadian shows the typical Babylonian dialect without Assyrian elements.<sup>1857</sup>

To sum up, the incantations inscribed on AuOrS 23 21 seem to reflect different textual traditions from the available first millennium duplicates.

1850 RS 17.155 Rev. 16-19.

1851 RS 17.155 Rev. 27-45.

1852 See § 5.1.5; see this section for the first millennium duplicates.

1853 CT 17 23, 198, SpTU II 2, 152.

1854 For this concept see § 4.5 and fn. 1047.

1855 Arnaud 2007, 13-14.

1856 Arnaud 2007, 85: 61; 86: 76; see also Nougayrol 1968, 35: 1.

1857 Note that in § 7 the Akkadian shows many variants, both orthographic and textual, to the first millennium sources of *Muššu'u* V.

## 7.3.8 AuOrS 23 13

**RS 16.416 = AuOrS 23 13** is a tiny fragment discovered in the Royal Palace and preserving six broken lines of an incantation on one side whereas the other side is broken away. The text is written in phonetic orthography as is clear from the rubric e-ne<sub>2</sub>-nu-ru.

## 7.3.9 AuOrS 23 67

**RS 25.462 = AuOrS 23 67** is a landscape tablet in Ugarit script discovered in proximity to the house of Agapšarri but stemming from the Lamaštu archive.<sup>1858</sup> Arnaud identifies this piece as a library catalogue listing Sumerian literary compositions in phonetic orthography. However, in my opinion the tablet contains a different composition, possibly a divinatory text. The same sequence of signs til-la in lines 2, 3 and 5 is more suggestive of a refrain than a list of incipits. Personally, I am not fully convinced that the text is written completely in Sumerian due to the consistent use of meš as a plural marker, which, even though attested in other texts from the Western periphery,<sup>1859</sup> does not elsewhere appear so frequently in a single tablet.<sup>1860</sup> The sequence DIŠ-aš identified by Arnaud as an indication of the beginning of a new title in the list can perhaps be read as the copula -me.<sup>1861</sup> My suggestion that this text possibly deals with divination derives from the mention of maš-maš-meš, 'diviners', (Obv. 8) and nam-uzu<sub>2</sub>, 'divination' (Obv. 9). Unfortunately, I am not able to provide an alternative reading of this text.

## 7.3.10 AuOrS 23 68

**RS 94.2372 = AuOrS 23 68** is a small fragment from the lower right-hand corner of its tablet written in Ugarit script<sup>1862</sup> discovered in the Maison d'Urtenu.<sup>1863</sup> Like the previous text, it is regarded by Arnaud as a library catalogue, but in my opinion there is no clear evidence for such a classification. Even though Arnaud's interpretation is not excluded, I would tend to consider this text as an unidentified literary composition written in phonetic Sumerian. May dam-gar<sub>3</sub> refer to Enlil in *The Fox and Enlil as Merchant*, of which a variant version is attested at Ugarit?<sup>1864</sup>

1858 van Soldt 2012, 182.

1859 See *PfK* where it appears three times, § 6.1.1.

1860 diġir-meš (Obv. 3, 4), 'a<sup>?</sup>-meš (Obv. 5), u<sub>4</sub>-meš (Obv. 7), maš-maš-meš (Obv. 8), si-meš (Obv. 10).

1861 See in particular -me-a (Obv. 7).

1862 See the shapes of the signs TI (l. 3) and RU (l. 4), LI (l. 9).

1863 Malbran-Labat 2008.

1864 See § 7.3.6.