

The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

8 The Sumerian Literary Tradition at Ḫattuša

8.1 Literary Texts

The number of Sumerian literary texts discovered in the Hittite capital is very limited. They do not represent the core of the Old Babylonian corpus but are minor compositions that are poorly attested in OB sources, as the following table demonstrates:

Composition	OB Manuscripts	Nippur Manuscripts	First Millennium
The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	0	0	-
MLM	5	1	-
Edubba E	3	1(?)	-
LI-LN	0	0	+
Nergal D	1	0	+
Dumuzi Text (D-I R?)	3	3	-

No composition belonging to the Tetrad, Decad or House F Fourteen is documented in the Hittite capital. Moreover, the number of OB Nippur manuscripts for each composition is very limited. The only texts from Ḫattuša attested in OB literary catalogues are, possibly, *Edubba E* and *LI-LN*. The first line of *Edubba E* is quoted in four literary catalogues¹⁸⁶⁵ but it is important to remember that other four compositions have the same incipit.¹⁸⁶⁶ Taking into consideration that the other texts are far more common in the Old Babylonian documentation than *Edubba E*,¹⁸⁶⁷ which is only known from three manuscripts, the literary catalogues, with all likelihood, refer to one of the these compositions.¹⁸⁶⁸ Moreover, *Edubba A*, *Edubba C* and *Dialogue 1* belong to the House F Fourteen group, whereas no exemplar of *Edubba E* was found in this building. The same incipit of *LI-LN* is attested in a catalogue of literary letters from Uruk, but it is unclear whether it actually refers to this text and no OB sources are presently known.¹⁸⁶⁹

Nevertheless, some of the Sumerian literary works from Ḫattuša probably had a curricular setting. Scribal letters and short tales like *MLM* were copied in scribal schools,¹⁸⁷⁰ likely in the Intermediary Phase of the curriculum.¹⁸⁷¹ Indeed in addition to *imgida* tablets (Type III), an extract of a few lines of *MLM* is inscribed on an OB lenticular tablet (Type IV) from Susa,¹⁸⁷² a tablet type typical of the

1865 N2: 50 (ETCSL 0.2.1), U1: 24 (ETCSL 0.2.3), U2: 33 (ETCSL 0.2.4), Y2: 6,7,8 (ETCSL 0.2.12).

1866 *Edubba A*, *Edubba C*, *Dialogue 1*, *Dialogue 3*.

1867 Robson 2001, 54.

1868 It is worth noting that in the Yale catalogue Y2 (Hallo 1982) this incipit is repeated in three consecutive lines (6-8), surely referring to different compositions.

1869 The identification of this entry in the catalogue is uncertain, § 5.3.4. Literary letters are also documented in the catalogue at Andrews University, B4 (ETCSL 0.2.11), see Huber Vulliet 2011, 495-496.

1870 Vanstiphout 1999, 83, Tinney 2011, 583-584; in three out five OB tablets of *MLM*, TLB 2 5, CT 42 41, CBS 1554, text lines are set off by rulings as is typical in school texts, cf. Tinney 2011, 581.

1871 For literary letters see Brisch 2007, Kleinerman 2011, Michalowski 2011. For the position of literary letters in the curriculum see Kleinerman 2011, 75-94, Michalowski 2011, 48-49. Minor compositions are not included in the main catalogues, which are usually oriented towards hymns and narratives, see Tinney 2011, 583.

1872 MDP 27 107, Michalowski 2011, 42.

Intermediary Phase.¹⁸⁷³ The so-called *Edubba*-texts,¹⁸⁷⁴ represented at Ḫattuša by *Edubba E*, were also used in the Intermediary Phase of scribal education¹⁸⁷⁵ as they were written on Type II tablets.¹⁸⁷⁶ The association of *MLM* and *Edubba E* with school activities at Ḫattuša is underscored by their attestation on multicolumn tablets that include phonetic Sumerian versions.¹⁸⁷⁷ It is clear that all the curricular Sumerian texts from the Hittite capital belong to the Intermediary Phase.

In addition to curricular texts, isolated Sumerian compositions¹⁸⁷⁸ were recovered at Ḫattuša. The original setting of *Nergal D* is unclear although its duplication rate – only a single OB manuscript is known – is typical of non-curricular texts. The composition is relevant, however, because it is included in the NA ‘Catalogue of Texts and Authors’ as are many important pieces of Mesopotamian scholarship. *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* is perhaps a post-Old Babylonian composition. Nevertheless, whatever the original setting of *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* was, it was used for the education of scribes at Ḫattuša as the addition of the phonetic Sumerian version and the Hittite translation indicates. The Middle Babylonian documentation offers parallel examples of OB non-curricular texts that continued to be copied as exercises after the Old Babylonian period. The text inscribed on KUB 37 41 belongs to the Dumuzi-Inana corpus which consists of liturgical compositions. Other sources (KUB 4 26+,¹⁸⁷⁹ KUB 4 41, KBo 19 98,) contain unidentified texts.

All the Sumerian literary texts from Ḫattuša are in bilingual format even though some tablets do not preserve the Akkadian translation. Hence, they reflect the work of the post-Old Babylonian scribal schools that provided OB Sumerian literary texts with Akkadian translations. Only two compositions from the Hittite capital, namely *LI-LN* and *Nergal D*, are known from the first-millennium documentation; yet the sources from Ḫattuša of these texts are very close to the late duplicates. This is particularly evident for the hymn *Nergal D* because the Ḫattuša and Nineveh manuscripts agree against the OB tablet not only in their bilingual format (even though the Akkadian translation is not preserved in KUB 4 7), but above all in their line order and the presence of segments of text unknown in the OB recension.¹⁸⁸⁰ The literary texts from Ḫattuša reflect an intermediate stage in the process of transmission of Sumerian literature to first-millennium libraries. Indeed, they do not correspond to the first-millennium (canonical) editions because texts underwent further modifications as is clear from *Nergal D* itself. Nevertheless, one may not state with full confidence whether such a late textual tradition is shared by all the Sumerian literary texts from Ḫattuša or whether it is only limited to *LI-LN* and *Nergal D*, due to the lack of first-millennium duplicates for the other compositions. Additionally, it is completely unknown whether *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad*, *MLM*, *Edubba E* and *D-I R* were indeed not transmitted to first-millennium libraries or whether duplicates have not yet been found or simply have not survived.

Most of the manuscripts of Sumerian literary texts from Ḫattuša are written in New Script and date to the 13th century. However, the reception of Sumerian literary texts was not limited to the empire period, but goes back to at least the Middle Kingdom as shown by the presence of older tablets. KBo 19 98 is written in MS and KUB 4 4, containing *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad*, is possibly older than the other manuscripts dated to the late 13th century. Further evidence for an early date of arrival in Ḫattuša of the Sumerian literary texts is provided by CTH 372-374, a group of Hittite prayers: the oldest manuscripts are written in MS and date to the Early Empire or even to an earlier period.¹⁸⁸¹ These prayers begin with a hymn to the Sun-god which ultimately turned out to be based

1873 For the Intermediary Phase and Type II and IV tablets see the Introduction.

1874 For this text type see Alster 2002, 291-293.

1875 Vanstiphout 1999, 83 places these compositions in the second level of the second phase of the scribal curriculum.

1876 See *Edubba A*, Veldhuis 1997, 66, Delnero 2006, 97-98.

1877 For the pedagogical function of phonetic Sumerian versions of standard orthography texts see § 4.5.

1878 For unique texts see Vanstiphout 1999, 82.

1879 It is unclear whether KUB 4 26+ contains a literary or a magical text, see § 5.3.7.

1880 Segments of the OB recension are also not attested in the Ḫattuša and Nineveh manuscripts.

1881 A new edition of these prayers has been provided by Schwemer 2015; one manuscript of CTH 373, KBo 25 111, may represent an OS tablet, see Vanstiphout 1999, 3.

upon an OB Sumerian hymn to Utu.¹⁸⁸² Due to the antiquity of the Hittite manuscripts, which possibly rely on even older models,¹⁸⁸³ the Sumerian hymn was received by the Hittite scribal circles, at the latest, at the beginning of the 14th century, but very likely earlier.

8.2 Incantations

The bulk of the Sumerian and bilingual compositions from Ḫattuša consist of incantations that are part of a larger body of Mesopotamian magical and medical texts discovered in the Hittite capital. Incantations are non-curricular texts and served a practical purpose. Nevertheless incantations were occasionally used in the schooling of scribes and exorcists during the Old Babylonian period.¹⁸⁸⁴ Moreover, the role of the *āšipu* in education increased in the post-Old Babylonian schools.¹⁸⁸⁵ However, the reason for such a massive presence of magical texts in the Hittite capital is not limited to the realm of education but is very much likely related to the presence of foreign experts, namely Babylonian exorcists (*āšipū*) and physicians (*asû*), at the Hittite court.¹⁸⁸⁶ Mesopotamian medical and magical texts were probably brought by these experts who used them in therapeutic and ritual practices.¹⁸⁸⁷ Sumerian and bilingual incantations possibly served the same practical use, at least at the time of their arrival.¹⁸⁸⁸ After the death of the foreign specialists who transmitted such texts to Anatolia, Hittites were probably unable to use the incantations, especially in the case of Sumerian monolingual texts. The *Marduk-Ea-Typ* and the *Prophylaktischer-Typ*, deriving from the Old Babylonian tradition, are the most common types of Sumerian incantations attested at Ḫattuša. Texts that are mainly known from the post-Old Babylonian documentation such as *Kiutu* incantations are also documented in Hittite capital.¹⁸⁸⁹

Contrary to the literary texts, most of the incantations are written in non-Hittite script, either Babylonian or Assyro-Mitannian. This is a further hint that magical texts served a practical purpose because they were written or brought by foreign specialists who actually performed these rituals.

Source	Script	Language	Old Babylonian	First Millennium
KUB 30 1	LOB/MB	S	+	-
KUB 37 109 ¹	LOB/MB	S	(+)	-
KUB 30 2	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KUB 30 4	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KUB 30 3	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KUB 37 108 + KUB 37 110	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KBo 36 13	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KBo 36 15	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KBo 36 16	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KBo 40 103	LOB/MB	S	?	?
KBo 36 21	LOB/MB(?)	S	?	?
KBo 36 19	LOB/MB	S	?	?

¹⁸⁸² Metcalf 2011; for the OB text see Cavigneaux 2009.

¹⁸⁸³ See Schwemer 2015, 363.

¹⁸⁸⁴ Schwemer 2011, 422; for the schooling purpose of magical texts at Ḫattuša see Cohen 2012b.

¹⁸⁸⁵ J. Cale Johnson, 'Scribe and Scholar, Physician and Exorcist', paper presented at the 60th RAI in Warsaw.

¹⁸⁸⁶ Beckman 1983.

¹⁸⁸⁷ See Schwemer 2013.

¹⁸⁸⁸ Schwemer (Schwemer 2013), however, does not assign any practical use to Sumerian and bilingual incantations.

¹⁸⁸⁹ For the types of Sumerian incantations see Falkenstein 1939, Cunningham 1997, Geller 2002.

Source	Script	Language	Old Babylonian	First Millennium
KBo 13 37	Bab	SA(?)	?	?
KBo 14 51	MB	S	a) ? b) -	a) ? b) +
CTH 794	Ass-Mit	SA	a) - b) -	a) - b) +
KBo 36 11+	Ass-Mit	SA	a) + b) ? c) ? d) +	a) + b) ? c) ? d) +
KUB 37 143	Ass-Mit	S (A)	+	+
KUB 37 101	Ass-Mit	SA	?	?
KUB 37 102	Ass-Mit	SA	(+)	+
KUB 37 107	Ass-Mit	(S) A	?	?
KUB 37 95	Ass-Mit	S (A?)	?	?
KUB 4 16	Ass-Mit	(S) A	+	+
KUB 34 3	Ass-Mit	SA	-	-
KUB 37 127	Ass-Mit	SA	?	?
KUB 4 23	MS/NS	SA	?	?
KUB 4 11	NS	SA	+	+
KUB 37 111	NS	SA	~ +	~ +
KBo 36 17	NS	SA	?	?
KBo 1 18	NS	S	-	-
KUB 4 24	NS	S	(+)	+
ABOT 1 43	NS	S (A?)	?	?
KBo 36 20	NS	S	?	?
KUB 34 4	NS	SA	?	?
KUB 37 92	(?)	S	?	?
KBo 36 14	(?)	S	?	?
KBo 36 18	(?)	SA	?	?

1 Probably it belongs to KUB 30 1.

The proportions of monolingual and bilingual texts are almost identical, but the majority of the monolingual incantations¹⁸⁹⁰ are inscribed on Babylonian script tablets (CTH 800), whereas only a few are attested in Hittite NS. All the Assyro-Mitannian texts are instead bilingual.

The arrival of magical texts in Ḫattuša is usually dated to the Late Hittite Empire period,¹⁸⁹⁰ but, as here suggested, the aforementioned group of Babylonian tablets containing monolingual Sumerian incantations (CTH 800) was possibly imported along with other booty from the raid of Muṣili I on Babylonia.¹⁸⁹¹ Therefore, the initial Hittite contact with Sumerian texts probably dates to an earlier period than previously believed.¹⁸⁹² It is likely that these tablets did not reach the Hittite capital alone but arrived in the wake of *āšipū*-priests travelling to Ḫattuša,¹⁸⁹³ and they may constitute the earliest evidence for Mesopotamian material at Ḫattuša together with

¹⁸⁹⁰ Beckman 1983, 101, Klinger 2005, 107; according to Klinger 1998, 369, there is no attestation of Mesopotamian scholarly texts in the Old Hittite period.

¹⁸⁹¹ See § 5.1.1.

¹⁸⁹² Cf. Klinger 2005, 108.

¹⁸⁹³ Foreign scribes are attested at the Hittite capital since the time of Ḫattušili I, Klinger 1998, 372; for the arrival of scribes after the campaigns of Ḫattušili I and Muṣili I see van den Hout 2012a, 41.

the unpreserved models of the Hittite Sargonic legends¹⁸⁹⁴ and the aforementioned prayers to the Sun-god.

Due to the fragmentary nature of most of the manuscripts, many incantations are unidentified and it is unknown whether they had either OB or first-millennium duplicates. OB duplicates are only known for a few texts and these are very limited in number:

Incantations with OB Duplicates				
Source	Script	OB Tablets	Provenance	First Millennium
KUB 30 1	LOB/MB	3	Sippar Sippar Nippur	-
KBo 36 11+	Ass-Mit	a) 1 d) 1	a) Non-Nippur d) Nippur	a) + d) +
KUB 37 143	Ass-Mit	4	Nippur (2) Sippar Unknown	+
KUB 37 102	Ass-Mit	(0)	?	+
KUB 4 16	Ass-Mit	1 ¹	Sippar	+
KUB 37 111	NS	~ 1 ²	Sippar	~ +
KUB 4 11	NS	1	Sippar	+

1 This number only refers to the manuscript preserving the quoted passage(s).
2 This number only refers to the manuscript preserving the quoted passage(s).

With the exception of KUB 30 1, possibly joining with KUB 37 109, all the incantations from Ḫattuša attested in OB manuscripts are bilingual.¹⁸⁹⁵ Almost all the texts attested in late copies entered canonical series, mostly *Udug-ḫul*. From this group KUB 37 111 is kept separate because although it is similar to *Udug-ḫul* Tablet IV it does not duplicate the canonical recension:

Canonical Series	Source	Format	Script
Udug-ḫul II	KUB 4 24	Monolingual	NS
Udug-ḫul III/VI (?)	KUB 37 102	Bilingual - Interlinear	Ass-Mit
Udug-ḫul V	KBo 36 11+(d)	Bilingual - Columns	Ass-Mit
Udug-ḫul VI	KUB 4 16	Bilingual - Columns	Ass-Mit
Udug-ḫul VII	KUB 37 143	Bilingual - Columns	Ass-Mit
Saḡ-geg VI	KBo 14 51	Monolingual (?)	MB
Muššu'u VI	KBo 36 11+(a)	Bilingual - Columns	Ass-Mit
Biṭ rimki House II	CTH 794(b)	Bilingual - Interlinear	Ass-Mit

Most of the tablets containing incantations that are forerunners of canonical series are written in Assyro-Mitannian script. The primary reason for this is the better preservation of these manuscripts compared to tablets written in other scripts, but it may also reflect the position of the Assyro-Mitannian texts in the standardization process. As explained below, Assyro-Mitannian texts reflect a later stage than the monolingual incantations CTH 800. It is not precluded that in the case of the CTH 800 incantations, there is a connection between their older stage and the lack of any first-millennium duplicate. The position of Hittite script incantations is not easy to evaluate due to the fragmentary nature of most of the tablets. However, it is to be recalled that KUB 4 11 is to be added to the list of Hittite script texts with first-millennium duplicates even though *Incantation to Utu* was never canonized.

Our comprehension of the relation between the incantations from Ḫattuša and the OB and first-

1894 Beckman 1983, 100-102.

1895 It is worth noting that within this group the only monolingual text, KUB 30 1, is also the only one without any preserved first-millennium duplicate.

millennium sources is greatly limited by the poor preservation of manuscripts, even when duplicates are known. The texts from the Hittite capital do not show a homogeneous picture because they display different degrees of variation when compared to their earlier and later duplicates. First, it should be remarked that no text corresponds to its first-millennium recension with the possible exception of KUB 37 102 (UH III/VI) which, however, bears a very common and formulaic text that can be found in almost identical form not only over time,¹⁸⁹⁶ but also in different magical series. Another text similar to its first-millennium duplicates is the forerunner to the series *Saġ-geġ* KBo 14 51, but several remarks are required: (1) only a small section of the text is preserved; (2) variants are nevertheless attested; (3) this text appears quite similar in all the sources; (4) above all, this is a Babylonian script tablet, hence it is not surprising that it is close to the first-millennium recension. On the contrary the forerunner to *Udug-ḫul* Tablet II, KUB 4 24, is far removed from the first-millennium recension, reflecting an older stage, but unfortunately the Old Babylonian manuscripts are unknown. To my knowledge, this is the oldest manuscript of the second tablet of the series. An additional text different from its first-millennium duplicates is the *Kiutu* incantation CTH 794b.

Texts with both OB and first-millennium duplicates do not present a uniform picture. The Marduk-Ea incantation inscribed on KBo 36 11+(a) is close to both OB and late (*Muššu'u*) recensions as this text shows a high degree of stability over time. The forerunner to *Udug-ḫul* Tablet V inscribed on the same tablet, KBo 36 11+(d), also shows similarity to both OB and first-millennium sources.¹⁸⁹⁷ The *Udug-ḫul* incantation inscribed on KUB 4 16 seems closer to the canonical recension, but it is necessary to note that where it differs from the late duplicates, the latter agree with the OB text. KUB 37 111 differs from both OB and late sources which, however, are similar to each other. Finally, the bilingual recension of *Incantation to Utu*, KUB 4 11, deviates from both OB and first-millennium sources, but an elevated degree of variation is attested among all the manuscripts and this composition never received a canonical form.

On the whole, Sumerian and bilingual incantations from Ḫattuša deviate from both the extant OB and first-millennium sources because they reflect different textual traditions. Only in the case of texts with a high degree of stability from the Old Babylonian period to the first millennium do the Ḫattuša tablets agree with duplicates. Usually, incantations from Ḫattuša represent a stage older than the first-millennium manuscripts as is particularly evident for the *Udug-ḫul* series. Also compared to the MA sources, which are very close to the first-millennium recensions,¹⁸⁹⁸ incantations from the Hittite capital clearly reflect an older stage in the standardization process.¹⁸⁹⁹ The division into tablets, a sign of the systematization occurring in the first millennium that is already attested in the MA tablets, is completely unknown in the texts from Ḫattuša. Moreover, unlike first-millennium sources that organize incantations in typologically coherent series (e.g. *Udug-ḫul*), the archives of the Hittite capital yielded *Sammel tafeln* combining various types of incantations, including Akkadian texts. Comparable examples of *Sammel tafeln* containing incantations of different types are known from the OB documentation.¹⁹⁰⁰ This is a further piece of evidence for the close relationship of the incantations from Ḫattuša to their OB stage. Nevertheless, collections of typologically related incantations¹⁹⁰¹ are attested at Ḫattuša as proven by the Babylonian tablet KUB 30 1 which belongs to a collection of several tablets.¹⁹⁰² Besides bilingual sources, a monolingual forerunner to *Udug-ḫul* is attested at Ḫattuša on KUB 4 24 that is also the only forerunner of this series inscribed on a Hittite script tablet – the rest of the manuscripts are Assyro-Mitannian tablets. KUB 4 24 and possibly KBo 14 51 are also the only incantations attested in a monolingual version from the Hittite capital that have first-millennium duplicates.

Due to the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts, only a limited number of incantations preserve the rubric and some of them do not report it.

1896 It needs to be remembered that the OB manuscripts are broken and do not preserve this passage.

1897 KUB 37 143 is too poorly preserved to be compared with earlier and later duplicates.

1898 See § 2.1.6.1; the MA tablets are also later in date.

1899 See in particular KUB 4 24, § 5.3.9.

1900 Geller 1985, 5

1901 The term ‘series’ is here avoided as it usually only refers to first-millennium recensions.

1902 See the subscript, § 5.1.1.

Source	Script	Language	Rubric
KUB 30 1	LOB/MB	S	Full
KUB 37 108+110	LOB/MB	S	Full
KBo 36 19	LOB/MB	S	Full
KBo 14 51	MB	S	Full
KBo 36 11+	Ass-Mit	SA	a) ? b) - c) - d) -
KBo 1 18	NS	S	-
KUB 4 24	NS	S	Full
KUB 37 92	(?)	S	Full

All the preserved rubrics are appended exclusively to Sumerian monolingual texts, and they show the full form $en_2-e_2-nu-ru$ ¹⁹⁰³ typical of the OB texts.¹⁹⁰⁴ It is worth noting that most of the manuscripts preserving rubrics are Babylonian tablets. This further underscores the old tradition behind some magical texts from Ḫattuša, notably the CTH 800 incantations where most of the occurrences are found. The late abbreviated form en_2 was probably also appended to some bilingual texts as attested in the contemporaneous sources from Emar and Ugarit, but none are preserved.

Marduk-Ea incantations are named for the dialogue between the two gods in which Enki/Ea instructs his son Asalluḫi/Marduk.¹⁹⁰⁵ In the OB texts, the Marduk-Ea formula appears in a long form whereas in late texts it is abbreviated to its first and last lines: $^dAsar-lu_2-ḫi igi im-ma-an-šum_2 / ḡen-na dumu-ḡu_{10} ^dAsar-lu_2-ḫi$. Only a few tablets preserve the Marduk-Ea formula and none of them is written in Hittite script.

Source	Script	Marduk-Ea Formula
KUB 30 1	LOB/MB	abbreviated
KUB 30 3	LOB/MB	complete
KUB 30 4	LOB/MB	complete
KBo 36 15	LOB/MB	abbreviated
KBo 40 103	LOB/MB	abbreviated
KBo 36 11+(a)	Ass-Mit	unorthodox
KBo 36 11+(b)	Ass-Mit	abbreviated
CTH 794a	Ass-Mit	abbreviated

The most common form is the abbreviated formula, but the presence of complete ones once more witnesses that Sumerian incantations from the Hittite capital reflect an intermediate stage between the Old Babylonian period and the first millennium, in which old and late features coexist.

8.3 Tablet Format

Bilingual tablets containing literary texts and incantations are attested in both interlinear and parallel column formats, with very similar proportions.¹⁹⁰⁶ There is no connection between format and script as both formats are documented in tablets of each script.¹⁹⁰⁷

1903 in- e_2 - nu - ru in phonetic Sumerian.

1904 In KUB 37 92 the rubric is appended to an Akkadian incantation following a probable monolingual Sumerian text.

1905 Falkenstein 1931, 53-58, 90.

1906 Parallel column format is slightly prevalent (sixteen to twelve manuscripts), but some fragments may belong to the same tablets, e.g. KUB 37 143, KUB 37 101, KUB 37 102.

1907 Tablets identified as LOB/MB are obviously not at issue here as they contain monolingual texts only.

Composition	Source	Script	Format	OB	First Millennium
Incantation	KBo 13 37 ¹	Bab	Interlinear(?)	?	?
Incantation	KBo 36 11+	Ass-Mit	Columns	a) + b) ? c) ? d) +	a) + b) ? c) ? d) +
Incantation	KUB 37 143	Ass-Mit	Columns	+	+
Incantation	KUB 37 101	Ass-Mit	Columns	?	?
Incantation	KUB 37 102	Ass-Mit	Columns	(+)	+
Incantation	KUB 37 107	Ass-Mit	Columns	?	?
Incantation	KUB 4 16	Ass-Mit	Columns	+	+
Incantation	KUB 37 95	Ass-Mit	Columns(?)	?	?
Incantation	CTH 794	Ass-Mit	Interlinear	a) - b) -	a) - b) +
Incantation	KUB 34 3	Ass-Mit	Interlinear (<i>Glossenkeil</i>)	-	-
Incantation	KUB 37 127	Ass-Mit	Interlinear	?	?
Unidentified Text	KBo 19 98	MS	Interlinear	?	?
Incantation	KUB 4 23	MS/NS	Interlinear	?	?
The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8 KBo 12 72 KUB 4 4 KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73	NS	Columns	-	-
MLM	KUB 4 2 KUB 4 97 AuOrS 23 50	NS	Columns	+	-
Nergal D	KUB 4 7	NS	Columns	+	+
Hymn to Nergal (?)	KUB 4 41	NS	Columns	?	?
Eduḫba E	KUB 57 126	NS	Columns	+	-
LI-LN	KUB 4 39	NS	Columns	(+)	+
Incantation	ABOT 1 43	NS	Columns	?	?
Incantation	KUB 4 11	NS	Interlinear	+	+
Incantation	KUB 37 111	NS	Interlinear ²	~+	~+
Incantation	KBo 36 17	NS	Interlinear	?	?
Incantation	KUB 34 4	NS	Interlinear (<i>Glossenkeil</i>)	?	?
Unidentified Text	KBo 36 24	NS	Columns	?	?
Unidentified Text	KUB 4 10	NS(?)	Columns	?	?
Dumuzi Text (D-I R?)	KUB 37 41	(?)	Interlinear	+	-
Incantation	KBo 36 18	(?)	Interlinear	?	?

1 It is unclear whether the text is bilingual.

2 Occasionally *Glossenkeile* are present.

Incantations are written in both formats in almost equal numbers whereas most of the literary texts are written in parallel column format with the exception of the Dumuzi composition KUB 37 41 and the unidentified text KBo 19 98 in MS. This, however, reflects the nature of literary texts as learning tools: three out of six literary texts in parallel column format also contain versions in phonetic Sumerian and Hittite, which clearly result from pedagogical activities. Hence, the format of the original Babylonian models is unknown. A pedagogical function can be supposed for those texts, both incantations and literary compositions, written on prisms (KBo 1 18, KBo 19 98, KUB 4 39, KUB 4 41), a format unknown to the Hittites¹⁹⁰⁸ but often used for school texts in Mesopotamia during the Old Babylonian period.¹⁹⁰⁹

Tablet format has no correlation with the transmission of texts to the first millennium as both formats may have late duplicates. The situation in Ḫattuša parallels that found in the Middle Babylonian texts where both formats are found in similar quantity. As with the Middle Babylonian texts, this reflects a stage in the transmission of Sumerian literary texts in which there was no standardized format, contrary to the later Middle Assyrian tablets.¹⁹¹⁰

8.4 Tradition and Reception

Throughout this work, it has been argued that several Sumerian texts from Ḫattuša reflect a textual tradition stemming from Northern Babylonia. This is very clear for the unorthographic monolingual incantations CTH 800 because phonetic orthography was a convention particularly adopted in Northern Babylonia during the Old Babylonian period.¹⁹¹¹ Another unorthographic text found at Ḫattuša but written on a Hittite script tablet is KUB 4 26+, although its nature (literary or magical text) is unclear. It is not precluded that this text was transmitted to the Western periphery in phonetic orthography.

The Assyro-Mitannian incantations that are written in standard orthography are the work of Northern Mesopotamian scribal circles,¹⁹¹² regardless of where they were actually drafted. Consequently, it seems reasonable to assume that they reflect textual versions typical of Northern Babylonia.

The available OB sources of incantations entered in the series *Udug-ḫul* usually show a very high degree of similarity to each other, probably because they participated in a common tradition that was widespread throughout Mesopotamia. This is not the place for an extensive treatment of the OB incantations but suffice it to say that Sippar manuscripts of forerunners to *Udug-ḫul* are close to the Nippur tablets.¹⁹¹³ On the contrary, some *Udug-ḫul* incantations from Ḫattuša are quite different from the extant OB manuscripts from Nippur and other sites.

The situation for literary texts is more complex. As pointed out above, there are only a few OB Nippur manuscripts of the compositions attested at Ḫattuša. Nevertheless, several Sumerian literary texts from the Hittite capital ultimately trace back to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition: *MLM*, *Edubba E*, *LI-LN*. During the 13th century, scribal schools in Nippur flourished once again after a period of decline in the early Kassite period,¹⁹¹⁴ boosting the dissemination of texts relying on the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition in Mesopotamia and in the Western periphery. However, the fact that a composition reflects the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition does not in itself imply that the Mesopotamian models transmitted to Anatolia contained the textual variants that were known, for instance, in Nippur. Direct interconnections with Kassite Nippur can only be seen in the Emar documentation and not at Ḫattuša.¹⁹¹⁵ Therefore, it is not precluded that even those texts belonging to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition were transmitted to the

1908 See Waal 2012, 224.

1909 Tinney 1999, 160.

1910 Cf. Cooper 1971, 5-6.

1911 See § 4.

1912 See Schwemer 1998, 50.

1913 See § 1.1.10.1.

1914 Hallo 1989; for a more extensive treatment of Nippur in the post-Old Babylonian period see §§ 9.4, 10.

1915 See § 9.4.

Hittite capital in a variant textual form, perhaps stemming from Northern Babylonian centers, as part of a common Mesopotamian body of knowledge.¹⁹¹⁶ These compositions probably belong to a widespread repertoire used in the Intermediary Phase of the curriculum. Indeed, towards the end of the Old Babylonian period scribes from southern Mesopotamia emigrated to the North, thereby disseminating their repertoire of texts. Another text possibly linked to the Nippur tradition is the Dumuzi composition inscribed on KUB 37 41 because the majority of the OB manuscripts for Dumuzi-Inana hymns were found in Nippur. However, due to the fragmentary nature of the manuscript it cannot be ascertained whether the text was entirely written in phonetic orthography. The literary compositions *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* and *Nergal D* cannot be assigned to any specific segment of the Sumerian literary tradition. If Sumerian literary and magical texts were transmitted to Ḫattuša from centers located in Northern Babylonia, it is nearly impossible to locate those centers more precisely.¹⁹¹⁷ The widespread importance of Sippar as a religious and intellectual center would make the city of the god Šamaš the privileged place for the origin of the Mesopotamian scholarly material transmitted to the Hittite capital. The attestation of a copy of *Incantation to Utu* at Ḫattuša could strengthen this hypothesis. However, it should be noted that the available OB sources from Sippar differ from the manuscripts from Ḫattuša.¹⁹¹⁸ Moreover, the Sippar manuscripts of *Incantation to Utu* also diverge from KUB 4 11.

A comparison with the LBA Mesopotamian sources clearly shows that none of the Middle Babylonian or Middle Assyrian Sumerian texts, which are mostly from Nippur or belong to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition, are attested at Ḫattuša. Particularly important is the absence of *Lugal-e* and *Angim* which are documented in both Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian corpora and were transmitted to first-millennium libraries. Emesal liturgies are completely absent from the documentation of Ḫattuša as well as from Emar and Ugarit.¹⁹¹⁹ The only compositions from Ḫattuša with LBA Mesopotamian duplicates are incantations. The series *Udug-ḫul* is attested in all the LBA corpora¹⁹²⁰ but only Tablet VII is known from both Ḫattuša¹⁹²¹ and Mesopotamian manuscripts. Unfortunately, no parallel passages are preserved.¹⁹²² It is not a coincidence that, besides *Udug-ḫul* incantations, *Incantation to Utu*, which originated in Northern Babylonia, is the only composition that is documented at Ḫattuša and in Middle Babylonian sources.

It is quite likely that the same paths of transmission were followed by at least some pieces of Akkadian literature.¹⁹²³ The Mesopotamian manuscripts of the Sargonic tales documented at Ḫattuša¹⁹²⁴ probably stem from Northern Babylonia¹⁹²⁵ even though the Hittite texts were possibly enriched by a tradition preserved from the time of the Old Assyrian merchants of Kaniš.¹⁹²⁶ It is not a coincidence that the only preserved OB source of one of the Sargonic tales attested at Ḫattuša in a Hittite ver-

1916 One of the unorthographic incantations inscribed on KUB 30 1 is known in standard orthography sources from Nippur and Sippar.

1917 Arguing that Northern Babylonia was the source of the Sumerian material from the Hittite capital by no means precludes that the transmission was mediated by other centers and/or scribal milieu.

1918 See KUB 30 1 (§ 5.1.1) and KBo 36 11+ (§ 5.2.1). This is probably associated with a certain degree of similarity between Sippar and Nippur sources.

1919 The only text possibly partially written in Emesal dialect is KUB 37 41, if it actually contains *D-I R*.

1920 Not all the tablets of this series are preserved in either MB or MA corpora.

1921 KUB 37 143.

1922 For the possible MB tablet see § 1.1.10.1.

1923 I here refer to compositions transmitted to Ḫattuša without Hurrian mediation; for the role of Mitanni in the transmission of Mesopotamian literature see Beckman 1983, Archi 2007.

1924 Beckman 2001.

1925 For different hypotheses on the transmission to Anatolia of the tales regarding the Old Akkadian rulers see Westenholz 2011, 286-291. For the Northern Babylonian orthographic conventions of KBo 19 98 see Westenholz 1997, 282.

1926 van de Mierop 2000, 157; the preservation of this tradition from the Old Assyrian period may explain the popularity of tales of the Sargonic rulers in the Hittite world (de Martino 1993, Beckman 2001, 88-91); this popularity is much more evident when compared with the Gilgameš epos, which seems to be limited to scribal circles, see Beckman 2003, 37-38.

sion, *Gula-AN and the Seventeen Kings against Naram-Sîn*,¹⁹²⁷ is a tablet from Sippar.¹⁹²⁸ Differences between the two recensions¹⁹²⁹ may simply be explained by the fact that the Hittite version is a free adaptation like all the texts in the Hittite language related to the Old Akkadian kings.¹⁹³⁰ Contrary to the Sumerian-Akkadian compositions, the Hittite versions of the Sargonic legends are not appended to the original Mesopotamian texts in a parallel column, but they represent independent editions as is clear from the absence of Akkado-Hittite bilingual tablets.¹⁹³¹ Consequently, there is no need to assume that both the Sippar and the Hittite sources must go back to Old Akkadian traditions as claimed by G. Westenholz.¹⁹³²

The Sumerian texts from the Hittite capital do not represent a homogeneous stage in the history of Sumerian literature. The unorthographic monolingual incantations reflect the OB stage. The Assyro-Mitannian texts represent a later stage resulting from the process of the adaptation and selection of Old Babylonian material made by the post-Old Babylonian scribal schools. The presence on an Assyro-Mitannian manuscript of a *Kiutu* incantation, a type of composition that is mostly attested in post-Old Babylonian sources, further evidences the later stage of this group of tablets. However, when the Assyro-Mitannian texts were written down this process was still in its initial phase.

Literary texts also reflect the post-Old Babylonian stage in the process of transmission. One composition, *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad*, was perhaps composed or deeply reworked during the Kassite period.

Akkadian translations reflect different stages in the standardization process. For instance the Akkadian translation of the Assyro-Mitannian incantation KBo 36 11 +(a) differs from its first-millennium duplicates, whereas that of *LI-LN* (KUB 4 39), in Hittite script, is very close to the late copies.

To sum up, the Sumerian texts discovered in the Hittite capital reflect the almost completely lost Sumerian textual corpus of the Late Old Babylonian and Middle Babylonian period. Different literary and textual traditions are represented in the Sumerian texts from Ḫattuša. However, it seems that a substantial part of this material was received from the Northern Babylonian scribal schools. The nearly contemporaneous Middle Babylonian texts (approximately 13th century), mostly from Nippur, have little relation to the corpus from the Hittite capital.

The transmission of Sumerian texts to the Hittite capital did not occur at a single moment but in several waves. Similarly, different phases of transmission can be seen for the Akkadian literary texts as illustrated by the epic of Gilgameš.¹⁹³³ Dissemination of the Mesopotamian material to Anatolia also involved foreign scribes employed in the Hittite court as masters and translators who, beginning in the 17th and 16th century, started a form of schooling.¹⁹³⁴ The best known case is that of Ḫanikkuli, the author of the Naram-Sîn prisms (KBo 19 98-99), whose father was a Mesopotamian scribe working at the Hittite court.¹⁹³⁵ He belongs to the second generation of Mesopotamian specialists settled at Ḫattuša that was already assimilated into Hittite culture, bearing Hittite names and writing in Hittite script. The chronological sequence of the Sumerian material from the Hittite capital may be sketched as follows:

1927 KBo 3 13 (CTH 311).

1928 BM 79989, Westenholz 1997, 246-257. For the role of the Naram-Sîn texts in Late Old Babylonian Sippar see Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 226 n. 27.

1929 van de Mierop 2000, 138-140, Westenholz 2011, 294-298.

1930 See Torri 2009b.

1931 For a list of Akkado-Hittite literary texts see Klinger 2010, 311.

1932 Westenholz 2011, 297; note that the OA pronunciation of the land of Marḫaši as Baraḫšum/Paraḫšum (RGTC 1, 24-25; 2, 25, 128; 3, 38, 160), assumed by Westenholz as evidence of the OA tradition of the Hittite text, is attested in the Akkadian version of *MLM* (l. 24), see § 5.3.2.

1933 At least two different Akkadian versions were known at Ḫattuša, George 2003, 24-27, see also Beckman 2003, 48-49, Klinger 2005, 114-117.

1934 See Gordin 2013, 68-69.

1935 Beckman 1983; for this scribe see also van den Hout 2009, 82-83, Gordin 2013, 67-69, Schwemer 2013.

Old Kingdom	Monolingual Incantations in phonetic orthography (CTH 800)
Middle Kingdom	Sumerian Forerunner to the Hittite Prayers to the Sun-god Prism KBo 19 98
Early Empire	Assyro-Mitannian Incantations Fragment KUB 4 23 (?) The Hymn to Iškur-Adad (model of KUB 4 4?) Saĝ-geĝ VI (KBo 14 51)
Late Empire	Literary Texts New Script Incantations

For the sake of simplicity tablets with different scripts, i.e. of different provenance, are listed together in the table, but the reader must be aware that the proposed dating has different meanings in relation to the script. As far as the LOB/MB Sumerian monolingual incantations are concerned, internal evidence leads us to date their importation after the raid of Muršili I to Babylonia; consequently their drafting should be placed slightly earlier. Assyro-Mitannian tablets are also here regarded as manuscripts imported after the defeat of the Mitannian kingdom by Suppiluliuma I in the middle of the 14th century.¹⁹³⁶ These tablets were drafted around the same period or possibly earlier in the late 15th century. On the contrary, if Assyro-Mitannian tablets were drafted in Ḫattuša by Assyrian scribes working in the Hittite capital, they were perhaps written down later in the 14th century or even in the early 13th century.¹⁹³⁷ The dating of the Hittite NS tablets obviously refers to the time of their drafting, not of the reception of their Mesopotamian models. The case of *The Hymn to Iškur Adad* illustrates that NS tablets may be copies of earlier manuscripts, hence relying on Mesopotamian models that arrived at an earlier date. The oldest preserved Hittite copy of a Sumerian text is the MS tablet KBo 19 98.

Two further aspects deserve attention, namely the role of Mitanni and Assyria in the transmission of Sumerian texts to Anatolia. The Hurrian milieu, which played an important role in the transmission of Akkadian scholarly material to Anatolia as exemplified by the epic of Gilgameš, seems, conversely, not to have exerted any influence in the reception of Sumerian texts by Hittites, as already argued by previous studies.¹⁹³⁸ The role played by the Assyrian scribal schools is more opaque especially because of its implications for the whole history of the Sumerian literature in the LBA. On the one hand, the Assyro-Mitannian texts, whatever their origin,¹⁹³⁹ clearly speak for Assyrian mediation in the transmission of Sumerian texts to Anatolia. Assyro-Mitannian tablets are copies of Babylonian texts transmitted to the Assyrian scribal schools and represent a bridge to Anatolia for the Mesopotamian material.¹⁹⁴⁰ However, this role seems to be limited to magical texts dated to the mid-14th century. When we move to literary texts, we find a very different picture with only scant traces of Assyrianisms that reflect nothing more than common features of peripheral Akkadian. It is worth noting that none of the texts from the Hittite capital is attested in the MA documentation from the 13th - 12th century. It is remarkable that *LI-LN*, which is known in two NA manuscripts from Assur, is absent from the Middle Assyrian documentation. This probably indicates that much material is lost to us¹⁹⁴¹ although it cannot be excluded that *LI-LN* was only transmitted to Assur in the first millennium. One must also take into account that the conquest of Babylon by Tukulti-Ninurta I and the consequent importation of scholarly material likely led to the replacement of the older tradition with a new one.¹⁹⁴²

1936 See § 8.5.

1937 Due to the difference between Assyro-Mitannian script and the Middle Assyrian script of the 13th century I would not be inclined to date these tablets to the late 13th century.

1938 See Beckman 1983, Klinger 2005.

1939 Whether they are a form of MA texts, or the product of Assyrian scribal circles under Mitannian rule, or the work of Assyrian scribes at the Hittite court, they issue from the Assyrian milieu.

1940 Doubtless, these texts were received by Assyrian scribal schools already in bilingual format; Klinger 2010, 335, expresses the same view.

1941 According to S. Maul (personal communication) there are no Sumerian texts among the circa 100 unpublished MA tablets belonging to a library, see § 2.

1942 Note, however, that some remains of an older tradition are perhaps found in Assur in Rm 376, see § 2.1.6.4.

In order to understand the lines of transmission, the Akkadian hymn on the supremacy of the Sun-god¹⁹⁴³ inscribed on a tablet from Ḫattuša, KBo 1 12,¹⁹⁴⁴ and on a MB manuscript discovered at Assur, KAR 19,¹⁹⁴⁵ is of little help. Unfortunately, the two manuscripts only overlap for a few lines in a fragmentary context.¹⁹⁴⁶ Even though variants are attested,¹⁹⁴⁷ perhaps suggesting different textual traditions, the parallel passage is too limited to determine to what extent the two manuscripts deviated from each other. Hence, we cannot state whether or not the tablet from the Hittite capital relies on the same textual tradition as KAR 19. This question is also tied to the time when KAR 19 was imported to Assur, namely after Tukulti-Ninurta's raid like many other MB tablets, or before. The fragmentary nature of the manuscripts does not allow us to choose between an independent transmission of this composition to Ḫattuša and an Assyrian mediation. To sum up, the role of Assyrian scribes in the dissemination of Sumerian texts to Anatolia in the 15th and 14th century is evident, but for the late 13th century there are no clear data at hand.

8.5 Archival Distribution

Sumerian literary and magical texts with recorded find-spots were discovered in several areas but they mainly come from Building A in Büyükkale:

CTH	Publication	Find-spot	Composition	Script	Language
Building A (Bk. A)					
800.1	KUB 30 1	Room 5 - along the southern half of the eastern wall, in tablet debris ¹	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
800.4	KUB 37 109	Room 5 - along the southern half of the eastern wall, in tablet debris	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
800.4	KUB 37 108 + KUB 37 110	Room 5 - along the southern half of the eastern wall, in tablet debris	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
800	KBo 40 103	Room 5 - along the southern half of the eastern wall, in tablet debris	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
800.2	KUB 30 2	Room 5 - northern end, in tablet debris	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
800.4	KUB 30 3	Room 6 - northern side, in tablet debris	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
800.3	KUB 30 4	Room 6 - northern side, in tablet debris	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
805.1	KBo 36 11+	Rooms 4, 5, 6 ²	Collection of Incantations	Ass-Mit	S A
819	KUB 37 127	Room 4	Incantation	Ass-Mit	S A
805.3	KUB 37 107	Room 5 - center, in tablet debris	Incantation	Ass-Mit	(S) A
806.3	KUB 37 95	Room 5 - along the southern half of the eastern wall, in tablet debris	Incantation	Ass-Mit	S (A?)
813	KUB 34 3	Büyükkale t/9 - debris over Hittite layer	Incantation	Ass-Mit	S A
813	KUB 34 4	Room 4 - northern side, in tablet debris	Incantation	NS	S A
795	KUB 37 41	Room 5 - northern side, in tablet debris	Dumuzi Text (D-I R?)	(?)	S A
813	KUB 37 92	Outside the southern side of Room 6 of magazine building, in tablet debris	Collection of Incantations	(?)	S
819	KBo 36 18	Room 5 - southeastern side, in tablet debris	Unidentified Text	(?)	S A

1943 Ebeling 1954, Seux 1976, 66-70, Foster 2005, 747-748.

1944 KBo 1 12 is an Akkado-Hittite bilingual tablet in parallel column format, Archi 2007, 185.

1945 For the MB date of KAR 19 see Pedersén 1985-1986, Vol. I, 38.

1946 See Seux 1976, 66.

1947 See Seux 1976, 69 n. 35, 70 n. 42.

CTH	Publication	Find-spot	Composition	Script	Language
Building C (Bk. C)					
805.2	KUB 37 143	Büyükkale q-r/16-17 - debris under Phrygian city wall	Incantation	Ass-Mit	SA
Building D (Bk. D)					
800	KBo 36 16	Büyükkale p-q/10-11 - from Phrygian layer	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
801	KBo 36 21	Büyükkale p/8 - under the first Phrygian layer	Incantation	LOB/MB(?)	S
794	KBo 7 1 + KUB 37 115 (+) KBo 7 2	KBo 7 1: Büyükkale m/13 - Room 3 - northern end KUB 37 115: Büyükkale m-n/9-10 - surface find KBo 7 2: Büyükkale n/11 - Room x - ca. 8 m in front of northern wall	Collection of Incantations	Ass-Mit	SA
805.2	KUB 37 101	Büyükkale p/14 - debris over Hittite layer	Incantation	Ass-Mit	(S) A
805.2	KUB 37 102	Büyükkale p/14 - debris over Hittite layer	Incantation	Ass-Mit	SA
801.4	KUB 37 111	Magazine 8	Collection of Incantations	NS	SA
819	KBo 36 14	Büyükkale p/14 - debris over Hittite layer	Incantation	(?)	S (A)
Building K (Bk. K)					
800	KBo 36 13	Büyükkale w/6 - from Phrygian debris near statues	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
Building M (Bk. M)					
800	KBo 36 15	Büyükkale w/18 - in front of the inner edge of the Phrygian city wall	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
812	KBo 36 19	Büyükkale x/20 - debris over Phrygian slope paving	Incantation	LOB/MB	S
Büyükkale (?)					
813	KBo 14 51	Büyükkale - southeastern excavation, from debris shedding	Collection of Incantations	MB	S
Haus am Hang (HaH)					
314	KBo 12 73	L/18 b/5 - old excavation debris	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	NS	S PhS H
806	KBo 36 20	L/18 b/5 - post-Hittite area	Incantation	NS	S
813	KBo 13 37	L/18 c/5 - post-Hittite area	Collection of Incantations	Bab	SA(?)
Temple I (T. I)					
819	KBo 19 98	East street before Magazine 4 - old excavation debris	Unidentified Text	MS	SA
801	KBo 36 17	L/19 - excavation debris	Incantation	NS	SA
Lower City (?)					
819	KBo 36 24	Lower City (?)	Unidentified Text	NS	S (A)

CTH	Publication	Find-spot	Composition	Script	Language
1		Fragments 1404/c and 1412/c were found in Room 5 - northern side, in tablet debris.			
2		523/b + 533/b + 536/b + 640/b stem from Room 4, northern side, in tablet debris; 226/c + 241/c stem from Room 5, along the southern half of the eastern wall, in tablet debris; 656/c + stems from Room 5, center, in tablet debris; 1016/c + 1048/c stem from Room 6, center, in tablet debris; 1829/c stems from Room 5, northern side, in tablet debris; 357/f stems from Büyükkale v/10, Room 6 of magazines, northern part, in the floor ramming.			

Sumerian texts discovered in Building A share both thematic and formal similarities that reveal the deliberate classification of this material by Hittites. Indeed, all but KUB 37 41 are incantations and, except KUB 34 4, all tablets are inscribed in non-Hittite script, either Babylonian or Assyro-Mitannian. Probably also belonging to this library is the small collection of fragments discovered near Building D because at least some of the tablets found in this area come from other locations.¹⁹⁴⁸ Features of these tablets, namely script and text-typology, perfectly fit those stemming from Building A. Indeed, all the texts found in the vicinity of Building D are incantations and are written in non-Hittite script except for KUB 37 111 which, it will be recalled, is perhaps a Hittite copy of an Assyro-Mitannian manuscript. The whole complex of Büyükkale, including Building A, was generally regarded as being completely rebuilt during the Late Hittite Empire, probably under Tutḫaliya IV,¹⁹⁴⁹ but recently Seeher provided evidence that the construction of the entire area cannot be attributed to this king alone.¹⁹⁵⁰ The collection housed in Building A contained material from the Old Kingdom as well as tablets stemming from the Early and Late Empire period, but, as pointed out by Košak, tablets written in the very late ductus, typical for Tutḫaliya IV and his successors, are quite limited in number.¹⁹⁵¹ At least part of this material was brought from other locations within the city.¹⁹⁵² The collection of Building A mostly consists of old tablets and less current texts considered important enough to be preserved for a long period (very few ephemeral documents were found there).¹⁹⁵³ Indeed, some of the oldest documents belonging to this collection are the incantations CTH 800 which, as here suggested, may have been imported after Muršili's raid on Babylonia. The area of Building K, which also housed a small library, yielded only one Sumerian text, but it probably does not belong here as it was found in Phrygian debris. Therefore, this fragment may belong to the Building A library along with the other fragments stemming from Büyükkale because they were also unearthed out of context, mostly in Phrygian layers. Indeed, KUB 37 143, found in the area of Building C, possibly joins KUB 37 101 and 102 which stem from Building D. To sum up, all the Sumerian texts from Büyükkale were originally stored in a single place, the library of Building A, and they are mostly incantations in non-Hittite script.¹⁹⁵⁴ Texts of foreign origin acquired up to the time of Suppiluliuma I were housed in the citadel archives and especially in Building A.¹⁹⁵⁵

The collection of Sumerian texts from Büyükkale is likely what remains of the magical texts imported (or written *in loco*) by foreign experts who moved, over time, to the Hittite capital. It also reveals the intent of the Hittites to preserve such material for a long period for its cultural interest, in addition to its possible practical use at the time of its arrival. There seems to be no evidence for

1948 Pedersén 1998, 50. Tablets housed in Building A were scattered in several places around the area, Košak 1995, 175; for the nature of the collection in Building D see van den Hout 2006, 81-82.

1949 Košak 1995, 174 and n. 9 with further bibliography.

1950 Seeher 2006, 138-140, 142-143; further evidence for an earlier date of the complex is provided by a group of scribes working in Building A under Ḫattušili III, Gordin 2011, 189.

1951 Košak 1995, 179; for the number of dated tablets in Building A see van den Hout 2008, 215.

1952 Alaura 2001, 26.

1953 van den Hout 2005, 283, van den Hout 2006, 96-97; for the content of texts housed in Building A see Archi 2007, 192-196.

1954 Only KUB 34 4 and KUB 37 111 may be attributed with certainty to Hittite scribes.

1955 Archi 2007, 196.

scribal education activities within Building A¹⁹⁵⁶ especially since no duplicates were found there.¹⁹⁵⁷ All the Sumerian incantations are preserved in single copies only, a fact that is unexpected for a scribal school.¹⁹⁵⁸ The only evidence for (multiple) copies of Sumerian texts is provided by the Hittite script manuscripts which obviously depend on (Syro-)Mesopotamian models. The foreign origin of most of the tablets (i.e. Babylonian and Assyro-Mitannian), their dating, the assortment of languages used and the limited number of Hittite script manuscripts are, in my opinion, further signs that this collection was not assembled for teaching purposes. This does not exclude that some tablets were drafted within the building, but the purpose of this collection was the preservation of a text-based cultural heritage. T. van den Hout described the tablet collections from the Hittite capital as archives and specifically as 'living archives'.¹⁹⁵⁹ However, he admits that this definition is not applicable to all text genres and collections.¹⁹⁶⁰ Indeed, part of the collection within Building A, precisely the Sumerian texts, may be defined as a library because its function was limited to the academic and cultural sphere.¹⁹⁶¹ The idea behind the collection of Sumerian texts in Büyükkale is closer to that of modern libraries where only one copy of each book is usually stored, rather than to ancient Near Eastern libraries. Using a more theoretical approach, as illustrated by van den Hout himself,¹⁹⁶² we may describe this tablet collection as a 'historical collection', probably part of a 'historical archive'.¹⁹⁶³ The Sumerian texts in Building A would be one of the earliest attestations of a 'historical archive or library'.¹⁹⁶⁴ Because most of the Sumerian texts housed in Building A were old foreign manuscripts, this group of tablets can be compared to collections of ancient books in modern libraries. In particular, texts under CTH 800 are the only example in the whole Syro-Anatolian documentation of monolingual Sumerian texts in phonetic writing written by foreign scribes¹⁹⁶⁵ that do not belong to a larger collection that also includes Akkadian incantations.¹⁹⁶⁶ These texts very likely reflect a sort of antiquarian interest among the Hittites.¹⁹⁶⁷

Unfortunately, we are not in a position to know whether the collection of Sumerian texts was kept separate from the other texts, because of disturbances to the archaeological context in both ancient and modern times. Fragments were scattered among Rooms 4, 5, 6 and even outside Building A, and sometimes pieces of the same tablets turned up in different find-spots.¹⁹⁶⁸ None of the known Sumerian texts can be identified with the entries listed in the inventory catalogues,¹⁹⁶⁹ mainly stemming

1956 Differently Gordin 2011, 189 and n. 57.

1957 The absence of duplicates is usually considered as indicative of ephemeral documents intended to be discarded (see van den Hout 2008 with previous bibliography) but it goes without saying that Sumerian texts are not everyday documents.

1958 van den Hout 2005, 287-288 and n. 51, distinguishing between translated and non-translated Sumero-Akkadian compositions, correctly states that the latter show a 'very low duplication rate'; we can now add that Sumero-Akkadian incantations from Büyükkale are not to be included among texts with duplicates (Group A) as opposed to *unica* (Group B) according to the classification of the text corpus from Hattuša proposed by van den Hout (van den Hout 2002, 864, van den Hout 2005, 282-283).

1959 van den Hout 2005, 282-285, van den Hout 2008, 211-212; he defines Building A as a 'record center' (van den Hout 2008, 218), but this definition does not cover all the functions of this archive, cf. Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 223-224.

1960 van den Hout 2005, 287-289.

1961 Cf. Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 217-218.

1962 van den Hout 2005, 281-282; the uniqueness of the Sumerian texts is paralleled at Hattuša by the *Landschenkungsurkunden*.

1963 van den Hout 2006.

1964 Cf. van den Hout 2005, 280-282, 289, van den Hout 2008, 219.

1965 As stated above, it is highly improbable that Hittite scribes were able to understand such texts without the help of foreign experts.

1966 AuOrS 23 25 and AuOrS 23 27 include Akkadian incantations, §§ 7.1.3, 7.1.4.

1967 For the Hittite antiquarian curiosity regarding the Sargonic kings see Beckman 2001, 89.

1968 See KBo 36 11+, table fn. 2 at p. 351.

1969 For these texts see Otten 1986, Güterbock 1991-1992 and more recently Dardano 2006; for the closely related inventory labels see Karasu 1996.

from Building A,¹⁹⁷⁰ even though they include Mesopotamian texts – the Akkadian anti-witchcraft ritual *šumma amīlu kašip* (CTH 803)¹⁹⁷¹ and possibly also the celestial omina (CTH 533) known in Akkadian and Hittite versions from Ḫattuša.¹⁹⁷²

The nature of the collection, especially the presence of tablets written in so many different scripts stemming from different periods gathered together for the purpose of preservation, leads me to regard the Assyro-Mitannian texts as imported tablets. Indeed, according to S. Košak's Konkordanz all the Assyro-Mitannian tablets (not only Sumerian texts, but also Akkadian) for which find-spots are known were found in Büyükkale and particularly within Building A. Only two pieces labeled as Assyro-Mitannian in the Konkordanz, IBoT 1 34 and KBo 36 28, stem from outside Büyükkale and specifically from Temple I. The first one is a letter from a king of Ḫanigalbat to the Hittite king that is actually not written in Assyro-Mitannian but in Mitannian script, hence not belonging here.¹⁹⁷³ KBo 36 28 is a fragment from a multicolumn tablet preserving a few broken lines on columns I and II on the obverse, whereas the reverse is broken away except for traces of signs in the colophon. The text, an unidentified incantation mentioning Asalluḫi (Obv. I, 7), is regarded by Wilhelm¹⁹⁷⁴ as 'wohl zweisprachig' but does not preserve any traces of Sumerian and as a consequence it has not been treated in the present study. Indeed, both columns have only an Akkadian text.¹⁹⁷⁵ On paleographical grounds, this fragment does not show any typical trait of the Assyro-Mitannian school that allows us to distinguish its script from the Hittite.¹⁹⁷⁶ For instance, the shape of LU₂ is different from the other Assyro-Mitannian manuscripts.¹⁹⁷⁷ Therefore, I would tend to regard this fragment as the product of a Hittite scribe. If the Assyro-Mitannian script had actually been used at Ḫattuša by foreign scribes, one would expect a larger diffusion within the city, instead of its restriction to a single archive. In this regard, the provenance of the Assyro-Mitannian tablets discovered during the early campaigns could be problematic, since Winckler's excavations were mainly concentrated in Building E and in the area of Temple I and the Haus am Hang.¹⁹⁷⁸ However, we know that in 1907 Makridi Bey initiated a survey in the inner court in the area between Building C and Building A¹⁹⁷⁹ where further tablets were unearthed. Nine tablets labeled as Assyro-Mitannian¹⁹⁸⁰ in Konkordanz have Bo-numbers including the Sumero-Akkadian incantation KUB 4 16. Since not a single Assyro-Mitannian tablet with a recorded find-spot comes from either Building E, Temple I or the Haus am Hang, these tablets may possibly stem from the surveyed area near Building A.¹⁹⁸¹ Further evidence for the remote provenance of the Assyro-Mitannian tablets is the fact that they only contain magical-ritual texts. In my opin-

1970 Dardano 2006, 3.

1971 Dardano 2006, 5-7, Tab. 2.

1972 See Güterbock 1991-1992, 136. KUB 29 11+ is an Akkado-Hittite bilingual with a duplicate from Emar (E 651).

1973 Weeden 2012, 232. Besides IBoT 1 34 three other letters from kings of Ḫanigalbat to Hittite kings (KBo 26 65, KBo 26 66, KUB 3 80) labeled as Assyro-Mitannian in the Konkordanz are actually Mitannian tablets. For the historical treatment of IBoT 1 34 see de Martino 2012; the letter was probably written at Taide, the capital of Mitanni at that time (de Martino's personal communication).

1974 KBo 36, v.

1975 Obv. I 6: *a-na-ku*; Obv. II 3: *a-n[a]*.

1976 J. Miller's insight; I thank Prof. J. Miller for his help with the paleography of some tablets.

1977 The oblique wedges are only three in number and are placed above the three uprights intersecting the initial horizontal, contrary to the Assyro-Mitannian manuscripts in which they are four and more to the left above the head of the horizontal. This form is compatible with the Hittite one, see HZL No. 78.

1978 For tablets from early excavations see below. I wish to express my gratitude to Silvia Alaura for her helpful remarks and for providing me with much information on the matter.

1979 Alaura's personal communication, see Bittel *apud* Neve 1982, XIII-XIV and Abb. V, see also in the same volume Beilage 1; Alaura 1998, 197 Abb. 4, Alaura 2006, 117. In his diaries Winckler also states that in 1906 some tablets were brought to him by workers during the excavation, see Klengel 1993, 512-513, Alaura 2006, 104.

1980 KUB 4 16, KUB 4 27, KUB 4 52, KUB 4 54, KUB 4 98, KUB 37 32, KUB 37 33, KUB 37 81, KUB 37 137; of these tablets KUB 4 16 (see below and § 5.2.3), KUB 4 27 and KUB 4 98 are possibly non-Assyro-Mitannian. To these tablets is to be added the aforementioned Mitannian manuscript KUB 3 80, see fn. 1973.

1981 One should remember that it is not precluded that some Assyro-Mitannian tablets were temporarily stored outside Building A due to the circulation of documents within the city archives for administrative purposes (van den Hout 2005,

ion, the only persons who could have written Assyro-Mitannian tablets at Ḫattuša are not foreign scribes, but *āšipū*-priests, who dealt exclusively with magical texts. If foreign scribes had composed the tablets, we would expect to find other types of texts written in Assyro-Mittanian script, but that is not the case. The question of where foreign script tablets were actually drafted also involves the tablets in Babylonian script, either LOB or MB.¹⁹⁸² A further hint that the non-Hittite script tablets were imported may be the fact that foreign scribes working at Ḫattuša or scribes trained in foreign scribal conventions (usually by their fathers) adopted Hittite script and ductus. This is the case of the aforementioned Ḫanikkuili, son of the Mesopotamian scribe Anu-šar-ilāni, who wrote tablets in Hittite MS.¹⁹⁸³ Additionally, Hurrian scribes drew up Hurrian and Hittite versions of the *Song of Release* in Hittite script.¹⁹⁸⁴

The collection of Sumerian texts stemming from the lower city has a completely different nature. With almost no exceptions, only Hittite script tablets were discovered in the Haus am Hang and in the storerooms surrounding Temple I, whereas the only Sumerian text in non-Hittite script stemming from the lower city is KBo 13 37 which was found in a post-Hittite layer.¹⁹⁸⁵ This distribution corresponds to the remainder of the tablet collection from Ḫattuša because most recent and current texts were drawn up and housed in the lower city, probably at least since the time of Muršili II.¹⁹⁸⁶ Indeed, tablets written in NS represent the vast majority in both the storerooms surrounding Temple I and the Haus am Hang.¹⁹⁸⁷ These two areas were also the venues of scriptoria or scribal schools as recent studies have shown.¹⁹⁸⁸ In this regard, the presence of a trilingual text such as *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* is relevant. The addition of a Sumerian phonetic version and a Hittite translation to a bilingual text is a clear indication of school training. Advanced students or scholars copied bilingual Mesopotamian texts and added further versions as part of their education. Indeed, as noticed by van den Hout,¹⁹⁸⁹ Hittite translations and adaptations of Sumero-Akkadian compositions were almost exclusively found in the lower city, whereas the non-translated Mesopotamian literature stems from Büyükkale. The function of the Sumerian texts in the lower city was therefore connected to schooling, contrary to the texts discovered in Building A. In fact, with the single exception of the list *Kagal* stemming from Building K, all the lexicographic texts, which represent the core of scribal education, were found in the lower city.¹⁹⁹⁰

The largest part of the tablets unearthed during the early campaigns (Bo and VAT numbers) conducted by H. Winckler during 1906-1907 and 1911-1912 have unrecorded or lost find-spots.¹⁹⁹¹ Provenance can be tracked in just a few cases¹⁹⁹² as only scant information can be extracted from Winckler's diaries and letters.¹⁹⁹³ As stated above, tablets discovered during these campaigns are

77-78). Hence Assyro-Mitannian tablets may have been brought to the lower city where scriptoria were located (see below) in order to be used in schooling.

1982 It is not certain that physical analysis of tablets would allow us to determine the provenance of the non-Hittite script tablets, as shown by the study of vocabularies: pXRF analysis of typical Hittite tablets suggests that they come from elsewhere, see Goren, Mommsen, Klinger 2011, 695. On paleography see Wilhelm 1992, Klinger 1998, Klinger 2003, Devecchi 2012.

1983 On the other hand GUR.Šarruma son of EN.UR.SAĜ wrote KUB 37 210 in non-Hittite script, see Schwemer 2013, n. 8

1984 Archi 2007, 190.

1985 All the Sumerian texts stemming from the lower city were found in secondary contexts.

1986 Archi 2007, 196; for the different nature ('komplementär') of the collections housed in the citadel and in the lower city see also Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 222-223.

1987 van den Hout 2008, 216; on the few Old Hittite texts in the HaH see Torri 2009a.

1988 For the Haus am Hang see Torri 2008, Torri 2010; for Temple I see Gordin 2010.

1989 van den Hout 2005, 288.

1990 Klinger 2005, 109, Archi 2007, 192-193, see also Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 225-226.

1991 Often Winckler and Makridi Bey recorded tablet find-spots, but these were lost in the museums, see Alaura 2004, 140-141, Alaura 2006, 117.

1992 Alaura 1998, 197 n. 5, Otten 1938, 40.

1993 Winckler 1907; the excavations are poorly recorded and reports were never published, see Klengel 1993.

mainly from three areas, Building E in Büyükkale, Temple I and the Haus am Hang¹⁹⁹⁴ but they were gathered together indiscriminately.¹⁹⁹⁵ Among these early findings, there are also Sumerian texts mostly in Hittite script.¹⁹⁹⁶

CTH	Inventory Number	Publication	Composition	Script	Language
812	Bo 6345	KUB 4 16	Incantation	Ass-Mit	(S) A
819	Bo 4490	KUB 4 23	Collection of Incantations	MS/NS	S A
314	Bo 503	KUB 4 5	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	NS	(S) PhS H
314	Bo 547 + 486	KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	NS	S PhS A H
314	Bo 5113	KUB 4 4	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	NS	(S) (PhS) A H
315	Bo 3681	KUB 4 2	MLM	NS	(S) PhS (A) (H)
315	Bo 4209	KUB 4 97	MLM	NS	(S) (PhS) A H
807	Bo 450	KUB 57 126	Edubba E	NS	S PhS (A) (H?)
807	Bo 5590	KUB 4 39	LI-LN	NS	S (A)
801.3	Bo 453	KUB 4 7	Nergal D	NS	S (A)
819	Bo 4547	KUB 4 41	Hymn to Nergal (?)	NS	S A
793	Bo 1760	KUB 4 11	Incantation to Utu	NS	S A
801	Bo 2747 Bo 4314	KUB 4 26 (+) HT 13 (+) KUB 37 112	a) <i>šūilla</i> to Adad (A) b) Hymn (?)	NS	S
806.1	VAT 7425	KBo 1 18	Collection of Incantations	NS	S
806.2	Bo 655	KUB 4 24	Collection of Incantations	NS	S
806.4	AnAr 6994	ABoT 1 43	Incantation	NS	S (A?)
819	Bo 7077	KUB 4 10	Unidentified Text	NS(?)	S A(?)

The possibility that these Sumerian tablets in Hittite script came from Building E should be excluded on the basis of the text-types discovered in that archive which, as pointed out by Alaura, are completely different from those stemming from Building A.¹⁹⁹⁷ Indeed, not a single Sumerian text has been discovered in Building E since excavations resumed in 1933, and Akkadian texts of Mesopotamian origin are also rare. The Hittite script of these tablets suggests that they stem from either the area surrounding Temple I or the Haus am Hang. A piece of evidence is provided by one of the fragments of *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad*, Bo 503 (KUB 4 5), which joins 146/t (KBo 12 73), discovered in the Haus am Hang.¹⁹⁹⁸ The very small number of Sumerian texts in Hittite script stemming from Building A makes it less probable that these tablets come from Winckler's aforementioned survey in the area. However, we cannot confidently assign all these tablets to the archives of the lower city. Provenance from the lower city (probably the HaH) is highly probable for the remaining fragments of *The Hymn to Iškur Adad*¹⁹⁹⁹ as well as for *MLM* and KUB 57 126, which also contain phonetic Sumerian and Hittite versions, because as argued in the present study this format is the product of schooling. The prisms KUB 4 39 and KBo 1 18 probably stem from Temple I where other prisms were found.²⁰⁰⁰ The

1994 Horozný 1915, 21-22.

1995 Bittel 1937, 33.

1996 The fragment with unrecorded find-spot ABoT 1 43 in the Archaeological Museum of Ankara may be added here.

1997 Alaura 2001, 25.

1998 According to Klinger 2010, 313 tablets with low find-numbers stem from the same complex; however, this does not preclude that higher Bo-numbers come from the lower city as well.

1999 It is not precluded that KUB 4 4 stems from the citadel because it is older than the other fragments, but the HaH is the more probable find-spot.

2000 See KBo 26; I thank Silvia Alaura for drawing my attention to this point.

script of KUB 4 16 is not completely clear: if it is in fact an Assyro-Mitannian tablet it probably stems from Building A as suggested above;²⁰⁰¹ on the contrary, if it turns out to be a Hittite manuscript (possibly a copy of an Assyro-Mitannian tablet) it could stem from either Building A (likewise KUB 37 111) or the lower city. KUB 4 11 might stem from Büyükkale²⁰⁰² due to its connection with the aforementioned *Prayers to the Sun-god* (CTH 372-374)²⁰⁰³ whose manuscripts were mostly found in Building A. The specific text typology of KUB 4 11²⁰⁰⁴ fits the collection of Sumerian texts from the citadel which, as noted above, consists almost exclusively of incantations. In addition it needs to be recalled that KUB 4 11, although written in NS, differs from the typical Hittite tablets as it shows several paleographic features that go back to the Babylonian model²⁰⁰⁵ as well as old and late Hittite sign forms that suggest an arrival before the 13th century. If this text had any influence on the composition of the *Prayers to the Sun-god*, we have to assume that it was transmitted to Ḫattuša during the Early Empire at the latest, the period to which the oldest manuscripts of CTH 372-374 are dated.²⁰⁰⁶ This early date of arrival might in turn explain the presence of KUB 4 11 in Building A, where less recent tablets were also located.

Texts stemming from the lower city differ from those discovered in the citadel not only in script but also in type. In fact, Sumerian texts different from incantations, such as wisdom texts and hymns, were only found in the libraries of the lower city.²⁰⁰⁷ The pattern of distribution is much more evident if we include the tablets discovered during early campaigns. According to this picture curricular texts stem from the scribal schools in the lower city. It is perhaps not a coincidence that a non-curricular text such as the Dumuzi composition KUB 37 41 is the only Sumerian literary text found in the citadel where, as argued here, no scribal schooling took place.²⁰⁰⁸ The higher number of incantations stemming from the citadel compared to the lower city is also tied to the nature of the collection of Building A, two-thirds of which consists of ritual and magical texts.²⁰⁰⁹ The most outstanding difference is the presence of duplicates in the lower city, which is further evidence for the educational purpose of the Sumerian texts in Temple I and HaH. *The Hymn to Iškur-Adad* and *MLM* are in fact preserved in multiple copies. The distribution of Sumerian texts across different archives reflects a diverse function of texts as with other text-typologies.²⁰¹⁰ This may be an additional hint that imported incantations were actually used by foreign experts.

Does the dichotomy in the distribution of the Sumerian compositions also reflect different stages in the transmission and canonization of texts?²⁰¹¹ Unfortunately, there is no clear indication as only a limited number of texts can be compared with first-millennium duplicates. Positive evidence only seems to be available in the case of the monolingual incantations CTH 800, which represent an old

2001 Note however my remarks in fn. 1981.

2002 Alaura's suggestion.

2003 See Alaura, Bonechi 2012, 54-55.

2004 On the incantatory nature of *Incantation to Utu* see Geller 1995, 102-107.

2005 The influence of the Babylonian model on KUB 4 11 is similar to that of an Assyro-Mitannian tablet on KUB 37 111, also found in the citadel.

2006 See above.

2007 Note that the largest part of the Mesopotamian mythological texts were found in the lower city, whereas the Anatolian myths stem from Büyükkale, Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 221.

2008 Note that the script of KUB 37 41 is unclear.

2009 Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 224.

2010 Imported and Anatolian mythological texts, which were housed in different places in Ḫattuša, were used for different purposes, Lorenz, Rieken 2010, 228-229.

2011 This question arises from the assumption that the date of reception may not coincide with the antiquity of the textual tradition: at least hypothetically, it is not excluded that a text that arrived in Anatolia in the late 13th century B.C. may reflect an older textual tradition than a text received earlier in the 14th or 15th century B.C. On the other hand, Hittite NS tablets housed in the lower city, being only copies, may contain texts transmitted to the Hittite capital earlier than some stored in the citadel, but copied as exercises for a longer period of time.

tradition,²⁰¹² and possibly literary texts, probably housed in the lower city (with the sole exception of KUB 37 41), which, conversely, reflect a later stage in the standardization process. However, this outcome is mostly based on the only literary texts with first-millennium duplicates, *Nergal D* and *LI-LN*, whose provenance is only supposed, because their find-spots are not recorded. Assyro-Mitannian incantations as remarked above do not show a coherent picture even though they differ from their first-millennium duplicates. The stage in the standardization process represented by the Hittite NS incantations in relation to the Assyro-Mitannian texts is unclear. The only Hittite script incantation with first-millennium duplicates is KUB 4 24 (find-spot unknown) which diverges from the first-millennium recension. Only for the library in Büyükkale is there clear evidence that it housed older tablets that reflected older textual traditions. On the other hand, it is unclear to what extent the texts from the lower city reflect a later stage than those housed in the citadel because only a few have first-millennium duplicates and all of them have unrecorded find-spots. The following tables, based on the proposed analysis, tentatively combine tablets whose find-spot is known with tablets with unrecorded find-spot.²⁰¹³

Büyükkale						
CTH	Publication	Composition	Script	Language	Old Babylonian	First Millennium
800.1	KUB 30 1	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	+	-
800.4	KUB 37 109	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	(?)	-
800.2	KUB 30 2	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
800.4	KUB 30 3	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
800.3	KUB 30 4	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
800.4	KUB 37 108 + KUB 37 110	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
800	KBo 36 13	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
800	KBo 36 15	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
800	KBo 36 16	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
800	KBo 40 103	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
801	KBo 36 21	Incantation	LOB/MB(?)	S	?	?
812	KBo 36 19	Incantation	LOB/MB	S	?	?
813	KBo 14 51	Collection of Incantations	MB	S	a) ? b) -	a) ? b) +
794	KBo 7 1 + KUB 37 115 (+) KBo 7 2	Collection of Incantations	Ass-Mit	SA	a) - b) -	a) - b) +
805.1	KBo 36 11+	Collection of Incantations	Ass-Mit	SA	a) + b) ? c) ? d) +	a) + b) ? c) ? d) +
805.2	KUB 37 143	Incantation	Ass-Mit	S (A)	+	+
805.2	KUB 37 101	Incantation	Ass-Mit	SA	?	?
805.2	KUB 37 102	Incantation	Ass-Mit	SA	(+)	+
805.3	KUB 37 107	Incantation	Ass-Mit	(S) A	?	?
806.3	KUB 37 95	Incantation	Ass-Mit	S (A?)	?	?
813	KUB 34 3	Incantation	Ass-Mit	SA	-	-
819	KUB 37 127	Incantation	Ass-Mit	SA	?	?
812	KUB 4 16	Incantation	Ass-Mit	(S) A	+	+

2012 As seen above, KUB 30 1 is the only incantation that is known from the OB documentation but lacks first-millennium duplicates.

2013 Texts with a recorded find-spot are listed in bold type.

Büyükkale						
793	KUB 4 11	Incantation to Utu	NS	SA	+	+
801.4	KUB 37 111	Collection of Incantations	NS	SA	~ +	~ +
813	KUB 34 4	Incantation	NS	SA	?	?
795	KUB 37 41	Dumuzi Text (D-I R?)	(?)	SA	+	-
813	KUB 37 92	Collection of Incantations	(?)	SA	?	?
819	KBo 36 18	Incantation	(?)	SA	?	?
819	KBo 36 14	Incantation	(?)	S (A)	?	?
Lower City						
CTH	Publication	Composition	Script	Language	OB	First Mill.
813	KBo 13 37	Collection of Incantations	Bab	SA(?)	?	?
819	KUB 4 23	Collection of Incantations	MS/NS	SA	?	?
314	KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73 KUB 4 6 (+) KUB 4 8 KUB 4 4	The Hymn to Iškur-Adad	NS	S PhS A H	-	-
315	KUB 4 2 KUB 4 97	MLM	NS	(S) PhS A (H)	+	-
807	KUB 57 126	Edubba E	NS	S PhS (A) (H?)	+	-
807	KUB 4 39	LI-LN	NS	S (A)	(-)	+
801.3	KUB 4 7	Nergal D	NS	S (A)	+	+
819	KUB 4 41	Hymn to Nergal (?)	NS	SA	?	?
801	KUB 4 26 (+) HT 13 (+) KUB 37 112	a) <i>šulla</i> to Adad (A) b) Hymn (?)	NS	b) S	?	?
806.1	KBo 1 18	Collection of Incantations	NS	S	?	?
806.2	KUB 4 24	Collection of Incantations	NS	S	(+)	+
801	KBo 36 17	Incantation	NS	SA	?	?
806	KBo 36 20	Incantation	NS	S	?	?
806.4	ABoT 1 43	Incantation	NS	S (A?)	?	?
819	KBo 19 98	Unidentified Text	MS	SA	?	?
819	KUB 4 10	Unidentified Text	NS(?)	SA(?)	?	?
819	KBo 36 24	Unidentified Text	NS	SA(?)	?	?

Texts from the lower city, the only ones that can be used to reconstruct the curriculum, show that Sumerian was still part of the scribal training at Ḫattuša at the end of the 13th century in the form of lexical lists as well as literary texts. Based on our knowledge of the Old Babylonian curriculum, Hittite scribes copied short compositions in the Intermediary Phase after lexical lists. This marked the highest level of Hittite proficiency in Sumerian, reached by a very limited number of scholarly scribes.

8.6 Concluding Remarks

Two different groups of Sumerian texts are known from the tablet collections of the Hittite capital. One, consisting almost exclusively of incantations written in non-Hittite script, served a practical purpose in rituals performed by Mesopotamian priests to repel diseases. On the basis of the archaeological evidence this collection was housed in Building A likely for cultural-antiquarian reasons but it is not excluded that magical texts continued to be used by Mesopotamian practitioners.²⁰¹⁴ The other group of Sumerian texts, made up of Hittite script tablets, includes incantations as well as literary texts used in the education of scribes. Some of these literary texts had a curricular setting in the Old Babylonian period and were used in schooling in the Hittite capital. Nevertheless, it is likely that the study of Sumerian was limited to a small circle of scholarly scribes who were concerned with non-ephemeral documents.²⁰¹⁵ Copying Sumerian texts probably had little role in the education of scribes employed in the state administration. The knowledge of Sumerian that Hittite scribes needed for writing Hittite and Akkadian texts was limited to logograms that were learned by means of lexical lists.²⁰¹⁶

Texts from Ḫattuša reflect an early stage of the process of selection, adaptation and innovation of Sumerian literature undertaken in the post-Old Babylonian period as is clear from the coexistence of old and late traditions.²⁰¹⁷ These sources represent a substantial part of the poorly known corpus of Middle Babylonian Sumerian literature. Sumerian texts from the Hittite capital reflect different traditions; some clearly derive from the Northern Babylonian tradition while others rely on the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. Throughout this work, it has been argued that most of the grammatical and orthographic anomalies and mistakes found in the tablets from Ḫattuša are commonly attested elsewhere in the Sumerian tradition, hence they were already contained in the Mesopotamian models transmitted to Anatolia.

2014 Two types of practitioners are here referred to: (1) Mesopotamian experts who moved to Ḫattuša after those who brought or wrote the magical tablets housed in Building A; (2) second generations of Mesopotamian experts settled in the Hittite capital, who were trained by their fathers.

2015 Besides Hittite, scribal education at Ḫattuša was mainly focused on Akkadian, see Fincke 2009b, 111-112.

2016 According to Klingler 2010, 307 n. 7, lexical lists in the Hittite scribal schools were tools for learning cuneiform writing but not languages. Note that no extract tablets or elementary exercises in Sumerian were found at the Hittite capital; only a tu-ta-ti exercise is written on a tablet of the series *Erimḫuš* (KBo 26 20), Klingler 2005, 112. This material is also lacking for Hittite and Akkadian, see Klingler 2012, 85-86

2017 The same stage of textual tradition is evident for lexical lists, Klingler 2005, 110-111.

