4 A Mosaic of Quotations: Intertextual Relationships in the Great Hymns and Prayers

In the first chapter, I highlighted the similarity between certain 'philosophical' thoughts attested in the *Great Hymns and Prayers* and several themes in wisdom texts, as the concept of wisdom patience (see chapter 1, § 1.2.5). In this chapter, my focus shifts to examining more specific intertextual connections that arise between the *Great Hymns and Prayers* and texts of different genres, such as literary and lexical sources.

Literary intertextuality is still relatively unexplored in the field of Assyriology, especially when compared to the investigation of this theme in classical studies.[1] However, similar to classical studies, the concept of intertextuality in Assyriology builds upon the definitions

1 For some examples of the study of intertextuality in Classics, as compared to Assyriology, see Weeden 2021, 80-4.

and theories mostly by Genette, Bakhtin, and Kristeva.[2] In particular, following Kristeva, the approach to intertextuality in Assyriology is based primarily on the notion that every text, while being a 'mosaic of quotations',[3] is profoundly shaped by processes of permutation and transformation resulting from the author's engagement with earlier texts. In other words, intertextuality, as applied to the Mesopotamian textual corpus, is in most cases not limited to mere copying and borrowing from one text to another, but also includes the active process of rewriting and assembling texts.[4]

The first scholar to introduce the concept of intertextuality to the study of Akkadian literature was Erica Reiner. Examining the occurrence of identical citations in the descriptions of the afterlife found in the *Epic of Gilgameš*, the *Descent of Ištar to the Netherworld*, and the myth of Nergal and Ereškigal, Reiner defined these parallels as 'intertextual relationships', maintaining that they allow the modern reader to follow in the footsteps of the ancient one, by tracing literary patterns and reconstructing connections between texts.[5]

The study of intertextual parallels in literary Mesopotamian texts has so far mainly focused on the analysis of directed intertextuality.[6] Directed intertextuality consists of the explicit reference of one text to another.[7] Texts connected through directed intertextuality dis-

2 See for example Genette 1997; Bakhtin 1981; 1984; Kristeva 1980 [1969]. For a history of intertextuality see Allen 2000.

3 So writes Kristeva 1980, 66, commenting on Bakthin's theory of the dialogical nature of all discourses (on which see the collection of essays in Bakthin 1981, and Bakhtin 1984): "any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another".

4 On this see Seri 2014, 89-90, who provides a succinct but thorough explanation of the most important theories of intertextuality and how they relate to Assyriology. Cf. also Foster 2005, 25-6 and Lenzi 2019, 66.

5 See Reiner 1985, 119 (also *apud* Seri 2014, 89): "Such verbatim quotes […] play the same role in Babylonian poetry as the quotes and allusions that punctuate modern poetry; they constitute intertextual relationships, and enable the well-read modern Assyriologist to make the same linkages across the ancient poems as the ancient reader was expected to make". Reiner is the first to emphasise how the links between Akkadian literary texts acquire significance only for an expert reader, that is, someone who can actually recognise the source to which the intertextual references allude, see e.g. Reiner 1985, 119: "such connections-in essence, what contemporary literary criticism likes to term 'intertextuality' – are meaningful only for the reader familiar with the entire poetic corpus". This concept obviously only applies to intentional references, since a considerable amount of intertextual connections in the Akkadian literary corpus may not necessarily be the result of a conscious choice by the text's author. This is evident in cases of infrastructural intertextuality, see *infra*.

6 For the use of this term as applied to Assyriology, see Weeden 2021, 83-4. Note that this kind of intertextuality is often referred to as allusion, see Wisnom 2019, 1-4 and Lenzi 2019, 65, with fn. 139.

7 For more on directed intertextuality in Assyriology, and some examples of Assyriological works related, see Lenzi 2019, 64-6 and Weeden 2021, 84-5. See also E. Jiménez

play – using a term coined by Genette – a 'co-presence' of elements,[8] for example, allusions, quotations, or imitation. This kind of intertextuality establishes a specific connection between compositions, sometimes reflecting authorial intention. However, determining the deliberate choices made by authors remains a highly challenging issue within the context of Mesopotamian works of literature.[9] While directed intertextuality has been the primary focus of most Assyriological works, some scholars have adopted a broader perspective on intertextual relationships, drawing inspiration from Kristeva's theories. This second approach examines connections that emerge not from specific textual parallels or borrowings, but rather from the broader interplay between texts and literary tradition. These connections can manifest, for instance, through formulaic expressions and literary topoi.[10]

The connections discussed in this chapter can be attributed to both types of intertextuality mentioned above. The first type of relationship I will present aligns with directed intertextuality, as it involves precise quotations that repeat the same phrases *verbatim*.[11] These intertextu-

2017a, 80-1, who defines the 'minimalistic approach', that is, an approach which "on the other hand, only accepts literary dependance of one text on another when an unmistakably distinctive expression – i.e. clearly not a topos". Jiménez further defines the notions of 'general intertextuality', such as the shared use of formulas, and 'specific intertextuality', which describes instead the usage of specific borrowings (Jiménez 2017a, 81). Similarly, Frahm, in his recent work on Assyrian royal inscriptions, used the terms 'palintextuality' referring to specific quotations or obvious allusions from a hypotext into a hypertext, and 'similtextuality' to indicate more vague similarities between texts (2019, 152). Bach 2020 borrows Genette's model of 'transtextuality' in analysing the Assyrian royal inscriptions, differentiating transtextual relationships into "Intertextual" (direct quotations), "Hypertextual" (allusions) or "Architextual" (general similarity). Cf. also Bach 2024, who proposes a methodology for transtextual analysis of Neo-Assyrian royal texts.

8 Genette 1997, 1-2.

9 Regarding the problematic notion of interdependence within the Mesopotamian literary corpus understood as an authorial intention, see Wisnom 2014, 4-7; cf. also Lenzi 2019, 65; in addition, Seri (2014, 91) observes that certain categories formulated by contemporary scholars in the study of intertextuality cannot be readily applied to Akkadian literature. For instance, the concept of plagiarism becomes indistinguishable from quotation in Mesopotamian texts, as "Mesopotamians did not have a notion of copyright and in most cases the name of the scribe at the end of a composition, if mentioned at all, indicates the copyist rather than the author" (Seri 2014, 91).

10 For an example of this approach, see Metcalf 2013 on some intertextual echoes between the wisdom text labelled as *Dialogue of Pessimism* and other literary compositions; see also Wisnom 2019, 1-4, who considers as intertextuality any type of connection between texts, cf. Weeden 2021, 84-5; see also Jiménez 2017a, 80, who terms this approach as 'maximalist'.

11 For the concept of quotations as examples of intertextuality between Akkadian texts, including intertextuality between literary and lexical sources, see the study on intertextual parallels in the list *Erimḫuš* provided by Boddy 2021. Boddy writes, quoting the *Oxford Dictionary of English* (Stevenson 2010), as follows: "In linguistics, the term 'intertextuality' is used to describe a connection between texts. A form of intertextuality identified in Erimḫuš is 'quotation', which can be defined as 'a group of words

al relationships are found within the corpus of the *Great Hymns and Prayers*, as well as between the corpus and other texts, that are mostly, but not exclusively, literary. Conversely, the second group of examples of intertextuality provided here are more closely associated with the second, broader type of intertextuality. They illustrate the connections between the *Great Hymns and Prayers* and lexical sources, a form of intertextuality defined as 'infrastructural' by Mark Weeden.[12] Infrastructural intertextuality, according to Weeden, pertains to the cultural substrate behind the texts: the cultural and ideological heritage transmitted through scribal education, which inevitably shaped those who copied and composed the texts, even if unconsciously.[13]

Infrastructural intertextuality does not exclude explicit connections between texts, that is, forms of directed intertextuality, including exact quotations of lemmas or groups of lemmas, but rather shifts the focus from the specific, possibly conscious, decision of the author to the cultural and ideological context in which the texts were produced and transmitted.[14]

4.1 The *Great Hymns and Prayers* and Literary Texts

The fact that literary and scholarly texts, together with lexical lists, constituted a substantial part of scribal education, especially during the first millennium BCE, led to considerable intertextuality within the Akkadian literary corpus.[15] Intertextual relations were further strengthened by the long transmission of certain compositions, which became part of common knowledge and lent themselves to expansion, quotation, reworking or integration into other texts.[16] Intertextual parallels can be observed between literary texts as well as between literary and technical texts, such as commentaries. Modern scholars have identified intertextual parallels in all periods of Akkadian literature. This is also true, for example, of texts from the Old Akkadian period, such as a letter from the reign of Agade, which shows

taken from a text or speech and repeated by someone other than the original author or speaker'" (2021, 170).

12 See Weeden 2021, 85, who elaborates on the pivotal, shaping role of lexical lists within the scribal curriculum, described as 'infrastructural' by Johnson (2015, 4; cf. also Johnson, Geller 2015, 31).

13 Weeden 2021, 85-6.

14 Cf. also the remark by Boddy 2021, 170, with respect to intertextual relationships between *Erimḫuš* and other texts: "By shifting the focus on the knowledge attached to these terms, movements of text can be examined as movements of knowledge".

15 Lenzi 2019, 67.

16 Lenzi 2019, 64-7; cf. also Foster 2005, 22-4.

strong links to an incantation against demons preserved in seventh-century Nineveh.[17] This particular case implies that diachronic connections are also possible.

Intertextual relationships can sometimes be observed through the direct quotation of entire passages.[18] One notable example is found in SB *Gilgameš* VII, in which a lengthy curse is uttered against Ištar, bearing striking similarities to a section in the Descent of Ištar to the Netherworld, wherein the goddess Ereškigal expresses her fury against the impersonator Asušunamir.[19] Another, famous example is represented by the depiction of the netherworld in SB *Gilgameš* VII, which bears partial resemblance to a passage in the Descent of Ištar to the Netherworld, and to another found in the myth of Nergal and Ereškigal.[20] As remarked by Foster,[21] it is possible that these very similar or nearly identical text portions were reusable stock passages, rather than intentional quotations or allusions to specific texts.[22]

17 Thureau-Dangin 1926, 23-5; cf. Foster 2005, 23.

18 Foster 2005, 23, 2007 113; see Lenzi 2019, 42-3 for further examples of Akkadian literary texts borrowing from earlier Akkadian sources. Furthermore, Lenzi emphasises the significant relationship between the Sumerian substratum and the Akkadian tradition, pointing out that numerous Akkadian literary texts show clear connections not only with other Akkadian texts, but also with earlier Sumerian sources. This connection is evident in some episodes of the *Old Babylonian Epic of Gilgameš*, which show many similarities with Sumerian compositions (Lenzi 2019, 41-2, with further references). For the continuity between the genre of hymns in Sumerian and Akkadian, see chapter 1.

19 SB *Gilgameš* VII, ll. 102-33 (George 2003, 638-9; see also George 2022, revised edition on *eBL*) and Descent of Ištar 103-8 (see Lapinkivi 2010, 20 and 32 and the latest edition by Setälä 2022 on the *eBL* platform.

20 SB *Gilgameš* VII, ll. 184-91 (George 2003, 644-5; 2022), Nergal and Ereshkigal, 149-56 (Ponchia, Luukko 2013, 16 and 25) and Descent of Ištar 3-11 (Lapinkivi 2010, 15 and 29; cf. Setälä 2022). Cf. Reiner 1985, 32-3

21 Foster 2007, 113.

22 Formulaic expressions are indeed typical of Akkadian epic literature, but also very common in the genre of Akkadian hymns and prayers, where divine epithets and literary motifs in Akkadian compositions are partially transmitted in continuity with the Sumerian tradition (see Metcalf 2015 for examples of standard epithets and formulas). In addition, the use of stock phrases is also commonly found in Akkadian incantations: Schwemer (2014, 277) defines these phrases as "originally self-contained building blocks of an incantation text". With regard to stock phrases in incantations for calming babies, Farber used the term 'Versatzstücke' to indicate the motifs and formulas that were freely reused and recombined in multiple texts (Farber 1989, 148-60; cf. Schwemer 2014, 277). Furthermore, Farber suggests that the characteristic formulaic nature of incantations may indicate oral transmission (Farber 1989, 148). The possible orality of Akkadian literature, specifically in the epic genre, has been discussed in the collection of articles edited by Vogelzang and Vanstiphout in 1992. However, it is highlighted that the 'oral hypothesis' and the 'formulaic theory' (as formulated in the pioneering works of Milman Parry and Albert B. Lord) are challenging to apply to the socio-cultural context of Mesopotamia, where the literary tradition belongs to a highly structured, written form. Therefore, even though Mesopotamian literature may have had oral origins, it evolved into a distinct mode of communication, thus differing from the vernacular oral tradition, which remains impossible to recover, see Michalowski

A further example of intertextuality lies in parody, i.e. the parodical use of quotations, such as the references to epic poetry and wisdom texts in the Akkadian disputation poems, or the satirical mention of the Cuthean Legend in a Neo-Assyrian invective against someone called Bel-etir (K.1351).[23] Imitation can also be considered a form of intertextuality, even though the intertextual connection is not established through the imitation of one particular text, but rather through the emulation of entire literary genres. An example is represented by an Old Babylonian manuscript describing the killing of a noisy goat by Enki, which seems to be a satirical imitation of an incantation.[24] A second example is provided by another text, referred to the same Bel-etir above mentioned, which also emulates the typical structure of incantations.[25] The satirical Aluzinnu-text, furthermore, also parodies various textual genres, including god lists and menologies.[26]

The *Great Hymns and Prayers* show several types of intertextuality with the literary sources: firstly, textual links can be observed between the texts themselves within the corpus, such as identical or almost identical recurring verses. Secondly, at least two of our texts, namely the *Šamaš Hymn* and *Queen of Nippur*, appear to be the result of extensive textual elaborations, most likely incorporating borrowings from other texts, perhaps even whole sections from other sources.[27] Since no antecedents of these two hymns have come down to us, however, it is difficult to trace their composition process. On the other hand, as noted above, *Marduk*1, has an earlier version from the Old Babylonian period, which shows numerous textual parallels with the later composition.[28] The *Great Hymns and Prayers* also

1992, 244-5; see also Lenzi 2019, 39-41 for further remarks on this topic, and a useful summary of the main studies on orality within the field of Assyriology.

Note, incidentally, that the occurrence of Versatzstücke was also observed in the Sumerian literary corpus, for example, in the *balaĝ* lament ú r u à m - m a - i r - r a - b i, as remarked by Volk (1989, 16). Volk suggested that this composition might have been orally recited, and the stock phrases could have been thus modified *ad libitum*. On Versatzstücke in Sumerian lamentations, see also more recently Delnero 2020, 137-8.

23 For intertextuality in the Disputation poems see Jiménez 2017, 79-99 and Jiménez 2018b; for the Assyrian invective, see Livingstone 1989, 64-5. Cf. Lenzi 2019, 67 and Foster 2007, 114, and 2005, 1020-1.

24 On this text see Lambert 1991, 415-19. Lambert offers three possible interpretations for this text: Firstly, it could be a genuine incantation. Secondly, it may be a mythological tale centred around Enki, presented in the form of an incantation. Lastly, most scholars who have studied the text lean towards the view that it is a light-hearted composition originating from the Edubba circle, possibly created for playful or humorous purposes, see Lambert 1991, 419; cf. Foster 2005, 1020-1.

25 Livingstone 1989, 66; cf. Foster 2005, 1021.

26 Veldhuis 2003, 25-6; cf. Lenzi 2019, 67.

27 See e.g. Lambert 1960, 123; 1982, 176-7.

28 Fadhil, Jiménez 2019, 162.

present quotations from or similarities with other literary and scholarly texts, like commentaries.

In most instances, it is not clear whether the quotations found within the corpus of texts under analysis, or between these and other texts, are expressions of authorial intention or whether, as already mentioned, they are mere repertoire pieces. However, there are also cases where the quotation is undoubtedly direct.

Identifying the direction of these intertextual parallels, that is, understanding the exact relationship between the texts involved and determining which source precedes and which follows, is extremely complex in most cases. Indeed, the lack of precise dating of texts and the speculative nature of the shared social and cultural context make it difficult to trace the history of textual borrowings.

Observing the occurrence of the same phrase or passage in different compositions can prove useful for two reasons. Firstly, these instances of intertextuality might illustrate direct relationships between texts. Secondly, even if establishing direct dependence from one text to another proves thorny, as the intertextual parallels may lack the necessary specificity or originality to indicate a definite connection between the sources, such links can nevertheless stimulate reflections on the composition techniques of Akkadian literary texts. In essence, the study of these intertextual parallels opens the door to a deeper understanding of the literary traditions and influences of Akkadian culture.

4.1.1 Intratextual Relationships in the Great Hymns and Prayers

The following is a list of intratextual parallels that can be observed within the corpus of the *Great Hymns and Prayers*. This list is not exhaustive, but it aims to provide a few illustrative examples of the kind of shared phrases and formulations found within this body of texts.[29]

1. *Nabû Prayer* // *Marduk*1

a) *Nabû Prayer*:
[173]*puṭur qunnabrašu ḫipi illu*[*rtaš*?]
[173]Release his fetters, break [his] bonds!

*Marduk*1:
[61]*rumme illurtašu puṭur maksīšu*
[61]Loosen his fetters, release his shackles![30]

29 In the *eBL* digital editions of these texts, some additional parallels are accessible.

30 Fadhil, Jiménez 2019, 167, 170; cf. Oshima 2011, 146, 160-1.

[155]*ḫipi qunnabrašu illurtašu puṭur maksīšu*
[155]Break his shackles and fetters, release his bonds![31]

b) *Nabû Prayer*:
[103][*tušē*]*ṣâm-ma*[?] *aradka tassakip* […]
[103][You ca]st your servant out, you have tossed away […]

*Marduk*1:
[41/43]*bēlu/Marduk uggukka tassakip aradka*
[41/43]O Lord/Marduk in your rage you have tossed away your servant.[32]

2. *Nabû Prayer* // *Ištar Prayer* (see chapter 2 and 3)

Nabû Prayer:
[26][*ša*[?] …] *išari tukān išdīšu*
[26][You …] the just, you shore him up.

Ištar Prayer:
[171]*kibsuš dunninī išduš k*[*innī*]
[171]Strengthen his path, make his foundations st[able]!

3. *Marduk*1 // *Marduk*2

*Marduk*1:
[5/6](Marduk) *ša amāruk šibbu gapaš abūšin*
[5/6](Marduk), whose stare is a dragon, a flood overwhelming.[33]

*Marduk*2:
[81/82]*bēlu/Marduk uggukka kī gapaš abūšin*
[81/82]Lord/Marduk your fury is like a flood overwhelming.[34]

4. *Marduk*2 // *Šamaš Hymn*

*Marduk*2:
[45']*[…] … parakkaka līteddiš*

31 Fadhil, Jiménez 2019, 168, 171; cf. Oshima 2011, 154, 166-7.

32 Translation by the Author. Cf. Oshima 2011, 146, 160-1. Thanks to a new manuscript, this line can now be completely restored. I am thankful to Enrique Jiménez who shared with me his forthcoming edition of *Marduk*1.

33 Fadhil, Jiménez 2019, 167 and 169; cf. Oshima 2011, 142, 158-9.

34 Jiménez 2022, 200. Cf. Fadhil, Jiménez 2019, 173; cf. Oshima 2014, 229, 244-5.

[45'][…] … may your throne dais be ever renewed.[35]

Šamaš Hymn:
[198][…] … *ina māti*[!?] *parakkaka līteddiš*
[198][…] in the land, may your throne dais be ever renewed.[36]

5. *Gula Bullussa-rabi* // *Gula Syncretistic*

Gula Bullussa-rabi:
[42]*šiprussa nāšât qantuppi ēpišat nikkassī*
[42]Who carries a stylus as she works, doing the accounts.[37]

Gula Bullussa-rabi:
[183]*asâku bārâku āšipāku ša ina arê*[!] *ḫīṭāku*
[183]I am physician, I am diviner, I am exorcist, I am expert with numbers.[38]

Gula Syncretistic:
[32]*ninkarrak bēlet riksī upšāšê ēpišat nikkassī arê labbat uzzat u muma'irrat*
[32]Ninkarrak the lady of bandages (and) ritual procedures, she who makes calculations, she is a lioness, she is fury, she is the ruler.[39]

4.1.2 Intertextual Relationships with Other Literary and Technical Texts

The presence of parallels between the *Great Hymns and Prayers* and other literary texts is one factor that could indicate a progressive elaboration of at least some of the compositions under study. Indeed, several compositions belonging to the *Great Hymns and Prayers* could be the result of adapting or assembling verses, phrases or entire blocks of text borrowed from other literary works, such as hymns or wisdom texts. There are, however, also intertextual connections with scholarly and technical sources, such as incantations

35 The end of this line can now be reconstructed thanks to the new manuscripts. An edition will be published by E. Jiménez, who kindly shared with me the provisional transliteration. Cf. Oshima 2011, 239, 252-3.

36 Rozzi 2021a; cf. Lambert 1960, 138.

37 Földi 2021a; cf. Lambert 1967, 118-19.

38 Földi 2021a; cf. Lambert 1967, 118-19.

39 Bennett 2021, 196-7.

and commentaries.[40] Like the previous list, the present one is not exhaustive, and further textual parallels may emerge with the identification of new manuscripts and the reconstruction of additional texts.

1. *Ištar Prayer* // *Syncretistic Hymn to Ištar*

   Ištar Prayer:
   [26][*petê idīki*? *šu*]*be'ê šūti*
   [27][*pīt purīdīki*?] *pān iltāni*
   [26][The spreading of your wings is the ru]sh of the South wind,
   [27][The opening of your legs is] the face of the North wind.

   Syncretistic Hymn to Ištar:
   [29]*petē idīki <šu>be'ê šūti ištar uruk*
   [30]*pīt purīdīki pān iltāni ištar akkade*
   [29]The spreading of your wings is the rush of the south wind – Ištar of Uruk,
   [30]the opening of your legs is the face of the north wind – Ištar of Akkad.[41]

2. *Ištar Prayer* // *Exaltation of Ištar*

   Ištar Prayer:
   [21][*šušqâ šušpula*?] *šadāda u nê'a*
   [21][To exalt, to bring down,] to pull and to turn back.

   Exaltation of Ištar:
   [IV c+16]dumu-ĝu$_{10}$ ki za-ra du$_{10}$-ga an-šè lá ki-šè lá tu-lu gíd-da-bi
   mar-ti ana e-ma ša-bu-ki šu-uš-qu-ú šu-uš-pu-la šá-da-da u ni-i'-u
   [IV c+16]My daughter, wherever it pleases you to raise someone, to diminish, to move away, or to turn around.[42]

3. *Marduk*2 // *Hymn to Ninurta as Savior*

---

40 Whether Mesopotamian texts dealing with magic should be considered technical or literary is debated among Assyriologists (see Wasserman, Zomer 2022, IX; cf. Schwemer 2014, 266-8). Mesopotamian incantations undoubtedly exhibit literary traits, such as rhetorical devices (particularly figures of sound) and imagery (see Foster 2007, 92 for the poetic features of Akkadian incantations). However, they also served a practical scope beyond the scholarly context. For the purpose of the present study, I will consider the genre of incantations and incantation series to be 'scholarly literature', i.e. technical texts, thus different from the *belles lettres* in the strict sense, see Foster 2005, 24.

41 For this parallel, see the edition in chapter 3, and the commentary on this line.

42 Hruška 1969, 489, 493; see also the new manuscript of this text BM 38166, recently identified by T. Mitto within the *eBL* project, and available on the *eBL* platform.

*Marduk*2:
9''*ana išdiḫ nēber kāri ša šitpurat alaktu*
10''*šar kiššati lā maḫri lā tēbâ tušaḫrap urḫa*
9''To do business at the quay which is busy with traffic,
10''You, O unrivalled king of the world, rouse at daybreak him who else would not rise.[43]

Hymn to Ninurta as Savior:
1*ana išdiḫ nēber kāri ša šuḫmuṭat alaktu*
2*šar kiššati lā maḫri lā tēbâ tušaḫrap urḫa*
1To do business at the quay where traffic rushes swiftly by,
2You, O unrivalled king of the world, rouse at daybreak him who else would not rise.[44]

4. *Šamaš Hymn* // *Counsels of Wisdom*

Šamaš Hymn:
100/106/119*ṭāb eli Šamaš balāṭa uttar*
100/106/119It is pleasing to Šamaš, and he will prolong his life.[45]

Counsels of Wisdom:
A+15*ṭāb eli Šamaš irâbšu dumqa*
A+15It is pleasing to Šamaš, he will requite him with favour.[46]

5. *Šamaš Hymn* // *Šurpu*

Šamaš Hymn:
125*šūt ulla pīšunu šakin ina maḫrīka*
125Those whose mouth says "No" – their case is before you.[47]

Šurpu II:
5*ana anna ulla iqbû ana ulla anna iqbû*
5Who said 'no' for 'yes', who said 'yes' for 'no'.[48]

43 Oshima 2011, 236, 250-1. The translation follows Mitto 2022a. Cf. Oshima's translation: "For the harbour ferry which is busy with coming and going, | You, the king of the universe with no rival, no opposition, hasten the way".

44 Mitto 2022a; cf. Mayer 1992, 20-1, 28.

45 Lambert 1960, 132-2; Rozzi 2021a.

46 Földi 2022a.

47 Lambert 1960, 132-3; Rozzi 2021a.

48 Reiner 1970, 13.

[56]*pīšu anna libbašu ulla*
[56](when) his mouth (says) 'yes', his heart (says) 'no'[49]

Šamaš Hymn:
[107]*ṣābit zibānīti ēpiš ṣilipti*
[107]He who cheats as he holds the scales[50]

Šurpu II:
[42]ĝiš*zi-ba-nit la kit-ti iṣ-*[*ṣa-bat* ĝiš*zi-ba-nit kit-ti ul iṣ-b*]*at*
[42]He us[ed] an untrue balance, (but) [did not us]e [the true balance][51]

6. *Šamaš Hymn* // *Commentary to Sagig* IV

Šamaš Hymn:
[31]*šaplâti malkī kūbu anunnakī tapaqqid*
[31]In the lower regions you take charge of the netherworld gods, the demons, the Anunna-gods

Commentary to Sagig IV:
[7][(x)] ⌜KÙ? (:) KI[ti]⌝: ⌜SU?:⌝ *na-ṣa-ri: šá šap-la-a-tú ma-al-ku* [d]*kù-bi* [d]*a-nun-na-ki ta-paq-qid*: SAG.⌜KI⌝ [x (x)
[7](…)] KÙ (?) means 'Netherworld' and SU (?) means 'to guard', (as in) "In the depth you review the Anunnaki, the princes of Kūbu"[52]

7. *Šamaš Hymn* // Anti-witchcraft ritual

Šamaš Hymn:
[190]*Ānu Enlil u Ea lišar*[*bû zik*]*irka*?
[190]May Anu, Enlil, and Ea glorify your [name][53]

---

49 Reiner 1970, 14. A similar concept is also attested in the inscription of Esarhaddon 113, l. 10, cf. RINAP 4 (Leichty 2011); cf. Lambert 1960, 322.

50 Rozzi 2021a; Lambert 1960, 132-3. A new Sippar manuscript allows to reconstruct the entire line, confirming Lambert's restoration, see Rozzi 2021a for the score edition.

51 Reiner 1970, 14. The theme of the dishonest merchant is also present in the *diĝiršadabba* prayer no. 11, see ll. 76-7, which display a very similar phraseology: [lú]DAM.GÀ[R MIN] | […] *ṣa-bit* ĝiš*<zi>-ba-ni-ti m*[*u-* …], "the merchant … | […] the one who holds the scales […]", see Jaques 2015, 75 and 89. A Hittite prayer (CTH 374) also displays the same theme, Jaques 2015, 142.

52 Jiménez 2016. Note that this line of the hymn to Šamaš is also quoted in a commentary on the menological series Iqqur īpuš (DT 35), in which it is used to explain the noun *malku* as the god Nergal or as the Anunnaki gods, see Jiménez 2013.

53 Rozzi 2021a; cf. Lambert 1960, 138.

Anti-witchcraft rituals addressed to Marduk and Ištar (*CMAWR*1, 8.6.1:72'-73'):[54]
72' […] … *lišar*[*bû zik*]*irka*?
73' […] … *ilī lišātir bēlūtka*
72' may […] praise your name
73' may [the ...] of the gods endow you with unrivalled lordship.

8. *Nabû Prayer* // *Omina*, e.g. *Šumma ālu* 22:

Nabû Prayer:
184 *ašar eklet namrat šēzuzu tayy*[*ār*]
184 Where there was darkness there was light, he who was in a rage relented.

Šumma ālu 22:
34 *šumma ina addari ṣerra īmur eklet namrat*
34 If a man sees a snake in Addaru, darkness will become light.[55]

4.1.3 Literary and Technical Intra- and Intertextuality: Conclusive Remarks

The corpus of the *Great Hymns and Prayers* includes both intratextual and intertextual parallels. Most of the intertextual parallels represent connections with literary texts, but links to technical texts also occur. As can be observed from the examples here provided, many of the parallels do not appear to be intentional intertextual borrowings. Instead, they seem to be part of a standard literary repertoire. Phrases like *parakkaka līteddiš* or *lišarbû zikirka* can probably be understood as typical language of religious poetry, commonly found in Akkadian hymns. Likewise, the use of the verb *kunnu* with *išdu* ('foundation'), as found in the *Nabû Prayer* and in the *Ištar Prayer*, is a proverbial expression, serving as a metaphor to symbolise the stability of someone's 'base', i.e. their legs. This expression is frequently found in literary texts, particularly in prayers.[56] Nevertheless, the similar phrases attested in *Marduk*1 and the *Nabû Prayer*, which exhibit the use of the same rare and learned terms (*qunnabru, illurtu*), are more likely to represent a direct link between the two prayers.

54 Abusch, Schwemer 2011; cf. Rozzi 2021a.

55 Freedman 2006, 12-13. Cf. also the edition of this text in chapter 2, particularly the note to this line in the philological commentary; the phrase *eklet namrat* is attested in many other divination texts, being for example a recurring formula in the liver omens as well, see Koch-Westenholz 2000, 328-42 no. 62.

56 Note the comment on this line in the commentary to the *Ištar Prayer* in chapter 3.

A possible connection seems to be shown between the *Ištar Prayer*, the *Syncretistic Hymn to Ištar*, and the bilingual composition called the *Exaltation of Ištar*, because they share entire verses, and all of them are centred around the goddess Ištar. Whether there is a direct connection between them, or whether they merely reuse stock phrases related to the goddess that also appear in other hymns or prayers, cannot be known.

The *Šamaš Hymn* is perhaps the text in the corpus under consideration that shows the greatest number of intertextual parallels with other texts.[57] The connections with the series *Šurpu* and some wisdom texts (e.g. Counsels of Wisdom)[58] lead to the hypothesis, as suggested by Lambert,[59] that this composition had gone through various stages of rewriting, possibly involving the addition of a hymnic frame to an original wisdom core. The first link between the *Šamaš Hymn* and the series *Šurpu* seems to be a recurring stock phrase, rather than a specific parallel: the phrase *šūt ulla pīšunu* in Šamaš, which shows correspondence with *Šurpu* II, is likely an idiomatic expression, perhaps found here in a shortened form.[60] The second connection between the *Šamaš Hymn* and *Šurpu* II, the motif of the dishonest merchant, is attested in other Akkadian prayers, even showing a Hittite parallel, and thus should not be regarded as specific to the *Šamaš Hymn*.

Similar observations can be made regarding the expression borrowed from divinatory texts, as attested in the *Nabû Prayer*: formulations derived from the language of omens can be observed in Akkadian literary texts as recurring tropes, so this parallel must be interpreted in this sense.[61]

57 Lambert 1960, 123, with a list of other intertextual parallels noted by Lambert.

58 See also the possible allusion to some lines of the *Šamaš Hymn* in the *Dialogue of Pessimism*, as noted by Hurowitz 2007, 33-6.

59 Lambert 1960, 123.

60 The epigrammatic nature of the couplet to which this phrase belongs (*Šamaš Hymn*, ll. 124-5) suggests that the original formula might have been longer. In fact, the meaning of the verse, as preserved in the hymn, is quite obscure, but it can be explained with the help of the *Commentary on Tummu bītu, Šurpu* II:

[39]*a-na an-na ul-la iq-bu-u*

[40]*a-na ul-la an-na iq-bu-u*

[41]*ma-ʿa aʾ-na qa-bi-ti la qa-bi-tu iq-ta-bi*

[42][(*ma-a*) *a-na*] ʿ*la*ʾ *qa-ʿbiʾ*-[*ti*?] *qa-bi-tu iq-ta-bi*

[39]"(Who) said no instead of yes [40]and said yes instead of no" (*Šurpu* II 6) – [41]this means, he said nothing about things better be spoken of, [41] and he said something [about] things better not be sp[oken of] (?), see Frahm 2018. On this truncated stock phrase, see also Lambert 1960, 322. On the phenomenon of truncated or abbreviated phrases, often attested in wisdom texts, and in particular within proverb collections, see also Cohen 2013, 83 and 106.

61 On the phenomenon of borrowings from omen series in Akkadian literary texts, see Foster 2005, 23-4, with fn. 2 for further references.

Some of the parallels shown, such as those between the two hymns to Gula, are fairly dissimilar, sharing only a short phrase or a rare word (e.g. *arû* in the Gula hymns quoted). In cases where the only common elements are one word or just a few, such as epithets like the phrase *ēpišat nikkassī*, it becomes difficult to postulate direct dependence from one text to the other, especially when the texts involved concern the same deity. However, a case of direct contact is likely represented by the obscure word *abušin*, found in both *Marduk*1 and *Marduk*2, which further serves as a direct link to lexical sources (see *infra*, § 4.2.3).

An undeniable parallel between texts, finally, is the citation of the *Šamaš Hymn* in the Medical Commentary. Clearly, in this context, the commentary is secondary to the literary composition, using it to support explanations of rare words.[62]

4.2 The *Great Hymns and Prayers* and the Lexicon

The use of exceptionally rare words, in some cases even *hapax legomena* or terms found mainly in lexical lists, is one of the distinguishing features of the *Great Hymns and Prayers* as highly literary and learned compositions. Being an integral part of scribal training, lexical texts were taught alongside literary works and other scholarly compositions, such as incantations. The transmission and memorisation of lists in combination with texts of different genres allowed for meaningful overlaps and intertextuality between the sources. Numerous studies, examining the connections between lexical, literary and scholarly texts, demonstrate the existence of these relationships. In accordance with this phenomenon, the *Great Hymns and Prayers* also show linguistic connections with lexical sources through the inclusion of individual words or word sequences that appear in the lexicon.

4.2.1 The Mesopotamian Lexical Lists and Their School Context

The scholarly approach to the Mesopotamian lexical lists has undergone many changes since von Soden's first comprehensive study on the lexical tradition in his well-known essay *Leistung und Grenze sumerischer und babylonischer Wissenschaft*.[63] Von Soden depicts the lexical lists as a primitive attempt to classify the world. His interpretation, has influenced numerous studies, and the term

62 Frahm 2011, 102-7.

63 Von Soden 1936.

Listenwissenschaft, first used by von Soden to define the Sumero-Akkadian practice of expressing knowledge through lists, has entered the vocabulary of modern Assyriology.[64]

Many scholars considered the Mesopotamian lexica as a reflection of reality, an almost pre-scientific catalogue of the world.[65] However, recent studies have proved how the pejorative assumption inherent in the concept of *Listenwissenschaft* should be dismissed, in favour of a different perception of the Mesopotamian lexical tradition that stresses the value of lists as a form of scholarship.[66]

The lexical lists represented more than simple dictionaries or naïve folk-taxonomies, and should be understood as instruments to order, classify and transmit lore.[67] The list-format is the standard structure of cuneiform scholarly inquiry, underlying all the different branches of Mesopotamian knowledge, from language and literature, to divination and legal practice.[68]

Lexical and literary texts derive from the same social and intellectual context, namely the scribal school, and this can explain the numerous interdependencies between the lexical and the literary genre. In the standard Old Babylonian curriculum, the study of lexical lists preceded that of Sumerian language and literature: in the first phase students would acquire familiarity with difficult signs and rare words belonging to the vocabulary of literary Sumerian, which was the subject of study in the advanced phase of education. Only highly educated scribes, who belonged to the social elite, would be imparted advanced linguistic and literary knowledge in Sumerian.[69]

The process of text elaboration was probably based on both copying and memorisation, yet also permitting a certain degree of innovation.[70] The fluid nature of lists, which could be changed and manip-

64 Veldhuis 2014, 19-23; Van de Mieroop 2015, 64-45; Crisostomo 2019a, 47-8. Cf. also Van de Mieroop 2018, esp. 24-6.

65 See for example Larsen 1987 and Cancik-Kirschbaum 2010; cf. Crisostomo 2019a, 48.

66 Hilgert 2009; Van de Mieroop 2015, 220-4; Crisostomo 2019a, 46-50.

67 Crisostomo 2019a, 49. Cf. Oppenheim 1978. Cf. also Crisostomo 2018 for the hermeneutical process inherent lexical lists, especially the translations.

68 Van de Mieroop 2015 and 2018, 25.

69 Michalowski 2012. Cf. Crisostomo 2016, 123.

70 Crisostomo 2016, 122-3. On memorisation within the scribal curriculum, see Delnero 2012; cf. also Jiménez 2022, 11, 23-4 for evidence of memorisation in the school tablets from Nippur. Archaic lexical lists were faithfully transmitted for many centuries, to the extent that some lists dating back to the third millennium BCE remained nearly intact until the beginning of the Old Babylonian period. An example of this conservatism is the list of professions defined by Assyriologists as ED *Lú* A, which includes titles and occupations that no longer existed at the beginning of the third millennium BCE (see Veldhuis 2010, 382-3). Veldhuis explains that copying these obsolete lexical texts, sometimes relics of social contexts that had changed completely, can be seen as

ulated, allowed borrowings from different sources, including literary ones; similarly, literary compositions could be informed by lexical texts and include words taken from lists.[71]

An investigation of the intertextual relationships between the lexicon and literature can shed light on the central role played by lists in both scribal education and also, in particular, in the composition of literary texts. Furthermore, a closer look at the interaction between the two corpora can also enhance the comprehension of the literary compositions themselves: on the one hand, it can provide helpful parallels and allow restorations of broken passages, on the other, it can improve our understanding of language and poetry. In fact, lists are closely related to the rhetorical device of enumeration that represents one of the most common stylistic features of Ancient Near Eastern poetry, also often found within the corpus of the *Great Hymns and Prayers*. This group of texts seems to display numerous connections with the lexical lists, as not only is this corpus characterised by the usage of special and learned words explained in the lists, but also because it occasionally employs enumerations of sets of lemmata that appear identical in the lexical sources.

4.2.2 Lexicon and Literature: Previous Studies

The interdependency between lists and literature has been the subject of investigation of numerous studies, the majority of which focused on texts written in Sumerian.

Miguel Civil first identified the element linking lexical and literary texts, namely the enumeration.[72] This poetical device consists of a list of words that may follow a specific thematic order or be arranged in

a way of preserving cultural and ideological heritage, maintaining continuity with the Sumerian past within the Akkadian context. Furthermore, Veldhuis identifies a watershed in the history of lexical tradition, highlighting that the characteristic feature of Akkadian lexical texts (from the Old Babylonian period onwards) is their extreme variability and flexibility, see Veldhuis 2010, 379; cf. also 2014, 223-5, Crisostomo 2016, 138 and Civil 2011, 229. In fact, fluidity, as well as a certain degree of intertextuality, is a general characteristic of lexicons, not only observed in Mesopotamian lists but also, for example, in Greek lexicography. In his study on Atticist lexica, for example, Vessella (2018, 16) comments as follows: "lexica tend to be the compilations of material coming from pre-existing lexica. The filiation between texts is often very intricate, and heavily characterised by cross-contamination between different branches of the same tradition, or sharing of the same sources". The reason why lexica undergo numerous modifications lies in their purpose: unlike literary texts, lexica serve not only scholarly functions but primarily practical ones, i.e. education. This means they can be enhanced and adapted for better usability (see Vessella 2018, 15-18).

71 Veldhuis 1997, 126-9; Crisostomo 2016; Cavigneaux 1985, 4.

72 Civil 1987.

an apparently chaotic catalogue (the so-called chaotic enumeration).[73] Whereas lists in lexical texts served pedagogical purposes, lists in literature are embedded in the text, and their scope is to convey a sense of completeness.[74]

As noted by Rubio, several Early Dynastic compositions seem to sit halfway between lexical lists and poetry.[75] The zà-mí hymns, for example, include two or three line long litanies composed of lists of cities and divine names, followed by the hymnic formula zà-mí 'be praised'.[76]

In his study on the relationship between the lexicon and Sumerian literature, Civil has brought attention to the occurrence of sets of lexical terms within various Sumerian literary compositions. He shows, for example, that in "Home of the Fish" or in "Feeding Dumuzi's Sheep" the lexical lemmata are encased in fixed formulas and followed by a short explanatory comment; the formulas, together with their comments, are in turn included in a broader frame, which forms the narrative context. Civil hypothesised that the comments on the lexical terms could derive from Early Dynastic lexical texts.[77]

A similar case of overlapping between literature and lexicography has been investigated by Veldhuis, who examined the Sumerian text labelled by modern scholars as "Nanše and the Birds".[78] This composition is constituted for the most part of a catalogue of bird names and their description, representing another example of the 'enumeration literature' previously defined by Civil. Veldhuis convincingly showed that the majority of bird names found in the text (79%) were also itemised in the Early Dynastic birds list, although the terms found in the literary composition are not listed in the same order in which they appear in the lexical sources.[79]

One example of exact correspondence between the lemmata listed in a lexical text and those enumerated in a literary text is provided by the Old Babylonian Sumerian hymn to Inana known as In-nin-šà-gur-ra$_4$. As Michalowski has demonstrated, the learned

73 For a study on the chaotic enumeration, see Spitzer 1945. Cf. Wasserman 2021 for possible examples of chaotic enumerations in Akkadian literature.

74 Wasserman forthcoming, 9. Merismus is another possible rhetorical strategy used to express totality in Akkadian literature, see Wasserman 2003.

75 Rubio 2003, 203-6.

76 Rubio 2003, 205; cf. Krecher 1992.

77 Civil 1987, esp. 37.

78 Veldhuis 2004.

79 Moreover, according to Veldhuis's study, most of the birds names used in the Sumerian proverbs match those appearing in OB Ura (see Veldhuis 2004, 95-8).

lexical series erim$_2$-ḫuš = *anantu* (MSL 17)[80] contains direct quotations from In-nin šà-gur-ra$_4$: l. 157 of the hymn is quoted in *Erimḫuš* I 280-3, and l. 159 appears in *Erimḫuš* II 1-5. Furthermore, the two texts share a similar vocabulary, often employing the same rare words, a trait that also suggests a strong interdependency between the genres.[81]

Analysing the lexical similarities between three curricular lists and various Sumerian compositions, Crisostomo illustrated other cases of intertextual relationship. His study indicates that two hymns belonging to the so-called Enḫeduanna corpus share a high number of lemmata with *Izi*, and that the Sumerian Proverbs collection employs some extremely rare sign values, only ever attested in the sign list *Ea*.[82] In addition, Crisostomo also noted that the word list Lú-azlag and two Sumerian dialogues ("A Father and his Perverse Son", also known as Eduba B, and the "Dialogue between two scribes") contain the same set of insults, listed precisely in the same sequence. More entries of Lú-azlag appear in other Eduba texts and dialogues, a fact that implies a strong correlation between the lexical and literary corpora.[83]

Löhnert has also drawn attention to a sequence of words enumerated in a *balaĝ* prayer: she noticed that the text contains a set of lexical terms for doors, which appears identical in a later literary composition and in the Proto-*Kagal* list.[84]

Learned lemmata used in a literary text can depend on multiple lexical texts from various periods. The list of plant names found in a passage of Enki and Ninḫursaĝa (ll. 190-221)[85] seems to rely on various lexical sources: the a-tu-tu plant, for example, is elsewhere attested only in the *Uruanna* list of plants (see *CAD* A/2 522 sub *atutu*), and the *amḫāra* plant is a medical plant attested, besides in Enki and Ninḫursaĝa, only in Ura = *ḫubullu* XVII (MSL 10, 84, 50; 117, 16; 120, 16).[86]

80 See also the recent edition of some manuscripts with an introduction to the series in Hrůša, Weiershäuser 2020, 8-11 and 103-36.

81 Michalowski 1998.

82 Crisostomo 2016, 133-5; for the connections between literary texts and the list *Izi*, see also Crisostomo 2019a, 195. For other correlations between lists and Sumerian proverbs, see Krebernik 2004 and Crisostomo 2019b. Cf. also the observation by Tinney in Veldhuis 2014, 209.

83 Crisostomo 2016, 136; cf. Veldhuis 2014, 164; see also Böck 1999, 55.

84 Löhnert 2009, 214-15.

85 The order of the lines follows the online *Oxford Electronic Corpus of Sumerian Literature* (http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/).

86 Katz 2008, 330-1; Johnson (2015, 3-4) observes that this section of Enki and Ninḫursaĝa is a good example of the process of entextualisation, namely the modification of a discourse and the creation of a text decontextualised from its prior setting (for the notion of entextualisation, cf. Silverstein, Urban 1996, esp. 21).

The phenomenon of interrelation of the lexicon and literary compositions has also been detected in Akkadian sources. In his edition of *Malku* = *šarru*, Ivan Hrůša provided examples of possible connections between the synonym list and numerous Akkadian literary texts of different genres, further stressing the relevance of the list *Malku* in the process of writing and composing works of literature.[87]

Among the examples offered by Hrůša, there are two that illustrate that *Malku* was well-known to the authors of commentaries. Indeed both the commentaries on *Ludlul* and on the *Babylonian Theodicy* contain words explained through the same equations provided by *Malku*, e.g. in the commentary on the *Theodicy*, the word *sattukku* 'regular offering', is equated, as in *Malku*, to: *gi-nu-ú šá* DIĜIR, namely 'present (*ginû*) of the gods'.[88]

Other texts that seem to use *Malku* as a source are some Neo-Assyrian inscriptions of Sargon II, which display rare words and expressions elsewhere attested only in the synonym list (e.g. *muʾāru* 'man', following *Malku* I 167: *muʾāru* = *eṭlu*).[89]

The fifth tablet of the Standard Babylonian version of the *Gilgameš Epic* includes an extensive enumeration of wind names (ll. 137-41), which depends on a list in *Malku* III 180-206.[90] In addition, SB *Gilgameš* contains further borrowings from the lexical sources: the portion of the text involving the mourning of Enkidu (tablet V, ll. 16-17), for example, includes a catalogue of wild animals which closely resembles a passage of Ura = *ḫubullu* VII.[91]

SB *Gilgameš* V, ll. 16-17:

16 *lib-ki-ku asu bu-ṣu nim-ru mìn-di-n[u lu-l]i-mu du-ma-mu*
17 [*nēšu rʔi-mu a-a-lu tu-ra-ḫu bu-lum u* [*nam-ma*]*š-šu-ú šá* EDIN
16 May the bear mourn you, the hyena, panther, cheetah, stag and jackal,
17 the lion, wild bull, deer, ibex, the herds and animals of the wild![92]

87 Hrůša 2010, esp. 16-18.

88 Hrůša 2010, 17; cf. Jiménez 2017b. Moreover, the *Theodicy* Commentary provides many further evidences of the strong correlation with the synonym list: l. 16 of the commentary, for example, quotes directly from *Malku* IV 196-8: *ta-ḫa-na-*ʿ*tú*ʾ [: *ta-li-mat: a-zi*]-ʿ*ba-tú*ʾ: *ú-sat*, "'Help' (*taḫanātu*) = 'succour', 'support' mean 'assistance'". See Jiménez 2017b.

89 Hrůša 2010, 17.

90 Hrůša 2010, 16-18.

91 See Weiershäuser, Hrůša 2018. Cf. Wasserman 2021, 63.

92 George 2003, 651-2.

***Ḫḫ* XIV, 48, 63, 75-76, 146-8:**

[48]a m = *ri-i-mu*
[63]u r = *ne$_2$-e-šu$_2$*
[75]u r - š u b$_5$ = *min$_3$-di-nu*
[76]u r - š u b$_5$ - k u d - d a = *du-ma-mu*
[146]l u - l i m = *lu-li-mu*
[147]s i - m u l = *a-a-lu*
[148]d u r a ḫ = *tu-ra-ḫu*[93]

In his study on poetic enumerations in Akkadian, Nathan Wasserman observed that borrowings from lexical lists are present in incantations as well (e.g. the list of mountain names in the Lipšur litanies, which is dependent on Ura = *ḫubullu* XXII).[94]

Recently, Mark Weeden has proposed potential intertextual connections between SB *Gilgameš* V and the sign lists from the early second millennium BCE. Additionally, he suggested a further intertextual link between SB *Gilgameš* V and a section of OB Ura.[95]

One notable example of literary-lexical overlapping is the exposition of Marduk's names in the *Enūma eliš* VI 121-VII 136. As convincingly demonstrated by Lambert, the fifty names of Marduk exhibit significant similarities with the god list An = *Anum*.[96]

Literary enumerations in the Akkadian language that exhibit parallels with lexical sources can, in certain cases, be regarded as standard sets. For instance, the enumeration of winds in *Malku* can be considered a fixed group, as it is attested in multiple sources, including literary and lexical texts, as well as incantations.[97] Ehelolf was the first scholar to analyse this phenomenon, particularly in Sumerian-Akkadian bilingual dictionaries.[98] He identified word length as the organising principle behind these fixed sequences, that is, the terms occurring in these standard sets seem to be listed from the one with the fewest number of syllables to the one with the most. Ehelolf also noted that standard sets were likely memorised by scribes.[99] The structure of these sequences of semantically related

93 Weiershäuser, Hrůša 2018, 145-6 and 149.

94 Wasserman 2021, 62. For *Ḫḫ* XXII Weiershäuser, Hrůša 2018.

95 Weeden 2021.

96 Lambert 2013, 149-54.

97 See the note on ll. 16-17 of the *Ištar Prayer* (chapter 3): the same sequence is found in incantations.

98 Ehelolf 1916.

99 Ehelolf 1916, 25.

words had a certain rhythm that probably facilitated memorisation.[100] This practice exemplifies the type of 'infrastructural' intertextuality mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. Having learned these fixed sequences of lemmas by heart, scribes would then repeat the same sets in other texts, including literary compositions, either consciously or unconsciously (i.e. automatically).

As can be seen from the previous examples, it is possible to identify two main types of interdependency between lexical and literary texts, one that involves the device of enumeration, which we shall call 'Type A', and another that results from the use of the same rare lemmata in both corpora, 'Type B'. In the first case (Type A), the intertextual connections can be determined by:

1. An identical enumeration: the lexical and the literary text contain the same list of lemmata, enumerated in the exact same sequence (as is the case of Lú-azlag and the Eduba texts and dialogues, or the list of the winds found in *Gilgameš* and in *Malku*).
2. A similar enumeration: the lexical and the literary text contain a list of lemmata which occasionally overlap; that is, the same terms might occur in both corpora, but they might appear in a different order (as for example in "Nanše and the Birds").
3. An enumeration lacking the hypotext:[101] the literary text contains an enumeration of lemmata which closely resembles a list of lexical items, although there appears to be no corresponding lexical counterpart. In other words, such enumerations seem to draw from lexical sources, yet lack an actual lexical parallel (as with the "Home of the Fish" or "Feeding Dumuzi's Sheep").[102]

The second type of interdependence (Type B) concerns the shared use of a special vocabulary, i.e. rare terms attested exclusively in the lexical lists and in the literary compositions (such as the plant

100 Poebel 1914, 254.

101 I use here the definition coined by Genette 1997, 5, related to the notion of hypertextuality: "By hypertextuality I mean any relationship uniting a text B (which I call the hypertext) to an earlier text A (I shall, of course, call it the hypotext), upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not a commentary. […] To view things differently, let us posit the general notion of a text in the second degree […]: i.e. a text derived from another pre-existent text". Cf. also Jiménez for the concept of hypotext within a discourse involving intertextuality as applied to the Akkadian literature (Jiménez 2017a, 80).

102 Cf. Johnson 2019, 17: "As always, Civil wisely avoids making any general statements about the generative properties of the process of enumeration, and at least in part, this is due to the fact that we do not have explicit textual precursors that demonstrate this type of derivational process. Stated somewhat differently, for the most part, we do not have the thematically driven lexical lists that would have served as direct written sources for the type of enumerations that Civil hypothesised".

names in Enki and Ninḫursaĝa, the shared vocabulary between the Enḫeduanna texts and the *Izi* list, or the rare words found in the above mentioned inscription of Sargon, also attested in *Malku*).

Similar cases of intertextuality can be detected within the corpus of the *Great Hymns and Prayers*. In the following paragraph, some examples of contact between these texts and the lexical lists will be provided.

4.2.3 The *Great Hymns and Prayers* and the Lexicon: Intertextual Connections

While the precise *Sitz im Leben* of the *Great Hymns and Prayers* texts is unknown, it is clear that they belonged to a scholarly context. Their importance within the stream of literary tradition is confirmed by the abundance of sources, many of which are school tablets,[103] a fact that proves that at least some of these texts had a wide circulation and were used in the scribal education.[104]

The extensive use of this group of texts in the scribal schools can explain the numerous intertextual connections between this corpus and the lexicon. In some manuscripts, passages of the *Great Hymns and Prayers* are preserved together with lexical lists, as for example BM 36296+BM 38070, which contains on the obverse the first seven lines of the *Šamaš Hymn*, immediately followed by a portion of Ura = *ḫubullu* XV (MSL 9, 10).[105]

The *Great Hymns and Prayers* present the types of intertextual relationship with the lexical corpus that have been described in the previous paragraph: they often contain literary enumerations, which in some cases correspond precisely to lists of terms in the lexical sources, together with special, high-register words, attested and explained in the lists.

As will be seen in the few examples provided below, several enumerations found in the *Great Hymns and Prayers* can be regarded as standard sets.[106]

103 For a list of the manuscripts see chapter 1, § 1.2.2.

104 Their exact date of composition is unknown, though there are indications that at least one of these texts (*Marduk*1) had been copied since the Old Babylonian period, and continued to be transmitted until the third century BCE, see Oshima 2011, 138 and Fadhil, Jiménez 2019, 155 and fn. 4. Cf. the remarks of Lambert 1960, 122 on the possible date of composition of the *Šamaš Hymn*, also preserved in numerous school tablets.

105 Weiershäuser, Hrůša 2018, 112-16. See George, Taniguchi 2019, 8. There are numerous cases of these texts being copied on school tablets, together with extracts from lexical lists, cf. George, Taniguchi 2019, 4-8 and cf. also chapter 1, § 1.2.2.

106 See infra, the set of words for 'cold' in the Great Šamaš hymn, as already highlighted by Landsberger (1949, 156-7), and the words for 'supplication' in the *Ištar Prayer*, for example.

Additionally, while the use of a complex lexicon, primarily sourced from lexical texts, is not a unique characteristic of the examined compositions, it is commonly found in various literary texts, including the Old Babylonian Hymns and certain wisdom texts (cf. below the Appendix). Nevertheless, specific rare lemmas within the *Great Hymns and Prayers* suggest a more direct and intimate relationship with the lexicon. These instances indicate a closer interconnection between the hymns and prayers and the lexical sources.

4.2.3.1 Identical or Similar Enumerations

An identical enumeration is found for example in the *Šamaš Hymn*, as it contains a set of synonyms for 'cold' that resembles a passage in *Antagal* I, col. i 8'-11' (MSL 17, 231),[107] cf. also *Erimḫuš* VI 71-4 (MSL 17, 83, 71-4):[108]

***Šamaš Hymn*:**

181 *mu-šal-biš ku-ṣu ḫal-pa-a šu-ri-pa šal-gi*
181 Who covers (the earth) with cold, frost, ice, (and) snow.[109]

***Antagal* I:**

8' en-te-[na(?)]IZI+A = [*ku-uṣ-ṣu*]
9' u d - š ú - u š - r u = [*ḫal-pu-ú*]
10' a-ʳmaˀ-gi a m a g i (MÙŠ×A+DI) = ʳ*šu*ˀ-*ri*-ʳ*pu*ˀ
11' A še-eg AN = *šal-gu*

Within the same hymn, the couplet immediately following includes a list of terms related to the door and its parts, the majority of which occur in a section of Ura = *ḫubullu* V:

***Šamaš Hymn*:**

182 *pe-tu-ú* ABUL *sik-kur* AN-*e muš-pal-ku-u da-lat da-ád-me*
183 *mu-še-lu-ú up-pu up-pi sik-ka-ta nam-za-qí áš-kut-ta*

107 For the restoration of this passage, see Landsberger 1934b, 248; cf. also Landsberger 1949, 156-7 on the 'stereotypical' sequence *ḫalpû šurīpu šalgu*.

108 Cf. Hrůša, Weiershäuser 2020, 123.

109 Lambert 1960, 136-7; for the new reading, based on the recently identified fragment BM 48214+BM 48226, see the *eBL* edition Rozzi 2021a; cf. Rozzi 2023b.

[182]Who opens the gate (and) the bolt of heaven, opens wide the doors of the inhabited world.
[183]Who lifts the socket, the pin, the latchkey, the bolt,[110]

***Ḫḫ* V:**

[270]ĝiš saĝ-kul = *si-ik-ku-ru*
[278]ĝiš aškud$_x$ = *áš-kut-tu*
[286]ĝiš mud = *up-*[*pu*] (also 290: ĝiš e$_{11}$ = *u*[*p-pu*])
[288]ĝiš níĝ-gag-ti = *na*[*m-za-qu*] (see also 291: ĝiš e$_{11}$ = [*na*]*m-za-qu*)[111]

Two further examples involving lists of terms that show similarities with lexical sources are found in the *Nabû Prayer* (see chapter 2 for the edition, and the note to this line in the commentary). In l. 105 two names of demons, namely the *ḫallulāju*-demon and *ilu lemnu*, are mentioned in the poetic composition. These demons also occur together in immediate succession in *Erimḫuš* I 213-15 (MSL 17, 19; cf. also the note to this line in the commentary, chapter 2).

***Nabû*:**
[105][*a*ʾ-*šam*ʾ-*š*]*á-niš ḫal-lu-la-a-a* DIĜIR *lem-ni ta-x* [x x]
[105][Like a wh]irlwind, the Hallulāyu-demon, the evil god you… […]

***Erimḫuš* I:**

[213]maškim$_2$ gi$_6$ lu$_2$-har-ra-an = *ḫal-lu-la-a-a,*
[214]maškim$_2$ gi$_4$ a-ri-a = *šá-niš* MIN
[215]diĝir ki-šu tag-ga nu-tuku = DIĜIR *lem-nu*

Ll. 176 and 178 of the same text display a vocabulary that seems to rely on a set of four entries found in *Malku* (*Malku* II 128-31; cf. the commentary on these lines in chapter 2): the rare terms *šuršurru* and *ḫinzūru* appear together in l. 176 of the prayer, forming a genitive chain. The two words also occur in *Malku*, in immediate succession (*Malku* II 128-9):

110 The Late Babylonian fragment BM 48214, only recently identified, allows now to restore this couplet (ll. 182-3) completely, cf. the *eBL* edition of the text in Rozzi 2021a; 2023b; cf. Lambert 1960, 136-7.

111 Weiershäuser, Hrůša 2018, 86-7; MSL 6, 30. The word *sikkatu* is itemised independently in *Ḫḫ* VI 120, nevertheless it is listed very often in *status constructus* in *Ḫḫ* V, e.g. 287 ĝiš gag mud = *sik-kàt up-pi*, ĝiš gag níĝ-gag-ti = *sik-kàt* KI.MIN for *sikkat namzāqi*.

***Nabû Prayer*:**

[176]*še-e-ru re-ṣu-ti-ia šur-šú-ru ḫi-in-zur-ru*
[176]My morning aid, the fruits of the apple-tree

***Malku* II:**

[128]*šur-šur-ru* = *n*[*u- úr*?*-mu*?*-ú*?]
[129]*ḫi-in-zu-ru* = *ḫaš-ḫu-ru*
[128]*šuršurru*-fruit = Pomegranate
[129]Apple-tree = Apple, Apple-tree[112]

Moreover, the occurrence of the terms *alamittu* and *mar* in l. 179 recalls *Malku* II 130-1:

***Nabû*:**

[179]*a-la-mit-tu*$_4$ *ú-ḫe-en-šá da-da-riš ma-a-*[*ar*]
[179]The early fruit of the date-palm is bit[ter] like stinkwort.

***Malku* II:**

[130]*mar-ra-tú* = *gi-šim-ma-ri*
[131]*a-la-mit-tu*$_4$ = MIN
[130]"The bitter one" = Datepalm
[131]*alamittu*-palm = *ditto*[113]

The *Nabû Prayer* contains yet another element that might be derived from lexical sources. L. 183 shows an expression which is attested both in the Assyrian commentary m u r - g u d = *imrû* = *ballu* and in the list of medical ingredients u r u - a n - n a = *maštakal* (also compare the note in chapter 2 on this line in the commentary):

***Nabû*:**

[183][*m*]*u-ú-ṣu šá lìb-bi ú-ru-la-ti-šú ik-kib* DINGIR.MEŠ *ka-la-ma ana* UN.MEŠ x [x]
[183]The discharge of his foreskin is an abomination to all the gods and [common] to the people.

112 Hrůša 2010, 60-1 and 341.

113 Hrůša 2010, 60-1 and 341.

HgB (commentary to *Ḫḫ* XV; MSL 9, 35, 70):

70 uzu*mu-ú-ṣu = šá* ŠÀ *ú-ru-la-ti-šú*: *pap-pal-tú šá bir-ki* LÚ
70discharge = that of the inside of his urethra (that is), discharge of the man's penis.[114]

***Uruanna* III (MSL 10, 70, 32):**

171 na4*mu-ṣu šá* (var. ŠÀ) *u2-ru-la-ti-šú: pap-pal-tu šá* GÌŠ NAM.LÚ.U_{18}.LU = calculus of his urethra, (that is) discharge of men's penis.[115]

Such an expression seems more suitable for a lexical or technical context, than for a poetic one. Furthermore, the verses preceding and following l. 183 do not deal with the same topic or a similar one, and the pronominal suffix found within this line, i.e. *-šu* in *urullātīšu*, does not seem to refer to any subject appearing within this portion of the text.

The 'agrammaticality' of this phrase, namely the discordance between this phrase and the rest of the composition, might suggest that it was borrowed from a different source.[116]

Another example of possible intertextuality is provided by the *Ištar Prayer* (see the edition in chapter 3). In ll. 16-18 the four winds are listed in the standard order, commonly found in lexical lists, and the mention of the 'side winds' which occurs after the four winds, points to a similar set in *Malku* III 197-202 (cf. the commentary on these lines in chapter 3):

***Ištar Prayer*:**

26[*petê idīki*(?) *šu*]*-bé-'e-i* IM I
27[*pīt purīdīki*(?)] *pa-ni* IM II
28[IM III IM IV(?)] IM *i-da-a-ti*
26[The spreading of your wings is the ru]sh of the South wind,
27[The opening of your legs is] the face of the North wind,
28[the East wind, the West wind], the side wind.

114 Cf. also HgD XV 75 (MSL 9, 38; Weiershäuser, Hrůša 2018, 214): [uz]u*mu-ú-ṣu = šá* ŠÀ ˹*ú-ru-la-ti-šú*˺: [*pap-pal-tú šá bir-ki* LÚ].

115 Cf. *CAD* U 270-1 sub *urullātu*. Compare also in Hrůša, Weiershäuser 2020, 37, *Uruanna* III 161: ˹na4˺*mu*˺-[*ṣu* NÍTA]= [na4*mu-ṣu šá* ŠÀ GÌŠ], "*mūṣu*-Stein des Mannes | *mūṣu*-Stein aus dem Inneren des Penis".

116 On the 'agrammaticality' as a sign of intertextuality, see Jiménez 2017a, 82.

***Malku* III:**

197[p i r i ĝ]-g[a l] = [*š*]*u-ú-ti*
198[p i r i ĝ -b à n]-d a = [*i*]*l-ta-nu*
199[p i r i ĝ -š]u-d u$_7$ = *ša-du-u*
200[p]i r i ĝ -n u -š u -d u$_7$ = *a-m*[*u*]*r-ru*
201i m -t i -l a = *šá-a-ri ṣ*[*e*]*-li*
202i m -t i -l a = MIN *i-da-a-t*[*i*][117]

Compare, moreover, *The Practical Vocabulary of Assur*, 19'-22', which also uses numbers for the ideograms of the winds.[118]

In addition, the *Ištar Prayer* also shows a case of identical enumeration:

246[*su*]*-up-pu-ú su-*ʳ*ul*ˀ*-*[*lu-u šu-te-m*]*u-qu ku-um-ma* ^{d}*iš-tar*
246Supplication, petition, prayer are yours, O Ištar!

The terms *suppû* and *sullû* form a well-known fixed pair, but a few lexical sources also add *šutēmuqu* to the sequence, thus forming a standard set (e.g. *Aa* V/III 43-5; MSL 14, 422; see the note on this line in the commentary in chapter 3 for further lexical references).

The prayer to Marduk labelled *Marduk*1 by scholars also seems to display an intertextual connection with *Malku*: ll. 21-4 employ a group of synonyms for 'intelligence' that resembles a similar set itemised in the synonym list (*Malku* IV 119-20):[119]

***Marduk*1:**

21/23*be-lu*$_4$/^{d}AMAR.UTU *at-ta-ma* [*mu-du*]*-ú ta-šim-ti*
22/24*šá mil-ka ru-up-pu-šá* [*ši-t*]*u-lu ir-šu*
21/23Lord, you are the [one who know]s intelligence,
22/24The one who gained profound advice and [con]sultation.[120]

***Malku* IV:**

119*ta-šim-tu*$_4$ = *mil-ku*
120*ši-tul-tu*$_4$ = MIN
119intelligence = advice
120consultation = *ditto*[121]

117 Hrůša 2010, 88-9, 237 and 374.

118 See Hrůša, Weiershäuser 2020, 47; Landsberger, Gurney 1958, 334; cf. Lambert 1959-60, 50.

119 Cf. Oshima 2011, 174 and *CAD* T 288 sub *tašīmtu* A, lex. sec.

120 I follow here Oshima 2011, 144, 158-9.

121 Hrůša 2010, 100-1, 244 and 386.

Cf. also the word group in *Antagal* A 200-3 (MSL 17, 188): *ṭè-e-mu, mil-ku, ši-tul-tu*$_4$, *ta-šim-tu*$_4$.

In the so-called *Queen of Nippur*, the goddess Ištar is invoked under numerous names, many of which are rare and mostly attested in lexical lists.[122] One couplet in particular (col. iii, 57-8) mentions two names of the goddess that also occur together in a god list (Lambert, Winters 2023, 288; cf. CT 25, pl. 30 i 22-3):

***Queen of Nippur*:**

57 d*mi-nu-ú-an-ni ek-de-tú pu-luḫ-tu*
58 d*mi-nu-ú-ul-la e-li-ia-tú šá-lum-mat bu-ri*
57Minû-anni, fierce with terror,
58Minû-ulla, the lofty, the splendour of the Bull-Calf.[123]

Shorter An = *Anum* Section H:

42 d*mi-nu-an-n*[*i*]
43 d*mi-nu-u*[*l-la*][124]

The examples provided so far have concerned the use of lists as poetic tools that can be inserted and manipulated within the literary compositions. In some cases 'identical enumerations' have been identified (as in the *Šamaš Hymn*, l. 181); other examples have illustrated enumerations in the literary texts, which only partially overlap those attested in the lexical lists (*Šamaš Hymn*, ll. 182-3). Occasionally, lexical sets can even be 'split' within the literary composition, thus losing their enumerative character (e.g. *Marduk*1).

4.2.3.2 Enumeration Lacking the Hypotext

In addition, the *Great Hymns and Prayers* also largely employ what we have defined as an 'enumeration lacking the hypotext'. For example, *Gula Bullussa-rabi* presents a couplet (ll. 40-1) containing an enumeration of lexical terms related to the semantic field of agriculture, which does not have any precise lexical parallel:

122 Lambert 1982, esp. his commentary to col. ii, ll. 18-19 and ll. 22-3 (208) and to col. iii, ll. 67-8 (213). Cf. also Földi 2021c.

123 Lambert 1982, 198-9. Cf. Földi 2021c.

124 Lambert, Winters 2023, 288 (Shorter An = *Anum* Section H 42-3).

***Gula Bullussa-rabi*:**

40 *be-let qup-pi* NUMUN ĝeš APIN *har-bu* ĝeš TUKUL *u re-di-i*
41 *mut-tab-bi-lat áš-lu am-mat* GI.MEŠ *gi-níg-da-nak-ku*
40 Mistress of basket, seed grain, plow, field plot, plowshare, and ox driver,
41 Who stretches out the measuring cord, reed cubits, and measuring rod.[125]

*Marduk*2, l. 37'' presents an enumeration of terms connected to navigation, for which no exact lexical parallel is found:

***Marduk*2:**

37'' [*ṭ*]*ur-ri kib-ri ka-a-ri né-be-ri qa-tuk-ka paq-du*
37'' My rope, bank harbour, embankment and ferry are entrusted to you.[126]

4.2.4 Lexical Interdependence

The dependence of the *Great Hymns and Prayers* on the lexical corpus is also corroborated by the occurrence of special, extremely learned words that are elsewhere found only in the lexical lists. This corresponds to what we have previously labelled as the "Type B"-interdependence, namely the lexical interdependence.

The following terms are attested exclusively or predominantly (see the term *abdu*) within the lexical lists and the *Great Hymns and Prayers*:

- *muṣallû* 'liar': *Šamaš Hymn*, l. 143[127] and *Malku* VIII 35[128] (cf. *AHw* II 678; *CAD* M/2 241);[129]
- *qunnabru* 'fetters': *Nabû Prayer*, l. 173, (cf. the edition and the commentary on this line in chapter 2), *Marduk*1, l. 61, l. 155[130] and *Malku* I 95 (cf. *AHw* II 928; *CAD* Q 306);

125 The translation used here is that of Foster, *apud* Földi 2021a. Cf. Lambert 1967, 118-19.

126 Oshima 2011, 238, 250-1.

127 Lambert 1960, 134-5; Rozzi 2021a.

128 Hrůša 2010, 140-1 and 423.

129 *CAD* considers the word as derived from *sullû* 'to pray', 'to implore'; but the meaning 'liar' could also be possible (ll. 143-4), since this verse and the following lines deal with evildoers facing the Sun-god; cf. the commentary on this line in chapter 5, § 5.2.5.1.5.

130 Oshima 2011, 147, 160-1; 154, 166-7.

- *ḫinzūru* 'apple-tree': *Nabû Prayer*, l. 176, *Malku* II 129[131] and esp. *Malku* III 210[132] (cf. *AHw* I 333-4; *CAD* Ḫ 139-40);
- *abdu* 'slave': *Nabû Prayer* ll. 104 and 150, *Ištar Prayer* l. 91 (cf. the edition of the prayer and the commentary on this line in chapter 3), *Malku* I 175[133] and *Antagal* 229 (MSL 17, 159; cf. *AHw* I 6; *CAD* A/1 52).[134]
- *abūšin* 'flood': *Marduk*1, ll. 5/7;[135] *Marduk*2, ll. 80/82 and *Malku* II 257[136] (cf. *CAD* A/1, 93a);
- *sissiru* 'granary': *Anūna Prayer*, ll. 29 and 111 and *Malku* I 273[137] (cf. *AHw* III 1038; *CAD* S 328 sub *sissiru* B);
- *gāgamu*, mng. uncertain, probably refers to a type of building: *Anūna Prayer*, l. 93 and *Malku* I 267[138] (cf. *AHw* I 273; *CAD* G 1);
- *karpaṣu* 'superb': *Gula Bullussa-rabi* l. 171[139] and Expl. *Malku* 154[140] (cf. *AHw* I 449; *CAD* K 219).

In analysing the relations between the lexicon and the literary corpus, it can be difficult to ascertain that an interdependence is in fact to be taken as such. Especially when dealing with enumerations lacking the lexical hypotexts, one has to consider the possibility that either the lexical source was lost in transmission or that there had been no lexical source at all, and the lexical-like listing inserted in the literary text should be understood as an original poetic expression.

However problematic it might be to recognise and classify intertextual connections, the examples presented above have shown that there is indeed a certain degree of correlation between the *Great Hymns and Prayers* and the lexical sources: a high level of interdependency is found especially between the literary compositions and the synonym list *Malku = šarru*. This confirms that *Malku* had a practical use in the composition and study of the Akkadian literary texts,

131 Hrůša 2010, 60-1 and 341.

132 Hrůša 2010, 182-3 and 452.

133 Hrůša 2010, 42-3 and 313.

134 This word is also attested in a literary letter to a god, l. 14: *ab-du pa-li-ḫu* (Kraus 1983, 205-9). Interestingly, the same letter features a parallel with l. 30 of *Marduk*1: *ša ar-hiš na-ap-šu-ru ba-*[*šu-ú it-ti-šu*], "The one from whom forgiveness arrives swiftly", cf. Oshima 2011, 158-9.

135 Oshima 2011, 142, 158-9, 171-2; cf. Fadhil, Jiménez 2019, 167, 169 and 173.

136 Hrůša 2010, 18, 70-1, 223-4, 352.

137 Hrůša 2010, 50-1 and 324.

138 Hrůša 2010, 48-9 and 323.

139 Lambert 1967, 126-7 and 132.

140 Hrůša 2010, 158-9 and 435.

and was not a mere scholarly collection of learned lemmata.[141]

Although in most cases it is impossible to ascertain whether it was the literary text using the lexicon as a source of inspiration or *vice versa*, there are instances where the direction of the process is clear. The case of [*m*]*u-ú-ṣu šá lìb-bi ú-ru-la-ti-šú* in line 182 of the *Nabû Prayer* (see above), for example, indicates that the author of the composition very likely relied on the lexical source and used it to create the text.

The difficult word *abūšin* (see above, in *Marduk*1 and *Marduk*2), on the contrary, probably reflects the opposite situation: Lambert explained it as a scribal mistake perhaps originated from an original *abūruk* (derived from *abāru* 'to be strong'), written *a-bu*-RUK and misinterpreted by the scribes copying the prayer, who understood the form as *a-bu*-ŠIN. This would have led to the various corrupted forms attested in the manuscripts of *Marduk*1 (i.e. BM 45476: *a-bu-ši-in* (l. 5) and *a-bu-si-in* (l. 7), BM 76492: *a-bu*-ŠIN) and in *Marduk*2 (BM 55300: ˹*a-bu-šin*˺, ll. 80/82), and then eventually to the peculiar entry in *Malku* II 257 *a-bu-ši-in*/*šin*.[142] Lamberts's hypothesis, however, should now be dismissed, due to the identification of a school tablet from the Kassite period (HS 1895), which duplicates *An* VIII 75-85 on its reverse side; HS 1895 features the following reading (rev. l. 17): *a-bu-ši-im* = *a-bu-bu*.[143] This suggests that the mistaken reading of RUK as ŠIN must have occurred in a period preceding the Kassite era. However, as pointed out by Jiménez in the first edition of this fragment,[144] the spelling RUK is unlikely to be found in an Old Babylonian or early Kassite manuscript.[145] Furthermore, the Cassite school-tablet shows the ending *-im*, and not *-in*. The word *a-bu-ši-im*/*in* seems therefore to be an actual word, whose exact meaning still evades us, possibly featuring a non-Akkadian ending. It can be hypothesised, in this case, that the direction of the intertextual connection probably shifted from the literary composition to the lexical texts, in which lexicographers itemised and explained the obscure term *abūšin*/*im*.[146]

Lexical and literary texts were integral parts of the scribal education, and were both used in the production of texts. Indeed scribes

141 Hrůša 2010, 18; cf. Edzard 2007, 24, who understands the synonym list *Malku* as a purely theoretical product of intellectual lucubrations.

142 Hrůša 2010, 18; Lambert 2011; 2013, 473; cf. Fadhil, Jiménez 2019, 173.

143 Jiménez 2022, 197, 199-200.

144 Jiménez 2022, 193-201.

145 This is because the Old Babylonian and Kassite orthographies typically preferred CV signs, whereas the use of CVC signs became more prevalent from the Middle Babylonian period onward, see Jiménez 2022, 200, with fn. 421.

146 Jiménez 2022, 200.

would use lexical lists to compose works of literature: they could, for example, creatively manipulate lists, shaping them into poetical enumerations, or select and re-use refined terms provided by the lexical sources. Similarly, scribes could extract single words or entire phrases from literary compositions and incorporate them into lexical texts, in order to collect and explain rare lemmata.[147] Lists pervade the Mesopotamian scholarship and culture so deeply that lexical and literary texts can intertwine.

This should remind modern scholars that it could be difficult to set and distinguish genres in Mesopotamia.[148] Cuneiform texts often defy western labels and categorisations, presenting problems related to authorship, purpose and context. As convincingly argued by Michalowski, Mesopotamian literature appears to be defined by a strong interweave of intertextual and intratextual references and connections, rather than by strict *taxa*.[149] The lexical and the literary, seemingly belonging to completely different literary categories, are heavily dependent on each other. Their comparison proves to be essential for the understanding and interpretation of cuneiform literary texts, shedding light on poetic techniques as well as on the process of text production and composition in scholarly contexts.

147 Cf. Crisostomo 2016, 137.

148 Vanstiphout 1986; Reiner 1992, 293; cf. Rubio 2003, 200-1. Cf. chapter 1, §.1.1.1

149 Michalowski 1999, 87-9; cf. Rubio 2003. 201.