

## The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery

Maurizio Viano

### 1 Middle Babylonian Sumerian Literary, Liturgical and Magical Texts

The corpus of the Middle Babylonian Sumerian literary texts dates to the period of Kassite rule over Babylonia (16<sup>th</sup>-mid-12<sup>th</sup> century).<sup>69</sup> The dearth of epigraphic findings due to a restricted archaeological investigation strongly limits our understanding of the Sumerian material from the Kassite period. Moreover, the attribution of cuneiform tablets to the Kassite dynasty is very problematic. Literary texts are not dated and frequently neither paleography nor archeology provides conclusive evidence for dating tablets. Distinguishing paleographically between the Late Old Babylonian and Kassite periods is notoriously complicated.<sup>70</sup> Much of the material has no clear archaeological context because it was acquired on the market, and even those tablets discovered during regular excavations often lack accurate archeological records.<sup>71</sup> Finally, several tablets are still unpublished or published only in hand-copy. In particular a substantial number of Middle Babylonian tablets from Babylon are unpublished.<sup>72</sup>

In addition to the Kassite tablets two sources are known from the period of the Sealand dynasty, but only one, an Emesal liturgy, has been published.

Text editions are scattered in various journals and books. The main reference here used to collect all the textual material and the relevant secondary literature is *The Diachronic Corpus of Sumerian Literature* (DCSL) project website which provides a list of the Middle Babylonian Sumerian and bilingual literary texts, with the exception of magical and Emesal texts. Additional bibliography has been provided by Sassmannshausen's article 'Babylonische Schriftkultur des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr. in den Nachbarländern und im östlichen Mittelmeerraum',<sup>73</sup> the CDLI website and Pedersén's studies on the ancient Near Eastern archives<sup>74</sup> and on the archives of Babylon excavated during Koldewey's campaigns between 1899 and 1917.<sup>75</sup>

A large number of tablets are badly preserved and several are excerpts, either lentil tablets or Type V tablets, usually containing a literary text on the obverse and a lexical list on the reverse.<sup>76</sup> The majority of tablets stem from Nippur, but several manuscripts are from Sippar and Babylon. As far as the archeological evidence shows, the material dates back to the late Kassite period (1350-1150 B.C.).<sup>77</sup> As in the case of the Old Babylonian manuscripts, it is uncertain which Kassite tablets may stem from Sippar. The city was the target of early campaigns in the 19<sup>th</sup> century which did not prepare excavation records, thus the exact provenience of many cuneiform tablets is unknown. In addition to the tablets that ended up in the British Museum and the Louvre, a group of circa 2000 tablets, probably from Sippar, was acquired on the market by the University of Pennsylvania Museum and registered as early numbers in the CBS collection, the so called

69 To my knowledge the Sumerian texts from the Second Dynasty of Isin are limited to a few royal inscriptions, some of which are only preserved in first-millennium copies, see Jestin 1958, Lambert 1974b, Jacobsen 1991.

70 See the discussion in Rutz 2006, 67-72.

71 Many of the Nippur tablets were found during the first campaigns of the University of Pennsylvania between 1889 and 1900 which did not provide accurate reports, see Pedersén 1998, 113.

72 Pedersén 2005, 69-108.

73 Sassmannshausen 2008.

74 Pedersén 1998.

75 Pedersén 2005.

76 Veldhuis 2000a, see Introduction.

77 Pedersén 1998, 103.

Khabaza collection.<sup>78</sup> This collection mostly includes Old Babylonian tablets but it also contains some Middle Babylonian manuscripts.

Genres represented in the Middle Babylonian corpus are those common in the Old Babylonian period, but the corpus also includes some new Middle Babylonian compositions.<sup>79</sup>

Texts are presented according to a typology that, with a few exceptions, follows Civil's unpublished catalogue as made available by ETCSL and Cunningham (2007). A full list of the Middle Babylonian Sumerian and bilingual literary and magical texts is presented in the following table. Only the published material is included in the present study.<sup>80</sup>

Provenance	Museum Number	Composition	Hand-copy	Edition	Language
Nippur	<b>N 3455</b>	Enlil and Ninlil	Peterson (2011), 26-27	NE	S
Nippur	<b>N 6126</b>	Enlil and Ninlil	Peterson (2011), 27	NE	S
Nippur	<b>N 1747</b>	Enlil and Ninlil	Behrens (1978), Pl. 16	Behrens (1978)	S
Nippur	<b>N 2431</b>	Enlil and Sud	Civil (1983), 43-64	Civil (1983)	S
Nippur	<b>N 2203</b>	Enlil and Sud	Civil (1983), 43-64	Civil (1983)	S
Nippur	<b>UM 29-13-495</b>	Enlil and Sud	NP	Civil (1983)	S
Nippur	<b>UM 29-13-545<sup>1</sup></b>	Enlil and Sud	NP	Civil (1983)	S
Nippur	<b>CBS 3832</b>	Inana and An	de Jong Ellis (1979), 225	van Dijk (1998)	SA
Nippur	<b>UM 29-16-35</b>	Inana's Descent to the Netherworld	Veldhuis (2000a), 90 fig. 10	Veldhuis (2000a), 74-75	S (A)
Nippur	<b>N 3783 + N 5031</b>	a) Unidentified Text b) Proverb c) Lugal-e	Veldhuis (2000a), 90 fig. 11	Peterson (2007) Veldhuis (2000a), 75	S
Nippur	<b>N 3719</b>	Lugal-e	NP	Peterson (2013)	S
Nippur	<b>N 6286 + CBS 11153</b>	Angim	Cooper (1978), Pl. XIV	Cooper (1978) Viano (2012a)	SA
Babylon	<b>VAT 17166</b>	Sargon and Urzababa	VS 24 75	Westenholz (1997), 52-55	SA
Nippur	<b>CBS 13509</b>	Šulgi B	Peterson 2011	Peterson 2011	SA
Nippur	<b>CBS 10900</b>	Šulgi O	NP	Klein (1976)	SA
Nippur	<b>Ni 13227</b>	Šulgi O	ISET I p. 208	Klein (1976)	
Nippur	<b>CBS 11341</b>	Shulgi Hymn	PBS 1/1 11	Westenholz (2005), 344	SA

<sup>78</sup> For the origin of these tablets see Civil in RA 73, 93, Tinney 2011, 586.

<sup>79</sup> A group of *Eršaruğa* prayers attributed by Krecher 1966a to the Middle Babylonian period have been identified as Old Babylonian by Michalowski 1987: BM 78198 = CT 44 14, VAT 1320 = VS 2 47 (these are duplicates of the same text, see Lambert 1974a, 288-293), CBS 35 = PBS 10/2 3 (Bergmann 1965, 33-42). These texts are not treated in the present work.

<sup>80</sup> Museum numbers in bold refer to texts taken into consideration. Some of the unpublished texts or those published only in hand-copy will be the object of future studies by the writer.

The following tablets have not been considered:

VAT 17316 = VS 24 70, a fragment of Farmer's Instructions indicated by van Dijk as possibly Middle Babylonian ('Mittelbabylonische (?) Schrift'), has been edited by Civil 1994, 4, as an Old Babylonian manuscript. The comparison with another OB fragment from Babylon of Farmer's Instructions, VAT 17142 = VS 24 69, does not provide evidence for dating VS 24 70 to the Middle Babylonian period; the only possible hint of a late date is the shape of the sign E.

CBS 1422, a bilingual extract tablet from an unknown literary text, probably from Sippar, is attributed by Michalowski 1981 to the Old Babylonian period and has not been included by Veldhuis 2000a in the catalog of Kassite exercise texts.

CBS 10295 = van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, Pl. 38 (C<sub>4</sub>), indicated in CDLI as MB is considered as OB by van Dijk with whom I agree on the basis of his copy.

CBS 11553 = ETCSL 2.4.2.e (Sjöberg 2005) is a hymn to Šulgi dated as Middle Babylonian(?) in CDLI, but in my opinion it is an Old Babylonian tablet: the shape of tablet (*Imgidda*) and the sign forms (see AN and TA, l. 6) might be evidence for an earlier date. Moreover Sjöberg does not mention a possible Middle Babylonian date.

Provenance	Museum Number	Composition	Hand-copy	Edition	Language
Nippur	<b>CBS 3558 + Ni 9696 (+) Ni 4557</b>	Lipit-Ištar A	CBS 3558 = de Jong Ellis (1979), 226 Ni 9696 = ISET I p. 109 Ni 4557 = ISET I p. 109	CBS 3558 = Peterson (2011), 192-194 Ni 9696 = Delnero (2006), 1909 ff. source N <sub>U1</sub> Ni 4557 = Delnero (2006), 1909 ff. source N <sub>U7</sub>	S A
?	<b>MAH 10828</b>	Lipit-Ištar A	Boissier (1926), Pl. 1	Römer (1965), 2-3	S
Nippur	<b>UM 29-15-399 + Ni 9734</b>	Lipit-Ištar F	Ni 9734 = ISET II Pl. 26 UM 29-15-399 = NP	Lines 115-121 = Civil (1976), 85	S A
Nippur	<b>N 3495</b>	Lipit-Ištar F	NP	NE	S (A)
Nippur	<b>N 3498</b>	Lipit-Ištar F	Peterson (2011), 208	Peterson (2011), 208	S A
Babylon	<b>VAT 19236</b>	A Praise-poem of Ĥammu-rābi	VS 24 41	NE	S A
Sealand	Private Collection	Praise-poem of Aadaragalama	NP	NE	S A
Nippur	<b>CBS 10475</b>	Enlil A	NP	Delnero (2006), 1216 ff.	S
Nippur	<b>CBS 10903</b>	Enlil A	NP	Peterson (2010b), 574-575	S A
Nippur	<b>CBS 13860</b>	Inana C	Sjöberg (1975a), 168	Sjöberg (1975a), 161-253	S A
?	<b>KM 89404 Obv.<sup>2</sup></b>	Inana C	Michalowski (1998)	Michalowski (1998)	S A
Nippur	<b>CBS 15203</b>	Inana C	NP	NE	S A
Nippur	<b>UM 29-13-560 (+) N 3529 (+) N 3196</b>	The song of the Plowing Oxen	Photo: Civil (1976), Pl. VI	Civil (1976), 83-95	S A
Borsippa (?)	<b>LB 806</b>	A Litigant's Prayer	Peiser Urkunden 92	Veldhuis (2014), 262-263 Peiser, Kohler (1905), 4	S A
?	<b>MS 2291</b>	The Instructions of Šuruppak	Alster (2005), Pl. 68	Alster (2005), 31-220	S
Babylon (?)	<b>MM 487b</b>	The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta = Ur-Ninurta G	Civil (1997), 53	Alster (2005), 221-240	S A
Nippur	<b>UM 29-13-419A Obv. I<sup>3</sup></b>	The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta = Ur-Ninurta G	Civil (1997), 53	Alster (2005), 221-240	S
Nippur	<b>UM 29-13-419A Obv. II - Rev. I-II</b>	Counsels of Wisdom	Civil (1997), 53	Alster (2005), 241-264	S
?	<b>AO 7739 + AO 8149</b>	The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab	TCL 16 80 + TCL 16 83 Cavigneaux (1987), 51-52	Alster (2005), 373-383	S
Nippur	<b>UM 29-15-848</b>	The Fowler and his Wife	Veldhuis (2000a), 89 fig. 5	Alster (2005), 371	S
Nippur	CBS 9899	Dialog5 - Two Women B	NP	NE	S
?	IM 44131	Lamentation to the Mother goddess	TIM 9 33	NE	S
Nippur	<b>CBS 8039</b>	Proverb	Veldhuis (2000a), 89 fig. 6	Veldhuis (2000a), 73	S
Nippur	<b>N 3395</b>	Proverb	Hand-copy: Lambert (1960), Pl. 71 Photo: Alster (1997), Pls. 98-99	Alster (1997), 288-290 Lambert (1960), 272-273	S A
Nippur	<b>N 5447</b>	Proverb	Sassmannshausen (1997), No. 22	Veldhuis (2000a), 72-73	S
Nippur	<b>UM 29-16-561</b>	Proverbs	Veldhuis (2000a), 94 fig. 22	Veldhuis (2000a), 80	S
Nippur	<b>Ni 679</b>	Proverb	ISET II Pl. 109	Alster (1997), 247	S

Provenance	Museum Number	Composition	Hand-copy	Edition	Language
Babylon	<b>VAT 17353</b>	Proverb	VS 24 113	Lambert (1960), 274	S A
?	<b>MS 2065</b>	Proverb	Alster (2007), 29	Alster (2007), 30	PhS S A
?	<b>MS 3310</b>	Proverbs	Alster (2007), 46-47	Alster (2007), 47-49	S
?	<b>MS 3323</b>	Proverb	Alster (2007), 52	Alster (2007), 52-54	S A
Nippur	<b>3N-T 195</b>	Unidentified Text	OIP 97, 90 No. 42	NE	S
Nippur	<b>CBS 4615</b>	Unidentified Text	PBS 12/1 44	Veldhuis (2000a), 75-76	S
Nippur	<b>CBS 13990</b>	Unidentified Text	NP	NE	S A
Nippur	<b>CBS 19831</b>	Unidentified Text	Veldhuis (2000a), 91 fig. 13	Veldhuis (2000a), 76	S
Nippur	<b>N 4529</b>	Unidentified Text	Veldhuis (2000a), 90 fig. 9	Veldhuis (2000a), 74	S
Nippur	<b>UM 29-13-543</b>	Unidentified Text	Veldhuis (2000a), 91 fig.12	Veldhuis (2000a), 76	S
Nippur	<b>UM 29-15-944</b>	Unidentified Text	Veldhuis (2000a), 92 fig. 18	NE	S
Nippur	<b>UM 19-16-383</b>	Unidentified Text	Veldhuis (2000a), 91 fig. 14	Veldhuis (2000a), 76	S
Sippar	<b>BM 81700</b>	Unidentified Text	CT 58 61	NE	S
Babylon	<b>VAT 17223</b>	Unidentified Text	VS 24 38	NE	S
Babylon	<b>VAT 17224</b>	Unidentified Text	VS 24 39	NE	S A
Babylon	<b>VAT 17357</b>	Unidentified Text	VS 24 72	NE	S A
Babylon	<b>VAT 17563</b>	Unidentified Text	VS 24 15	NE	S
?	<b>IM 13365</b>	Unidentified Text	TIM 9 29	NE	S A
?	<b>MS 3362</b>	Unidentified Text	Alster (2007), 67	Alster (2007), 67	S
?	<b>MS 3405</b>	Unidentified Text	Alster (2007), 70-71	Alster (2007), 70-71	S
Sippar (?)	<b>BM 78164</b>	Eršaḫūga	CT 58 70	Geller (1992)	S A
Sealand	<b>Private Collection</b>	Balaġ to Enlil	Photo: ZA 104, 153-154	Gabbay (2014a)	S
Sippar (?)	BM 83021	Emesal Lyric (?)	NP	NE	S
Nippur	CBS 8547	Emesal Lyric	NP	NE	S
Babylon	VAT 17119	Emesal Lyric	VS 24 25	NE	S A
Nippur	<b>Ni 2676 + Ni 2997 + Ni 4017 + Ni 4018</b>	Incantation	Geller (1985), Pls. 5-6	Geller (1985) Ms C	S A
Nippur	12 N 228	Incantation	NP	NE	S
Sippar (?)	<b>AO 7738 + CBS 1521</b>	Incantation to Utu	AO 7738 = TCL 16 79 CBS 1521 (Hand-copy) = PBS 12/1 25 CBS 1521 (Photo) = Castellino (1969), 14-15	Alster (1991a) Castellino (1969)	S
Sippar (?)	<b>CBS 587 + CBS 353 (+) D fragment</b>	Incantation to Utu	Castellino (1969), Pls. XI-XIII	Alster (1991a) Castellino (1969)	S
Sippar (?)	<b>CBS 1686 + CBS 1533</b>	Incantation to Utu	NP	Alster (1991a)	S
?	<b>HS 1512</b>	Kiutu Incantation	Krebernik (2001)	Krebernik (2001)	S A
Sippar	<b>BM 54692</b>	Incantation	Lambert (2006)	Lambert (2006)	S
?	VAT 1514	Incantation	VS 17 43	NE	S A
Nippur	<b>UM 29-13-542</b>	Omen	Veldhuis (2000a), 89 fig. 8	Veldhuis (2000a), 74	S
Dūr-Kurigalzu	<b>IM 50009 (+) IM 50140 (+) IM 50010 (+) IM 50011</b>	Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription	Kramer (1948), 30-34 Pls. 1-5	Veldhuis (2008) Kramer (1948), 1-38	S

1 Published in Civil 1983 as UM 29-13-345.

2 This manuscript could be Late Old Babylonian.

3 The Middle Babylonian date is uncertain, see DC SL.

## 1.1 Text Analysis

## 1.1.1 Divine Narratives

## 1.1.1.1 Enlil and Ninlil

The mythological text *Enlil and Ninlil*<sup>81</sup> relates the story of the encounter between Enlil and Ninlil. Enlil in disguise seduces Ninlil who gives birth to the gods Sîn, Nergal, Ninazu and Ennibilulu. All the preserved OB manuscripts (eighteen) are from Nippur.<sup>82</sup> However, the text's circulation was not limited to Nippur, as it is attested in a catalogue from Sippar<sup>83</sup> and in the Nippur and Louvre catalogues.<sup>84</sup> This was not among the most popular compositions in House F, as only four manuscripts were found in this scribal school.<sup>85</sup> The text survived in the first millennium in two Neo Babylonian bilingual manuscripts,<sup>86</sup> one of which is from Nippur. Three monolingual MB manuscripts, all from Nippur, are known: N 3455, N 1747, N 6126.

**N 3455** is a fragment from the left edge of its tablet preserving six lines on the obverse, whereas the reverse is broken away. No distinctive MB sign is preserved but according to Peterson<sup>87</sup> the manner of incision is reminiscent of other MB tablets from Nippur. According to Peterson, the fragment preserves lines 23-28 of the composition. However, N 3455 seems to offer a conflation of lines 15-20 and 23-28 which feature the same refrain: lines 15-20 contain the speech of Nunbaršegunu to her daughter Ninlil reported in the Emesal form, whereas lines 23-28 repeat the same sentences in the main dialect and in an anonymous third person voice. N 3455 shows a combination of Emesal and eme-gir<sub>15</sub> forms, but it is too fragmentary – no line is fully preserved – to be assigned with full confidence to either of the two sections. The transliteration proposed here might suggest that the tablet reports a variant of lines 15-20:<sup>88</sup>

N 3455	1	[.....] 'a' n[am <sup>2</sup> - .....
15 A	i 15	i <sub>7</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga nu-nus(=NUNUZ)-e i <sub>7</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> a nam-mi-tu <sub>5</sub> -tu <sub>5</sub>
B	15	i <sub>7</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> munus-e i <sub>7</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> a nam-mi-tu <sub>5</sub> -tu <sub>5</sub>
C	15	i <sub>7</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga nu-nus(=NUNUZ)-e i <sub>7</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga a nam-mi-tu <sub>5</sub> -tu <sub>5</sub> <i>i-na na-a-ri el-le-ti sin-niš-tu<sub>4</sub> MIN me-e la' ram'-k[at<sub>3</sub>]</i> <sup>89</sup>
G	11	[.....] i <sub>7</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> [.....]
H	i 9	[.....]-en
	i 9	[.....] 'i <sub>7</sub> '-ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> a nam-mi-tu <sub>5</sub> '-tu <sub>5</sub> <i>The river is holy, woman! The river is holy – don't bathe in it!</i>
23 A	i 23	[i <sub>7</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -g]a-am <sub>3</sub> munus-e i <sub>7</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> im-ma-ni-tu <sub>5</sub> -tu <sub>5</sub>
B	23	i <sub>7</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-a[m <sub>3</sub> munus-e] 'i <sub>7</sub> '-ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> a im-ma-tu <sub>5</sub> -tu <sub>5</sub> <i>The river is holy; the woman bathed in the holy river.</i>

81 ETCSL 1.2.1; lineation according to Behrens 1978.

82 Cooper 1980, 176.

83 Si 331 Rev. 10, van Dijk 1989, 448, see Robson 2001, 56.

84 N2: 22 (ETCSL 0.2.1), L: 19 (ETCSL 0.2.2)

85 Robson 2001, 56.

86 See comments in Cooper 1980, 176.

87 Peterson 2011, 26-27.

88 A = CBS 9205; B = A 30202; C (NB) = BM 38600 (80-111-12, 484); G = UM 29-15-611; H = CBS 13853 + CBS 8315 + CBS 8176; I = Ni 2707; see Behrens 1978, 8-11.

89 In C the line is repeated twice, Behrens 1978, 77.

N 3455	2	[.....g]u <sub>2</sub> 'i <sub>7</sub> '-nun-bi-ir-k[a] n[am <sup>2</sup> -.....]
16 A	i 16	<sup>d</sup> nin-lil <sub>2</sub> -le gu <sub>2</sub> i <sub>7</sub> -nun-bi-ir-ka nam-mi-in-du-de <sub>3</sub>
B	16	<sup>d</sup> nin-lil <sub>2</sub> -le gu <sub>2</sub> i <sub>7</sub> -nun-bi-ir-tum <sub>2</sub> -ka / nam-mi-du-e-de <sub>3</sub>
G	12	[.....-n]un-bi-i[r-.....]
H	i 10	[.....] 'x'
I	10	[.....]-ir-tum <sub>2</sub> -ka nam-mi-in-KAŠ-'x' <i>Ninlil, do not walk along the bank of the Nunbirdu Canal!</i>
24 A	i 24	[ <sup>d</sup> nin-lil <sub>2</sub> ]le gu <sub>2</sub> i <sub>7</sub> -<<gu <sub>2</sub> >>-nun-bi-ir-ka i-im-du-de <sub>3</sub>
B	24	<sup>d</sup> n[in]-lil <sub>2</sub> gu <sub>2</sub> i <sub>7</sub> -nun-bi-ir-tum <sub>2</sub> -ka i-im-du-e-de <sub>3</sub> <i>Ninlil walked along the bank of the Nunbirdu Canal.</i>
N 3455	3	[.....-g]a <sup>2</sup> lugal i-bi <sub>2</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga i-bi <sub>2</sub> [.....]
17 A	i 17	i-bi <sub>2</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> u <sub>3</sub> -mu-un-e i-bi <sub>2</sub> -ku[g-ga-am <sub>3</sub> ] i-bi <sub>2</sub> ba-ši-bar-re
B	17	'i-bi <sub>2</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> '-ga-am <sub>3</sub> u <sub>3</sub> -mu-un-bi i-bi <sub>2</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> / i-bi <sub>2</sub> ba-e-ši-bar-re
H	i 11	[.....] 'x'
I	11	[.....]-ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-[.....] <i>(His) eye is bright, the lord's eye is bright, he will look at you!</i>
25 A	i 25	[igi-ku <sub>3</sub> -g]a-am <sub>3</sub> lugal-e igi-ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> igi im-ma-ši-in-bar
A	25	igi-ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> lugal-e igi-ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> / igi im-ma-ši-in-bar
H	i 1'	[.....]-'bar' <i>(His) eye was bright, the king's eye was bright, he looked at her.</i>
N 3455	4	[.....a]-a <sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> [(...)]
18 A	i 18	kur-gal aia <sup>d</sup> mu-ul-lil <sub>2</sub> i-bi <sub>2</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> i-bi <sub>2</sub> ba-ši-bar-re
B	18	k[ur-gal] 'aia' en-lil <sub>2</sub> i-bi <sub>2</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> / i-bi <sub>2</sub> ba-e-ši-bar-re
H	i 12	[.....] 'x'
I	12	[..... b]a-ši-bar-re <i>The Great Mountain, Father Enlil - his eye is bright, he will look at you!</i>
26 A	i 26	[kur-gal aia] <sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub> igi-ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> igi im-ma-ši-in-bar
B	26	[kur-gal] 'aia' <sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub> -le igi-ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> igi im-ma-ši-in-bar
H	i 2'	[.....]-'ši-in-bar' <i>The Great Mountain, Father Enlil - (his) eye was bright, he looked at her.</i>
N 3455	5	[.....x] 'nam'-tar-tar-ra [(...)]
19 A	i 19	sipa-x-NE nam-tar-tar-re i-bi <sub>2</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> i-bi <sub>2</sub> ba-ši-bar-re
B	19	sipa na <sup>1</sup> -aĝ <sub>2</sub> -tar-tar-re i-bi <sub>2</sub> -ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> i-bi <sub>2</sub> ba-e-ši-bar-re
H	i 13	[.....] 'x'
I	13	[.....] 'x' [.....] <i>The shepherd who determines destinies - (his) eye is bright, he will look at you!</i>
27 A	i 27	[.....N]E nam-tar-tar-re igi-ku <sub>3</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> igi im-ma-ši-in-bar
B	27	[.....n]a-aĝ <sub>2</sub> -tar-tar-re igi-KU <sub>2</sub> -ga-am <sub>3</sub> igi im-ma-ši-in-bar
H	i 3'	[..... i]m-ma-[ši-in]-bar <i>The shepherd who determines destinies - his eye was bright, he looked at her.</i>

	N 3455	6	[.....ĝe]š <sub>3</sub> 'ma'-ra-'an'-du <sub>11</sub> ne [.....]
20	A	i 20	a-da'-lam mu-bi am <sub>3</sub> -i-i še am <sub>3</sub> -mi-su-ub-be <sub>2</sub>
	B	20	a-da'-lam mu-bi am <sub>3</sub> -i-i še am <sub>3</sub> -mi-ib <sub>2</sub> -su-ub-be <sub>2</sub>
	H	i 14	[.....] 'x' <i>At that moment he will want to have intercourse, he will want to kiss!</i>
28	A	i 28	[lugal] ne ga-e-du <sub>11</sub> mu-na-ab-be <sub>2</sub> nu-da-ra-ši-ib-še-ge
	B	28	[.....]-'x'-du <sub>11</sub> mu-na-ab-be <sub>2</sub> nu'-un-da-ši-ib-še-ge
	H	i 4'	[.....]-'da-ra-ši-ib-še-ge <i>The king said to her, 'I want to have sex with you!', but she would not agree to do it there with him.</i>

1. The last sign resembles NAM as in line 16 rather than IM as in line 23.

2. N 3455 shares with A the variant *i*<sub>7</sub>-nun-bi-ir-(ka) for the Nunbirdu canal; in light of the MB manuscript, it can no longer be assumed that this writing was a mistake as argued by Behrens.<sup>90</sup> The remains of the last sign resemble nam- as in line 16; this could be further evidence that the MB fragment reports a variant of lines 15-20.

3. This line has the Emesal form *i*-bi<sub>2</sub> as in line 17 and lugal as in line 25 instead of /umun/. The copula -am<sub>3</sub> and the ergative case ending -e are omitted; it is worth noting that -am<sub>3</sub> is omitted in line 15 in the NB manuscript C.<sup>91</sup>

4-5. N 3455 indicates the ergative with -a; this phenomenon first appears in the Old Babylonian period.<sup>92</sup>

6. According to Cooper<sup>93</sup> line 28 should be emended as ĝeš<sub>3</sub>--du<sub>11</sub> and line 29 as ne--su-ub; the two verbal forms appear together in line 20 but in Emesal: ĝeš<sub>3</sub>--du<sub>11</sub> VS mu--i-i, ne--su-ub VS še--su-ub.<sup>94</sup> The MB manuscript seems a main dialect variant of line 20 or a conflation of the first part of lines 28 and 29 in a single line; cf. *Enlil and Ninlil* 45=47=49, ĝeš<sub>3</sub>-bi na-mu-un-du<sub>11</sub> ne-bi na-mu-un-su-ub.

Whatever segment N 3455 reports, it is clear that this fragment does not duplicate any of the OB manuscripts. Probably the text results from modification and adaptation by Middle Babylonian scribes.

Another possible MB manuscript of *Enlil and Ninlil* is **N 6126**.<sup>95</sup> This tiny fragment preserves a few signs corresponding to lines 59-64. The following observations are worth noting:

- In line 2 (= *Enlil and Ninlil* 60) /muzug/, 'priest', is written muzug<sub>2</sub> (U<sub>2</sub>.KA) instead of muzug<sub>6</sub> (U<sub>2</sub>.KAxLI) as in the OB manuscripts. muzug<sub>2</sub> is also attested in the NB manuscript C. N 6126 seems to omit -(g)e after muzug<sub>2</sub>.
- Lines 3 and 4 (= *Enlil and Ninlil* 61-62) seem to omit -še<sub>3</sub> after niĝ<sub>2</sub>-nam, but here as in the preceding line the omitted sign could have been written in the unpreserved part of the line.

<sup>90</sup> Behrens 1978, 49.

<sup>91</sup> Lines 16 and 17 are not preserved in C.

<sup>92</sup> Attinger 1993, 214; see § 6.1.1 and fn. 1547.

<sup>93</sup> Cooper 1980, 181: 28f.

<sup>94</sup> For these forms see Behrens 1978, 78-79, 92-94, Cooper 1980, 181.

<sup>95</sup> See observations in Peterson 2011, 28.



**N 1747** is the only MB manuscript edited by Behrens.<sup>96</sup> Despite Cooper's remarks<sup>97</sup> it shows the typical MB shape of KUR (l. 4).<sup>98</sup> This fragment is part of a multicolumn tablet as is clear from the vertical double rulings on the left edge. Only the Sumerian text is preserved on the obverse which contains lines 128-140 of the composition, but possibly an Akkadian translation was arranged in a parallel column. The reverse is broken away. Lines 129-140 containing the refrain narrating the intercourse between Ninlil and Enlil are repeated in lines 77-88 and 103-114. As well as N 3455 this fragment shows several variants, but purely orthographic:

Line	N 1747	OB Manuscripts <sup>1</sup>
129	<sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub>	<sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub> -le (A)
130	DU <sub>10</sub> -ĝu <sub>10</sub>	umuš-ĝa <sub>2</sub> (A L)
130	i <sub>3</sub> -ib <sub>2</sub> -tar <sup>92</sup> -(ra)]	i-ni-in-tar-ra (A)
131	-su <sub>13</sub> (BU)-ga-da-ĝu <sub>10</sub>	-su <sub>3</sub> -ge-da-ĝu <sub>10</sub> (A L)
132	<sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub>	<sup>d</sup> mu-ul-[lil <sub>2</sub> ] (L)
132	en	lugal (L)
133	<sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub>	<sup>d</sup> mu-ul-lil <sub>2</sub> (A L)
133	en-zu-gen <sub>7</sub>	u <sub>3</sub> -mu-un-zu i <sub>3</sub> -me-a-gen <sub>7</sub> (A L)
134	za-e-me-e[n]	-me-en (A L)
135	en	u <sub>3</sub> -mu-un (A L)
136	<sup>d</sup> nin-a-zu	<sup>d</sup> sin-(na) (A L R)
137	a-lugal-ĝu <sub>10</sub>	a-lugal-ĝu <sub>10</sub> (A L) a-lugal-ĝa <sub>2</sub> (R)
138	a-lugal-ĝu <sub>10</sub> -gen <sub>7</sub>	a-lugal-ĝu <sub>10</sub> -gen <sub>7</sub> (A) a-lugal-ĝa <sub>2</sub> -(a)-gen <sub>7</sub> (L R)
139	[ <sup>d</sup> e]n-lil <sub>2</sub>	<sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub> -le
139	lu <sub>2</sub> -SI.[...]	nam-SI.LU.IGI-e (A L R)

1 A = CBS 9205, L = 3N-T 901, R = N 1774.

2 Behrens 1978, 41, reads GID<sub>2</sub>, but the sign is probably a badly written TAR.

- N 1747 consistently uses the main dialect forms for the corresponding Emesal in the OB manuscripts: <sup>d</sup>en-lil<sub>2</sub> VS <sup>d</sup>mu-ul-lil<sub>2</sub> (ll. 132, 133), en VS u<sub>3</sub>-mu-un (l. 133).
- The genitive case ending is omitted in <sup>d</sup>en-lil<sub>2</sub> (ll. 129, 139). The expected genitive/locative form of the 1sg. possessive suffix -ĝa<sub>2</sub> is written as -ĝu<sub>10</sub> (ll. 130, 137, 138); in lines 137-138 this form is also attested in A and L against R which has the correct form.
- The tablet shows a certain degree of carelessness in writing: TAR in line 130 is badly written; in line 131 the use of BU for SUD is probably due to the omission of the vertical strokes.
- In line 136 the god Sîn is replaced by Nin-azu.<sup>99</sup>
- The presence of lu<sub>2</sub> is probably influenced by lu<sub>2</sub> abul-la, 'the city gatekeeper' (l. 87), and lu<sub>2</sub> i<sub>7</sub>-kur-ra, 'the man of the River of the Netherworld' (l. 113), the two other disguises of Enlil.

96 Manuscript T in Behrens 1978.

97 Cooper 1980, 176.

98 Photo available on CDLI.

99 See Cooper 1980, 163.



Variants attested in N 1747 are only orthographic and often they are shared by one of the OB manuscripts.

The very few variants attested in the first-millennium manuscripts indicate the stability of the text already in early periods. A comparison between MB and NB sources is not possible on the basis of the preserved lines, but it is worth noting that they may share the same variants.<sup>100</sup> To conclude, this typical Nippur composition continued to be copied at Nippur during the Kassite period with some modifications especially concerning Emesal forms.

### 1.1.1.2 Enlil and Sud

The mythological text *Enlil and Sud*<sup>101</sup> narrating the marriage between Enlil and Sud, who becomes Ninlil after the wedding, is attested in a relatively high number of OB tablets from Nippur (mostly), Susa and probably Sippar. This literary work survived in the first millennium in four Neo Assyrian manuscripts from Nineveh and Sultan-Tepe.<sup>102</sup> The composition was particularly popular in House F as seven manuscripts come from this building.<sup>103</sup> According to Civil<sup>104</sup> *Enlil and Sud* is perhaps quoted in the OB Nippur catalogue (N2: 22).

Four unilingual Sumerian tablets, all of them from Nippur, are possibly Middle Babylonian in date: N 2431, N 2203, UM 29-13-495 and UM 29-13-545.

**N 2431** (D) is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving lines 33-44 on the obverse whereas the reverse is broken away. Its MB date is uncertain.<sup>105</sup> On paleographical grounds<sup>106</sup> the mix of earlier and later sign forms<sup>107</sup> might be a Kassite trait.<sup>108</sup> This manuscript does not show any important variants compared to the OB recension.<sup>109</sup>

**N 2203** (F) is a fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving, on the obverse, lines 39-40 followed by 60-63 whereas the reverse is broken away. Except for a few minor orthographic variants,<sup>110</sup> the MB manuscript adheres to the OB text. It is worth noting that in line 62, where the NA text slightly differs from the OB manuscripts, za-e-ke<sub>4</sub> VS za-gen<sub>7</sub>, N 2203 agrees with the OB recension, za-a-gen<sub>7</sub>. No difference can be detected with N 2431 since the two manuscripts do not preserve the same portion of lines 39-40. The major difference with the OB recension is therefore the omission of lines 41-59.

**UM 29-13-495** (G) and **UM 29-13-545** (J)<sup>111</sup> are two pillow-shaped tablets each containing a one-line extract. UM 29-13-495 has line 40. It is interesting that this manuscript shares with N 2203 the variant za-a-ra for za-ra in the OB manuscripts. UM 29-13-545 reports line 70=99 with no variants compared to the OB recension. The NA manuscripts have instead some graphic variants.<sup>112</sup>

<sup>100</sup> N 3455, 3; N 6126, 2.

<sup>101</sup> ETCSL 1.2.2; lineation and manuscripts according to Civil 1983.

<sup>102</sup> For details on sources see Civil 1983, 47-48.

<sup>103</sup> Robson 2001, 56.

<sup>104</sup> Civil 1983, 61: 1.

<sup>105</sup> It is indicated as MB? in Civil 1983, 47.

<sup>106</sup> Photo available on CDLI.

<sup>107</sup> The sign AN has the later form in ll. 34, 35, 38 and 44 but the older one in l. 37.

<sup>108</sup> See Veldhuis 2008, 31 n. 11.

<sup>109</sup> The only variants not attested in other manuscripts are in line 39: the omission of -er in diġir-gal-gal-en-ne-er and the verbal form ħe<sub>2</sub>-en-ne-[...] VS ħe<sub>2</sub>-im-mi-ib<sub>2</sub>-ĥal-ĥa, but the latter is possibly documented in E ħe<sub>2</sub>-e[n...].

<sup>110</sup> za-a-ra VS za-ra (l. 40), -an- VS -na- (l. 60), za-a-gen<sub>7</sub> VS za-gen<sub>7</sub> (l. 62).

<sup>111</sup> Published as UM 29-13-345, see Veldhuis 2000a, 84 n. 48.

<sup>112</sup> See Civil 1983, 54.

The MB manuscripts only preserve a few lines but it seems that they reflect the OB text and are closer to the OB sources rather than to the NA recension.

### 1.1.1.3 Inana and An

The composition *Inana and An*<sup>113</sup> is known from only three Old Babylonian manuscripts, none of them from Nippur. CBS 1531<sup>114</sup> is a two-column tablet from the Khabaza collection, thus possibly from Sippar. YBC 4665<sup>115</sup> is a single-column tablet of unknown provenance, which, according to van Dijk,<sup>116</sup> shows the ductus of the Rīm-Sîn period. W 16743ac<sup>117</sup> is a small fragment of a two-column tablet<sup>118</sup> from Uruk. The only Nippur source is **CBS 3832**, a MB bilingual tablet in parallel column format preserving lines 55-76.<sup>119</sup> Unfortunately, the Sumerian column is poorly preserved<sup>120</sup> and most of it is unparalleled in the other manuscripts. From the few preserved parallel passages no significant difference from the OB manuscripts is evident.<sup>121</sup> It is worth noting that line 75a quoted in this manuscript is not attested in CBS 1531, the only source that contains this section. The several variants between YBC 4665 and CBS 1531 show that the OB sources display a low degree of textual stability; this is common in non-curricular texts,<sup>122</sup> a category to which *Inana and An* probably belonged. Moreover, the OB manuscripts have some phonetic writings<sup>123</sup> which are not unexpected for non-Nippur tablets. It is interesting that a composition unknown from the OB Nippur documentation is attested at Nippur in the Middle Babylonian period.

### 1.1.1.4 Inana's Descent to the Netherworld

**UM 29-16-35** is a Nippur fragment from the upper left corner of a pillow-shaped extract tablet containing, on the obverse, an extract from *Inana's Descent to the Netherworld*.<sup>124</sup> Since only half of the tablet is preserved, a second column with the Akkadian translation was possibly present. The reverse has an extract from the *An=Anum* list.

This composition is known from fifty-eight OB manuscripts, mainly from Nippur and Ur,<sup>125</sup> and is quoted in several catalogues.<sup>126</sup> The MB extract tablet preserves lines 26-35 of the Old Babylonian text<sup>127</sup> and shows some variants. However, one must remember that not all the OB manuscripts have

113 ETCSL 1.3.5.

114 Copy in van Dijk 1998, 32-33.

115 Copy in van Dijk 1998, 36-37.

116 Van Dijk 1998, 12.

117 AUWE 23 101; hand-copy in van Dijk 1998, 38.

118 Zólyomi 2000.

119 Note the alternation between archaic and later forms in *a-wa-at* (l. 74) and *a-ma-tu<sub>4</sub>* (l. 62).

120 Only the right edge of the column is preserved.

121 Lines 66-69 are duplicated in 112-115.

122 See Tinney 2011, 585-586, 591-592.

123 See van Dijk 1998, 30.

124 ETCSL 1.4.1.

125 Ferrara 2006, 127; new fragments are published in Peterson 2011, 45-48.

126 N2: 41 (ETCSL 0.2.1), L: 33 (ETCSL 0.2.2), Ur2: 27 (ETCSL 0.2.4).

127 Sladek 1974, 106-107.

been published<sup>128</sup> and the composition existed in different versions.<sup>129</sup> As noted by Veldhuis<sup>130</sup> the most interesting variant is u<sub>4</sub>-da kur-ta (ll. 5-6) for u<sub>4</sub>-da kur-še<sub>3</sub>, which is probably influenced by the fact that Akkadian *ina* may correspond to -ta. The writing di-di-da (l. 7) is a phonetic variant for du<sub>6</sub>-du<sub>6</sub>-dam.<sup>131</sup>

No first-millennium sources of this composition are so far known, but this fragment provides a link with the Akkadian text of *Ištar's Descent to the Netherworld*.

#### 1.1.1.5 Lugal-e

In the Middle Babylonian documentation *Lugal-e*<sup>132</sup> is preserved on two extract tablets from Nippur. **N 3783 + N 5031**<sup>133</sup> only quotes the first line of the composition (l. 4).<sup>134</sup> **N 3719** is a fragment from a tablet<sup>135</sup> inscribed with a monolingual text continuing from the obverse to the reverse without a change in orientation. This extract is inscribed with lines 683-687 and reflects the OB recension.

#### 1.1.1.6 Angim

The Nippur tablet **N 6286 (+) CBS 11153** is the only known MB manuscript of *Angim*.<sup>136</sup> This is a bilingual two-column tablet with the Sumerian text in the left column and the Akkadian in the right. The tablet originally contained the second part of the composition, but only lines 129-154 on the obverse and 162-185 on the reverse are preserved. *Angim* is a typical Nippur composition and all the OB manuscripts are from Nippur.<sup>137</sup> The study of lexical variants and line order<sup>138</sup> shows that the MB manuscript is closer to the OB recension than to the NA. However, in light of CBS 11153, not used by Cooper,<sup>139</sup> which has a different line order from the OB recension and, above all, reports line 139, which is only attested in one NA manuscript<sup>140</sup> but omitted in the OB tablets,<sup>141</sup> the MB text must be considered an intermediate stage between OB and first-millennium recensions. CBS 11153 allows us to understand that lines 148-149 are not omitted in the MB recension but they have a different order from the OB manuscripts; only line 147 is omitted. Therefore, the line order of the MB recension differs from both the OB and the late manuscripts:

<sup>128</sup> A full edition of *Inana's Descent* has been announced by A. J. Ferrara; Sladek's edition is based upon 32 manuscripts.

<sup>129</sup> Ferrara 2006.

<sup>130</sup> Veldhuis 2000a, 75.

<sup>131</sup> For similar variations see *Inana B*, 35, Zgoll 1997, 224, 452-453.

<sup>132</sup> ETCSL 1.6.2.

<sup>133</sup> For this tablet see § 1.1.8.5.

<sup>134</sup> Another possible MB manuscript of *Lugal-e* is AO 8186 + ÉPHÉ 523 = TCL 16 85 + van Dijk 1983, Vol. II, Pl. 78 (text edited by Borger 1986) which is dated by de Genouillac to the first dynasty of Babylon but with a question mark; this would be the only OB bilingual manuscript, but according to Seminara 2001, 24 n. 7, it is too close to the late bilingual recension for the OB dating to be acceptable. As the fragment is actually missing from the collection (M. Guichard's personal communication), I do not consider this piece in the present work; on the basis of van Dijk's copy, the sign KUR does not show the typical MB shape, but many MB manuscripts have the same form; the sign NI seems to me OB rather than MB. I would tend to regard this fragment as a Late Old Babylonian tablet.

<sup>135</sup> The size of the manuscript is not clear, Peterson 2013.

<sup>136</sup> ETCSL 1.6.1.

<sup>137</sup> Cooper 1978, 39.

<sup>138</sup> Cooper 1978, 36-39, 42-43.

<sup>139</sup> See Viano 2012a.

<sup>140</sup> K 38 (e).

<sup>141</sup> See Cooper 1978, 37, 125.

N 6286 (+) CBS 11153	
<b>Obverse:</b>	
	129-138
	140-146
	152
	150
	151(?)
	139
	148-149
	153-154
<b>Reverse:</b>	
	162-185

It should be noted, however, that the various stages of *Angim* (OB, MB, MA, NA, NB) do not present different traditions.<sup>142</sup> Moreover, variants of the MB tablet are primarily documented in the section inscribed on the obverse that was particularly susceptible to errors and variants already in the OB manuscripts.<sup>143</sup>

The Akkadian translation for the extant portion<sup>144</sup> adheres to the later recensions, but only a few lines can be compared.<sup>145</sup>

To sum up, the MB recension results from modifications elaborated by Kassite scribes. However, OB, MB and first-millennium recensions belong to the same line of tradition.

### 1.1.2 Royal Narratives

#### 1.1.2.1 Sargon and Ur-Zababa

**VAT 17166 = VS 24 75** is a pillow-shaped tablet from Babylon containing a three-line bilingual extract in interlinear format of a Sargon narrative. Only the obverse is inscribed whereas the reverse is left blank. The text relates to Sargon's departure from the palace of Ur-Zababa. The composition *Sargon and Ur-Zababa*<sup>146</sup> is known from two OB unilingual Sumerian manuscripts, AO 7673 = TCL 16 73 - Segments A and C - from Uruk and 3N-T 296 (IM 58430) - Segment B - from Nippur.<sup>147</sup> The MB manuscript does not duplicate any portion of the OB text, but it seems to be the continuation of the story of Segment B.<sup>148</sup> The text shows some peculiarities:

- The spelling of Sargon as šar-rum-GI (l. 1) is nowhere else attested.<sup>149</sup>
- Line 2 seems to be corrupted:

pa<sub>5</sub>-sar-ra-ta mu-un-na-an-te-na-ra  
*a-na pa-lag mu-ša-ri-e iṭ-ṭe<sub>4</sub>-ḫi*  
*He approached the canal of the garden*

<sup>142</sup> Black 1980, 155-156.

<sup>143</sup> Cooper 1978, 39.

<sup>144</sup> Ll. 166-182.

<sup>145</sup> Only in line 173 does a variant occur.

<sup>146</sup> ETCSL 2.1.4; Cooper, Heimpel 1983.

<sup>147</sup> Heimpel 1983.

<sup>148</sup> Westenholz 1997, 52.

<sup>149</sup> Westenholz 1997, 52.

In pa<sub>5</sub>-sar-ra-ta, also attested in line 3, -ta has a locative meaning corresponding to *ana* and *ina*.<sup>150</sup> The verbal form mu-un-na-an-te-na-ra as a preterite of an intransitive verb is expected to end with -te; the sequence -na-an- is also unclear.

- The plural stem of the verbal form in line 3, šar-rum-GI pa<sub>5</sub>-sar-ra-ta i<sub>3</sub>-dur<sub>2</sub>-ru-na-ta = MIN *i-na* MIN [*it-ta-a*]š<sub>2</sub><sup>1</sup>-ba-ma, ‘Sargon having reclined by the canal of the garden’, finds no corresponding plural form either in the subject or in the object.

No manuscripts of this text are known from later periods, but it is well known that Akkadian texts of the legends of the kings of Akkad were transmitted to the Western periphery and into the first millennium.<sup>151</sup> This composition likely does not belong to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition.<sup>152</sup> However, this fragment attests to the preservation of the Sumerian legends of the kings of Akkad in the post-Old Babylonian period. Remarkably, the composition – a non-curricular text as shown by the limited number of attestations – is inscribed on an extract tablet. It seems therefore that this text was adopted in schools in the Kassite period.

### 1.1.3 Royal Praise Poems

#### 1.1.3.1 Šulgi B

The hymn *Šulgi B*<sup>153</sup> is known from a great number of OB manuscripts<sup>154</sup> of which around 90 percent are from Nippur. This composition belongs to the so called House F Fourteen<sup>155</sup> and is quoted in several literary catalogues.<sup>156</sup>

**CBS 13509**, a MB manuscript from Nippur,<sup>157</sup> is a large fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving lines 311-326.<sup>158</sup> Only one side is preserved. The text is bilingual in interlinear format with the Akkadian version written in small script underneath Sumerian lines. For the extant portion, the text adheres to the OB manuscripts. Only a few minor variants are in fact attested:<sup>159</sup>

Line	CBS 13509	OB Text
312	ḫe <sub>2</sub> -en-ĝen	ḫe <sub>2</sub> -ĝen
313	ḫe <sub>2</sub> -en-ĝen-ne <sub>2</sub> <sup>?</sup>	ḫe <sub>2</sub> -(en)-ĝen
317	dib <sub>2</sub> -ba-a[m <sub>3</sub> ]	dib <sub>2</sub> -ba
318	en <sub>3</sub> -du-ĝa <sub>2</sub> -ka	en <sub>3</sub> -du-ĝa <sub>2</sub> -a-kam
320	na-e <sup>2</sup> -x <sup>1</sup> -[...]	na-an-ga-am <sub>3</sub> -me

<sup>150</sup> For the locative meaning of the ablative see Thomsen 1984, 107.

<sup>151</sup> Westenholz 1997, 4-5.

<sup>152</sup> Sumerian Sargonic tales are poorly documented, notably at Nippur. The only composition well attested in the OB documentation – most of the manuscripts stem from Nippur – is the *Curse of Akkad* that not by chance describes the sacrilegious destruction of the Ekur by Naram-Sîn; the defamatory portrayal of Naram-Sîn in *The Curse of Akkad* counters that of other historical-literary texts, see Cooper 1983, 5-10, 15-18.

<sup>153</sup> ETCSL 2.4.2.2.

<sup>154</sup> Castellino 1972, 27-29, new sources in Peterson 2011, 153-157.

<sup>155</sup> Robson 2001, 54-55.

<sup>156</sup> N2: 26 (ETCSL 0.2.1); L: 17 (ETCSL 0.2.2); U1: 13 (ETCSL 0.2.3).

<sup>157</sup> Another MB manuscript of *Šulgi B* is housed in the Schøyen Collection, Peterson 2011, 154 n. 6.

<sup>158</sup> Peterson 2011, 153-156.

<sup>159</sup> See also Peterson 2011, 155 n. 7.

## 1.1.3.2 Šulgi O

The royal hymn *Šulgi O*<sup>160</sup> contains a praise of Šulgi and Gilgamesh<sup>161</sup> in the form of a dialogue between the two kings. From the Old Babylonian period the text is preserved on an unclear number of Nippur manuscripts (six to eight) because some fragments may be part of the same tablet.<sup>162</sup> Additionally, *Šulgi O* is quoted in the Louvre catalogue (L: 62). The very last entry in this list (L: 68) reads ‘14 na-ru<sub>2</sub>-a’ which has been acknowledged to refer to the previous 14 entries in the catalogue that, therefore, were originally composed as royal inscriptions and written on stele (*narua*).<sup>163</sup> This interpretation has been recently challenged:<sup>164</sup> line 68 of the Louvre catalogue would be a summarizing entry referring to 14 unspecified copies of monumental inscriptions not listed in the catalogue to be added to the other compositions quoted in the inventory, rather than a subtotal referring to the preceding royal hymns. Hence there is no conclusive evidence that *Šulgi O* was actually written on monuments. However, it is possible that some royal hymns were originally composed for monumental inscriptions and later incorporated in the curriculum.<sup>165</sup> The quotation in the Louvre catalogue and the tablet format of the OB manuscript SLTN 79, a well ruled *imgidda* tablet, are evidence that this text was associated with pedagogical activity. However, its use in school was restricted as shown by the limited number of duplicates.

Possible MB tablets are the Nippur fragments CBS 10900 and Ni 13227<sup>166</sup> which Klein tentatively assigned to the hymn as unplaced segments. The ductus resembles the Middle Babylonian script, but no diagnostic signs are preserved. The list of cuneiform sources in ETCSL quotes the UM-29-15-231 as a possible further manuscript of *Šulgi O*. This is a MB fragment, but the nature<sup>167</sup> and even the language<sup>168</sup> of the text are unclear to me.<sup>169</sup>

**CBS 10900** is a multicolumn tablet preserving on the obverse the right-hand side of the left column and the left-hand side of the right column. Both are inscribed with Sumerian text with Akkadian glosses in small script between lines. The reverse is broken away.

**Ni 13227 = ISET I 208** is a fragment from the upper edge of its tablet preserving five broken lines of a bilingual version of the text with Akkadian translation in small script underneath Sumerian lines. Only one side is preserved.

According to CDLI and ETCSL these two fragments might join, but one may note that the Akkadian version in CBS 10900 does not seem to comprise a consistent translation in interlinear form as in Ni 13227.

Unfortunately, a large portion of the composition is missing. The two possible MB manuscripts are too poorly preserved and no parallel passages are known in the extant OB tablets. The possible MB date of these fragments witnesses the survival into the Kassite period of this royal hymn while no first-millennium sources are known to date.

<sup>160</sup> ETCSL 2.4.2.15.

<sup>161</sup> Klein 1976, 271-273.

<sup>162</sup> See the list of cuneiform sources in ETCSL and Peterson 2011, 174-175: Ni 2477 = SLTN 79, UM 29-15-9 + UM 29-15-158, CBS 10306, Ni 4112 = ISET I p. 130, Ni 4101 = ISET I p. 85, Ni 4535 = ISET II Pl. 1, UM 29-13-990, N 2541; CBS 10306, Ni 4112 and Ni 4101 are possibly part of the same tablet, Klein 1976, 272.

<sup>163</sup> Flückiger-Hawker 1996.

<sup>164</sup> Delnero 2010, 36 n. 10, Vacín 2014.

<sup>165</sup> Tinney 2011, 583.

<sup>166</sup> See Peterson 2011, 154.

<sup>167</sup> The tablet is listed as administrative in CDLI, but the layout with every line of the text ruled shows the scholarly nature of the tablet.

<sup>168</sup> L. 8, DIĜIR-šu?

<sup>169</sup> The text quotes <sup>d</sup>utu (l. 2) and <sup>d</sup>maš, ‘Ninurta’, (l. 7, 9, 10).



## 1.1.3.3 Hymn to Šulgi – PBS 1/1 11

**CBS 11341 = PBS 1/1 11** is a two-column tablet containing a bilingual text found in Nippur during the first excavation campaign. Only the reverse is well preserved whereas the obverse is almost completely lost. The tablet gives the Sumerian text in the left column and the Akkadian in the right but the lines do not evenly match and only the Sumerian lines have rulings.

This composition is probably a hymn to the king Šulgi although in view of the unusual character of this text different interpretations have been advanced.<sup>170</sup> No duplicates from earlier or later periods are known.

The date of the tablet is uncertain. J. G. Westenholz<sup>171</sup> attributes this manuscript to the Old Babylonian period based on the presence of the OB form of the sign KUR and the preservation of Old Babylonian orthography throughout the text. Conversely, Veldhuis<sup>172</sup> dates PBS 1/1 11 to the Middle Babylonian period;<sup>173</sup> the format in parallel columns is typical of the Kassite texts while the OB bilinguals were usually in interlinear format; the odd mix of earlier and later sign forms, which attempts to imitate an earlier script, is similar to that found in *Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription*.<sup>174</sup> Additionally, Veldhuis argued that some words are unusual or only attested in lexical lists providing evidence for an artificial and late creation of this composition.<sup>175</sup> In support of Veldhuis's view, the mix of earlier and later signs is typical not only of *Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription*, but of other Kassite texts such as HS 1512<sup>176</sup> and N 2431.<sup>177</sup> Moreover, the manner of incision reminds me of that of the MB manuscripts. Furthermore, the text does not agree with the Old Babylonian orthography: the etymological writing of Dental + Sibilant in *zi-im-ma-at-su<sub>2</sub>-nu* instead of *zi-im-ma-as-su<sub>2</sub>-nu* put forward by J. G. Westenholz<sup>178</sup> is a Middle Babylonian rather than Old Babylonian trait;<sup>179</sup> the value pi of the sign PI<sup>180</sup> is common in MB texts.<sup>181</sup> Finally, the alleged absence of other MB bilinguals from Nippur claimed by J. G. Westenholz<sup>182</sup> is rejected by the present study. All these pieces of evidence along with the unusual and unique nature of this composition<sup>183</sup> would lead me to attribute it to the Middle Babylonian period. However, it should be noted that mimation is retained throughout the text<sup>184</sup> and that the typical Old Babylonian signs *ša*, as preposition/pronoun, and *-šu* as suffix pronoun are used. These traits as well as the retention of *wa-* could be archaisms.

It is unknown whether this text already existed in the OB period or whether it was composed by the Middle Babylonian scribal schools. Features mentioned above may speak for an artificial creation

170 Westenholz 2005; according to Krecher PBS 1/1 11 may have had a ritual function, see RIA 5, 127.

171 Westenholz 2005, 345.

172 Veldhuis 2008, 31 n. 11; I thank Prof. Niek Veldhuis for providing me with his transliteration of the text.

173 Also van Dijk 1998, 12 n. 16 dates this text to the Middle Babylonian period.

174 See § 1.1.12.1.

175 The word *abnununu* (UD.MUD.NUN.NA), in Col. iv 72, is only attested in the lexical list *Diri*, Veldhuis 2008, 31; Westenholz 2005 reads UD.KIB.NUN.KI = *Sippar*. Veldhuis 2014, 265, mentions the value *ħara<sub>4</sub>* in the unorthographic writing *ħara<sub>4</sub>-tuš-a* for *ħal-la-tuš-a* (Col. iv 82) as unusual; the word *ħal-la-tuš-a*, 'apprentice singer' is itself a rare word only known from lexical lists, see Volk 1995, 210 n. 1007. *murub<sub>2</sub>* (Col. iv 84), the Emesal form for *murub<sub>4</sub>*, 'middle', is a learned equivalent for *ka*, Veldhuis 2014, 265-266.

176 See § 1.1.10.3.

177 See § 1.1.1.2.

178 Westenholz 2005, 353.

179 Aro 1955, 26.

180 Westenholz 2005, 353.

181 Aro 1955, 25.

182 Westenholz 2005, 345.

183 See Westenholz 2005, 346-351.

184 In Col. iii 44 mimation is missing in *eb-bu* (so Veldhuis; Westenholz: *ṭa-bu*), see Westenholz 2005, 360.



of the Kassite period on the basis of passages drawn from different OB literary and lexical texts.<sup>185</sup> Nevertheless it is not precluded that it results from the modification and adaptation of an OB text.

The Akkadian depends on the Sumerian<sup>186</sup> contrary to other new creations where Sumerian seems to be a secondary language.<sup>187</sup> As noted by J. G. Westenholz the Akkadian text seems more a paraphrase than a translation.<sup>188</sup> The Sumerian is in many cases poor<sup>189</sup> and very challenging. A few phonetic and uncommon writings are also attested.

Line	Phonetic Writing	Orthographic Writing
Col. iv 72	ad-ša	ad-ša <sub>4</sub>
Col. iv 74	gu <sub>2</sub> -bi	gu-bi
Col. iv 82	pa-aḥ-tuš-a <sup>1</sup>	ḫal-la-tuš-a <sup>2</sup>
Col. iv 88	ki-šu <sub>2</sub>	ki-šu
Col. iv 95	ĜEŠ	ḡeštug <sub>2</sub> <sup>3</sup>
Col. iv 95	ur <sup>ki</sup> -ga	urim (ŠEŠ.AB) <sup>4</sup>

1 ḫara<sub>4</sub> (DAG.KISIM5 x BI) is written as PA.Aḫ

2 The word ḫal-la-tuš-a is attested in the Akkadian version.

3 ḡeštug<sub>2</sub> (ĜEŠ) is an abbreviated form (Veldhuis's reading).

4 According to Veldhuis, ur<sup>ki</sup>-ga is a reading for the city of Ur which is written in the usual way ŠEŠ.AB<sup>ki</sup> in the Akkadian version.

The nature of the composition is obscure and no performative subscripts such as *tigi* or *adab* are given, nor is the za<sub>3</sub>-mi<sub>2</sub> doxology present.<sup>190</sup> On the contrary the text ends with an unusual reference to the *apkallu* sage. The composition is possibly connected with hymnic liturgies<sup>191</sup> given the frequent references to music performances throughout the text<sup>192</sup> and also because praise of the king is not the main concern. This may explain the absence of OB manuscripts if the composition already existed at that time. However, the text never refers to either *tigi* or *adab* and its connection with the ritual seems to be more descriptive rather than performative.

185 For parallels from Šulgi hymns and other compositions see commentary in Westenholz 2005. A similar manner of text-creation will be suggested for *A Prayer for a King*, attested at Emar and Ugarit, § 6.1.1.

186 See *a-na za-ma-ri-im i-za-am-mu-[ru]*, 'They will sing a song' (Col. iii 49), where the construction with the preposition *ana* seems to be a translation of the Sumerian adverbial postposition /eš(e)/, Westenholz 2005, 364; similarly in Col. iv 59 locative postposition -a is rendered with the preposition *ina* even though in Akkadian a direct object would be required, Westenholz 2005, 370.

187 See § 1.1.7.2.

188 Westenholz 2005, 344.

189 Note the position of the verb at the beginning of the sentence and the double accusative (the directive in the second object is unmarked) in Col. iv 78: *igi u<sub>3</sub>-bi<sub>2</sub>-za<sub>3</sub> ser<sub>3</sub> silim-e-eš du<sub>7</sub>-a*, 'After I will have selected a song fit for praise' (Veldhuis). In Col. iv 91 *Šul-gi-ir-e-eš = a-na Šul-gi* (Veldhuis's reading; Westenholz reads differently) it seems that two cases, dative and terminative, are appended to the king's name.

190 For music terminology see Shehata 2009.

191 Tinney 2011, 585-586, defines hymnic liturgies as texts containing performative subscripts that were associated with the cultic sphere. These compositions were not part of the OB scribal curriculum and show a low rate of duplication. For royal praise poems hymnic liturgies substantially correspond to the traditional classification of Type A hymns (cultic hymns) that are addressed to a deity and show the performative subscripts, but contain a petition and blessing for a king. On the contrary Type B hymns do not contain performative subscripts but usually end with the za<sub>3</sub>-mi<sub>2</sub> doxology and focus on the praise of the king, Römer 1965, Hallo 1976, 191-194; on the inadequacy of the traditional classification see Flückiger-Hawker 1999, 11-17.

192 Westenholz 2005, 344-351.

## 1.1.3.4 Lipit-Ištar A

The hymn *Lipit-Ištar A*,<sup>193</sup> a composition belonging to the so called Decad, is attested in many OB sources, mainly from Nippur, but is also known from Ur (five manuscripts), Babylon (one manuscript), Isin (one manuscript), Kiš (three manuscripts) and Larsa (one manuscript) as well as from twelve unprovenanced manuscripts.<sup>194</sup> Among the Nippur tablets, twelve are from House F.<sup>195</sup> Two MB tablets are preserved: CBS 3558 + Ni 9696 (+) Ni 4557<sup>196</sup> and MAH 10828.

**CBS 3558 + Ni 9696 (+) Ni 4557** is a Nippur fragment from the upper edge of a single column tablet giving the text in bilingual interlinear format. CBS 3558 + Ni 9696<sup>197</sup> preserve lines 1-17 and Ni 4557,<sup>198</sup> from the reverse of the tablet, has lines 93-104. The script is quite archaic and does not show any typical Kassite feature. This source adheres to the OB manuscripts but a few variants may be noted:

Lipit-Ištar A Line	MB Tablet	MB Variant	OB Text
4	Ni 9696	lirum-a	lirum-ma
6	Ni 9696	nu-tuku-a	nu-tuku
11	CBS 3558	maš <sub>2</sub> keš <sub>2</sub> -d[a-me-en] <sup>1</sup>	ĝir <sub>2</sub> KEŠ <sub>2</sub> -KEŠ <sub>2</sub> -sa-me-en
12	CBS 3558	ša <sub>3</sub> -ga	ša <sub>3</sub>
95	Ni 4557	-ĝu <sub>10</sub> -še <sub>3</sub> <sup>3</sup>	-ĝu <sub>10</sub> -uš
102	Ni 4557	˘zu <sup>7</sup> -a	-
103	Ni 4557	˘x'(-)in(-)[...]	-

1 Reading according to George 2012, 369.

2 This variant is also shared by sources N<sub>17</sub> = HS 1492 + HS 1493 + HS 1557 + HS 2532 + HS 7432 + HS 2986 and Ur<sub>2</sub> = UET 6 395, in Delnero 2006, 1909 ff.

As noted by George<sup>199</sup> the Akkadian translation shows Old Babylonian forms as well as Middle Babylonian.<sup>200</sup> He suggests that in the Old Babylonian period single words were glossed and later these glosses became part of a full translation. Peterson<sup>201</sup> noticed that the mistranslation of unken, 'assembly', by *ummanum*, 'army', in line 10 might reflect the conflation of two different traditions. The OB tablet UM 29-16-198 + UM 29-16-219 + N 1519 + N 1572<sup>202</sup> has indeed uĝnim, 'army'. However according to Delnero<sup>203</sup> this is an unconscious memory error influenced by the phonetic similarity of the two forms. These two hypotheses might be reconciled by speculating that the mistake in UM 29-16-198+ was recopied in other unpreserved manuscripts leading to the creation of a textual variant reflected in the MB tablet. However, it seems to me more likely that the mistranslation is a scribal mistake due to phonetic similarities: the scribe misread unken as uĝnim and translated it with 'army'.

193 ETCSL 2.5.5.1.

194 For the full list of manuscripts see Delnero 2006, 1909-1916; line numbers are noted here as in his edition, Delnero 2006, 1917 ff.; newly identified Nippur fragments in Peterson 2011, 194-196.

195 Robson 2001, 53.

196 Joins according to Peterson 2011, 192.

197 Ni 9696 source N<sub>U1</sub> in Delnero 2006.

198 Source N<sub>U7</sub> in Delnero 2006.

199 George 2012.

200 Note also the use of ša<sub>2</sub> in Ni 9696 (*Lipit-Ištar A*, 4), Delnero 2006, 1918.

201 Peterson 2011, 193-194.

202 Source N<sub>16</sub> in Delnero 2006.

203 Delnero 2006, 855.

**MAH 10828**<sup>204</sup> is a pillow-shaped extract tablet of unknown provenance containing, on the obverse, § 7 of the Codex Hammu-rābi preceded by two lines of *Lipit-Ištar A*.<sup>205</sup> The reverse has an unidentified lexical text, possibly a list of birds.<sup>206</sup> MAH 10828, 1-2 reports lines 78-79 of *Lipit-Ištar A* with no variants attested.

These two tablets show that an important curricular text such as *Lipit-Ištar A*, which was adopted in many Old Babylonian scribal schools, continued to be copied as a learning tool during the Middle Babylonian period.

### 1.1.3.5 Lipit-Ištar and the Plow – Lipit-Ištar F

The composition *Lipit-Ištar and the Plow – Lipit-Ištar F*<sup>207</sup> is a hymn composed to commemorate the *gusisu*-festival at Nippur during the reign of Lipit-Ištar of Isin.<sup>208</sup> In the ritual the king assumes the characteristics of the divine farmer Ninurta. This text is known from a few OB Nippur manuscripts,<sup>209</sup> but unfortunately remains unpublished.<sup>210</sup> Three MB tablets from Nippur are known so far.

**UM 29-15-399 + Ni 9734**<sup>211</sup> (MB<sub>1</sub>) is a bilingual tablet in parallel column format.<sup>212</sup> The obverse duplicates STVC 75<sup>213</sup> Rev. I 10-22 and STVC 79<sup>214</sup> 1-7.<sup>215</sup> The reverse duplicates STVC 75 Rev. II 1-22.<sup>216</sup> This manuscript adheres to the OB sources, although some variants are attested.<sup>217</sup>

**N 3495** (MB<sub>2</sub>) is a small fragment from the central part of its tablet preserving, on the obverse, *Lipit-Ištar F* 113-118 duplicated in UM 29-15-399+. Only the Sumerian text is preserved but it is not precluded that an Akkadian translation was arranged in a parallel column. The reverse is broken away. This fragment, therefore, offers the rare opportunity to compare two different MB manuscripts of the same composition.<sup>218</sup>

113 A	Rev. II 1-2	[...] a[ <i>pin</i> ?] [.....] / [.....-r]a <sup>2</sup> mu-ra-an-dar-e
MB <sub>1</sub>	Rev. 1	[.....] x-na <sup>2</sup> ḥu- <sup>2</sup> mu- <sup>2</sup> ra-ab-du <sub>7</sub> -du <sub>7</sub> -uš-ra <sup>2</sup> mu- <sup>2</sup> ra-[...] <sup>219</sup>
MB <sub>2</sub>	1	[.....ḥ]u- <sup>2</sup> mu- <sup>2</sup> ra- <sup>2</sup> x-du <sub>7</sub> - <sup>2</sup> d[u <sub>7</sub> ... mu-ra-an]-dar <sup>2</sup>

204 Source X<sub>10</sub> in Delnero 2006.

205 Veldhuis 2000a, 72.

206 Veldhuis 2000a, 67 n. 1.

207 ETCSL 2.5.5.6.

208 Cohen 1993, 89-90.

209 The Old Babylonian manuscripts are listed in the DCSL website, see Civil 1976, 84 n. 3; newly identified Nippur fragments are published in Peterson 2011, 202-209.

210 A score transliteration by Miguel Civil is housed in the PSD files of the University Museum, Philadelphia, see Peterson 2011, 202 n. 68; an edition of the MB tablets will be prepared by the writer.

211 In Ni 9734 = ISET II Pl. 26, obverse and reverse must be interchanged; this fragment is the left edge of the tablet.

212 The sign KUR shows the typical Kassite form in Ni 9734 (ISET II Pl. 26) Rev<sup>1</sup>. 4, 7 and UM 29-15-399 Obv. 3.

213 CBS 14062.

214 CBS 14054.

215 UM 29-15-399+, 7-9 have no duplicated lines preserved.

216 These lines correspond to *Lipit-Ištar F* 113-125, see Civil 1976, 85.

217 See for instance UM 29-15-399+, 4, kur-gal <sup>d</sup>en-lil<sub>2</sub> en [<sup>d</sup>n]in-urta-ra mi<sub>2</sub>-zi na-mu-un-e<sub>3</sub> VS STVC 75 Rev. I, 17-18, <sup>d</sup>en-lil<sub>2</sub> en [<sup>d</sup>n]in-urta-ra mu-un-na-ni-ib-gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>.

218 A = STVC 75.

219 N 3507, 8, [.....ḥ]u-mu-ra-an-d[u<sub>7</sub>...], Peterson 2011, 209.

114 A	Rev. II 3-4	[ <sup>d</sup> li-pi <sub>2</sub> -it-ištar dumu <sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> ke <sub>4</sub> / muš <sub>3</sub> nu-tum <sub>2</sub> -mu he <sub>2</sub> -me-en
MB <sub>1</sub>	Rev. 2	[ <sup>d</sup> li]- <sup>r</sup> pi <sub>2</sub> -ištar dumu <sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub> -la <sub>2</sub> -ke <sub>4</sub> muš <sub>3</sub> nu-tum <sub>2</sub> -mu ḥ[e <sub>2</sub> -me-en]
MB <sub>2</sub>	2	[ <sup>d</sup> li-pi <sub>2</sub> -it]-ištar dumu <sup>d</sup> en-lil <sub>2</sub> -[l]a <sub>2</sub> -ke <sub>4</sub> muš <sub>3</sub> nu-tum <sub>2</sub> -[mu he <sub>2</sub> -me-en]
115 A	Rev. II 5-6	ʾlugal-ḡu <sub>10</sub> gud [sa]ḡ <sup>?</sup> ḡeš <sup>š</sup> apin-na / mi <sub>2</sub> ga-am <sub>3</sub> -ma-ni-du <sub>11</sub>
MB <sub>1</sub>	Rev. 3	[lugal]-ḡ[u <sub>10</sub> ] gud saḡ ḡeš <sup>š</sup> apin-na ʾmi <sub>2</sub> ga-ʾam <sub>3</sub> -ma-ni-ib-du <sub>11</sub>
MB <sub>2</sub>	3	[lugal-ḡu <sub>10</sub> gud s]aḡ <sup>?</sup> ḡeš <sup>š</sup> apin-ʾra <sup>?</sup> mi <sub>2</sub> ga-am <sub>3</sub> -ma-ni-[(ib)-du <sub>11</sub> ]
116 A	Rev. II 7-8	e-el-lu gud-ba [...]ḡen-a / ḡeš <sup>š</sup> utul <sub>4</sub> -a gu <sub>2</sub> -ḡar-i <sub>3</sub>
MB <sub>1</sub>	Rev. 4	[e-e]l-lu gud ḡen-ḡen-a ḡeš <sup>š</sup> utul <sub>4</sub> -a gu <sub>2</sub> -ḡar-i <sub>3</sub>
MB <sub>2</sub>	4	[e-el-lu gu]d ḡen-a ḡen-a ḡeš <sup>š</sup> utul <sub>4</sub> -a gu <sub>2</sub> -ḡar-i <sub>3</sub>
117 A	Rev. II 9-10	gud lugal-la-ke <sub>4</sub> ḡen-a ḡen-a / ḡeš <sup>š</sup> utul <sub>4</sub> -a gu <sub>2</sub> -ḡar-i <sub>3</sub>
MB <sub>1</sub>	Rev. 5	[gud luga]l-la-ke <sub>4</sub> ḡen-a ḡeš <sup>š</sup> utul <sub>4</sub> -a gu <sub>2</sub> -ḡar-i <sub>3</sub>
MB <sub>2</sub>	5	[gud lugal-la k]e <sub>4</sub> ḡen-a ḡen-a [(...)]
118 A	Omitted	
MB <sub>1</sub>	Rev. 6	ʾx <sup>r</sup> (x) RI <sup>?</sup> [x] ḡiri <sub>3</sub> DU.DU-i <sub>3</sub> us <sub>2</sub> si-sa <sub>2</sub> ḥe <sub>2</sub> -e-dib
MB <sub>2</sub>	6	[..... ḡi]ri <sub>3</sub> ʾDU.DU-i <sub>3</sub> us <sub>2</sub> si <sup>?</sup> -sa <sub>2</sub> <sup>?</sup> [ḥe <sub>2</sub> -e-dib]

As one may easily notice the two MB manuscripts are almost identical and also correspond to the OB tablet. The only relevant variant is the presence of line 118 in UM 29-15-399+ which is omitted in the OB manuscript. Although only a few traces are preserved, it seems that this line was inscribed in N 3495 as well. This addition is another example of the modifications of OB texts occurring in the Kassite period.

Another possible MB manuscript of *Lipit-Ištar F* is **N 3498**, a small fragment preserving a few lines on one side whereas the other side is broken away. The text is bilingual in interlinear format with the Akkadian version written in small script underneath Sumerian lines. This fragment does not duplicate any part of the OB recension, but according to Peterson<sup>220</sup> it echoes lines 27 ff.

Although this composition was originally associated with the celebration of the *gusisu*-festival, its attestation on *imgidda* tablets<sup>221</sup> suggests that at a certain point it entered into the curriculum. Nevertheless *Lipit-Ištar F* did not become a very popular text as only ten OB manuscripts are preserved which is, however, a duplication-rate higher than for hymnic liturgies.<sup>222</sup> Moreover, it seems that the text has no practical association with the *gusisu*-festival because it probably lacks any performative subscripts typical of hymnic liturgies.<sup>223</sup> The MB manuscripts should be regarded as ensuing from school activities. The provenance of the OB manuscripts and the context of the festival clearly indicate that this text is representative of the Nippur tradition.

220 Peterson 2011, 208.

221 N 3520, N 2571, see Peterson 2011, 202-204.

222 Cf. Tinney 2011, 585.

223 The OB tablet N 3520 ends with the phrase za<sub>3</sub>-mi<sub>2</sub> du<sub>10</sub>-ga that is evocative of the za<sub>3</sub>-mi<sub>2</sub> doxology (for this term see Shehata 2009, 238-239), although this is not the last line because the tablet is an extract, Peterson 2011, 207.

## 1.1.3.6 Praise Poem of Ḫammu-rābi

**VAT 19236 = VS 24 41**<sup>224</sup> is a pillow-shaped tablet from Babylon containing a two-line extract of a self-praise poem of Ḫammu-rābi<sup>225</sup> (Type B.II)<sup>226</sup> in interlinear bilingual format on the obverse. The reverse is uninscribed. This composition is known from two OB sources: LB 2111 = TLB 2 3 (A) a single-column tablet of unknown provenance; UET 1 146 Fragment b (B) a bilingual fragment of a diorite stele from Ur.<sup>227</sup> A number of fragments of a Ḫammu-rābi inscription from Ur were excavated at the site – published under UET 1 146 – or purchased on the market – YOS 9 39-61 and A 3518.<sup>228</sup> The relationship among these fragments is unclear but it seems unlikely that they belong to the same monument.<sup>229</sup> This is one of the very few royal hymns actually found inscribed on monuments. The vast majority of royal hymns that were perhaps composed to be inscribed on monuments are only preserved on OB school tablets.<sup>230</sup>

VS 24 21 (C) reports lines 11-12 of the manuscript A:

C	1	ur-saĝ-ur-saĝ-e-ne bada <sub>3</sub> <sup>d</sup> [ <sup>a</sup> giri <sub>17</sub> -zal-e-ne ...]
	2	<i>qar-ra-ad qar-ra-a-di e-qi<sub>2</sub>-i[d...]</i>
A	11	ur-saĝ-ur-saĝ-e-ne banda <sub>3</sub> <sup>da</sup> giri <sub>17</sub> -zal-e-ne / nam-šul nam-ur-saĝ šu-du <sub>7</sub> -du <sub>7</sub> -me-en
B	2-3	[ur-saĝ-ur-saĝ-e-n]e // banda <sub>3</sub> <sup>da</sup> giri <sub>17</sub> -zal-e-ne [nam-šul nam-ur-sa]ĝ // [šu-du <sub>7</sub> -du <sub>7</sub> -me]-en <i>qar-ra-ad qar-r[a-di] // e-qi<sub>2</sub>-id mu-t[a-al-lu-tim] //</i> <i>mu-ša-ak-li-[il eṭ-lu-tim u<sub>3</sub>] // mu-tu-t[im...]</i>
C	3	kalam <sup>d</sup> amar-utu-ke <sub>4</sub> gu <sub>2</sub> nu-un-[x ...]
	4	KALAM ša a-na <sup>d</sup> Marduk la ka-an-ša [...]
A	12	kalam <sup>d</sup> amar-utu-ke <sub>4</sub> gu <sub>2</sub> nu-ĝar-ra-ma
B	6-7	[kalam <sup>d</sup> amar-utu]-ke <sub>4</sub> // [gu <sub>2</sub> nu-ĝar-ra]-še <sub>3</sub> <i>ma-tam ša [a-na <sup>d</sup>Marduk] // la ka-[an-šu...]</i>

The second part of line 11 (A) was perhaps inscribed on the broken portion of the extract tablet.<sup>231</sup> The text adheres to the OB sources both in Sumerian and Akkadian; the only variant in the Sumerian text is in line 3: nu-un- instead of nu- as in A. Although this is considered one of the rare examples of a royal hymn that was originally carved on a preserved monument, it is unclear whether the OB tablet TLB 2 3 is actually a copy of the inscription or an inspiration for it.<sup>232</sup> As with the Codex Ḫammu-rābi which is also attested on a MB excerpt,<sup>233</sup> VAT 19236 shows the two poles of the setting of a royal inscription, the stele and the extract tablet. It is important that a possible piece of *narua* literature survived in the Kassite period for a pedagogical purpose. To date no first-millennium duplicates have been recovered.

224 For the date of this tablet see remarks in Veldhuis 2000a, 69-70.

225 ETCSL 2.8.2.c, see Cunningham 2007, 370.

226 For the classification of Sumerian hymns see fn. 191.

227 Sjöberg 1961a.

228 An edition of the relevant fragments is provided by Van de Mieroop 2011.

229 Van de Mieroop 2011, 310.

230 Flückiger-Hawker 1999, 78-85.

231 See Van de Mieroop 2011, 315 n. 25.

232 Van de Mieroop 2011, 329-331.

233 See Veldhuis 2000a, 71-72 and § 1.1.3.4.

## 1.1.4 Divine Praise Poems

## 1.1.4.1 Enlil A

The hymn *Enlil A*<sup>234</sup> is one of the most popular compositions in the Old Babylonian Nippur curriculum due to its inclusion in the Decad. It is attested in many sources mainly from Nippur but is known in manuscripts from Ur (four manuscripts), Babylon (one manuscript), Isin (one manuscript), Kiš (two manuscripts) and Sippar (one manuscript) as well as in eight unprovenanced tablets.<sup>235</sup> Twenty-four tablets were unearthed in House F in Nippur.<sup>236</sup>

Two MB manuscripts from Nippur are preserved: CBS 10457 and CBS 10903. Unfortunately no lines are paralleled between these two tablets.

**CBS 10457**<sup>237</sup> is a two-column tablet containing a monolingual version of the text. Lines 16-22, 31-48 (Col. I) and 62-95 (Col. II) are preserved on the obverse and lines 99-128 (Col. III) and 144-160 (Col. IV) on the reverse. This tablet presents several variants<sup>238</sup> most of which are not attested in any other manuscript of *Enlil A*.<sup>239</sup> Here follow some relevant variants:

- Substitution of -(C)e with -(C)a and vice versa:<sup>240</sup>

e > a:		
	72	kur-kur-ra VS kur-kur-re
	120	nu-du <sub>8</sub> -a VS nu-du <sub>8</sub> -e
	123	nu-il <sub>2</sub> -la VS nu-il <sub>2</sub> -e
a > e:		
	120	an-e VS an-na

- Incorrect substitution of -n- with -b- in the verb:<sup>241</sup>

102	ši-im-mi-ib-[...] VS ši-im-mi-in-tar-re
106	ša <sub>3</sub> mu-un-da-ab-[...] VS ša <sub>3</sub> mu-un-da-an-kuš <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>3</sub>

- Assimilation:<sup>242</sup>

102	ni <sub>2</sub> -te-a-na VS ni <sub>2</sub> -te-a-ni
106	mu-un-du-zu VS mu-(un)-da-an-zu

Confusion of -e and -a and of -b- and -n- are phenomena known since the Old Babylonian period, whereas the cases of assimilation are probably to be assigned to the scribe. Likely, the several omissions and additions are also scribal mistakes.<sup>243</sup> Tablets sharing variants with CBS 10457 are mainly from Nippur.

<sup>234</sup> ETCSL 4.5.1.

<sup>235</sup> For the full list of sources see Delnero 2006, 2108-2114; lines are here cited according to his edition, Delnero 2006, 2115 ff.; newly identified Nippur fragments in Peterson 2010b, 574-579.

<sup>236</sup> Robson 2001, 53.

<sup>237</sup> Source N<sub>13</sub> in Delnero 2006.

<sup>238</sup> For the full list of variants see Delnero 2006, 1221.

<sup>239</sup> Delnero 2006, 1221-1222 (Type A variants).

<sup>240</sup> Type A variations No. 185, 313, 316, 323 in Delnero 2006, 1309-1318.

<sup>241</sup> Type A variations No. 271, 278.

<sup>242</sup> Type A variations No. 269, 277.

<sup>243</sup> See for instance ni<sub>2</sub> me-bi for ni<sub>2</sub> me-lim<sub>4</sub>-bi (l. 78).

**CBS 10903**<sup>244</sup> is a fragment from the upper right corner of a two-column tablet. The obverse preserves lines 1-11 of the composition with Akkadian glosses whereas the reverse is left blank, but probably column IV was inscribed.<sup>245</sup> Only a few variants are attested:

- 1. -am<sub>3</sub> is omitted at the end of the line; this variant is shared with manuscripts N<sub>III</sub> and X<sub>1</sub>.
- 5. -a is omitted after para<sub>10</sub>-mah; this variant is shared with manuscript N<sub>III</sub> only.
- 9. The verbal form begins with the prefix ši- instead of im-; this variant is shared with the tablet from Babylon Ba<sub>1</sub>.

It is clear that both manuscripts rely on the Old Babylonian Nippur textual tradition of this composition but some modifications elaborated in the Middle Babylonian period occur. The attestation of *Enlil A* in the Kassite documentation shows that this composition continued to be used in the Advanced Phase of the curriculum during the Middle Babylonian period. Nevertheless, no first-millennium sources have been recovered so far.

#### 1.1.4.2 Inana C

The hymn *Inana C*<sup>246</sup> is known from over thirty OB manuscripts,<sup>247</sup> most of which are from Nippur (24). Seven bilingual tablets in phonetic Sumerian have been found in Tell Harmal, the ancient Šaduppum.<sup>248</sup> Other manuscripts stem from Susa<sup>249</sup> and probably Sippar;<sup>250</sup> some are of unknown provenance. This text is quoted in the Louvre literary catalogue (L: 40)<sup>251</sup> and in the Andrews University catalogue (B4: 1).<sup>252</sup> Although the composition is not part of the Decad it is worth noting that in the unprovenanced Andrews University catalogue it is listed as the first entry, suggesting that *Inana C* was likely copied as an exercise in the school from which that catalogue stems, whatever the nature of literary catalogues was.<sup>253</sup> Moreover *Inana C* was quite popular in House F in Nippur since nine manuscripts were unearthed there.<sup>254</sup>

Three MB tablets are thus far known: CBS 13860, KM 89404, CBS 15203.

**CBS 13860** is a fragment from a two-column tablet from Nippur preserving a bilingual version of *Inana C* 7-22 in parallel column format.<sup>255</sup> Only the right-hand side of the Sumerian column and the left-hand side of the Akkadian are preserved. Hence a complete comparison with the OB manuscripts is not possible. Some orthographic variants<sup>256</sup> are attested but the OB manuscripts are also characterized by textual variation. Unfortunately, it is unknown whether some variants attested in CBS 13860 were contained in the OB manuscripts because of their fragmentary nature. The only

<sup>244</sup> This source is not included in Delnero 2006.

<sup>245</sup> See remarks in Peterson 2010b, 574.

<sup>246</sup> ETCSL 4.7.3.

<sup>247</sup> The tablets edited in Peterson 2010b, No. 24, 25, 26, 27, are to be added to the manuscripts listed in ETCSL.

<sup>248</sup> See § 4.

<sup>249</sup> Sb 12366.

<sup>250</sup> BM 54316 = CT 58 53.

<sup>251</sup> ETCSL 0.2.2.

<sup>252</sup> ETCSL 0.2.11, see Sjöberg 1975a, 166.

<sup>253</sup> Cf. Delnero 2010, 53.

<sup>254</sup> Robson 2001, 56.

<sup>255</sup> Sjöberg 1975a, 207-208.

<sup>256</sup> Note for instance that e-ne in line 10, [...]ig E-NE, is probably copied from the following line [...ur<sub>4</sub>]-re-e-ne; also lines 13, 16, 22 might contain mistakes.



relevant variant is the writing  $\text{\textcircled{S}}i-la_2$  for  $e\text{\textcircled{S}}_2-la_2$ <sup>257</sup> which is also shared by 3N-T 387 (IM 58456) (E). The lines of the Akkadian version in CBS 13860 are not preserved in any of the Tell Harmal manuscripts.

**KM 89404** is a pillow-shaped tablet housed in the collection of the Kelsey Museum of Archeology at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. It is a bilingual extract tablet in interlinear format inscribed with two lines (*Inana C* 158-159) on the obverse whereas the reverse is uninscribed. Both date and provenance are uncertain, but according to Michalowski<sup>258</sup> it could be an early Kassite tablet that is not from Nippur. Line 158 is only preserved in the Nippur manuscript Q (CBS 2357 = HAV 20), whereas line 159 is attested in Q as well as in R (IM 51176 = TIM 9 24), one of the bilingual tablets in phonetic writing from Tell-Harmal, and is quoted in the first five lines of Tablet II of the lexical series *Erimḥuṣ*.<sup>259</sup> Variants are attested between KM 89404 and manuscript Q, some of which are phonetic writings:

Line	KM 89404	OB text
1=158	ba-an-gi	ba-an-gi <sub>4</sub> <sup>1</sup>
1=158	niĝ <sub>2</sub> kur <sub>2</sub> di-di	niĝ <sub>2</sub> -a <sub>2</sub> -zi du <sub>11</sub> -du <sub>11</sub>
2=159	niĝ <sub>2</sub> kur <sub>2</sub> di-di	niĝ <sub>2</sub> kur <sub>2</sub> du <sub>11</sub> -du <sub>11</sub>
2=159	pi-il-la <sub>2</sub>	pe-el

1 For this word see Michalowski 1998, 68-69.

- Note that niĝ<sub>2</sub>-kur<sub>2</sub>--du<sub>11</sub>, 'to say something hostile',<sup>260</sup> replaces niĝ<sub>2</sub>-a<sub>2</sub>-zi--du<sub>11</sub>, 'to speak roughly, to make violence',<sup>261</sup> in line 158; in the OB text niĝ<sub>2</sub>-kur<sub>2</sub>--du<sub>11</sub> is attested in line 159 and in the shortened form kur<sub>2</sub> du<sub>11</sub>-ga in line 157; the MB variant in l. 158 might be a mistake of the scribe who perhaps miscopied from the following line.
- The writing pi-il-la<sub>2</sub> is documented in the first-millennium sources of the series *Erimḥuṣ*.

As noted by Michalowski, the KM tablet provides a better Akkadian translation for line 159 than the Tell-Harmal manuscript and is closer to the first-millennium lexical list. The rendering of niĝ<sub>2</sub>-kur<sub>2</sub> du<sub>11</sub>-du<sub>11</sub> with *qabê šanīti*, instead of *ēpeš namūtīm* as attested in the Tell Harmal manuscript, is also documented in OB Lu and in the Middle Assyrian lexical text CT 51 168.<sup>262</sup>

This composition is known to us in two different textual traditions, one from Nippur in standard orthography, and another one from Northern Babylonia - Tell Harmal - in phonetic orthography.<sup>263</sup> The relation of KM 89404 to these two traditions cannot be fully understood on the basis of only two lines. According to Michalowski, KM 89404 stems from Northern Babylonia. However, with the exception of the variants noted above, it resembles the Nippur textual tradition of manuscript Q rather than the Tell Harmal tradition. Indeed, the KM tablet does not contain any of the phonetic writings of manuscript R. The first-millennium tablets of the lexical list *Erimḥuṣ* rely on the same tradition as manuscript Q. On the basis of the evidence presently available it is not possible to clearly place KM 89404 within a stream of tradition. However, it is not precluded that this source represents a variant of the Nippur textual tradition.

257 For this term attested in CBS 13892 (A), see Sjöberg 1975a, 212; CBS 19795 (F) has  $\text{\textcircled{S}}u-la_2$ .

258 Michalowski 1998, 66-67.

259 MSL 17.

260 Attinger 1993, 590-593.

261 Attinger 1993, 628-629.

262 Attinger 1993, 591.

263 On phonetic orthography in Northern Babylonia see § 4.

**CBS 15203** is a bilingual manuscript in interlinear format<sup>264</sup> with the Akkadian text written in small script. This is the largest MB fragment and contains lines 205 ff., but is unfortunately unpublished.<sup>265</sup>

### 1.1.5 Types of Songs

#### 1.1.5.1 The Song of the Plowing Oxen

*The Song of the Plowing Oxen*<sup>266</sup> is a short composition bearing a subscript that describes the text as an *ululumama*-song for Ninurta. Only four texts have the *ululumama* subscript appended and display thematic similarities in connection with cowherds and cattle.<sup>267</sup> *The Song of the Plowing Oxen* was composed to be recited during the *gasisu*-festival at Nippur.<sup>268</sup> As is typical of non-curricular texts this composition shows a low rate of duplication:<sup>269</sup> only three OB multicolumn tablets from Nippur are preserved.<sup>270</sup> Nevertheless it continued to be copied in the post-Old Babylonian period as a scribal exercise. Indeed, it is unlikely that the *gasisu*-festival continued to be observed after the Old Babylonian period.<sup>271</sup> The composition survived in the first millennium in a fragment from Nineveh, K 18450,<sup>272</sup> preserving the Akkadian translation,<sup>273</sup> but probably the Sumerian version was arranged in a parallel column. *The Song of the Plowing Oxen* is also quoted in the Neo Assyrian catalogue of the series of Sidu that lists 35 wisdom compositions.<sup>274</sup>

Three bilingual fragments from Nippur, **UM 29-13-560**, **N 3529** and **N 3169**, date to the Middle Babylonian period. They probably belong to the same multicolumn tablet with Sumerian and Akkadian arranged in parallel sub-columns. Due to the fragmentary nature of the MB manuscripts Civil only edited column II of UM 29-13-560 preserving the Sumerian text of lines 15-29.<sup>275</sup> The other two fragments are unplaced. For the extant portion of the text, the MB manuscript adheres to the Old Babylonian sources with only irrelevant variants attested.

#### 1.1.5.2 A Litigant's Prayer

The small tablet **LB 806 = Peiser Urkunden 92** contains a bilingual prayer,<sup>276</sup> with Sumerian on the obverse and Akkadian on the reverse.<sup>277</sup> The tablet is part of a family archive of legal and business documents.<sup>278</sup> This text is a personal prayer to the gods Šamaš and Nabû in order to gain their favor in a lawsuit. Likely the text was composed during the Kassite period; indeed no duplicates are

<sup>264</sup> Veldhuis 2000a, 75 n. 23.

<sup>265</sup> An edition of the manuscript will be prepared by the writer.

<sup>266</sup> ETCSL 5.5.5.

<sup>267</sup> Shehata 2009, 302-303.

<sup>268</sup> *Lipit-Ištar F* is also associated with this festival, see § 1.1.3.5.

<sup>269</sup> Cf. Tinney 2011, 585.

<sup>270</sup> Civil 1976, 86.

<sup>271</sup> Cohen 1993, 91-92.

<sup>272</sup> Livingstone 1980.

<sup>273</sup> Lines 117-129.

<sup>274</sup> Finkel 1986; for the series of Sidu see § 9.4. Two texts from the Western periphery, *The Ballad of Early Rulers* and possibly *The Fowler*, are quoted in the same catalogue, §§ 6.2.1, 6.2.3.

<sup>275</sup> Col. I contains the Akkadian translation of either the previous section of the text or of another composition, see remarks in Civil 1976, 86.

<sup>276</sup> See Cooper 1971, 3.

<sup>277</sup> For this type of text see RIA 5, 125.

<sup>278</sup> Foster 2005, 767.



- The use of the verbal prefix *ši-* in lines 124-125 is shared by MS 3366, another manuscript of unknown provenance.
- The possible use of the non-human possessive suffix *-bi* instead of the human *-ani* after *ama<sub>5</sub>* in line 125 perhaps indicates the late date of the manuscript.<sup>284</sup>

*The Instructions of Šuruppak* are included in the House F Fourteen and can be assigned to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. Nevertheless, despite its popularity in Nippur, this composition, as is clear from the Early Dynastic sources, did not originate in Nippur. In the Old Babylonian period different versions existed from Susa and Kiš<sup>285</sup> and the Ur sources also display a certain degree of variation.<sup>286</sup> The poor state of preservation of the Schøyen Collection tablet and the limited number of lines quoted do not allow us to sufficiently understand the relation between MS 2291 and the Old Babylonian recension(s). However, the variation shown by this manuscript – unclear placement of lines on the obverse; the absence of Rev. 3 from the OB tablets; orthographic variants – suggests that it reflects a tradition different from the OB Nippur recension.

A monolingual Akkadian version of *The Instructions of Šuruppak* is preserved on a MB tablet from Sippar<sup>287</sup> and on a MA manuscript from Assur.<sup>288</sup> This composition is also attested in an Akkado-Hurrian bilingual version inscribed on a fragment stemming from an unknown Syrian center.<sup>289</sup> Only a few lines are duplicated in these tablets, but according to Alster<sup>290</sup> the Akkadian translation was made up independently. Although there was much interest in this composition during the Late Bronze Age, no first-millennium copies are so far known.

#### 1.1.6.2 The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta

*The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta (Ur-Ninurta G)*<sup>291</sup> and *Counsels of Wisdom* are related compositions; they reflect on similar themes and appear on the same OB *Sammeltafel*.<sup>292</sup>

*The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* is a composition of seventy-one lines comprising three different sections of 37, 27 and 7 lines respectively. The first section describing the installation of Ur-Ninurta as ruler of Nippur bears the subscript<sup>293</sup> ‘precepts of a god’. The second section containing instructions on the work at the time of harvest, but with more of a religious tone than a practical one, is marked by the subscript ‘precept of a farmer’. The last section advises men to observe worship of the gods. This composition is transmitted either on *Sammeltafel* together with *Counsels of Wisdom* or as a single composition written on single-column tablets.<sup>294</sup> In one of the *Sammeltafel*, VS 10 204,<sup>295</sup> *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* and *Counsels of Wisdom* are preceded by *The Disputation of the Bird and the Fish* and an unknown composition.<sup>296</sup> An OB catalogue from Sippar quotes the

284 Alster 2005, 142: 125.

285 See Alster 2005, 219.

286 Alster 2005, 220.

287 BM 50522 + BM 52767 + BM 52946 + BM 77468 + ?; edition in Alster 2005 with Lambert’s copies on Pl. 13-15.

288 VAT 10151 = KAR 27, Weidner 1952-53, No. 109; published in Lambert 1960, 92-95, 311, Alster 2005.

289 Alster 2005, 204-208; for this source see § 9.1.

290 Alster 2005, 207.

291 ETCSL 2.5.6.7.

292 See discussion in Alster 2005, 221-224.

293 Alster 2005, 222; for a possible subscript to the third section see Civil 1997, 49.

294 IM 55403 = TIM 9 1, Ni 4035 = SLTN 137.

295 VAT 6977 + VAT 6978.

296 Civil 1972, 88; the unknown composition is not preserved but its existence has been calculated by Civil from the size of VS 10 204.

first part of the incipit of *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* but it is unclear whether the entry actually refers to this composition.<sup>297</sup>

The text of *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* is preserved on three OB tablets of which just one, SLTN 137 (B), stems from Nippur. TIM 9 1 (A) is a single column tablet from Tell Harmal inscribed with the text in phonetic writing and VS 10 204 (C) is a three-column tablet of unknown provenience, but possibly from Sippar. Two additional manuscripts, UM 29-13-419A (D) and MM 487b (E), are probably Middle Babylonian.

**UM 29-13-419A** is a fragment from Nippur from the left edge of a three-column tablet inscribed with 40-50 lines per column. It contains monolingual Sumerian versions of *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* and *Counsels of Wisdom*. Lines 23-37 of *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* are preserved on the obverse.

**MM 487b** is a fragment of a two-column tablet housed in the Montserrat Museum in Barcelona, probably stemming from Babylon.<sup>298</sup> Only part of the obverse is preserved whereas the reverse is broken away. This manuscript preserves lines 20-33 and 56-68 of *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta*, but it probably included *Counsels of Wisdom*.<sup>299</sup> The text presents several Akkadian glosses.

As it stands, the MB manuscripts belong to a different textual tradition from source A which is written in phonetic orthography and comes from Northern Babylonia. Phonetic writings are also attested in C.<sup>300</sup> Here follows the list of variants among manuscripts written in standard orthography:

Line	D	E	B	C
21	x	siškur	siškur-ra	x
23	[...-d]e <sub>3</sub>	ku <sub>5</sub> -ru-da	<i>Line Omitted</i>	x
25	in-na-a[b-...]	im-ma-ab-su-su	in <sup>ˆ</sup> -na-ab- [...]	x
25	x	[niĝ <sub>2</sub> -ug]u-	x	u <sub>2</sub> <sup>ˆ</sup> -[gu-...]
26	mu-da-an-daḥ <sup>ˆ</sup> -[e]	mu-un-da-an-daḥ-e	mu-da-an- [...]	<i>Line Omitted</i>
27	[...-n]i	[...-r]a-na	x	<i>Line Omitted</i>
27	mu <sup>ˆ</sup> mu-a	mu	mu mu	<i>Line Omitted</i>
27	ib <sub>2</sub> -diri-diri	bi-ib <sub>2</sub> -diri-diri-ge	ib <sub>2</sub> - [...]	<i>Line Omitted</i>
28	[eĝir-a-n]i	[eĝir-r]a-na	x	<i>Line Omitted</i>
28	šu-gi <sub>4</sub>	šu	šu-gi <sub>4</sub> -a	<i>Line Omitted</i>
28	bi <sub>2</sub> -ib <sub>2</sub> -su <sub>3</sub> -su <sub>3</sub>	mu-ub-gi <sub>4</sub> -gi <sub>4</sub>	bi <sub>2</sub> <sup>ˆ</sup> - [...]	<i>Line Omitted</i>
29	mu-na-an-de <sub>2</sub> <sup>ˆ</sup> -e	mu-na-an-de <sub>2</sub> -e	mu-un-na-d[e <sub>2</sub> -e]	x
29a	mu-un-ši-bar-re	<i>Line Omitted</i>	ba-an-[ši-bar-re]	<i>Line Omitted</i>
29b	ḥe <sub>2</sub> -bi <sub>2</sub> -ib-gub-b[e <sub>2</sub> ]	<i>Line Omitted</i>	ḥe <sub>2</sub> -em-x <sup>ˆ</sup> - [...]	(x)
31	nu-mu-na-kal-le	x	nu-mu-un-na- [...]	x
32	nu-mu-na-geg-ga	[nu-m]u-un-na-geg-ga	nu-mu-u[n-...]	x
33	[...-l]a-ni	x	x	til-la-a <sup>ˆ</sup>
57	x	gud-da- [...]	[...]-da-si <sub>3</sub> -ke-bi	gud <sup>ˆ</sup> -ba <sup>ˆ</sup> (-)-da <sup>ˆ</sup>
60	x	ki a-du <sub>11</sub> -ga	x	ki-za de <sub>2</sub> K[A]
62	x	šu na-ab-ta <sub>3</sub> -ta <sub>3</sub>	x	n[am-...]
63	x	mur <sup>ˆ</sup>	x	lu <sub>2</sub> <sup>ˆ</sup>
65	x	-	x	lu <sub>2</sub> <sup>ˆ</sup>

297 Si 331 Rev. 6, van Dijk 1989, 448, cf. fn. 83.

298 Civil 1997, 43-44.

299 Alster 2005, 225.

300 25: u<sub>2</sub><sup>ˆ</sup>-[gu] ~ ugu; 31: šu-wi-l[e] ~ šu-il<sub>2</sub>-la; 33: til ~ til<sub>3</sub>; 66: erin<sub>2</sub> ~ iri/eri<sup>ki</sup>.

Line	D	E	B	C
66	x	eri-na-ka	x	erin <sub>2</sub>
67	x	šu-kin-dab <sub>5</sub> -ba	x	šu-ku-[...]²

1 Cf. mu-ri (A), Alster 2005, 239.  
2 Cf. šu-ku-un-di-ip-pa (A).

Only lines 23-33 are preserved in the two MB manuscripts D and E. The only phonetic writing attested in the MB tablets is ere-na-ka for erin<sub>2</sub> in E (l. 66). On the contrary, in lines 25 and 67 where the Sippar manuscript C has phonetic writings E reports the text in standard orthography. Manuscript E diverges from C also in lines 60 and 63. Manuscript A shows some textual variants from the MB tablets, in addition to phonetic writings: 27. D-E: mu-(a) (bi<sub>2</sub>)-ib<sub>2</sub>-diri-diri-(ge) VS A: mu im-ma-<sup>si</sup>; 32. D-E: nu-mu-(un)-na-geg-ga VS A: nu-mu-un-na-teĝ<sub>3</sub>-ĝi<sub>6</sub>-e; 35. D: si nu-sa<sub>2</sub>-e VS A: a nu-mu-un-de-e. In these passages the OB Nippur tablet B agrees with the MB manuscripts. It can be said that manuscripts B, D and E belong the same stream of tradition.<sup>301</sup> However, B shows closer similarities to D than to E, as in the following instances: 25. B-D: in-na-ab- VS E im-ma-; 26. B-D: mu-da-an- VS E: mu-un-da-; 27. B-D: mu mu-(a) ib<sub>2</sub>-diri-diri VS E: mu bi-ib<sub>2</sub>-diri-diri-ge; 28. B-D: šu-gi<sub>4</sub>-(a) bi<sub>2</sub>-ib<sub>2</sub>-su<sub>3</sub>-su<sub>3</sub> VS E: šu mu-ub-gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>.<sup>302</sup> Moreover, B and D are the only manuscripts to report lines 29a-c even though they display variants. The close relation between B and D is obviously tied to their common provenance from Nippur.<sup>303</sup> MM 487b perhaps represents a variant within this stream of tradition.<sup>304</sup> It seems plausible that the text of MM 487b was modified where the tablet was copied.

It is worth noting that *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta*, a composition poorly attested in Nippur<sup>305</sup> in the Old Babylonian period, is known from the MB Nippur documentation. Despite the limited number of OB sources, its possible quotation in a catalogue and presence on *Sammeltafeln* suggest that this text could have been used in scribal training at least in Sippar. As will be pointed out in the following section this composition possibly survived into the first millennium, even though no duplicates are preserved.

### 1.1.6.3 Counsels of Wisdom

As stated above *Counsels of Wisdom*<sup>306</sup> was written on the same *Sammeltafeln* as *The Instructions of Ur Ninurta*. *Counsels of Wisdom* comprises two sections which probably were independent compositions before they were combined in *Sammeltafeln*.<sup>307</sup> The first section deals with the building of a palace by the king whereas the second includes precepts concerning religious duties. This composition is preserved on seven manuscripts, inscribed either on *Sammeltafeln* or on single column tablets. Two OB single-column tablets stem from Nippur: UM 29-15-979;<sup>308</sup> Ni 4193 = ISET I p. 136. Three multicolumn tablets are probably from Sippar: the aforementioned *Sammeltafeln* VS 10 204; VAT 6448 (+) VAT 6479 + VAT 6503 = VS 10 205; VAT 6464 + 6604 = VS 10 206.<sup>309</sup> The only MB manuscript is the aforementioned UM 29-13-419A but, as seen above, MM 487b perhaps contained *Counsels of Wisdom* along with *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta*. CBS 11945 (J) is a bilingual tablet

301 For differences between B and C see Alster 2005, 238: 57.

302 Cf. šu mu-un-di-ib-gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub> (A).

303 Note however line 32 where E is closer to B than D.

304 The only mistake in MM 487b is -ni- for the genitive -na- (l. 24), see Alster 2005, 237.

305 Alster 2005, 224.

306 ETCSL 5.6.2.

307 Alster 2005, 223-224.

308 See Sjöberg 1974-75, 180, this is the only manuscript inscribed with the first section alone.

309 VS 10 205 and VS 10 206 are two-column tablets.



from Nippur published by Cavigneaux<sup>310</sup> as a NB fragment, but which according to Civil is a MB tablet.<sup>311</sup> Paleography reveals that is a NB manuscript.<sup>312</sup>

**UM 29-13-419A** preserves the first lines of the composition on the obverse and lines 204-225 on the reverse. Unfortunately, the tablet is too poorly preserved and no parallel lines can be found in the other manuscripts for comparison. For the present work it is worth noting that this composition, as shown by CBS 11945, survived until the first millennium. Hence it is not excluded that *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* were also transmitted to first-millennium libraries due to the relation between these two compositions.

#### 1.1.6.4 The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab

The tale *The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab*,<sup>313</sup> which presents the king in his traditional role as judge after a litigation of three men, is known from only three manuscripts.<sup>314</sup> CBS 1601 (B)<sup>315</sup> is an OB tablet belonging the Khabaza collection, hence probably from Sippar. **AO 7739 + AO 8149 = TCL 16 80+83** (A) is a tablet of unknown provenance containing a monolingual recension of the composition. Despite the date of Amīšadūqa year 8 in the colophon, Cavigneaux<sup>316</sup> attributes the tablet to the Kassite period on paleographical grounds<sup>317</sup> but unfortunately photographs are not available.<sup>318</sup> A new source has been recently published by Peterson:<sup>319</sup> UM 29-16-719, an OB fragment of a lenticular tablet (Type IV) containing an extract of one or two lines, is the only known Nippur manuscript of the composition. It demonstrates that this text was known at Nippur during the Old Babylonian period and was utilized as a school exercise. This composition is treated in the present study by considering source A as a MB tablet, but I am aware that this may not prove to be the case.

As noted by Alster the two main sources 'follow each other so closely that one has the impression that they came from the same site, or even that one of them was copied from the other'.<sup>320</sup> A very limited number of only orthographic variants occur:

Line	TCL 16 80+ (A)	CBS 1601 (B)
12	u <sub>3</sub> -un-du-du-ru	u <sub>3</sub> -un- <sup>ˊ</sup> dur <sub>2</sub> -dur <sub>2</sub> - <sup>ˊ</sup> ru
14	ba-a-la <sub>2</sub> -e	ba-a-la <sub>2</sub> -a
15	a-ba-kam	a-ba-a-kam
15	a-ba-am <sub>3</sub>	a-ba- <sup>ˊ</sup> a <sup>ˊ</sup>
80	e <sub>2</sub> -a- <sup>ˊ</sup> ni <sup>ˊ</sup> ?	e <sub>2</sub> -a-na
82	u <sub>3</sub> -un-d[u-du-ru]	um-ku <sub>5</sub> -ku <sub>5</sub> -ru

<sup>310</sup> Cavigneaux 1996b, 18-21.

<sup>311</sup> Civil 1997, 43.

<sup>312</sup> Beaulieu's insight. I thank Prof. P. A. Beaulieu for his help in dating the tablet. Indications of NB date are the following: signs have slanting shapes typical of NB manuscripts; the form of MU in Rev. 17 is NB. Moreover, there is no clear separation between Sumerian and Akkadian: the Akkadian translation runs immediately after the Sumerian text so that the first sign of each Akkadian line is not aligned; this format is unusual in MB tablets. Scholarly texts are attested in Nippur in the Neo Babylonian period, see Gesche 2000, 21-22, 37-38.

<sup>313</sup> ETCSL 5.6.5.

<sup>314</sup> For the plot see Alster 2005, 374-376.

<sup>315</sup> Hand-copy in Alster 1991c, 28; sources and lineation according to Alster 2005, 373-383.

<sup>316</sup> Cavigneaux 1987, 52.

<sup>317</sup> For a similar case see *Incantation to Utu*, § 1.1.10.2.

<sup>318</sup> The diagnostic sign KUR does not occur in this tablet and the sign NE does not show the typical Kassite form as often in Middle Babylonian manuscripts.

<sup>319</sup> Peterson 2010a, 565.

<sup>320</sup> Alster 2005, 374; in line 12, u<sub>3</sub>-un-dur<sub>2</sub>-dur<sub>2</sub> in B and the corresponding phonetic spelling u<sub>3</sub>-un-du-du-ru in A misunderstood ku<sub>5</sub> (attested in B 82, um-ku<sub>5</sub>-ku<sub>5</sub>-ru) as KU then read as dur<sub>2</sub>, Alster 2005, 381.



83	me	me-ni
83	u <sub>3</sub> -da-an-tum <sub>2</sub>	u <sub>3</sub> -ba-tum <sub>2</sub>
84	bi <sub>2</sub> -in-tum <sub>4</sub> -mu- <sup>˘</sup> da/uš <sup>˘</sup> ?	bi <sub>2</sub> -in-tum <sub>3</sub> - <sup>˘</sup> tum <sub>3</sub> - <sup>˘</sup> a-ni
86	ki-šub-ba-ni-ta <sup>1</sup>	ki-gub-ba- [...]
1 Alster suggests that this line needs collation, Alster 2005, 382: 86.		

This composition likely does not belong to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. Manuscripts A and B clearly reflect the same textual tradition. Unfortunately, these tablets cannot be compared with the only preserved Nippur manuscript because of its fragmentary nature. Nevertheless, line 10=25 inscribed on UM 29-16-719 exactly duplicates the text of manuscript A and B. The grammar is usually correct even though some lines are problematic<sup>321</sup> and phonetic writings are attested in A.<sup>322</sup> No first-millennium copies are so far known.

#### 1.1.6.5 The Fowler and his Wife

**UM 29-15-848** is a lentil-shaped tablet from Nippur containing on the obverse a one-line extract from the tale *The Fowler and his Wife* in monolingual Sumerian.<sup>323</sup> The reverse of the tablet has an extract from *Urra. The Fowler and his Wife* exists both as a single text and as a part of Proverb Collections 21 and 24. It was inscribed on several OB manuscripts<sup>324</sup> including excerpts<sup>325</sup> and a Type II tablet 3N-T 168 (A 30175).<sup>326</sup> The tablets' format indicates that this composition was used in the Old Babylonian curriculum, notably in the Intermediary Phase. The same function is retained in the Middle Babylonian period as is clear from the tablet format of UM 29-15-848. The MB manuscript quotes line 5 of the composition, dam mušen-du<sub>3</sub> dam-a-n[i-ir<sup>2</sup>], 'The fowler's wife spoke to her husband', which although incomplete adheres to the Nippur manuscripts. Nevertheless, UM 29-15-848 omits -ke<sub>4</sub> after mušen-du<sub>3</sub>. The University of Iowa manuscript,<sup>327</sup> possibly from Larsa, and an unprovenanced tablet in Copenhagen<sup>328</sup> report a different text for this line.

UM 29-25-848	dam mušen-du <sub>3</sub> dam-a-n[i-ir <sup>2</sup> ]
Ni 3206 <sup>329</sup>	dam mušen-du <sub>3</sub> -ke <sub>4</sub> dam-a-ni-[ir] // gu <sub>3</sub> mu-un-na-de <sub>2</sub> -e
UM 29-15-667	dam mušen-du <sub>3</sub> -ke <sub>4</sub> dam-a-ni / [...]
N 1237	dam mušen-du <sub>3</sub> -ke <sub>4</sub> dam-a-ni-ir gu <sub>3</sub> mu-un-na-de <sub>2</sub> -e
UM 29-13-254B	dam mušen-[...] gu <sub>3</sub> mu-un-n[a ...]
N 7918	[dam muš]en-du <sub>3</sub> -ke <sub>4</sub> pa <sub>4</sub> -[...]
Cop.	dam-a-ni ka paḥ-a-ka im-ma-na <sup>˘</sup> x <sup>˘</sup> [(x)]
Iowa	dam-a-ni ka <sub>2</sub> pa <sub>4</sub> -paḥ-ka // gu <sub>3</sub> mu-na-de-e

<sup>321</sup> For instance ll. 22-24, 79, 87, 90, 92, Alster 2005, 381-383.

<sup>322</sup> gi ~ gi<sub>4</sub> (ll. 3, 13, 17, 88); -ni<sub>3</sub> ~ -ni (l. 86); u<sub>3</sub>-un-du-du-ru ~ u<sub>3</sub>-un-dur<sub>2</sub>-dur-(ru) (l. 12).

<sup>323</sup> ETCSL 5.6.9.

<sup>324</sup> Alster 1997, 253-254, Alster 2005, 371-372, 398, with previous bibliography.

<sup>325</sup> Kroch-05, University of Iowa No. 18 (= JCS 31, 143).

<sup>326</sup> MSL 15, 9.

<sup>327</sup> See fn. 325.

<sup>328</sup> National Museum, Copenhagen, 10068.

<sup>329</sup> ISET II Pl. 121.

No first-millennium duplicates are known, but the composition *The Fowler* which is closely related to *The Fowler and his Wife*, or perhaps a rephrased version of the same text, is attested at Emar and is possibly quoted in the first-millennium catalogue of the series of Sidu.<sup>330</sup>

### 1.1.7 Proverbs

#### 1.1.7.1 CBS 8039

**CBS 8039** is a pillow-shaped tablet from Nippur containing a one-line extract from a text which seems to be a proverb. Even though it does not duplicate any of the extant OB manuscripts, it looks similar to the beginning of Proverb Collection 1. The text contains the phonetic writing si-li-im for silim. According to Veldhuis<sup>331</sup> this line may have existed in one of the non-Nippur recensions of Proverb Collection 1. Nevertheless it is attested on a Nippur tablet during the Middle Babylonian period.

#### 1.1.7.2 N 3395

**N 3395**<sup>332</sup> is a fragment from the lower edge of a bilingual tablet discovered in Nippur. The format is quite unusual: the text is divided into paragraphs by means of horizontal rulings, but the Akkadian version follows the Sumerian text on the same line without any clear separation. This fragment contains a proverb collection of which no duplicates are known from either Old Babylonian or first-millennium sources.<sup>333</sup> The Sumerian and Akkadian versions are often difficult to harmonize. The Sumerian text presents rare equivalents to the Akkadian words, often attested only in lexical lists, or even as *hapax legomena*,<sup>334</sup> and it is often understandable only through the Akkadian version. Sequences of signs such as 𒄩 IR BU (Rev. 3), and BU<sup>2</sup> KUN<sup>2</sup> KA<sup>2</sup>-na KA-KA ba<sup>2</sup>-NIM-ma (Rev. 4) likely contain scribal mistakes. Moreover, as noted by Lambert<sup>335</sup> the scribe was none too skilled because identical signs are written in different ways even in the same line.<sup>336</sup> Features of the text and the lack of parallels perhaps indicate that this proverb was composed during the Kassite period. The Akkadian text seems to be the primary version.

#### 1.1.7.3 N 3783 + N 5031

**N 3783 + N 5031** is a fragment from a lentil-shaped tablet from Nippur inscribed on the obverse with four lines containing extracts from three different texts.<sup>337</sup> Horizontal rulings are traced after the first and the last line. The first line cites an unidentified text followed by two lines from Proverb Collection 3.150. The last line quotes the incipit of *Lugal-e*.<sup>338</sup> The proverb is not quoted in full. The reverse has an extract of *Syllabary B*.<sup>339</sup>

<sup>330</sup> See § 6.2.3.

<sup>331</sup> Veldhuis 2000a, 73.

<sup>332</sup> ETCSL 6.2.1. Lineation according to Alster 1997, 288-290.

<sup>333</sup> On the date of the manuscript see the remarks in Veldhuis 2000b, 394.

<sup>334</sup> Obv. 2.1, 2.3, 2.4; Rev. 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, see Alster 1997, 460-461.

<sup>335</sup> Lambert 1960, 272.

<sup>336</sup> This, however, can be characteristic of the Kassite scribes as noted above, see for instance § 1.1.1.2 fn. 107 and § 1.1.1.3.

<sup>337</sup> Peterson 2007.

<sup>338</sup> See § 1.1.1.5.

<sup>339</sup> See Veldhuis 2000a, 80.

## 1.1.7.4 N 5447

**N 5447** is a fragment of a lentil-shaped tablet from Nippur. The obverse preserves the first words of Proverb Collection 2.113 and 114<sup>340</sup> in monolingual Sumerian, unusually followed by an extract of *Urra*. The reverse is uninscribed. The date of this fragment is uncertain and it could turn out to be Old Babylonian. The first proverb adheres to the OB manuscripts, whereas it is possible that the second one slightly differs from the OB recension of SP 2.114:

SP 2.114	ur ki tuš-bi nu-mu-zu-a
N 5447	ur ki tuš-tuš ʾx x <sup>341</sup>

## 1.1.7.5 UM 29-16-561

**UM 29-16-951** is a pillow-shaped extract tablet from Nippur. The obverse is broken away, but originally had a two-line excerpt text. The reverse is inscribed with three unilingual Sumerian proverbs of which only the third has been identified as a duplicate of Proverb Collection 2.134. The text presents some variants which can be classified as omissions or additions of signs. Due to their features, it seems likely that the variants are to be attributed to the scribe who improperly copied the text rather than to a different textual tradition.

UM 29-16-951	OB Text
saĝ siki sar-ra <sup>1</sup>	saĝ-sar-ra
ba-an-tuku-tuku-a	ba-an-tuku-tuku
u <sub>3</sub> še <sup>2</sup>	u <sub>3</sub> lu <sub>2</sub> še
ri-ri	ri-ri-ga

<sup>1</sup> The addition of siki is probably due to a copying mistake as this sign also appears in the following line.

## 1.1.7.6 Ni 679

**Ni 679** is a pillow-shaped tablet from Nippur containing, on the obverse, a two-line extract from Proverb Collection 19 (Sec. E 2) in monolingual Sumerian. The reverse is uninscribed. The OB parallels are too badly preserved to be used for comparison. The only variation which can be noted is the different spelling of the first word ku<sub>3</sub>-zu as NA<sub>2</sub>.SAL-ni.<sup>342</sup> No first-millennium duplicates are known.

## 1.1.7.7 VAT 17353

**VAT 17353 = VS 24 113**, discovered in Babylon, is a fragment of a bilingual tablet in parallel column format. For the preserved part, the tablet is only inscribed on the obverse. The Sumerian version, on the left, is only poorly preserved and is separated from the Akkadian translation in the right column by a double ruling.<sup>343</sup> Lines 1-9 duplicate Proverb Collection 3.149 and 14.6 and lines 10-18 contain Proverb Collection 7.77.<sup>344</sup> SP 3.149 is also attested in the NA bilingual manuscript BM 38283 (Rev. 11-14).<sup>345</sup> Two variants are not attested in any of the OB manuscripts:<sup>346</sup> al-šeĝ<sub>3</sub> (l.

<sup>340</sup> SP 2 is quoted in the Series of Sidu, Finkel 1986.

<sup>341</sup> According to Veldhuis 2000a, 73, traces of signs in N 5447 cannot be reconciled with the OB manuscript (CBS 10972+).

<sup>342</sup> Alster 1997, 440.

<sup>343</sup> The MB date seems to be confirmed on the basis of the form of the sign RU; note also the sign KAR, see BE 14 No. 220.

<sup>344</sup> Cf. SP 1.179.

<sup>345</sup> Lambert 1960, 262-264.

<sup>346</sup> nu-du<sub>8</sub>-a VS nu-du<sub>8</sub> is attested in SP 14.6; [id<sub>2</sub>idig]na VS id<sub>2</sub>idigna-a is attested in SP 3.149 source II.

2) VS nu-šeĝ<sub>3</sub>-šeĝ<sub>3</sub> and [(mu-un)]-ḫub<sup>347</sup> (l. 7) VS mu-un-zur-re.<sup>348</sup> It is interesting to note that these variants are not attested in the NA manuscript either, which, however, has nam-b[ir-re] instead of mu-un-zur-re. Conversely the Akkadian translation is identical in the MB and NA manuscripts.

In the Sumerian column only the ends of lines 10-18 (= SP 7.77) are preserved, therefore a comparison with the OB recension is not possible. The text seems to be very close to the OB version although a few variants are possibly attested.<sup>349</sup> It is worth noting the writing [b]a-da-su<sub>3</sub> for OB ba-da-an-su.

#### 1.1.7.8 MS 2065

**MS 2065** is a pillow-shaped tablet of unknown provenance, possibly Middle Babylonian in date, containing an Emesal proverb on the obverse whereas the reverse is uninscribed. What makes this tablet unique is the fact that the text is written in phonetic Sumerian, standard orthography, and Akkadian. Each version comprises three lines separated by horizontal rulings. The three versions are therefore arranged top-to-bottom on the tablet with phonetic Sumerian preceding the standard orthography text. The proverb relates to *The Song of the Millstone*, an *ululamama*-song<sup>350</sup> known from only four manuscripts mainly from Nippur.<sup>351</sup> To my knowledge this is the only MB manuscript and one of only three tablets from Mesopotamia<sup>352</sup> that contain parallel versions in phonetic Sumerian and standard orthography. The phonetic Sumerian version differs from the standard orthography text in the spelling of merely two signs without any phonetic alteration:

SS	PhS
-de <sub>2</sub> -	-de-
nu-geg-ga	nu-ge-ga

#### 1.1.7.9 MS 3310

**MS 3310** is a square tablet of unknown provenance, possibly Middle Babylonian. The obverse contains two monolingual proverbs of three lines each separated by a horizontal ruling. The reverse has three monolingual proverbs of two, four and two lines respectively. Two additional lines are inscribed on the lower edge, possibly continuing the last proverb on the reverse. With the exception of the fifth proverb, an abbreviated version of SP 1.84,<sup>353</sup> the other proverbs are unknown so far.

#### 1.1.7.10 MS 3323

**MS 3323** is a pillow-shaped tablet of unknown provenance inscribed with a six-line bilingual proverb on the obverse whereas the reverse is left blank. The text is arranged in interlinear format with a Sumerian line followed by two Akkadian lines. According to Alster<sup>354</sup> this tablet is an exercise in translating from Akkadian into Sumerian due to the difficulty in harmonizing the two versions and the several mistakes in the Sumerian text. No duplicate of this proverb are known from either earlier or later sources.

<sup>347</sup> The Akkadian *iš-ta-ra* is probably a verbal form from *sāru*, 'to whirl, to circle'; šu ḫub-ḫub = *sa-a-ru*, *Erimḫuš* II 244, see CAD S, 190.

<sup>348</sup> See also the omission of -re in [a]-gar<sub>3</sub> which, however, is documented in the NA manuscript.

<sup>349</sup> See Alster 1997, 110.

<sup>350</sup> For this type of song see § 1.1.5.1.

<sup>351</sup> Civil 2006.

<sup>352</sup> The others are UM 29-15-174 and CBS 11319+, see § 4.5.

<sup>353</sup> Alster 2007, 49.

<sup>354</sup> Alster 2007, 52-54.

## 1.1.8 Unidentified Literary Texts

A number of manuscripts, mostly extract tablets, contain unidentified Sumerian literary texts.<sup>355</sup>

## 1.1.8.1 3N-T 195

**3N-T 195 = OIP 97 No. 42** is a fragment from the lower right corner of a pillow-shaped tablet from Nippur containing an unidentified monolingual Sumerian literary text on the obverse<sup>356</sup> and a bilingual version of *Urra XIII* on the reverse<sup>1</sup>. Of the literary text only the phrases šu-sikil-la-kam (l. 4) and u<sub>3</sub>-du<sub>2</sub>-ud-da can be safely read.<sup>357</sup>

## 1.1.8.2 CBS 4615

**CBS 4615 = PBS 12/1 44** is a pillow-shaped tablet from Nippur inscribed, on the obverse, with a two-line extract of an unknown composition, possibly a proverb, in monolingual Sumerian.<sup>358</sup> The reverse is uninscribed.

## 1.1.8.3 CBS 13990

**CBS 13990**, unearthed in Nippur, is a small fragment from the lower right corner of its tablet. One side preserves a bilingual text in interlinear format whereas the other side is broken away.

## 1.1.8.4 CBS 19831

**CBS 19831** is a fragment of a pillow-shaped tablet from Nippur that contains a monolingual Sumerian extract of an unknown literary text, probably a royal inscription or a royal hymn. The reverse is broken away.

## 1.1.8.5 N 3783 + N 5031

See §§ 1.1.1.5 and 1.1.7.3.

## 1.1.8.6 N 4529

**N 4529** is a pillow-shaped extract tablet from Nippur. The obverse has six monolingual Sumerian lines from an unidentified hymn quoting Nippur and the Ekur; the reverse is broken away.

<sup>355</sup> VAT 17460 = VS 24 76, a fragment from a pillow-shaped extract tablet which Veldhuis 2000a, 85, tentatively assigns to the MB period, is not listed here because its archeological context is OB according to Pedersén 2005, 62 No. 39; it contains four broken lines from an unidentified literary text, possibly a hymn.

<sup>356</sup> Obverse and reverse of the hand-copy are mislabeled as reverse and obverse.

<sup>357</sup> OIP 97, 76; see Veldhuis 2000a, 68.

<sup>358</sup> See Veldhuis 2000a, 75-76.

## 1.1.8.7 UM 29-13-543

**UM 29-13-543** is a pillow-shaped tablet from Nippur inscribed on the obverse with a two-line extract from a monolingual Sumerian literary text quoting Enlil. The reverse is uninscribed.

## 1.1.8.8 UM 29-15-944

**UM 29-15-944** is a pillow-shaped tablet from Nippur containing a four-line extract in monolingual Sumerian on the obverse. The reverse has an *Urra* extract.<sup>359</sup>

## 1.1.8.9 UM 29-16-383

**UM 29-16-383** is a pillow-shaped tablet containing a one-line extract on the obverse. The reverse has an *Urra* extract.

## 1.1.8.10 BM 81700

**BM 81700 = CT 58 61** is a pillow-shaped tablet probably from Sippar inscribed with a one-line extract. The reverse is uninscribed.

## 1.1.8.11 VAT 17223

**VAT 17223 = VS 24 38** is a pillow-shaped tablet from Babylon. The obverse is inscribed with a three-line extract from an unidentified monolingual Sumerian text, possibly a temple hymn. The reverse is uninscribed.

## 1.1.8.12 VAT 17224

**VAT 17224 = VS 24 39** is a fragment from the left edge of a pillow-shaped tablet from Babylon. The obverse is inscribed with a six-line extract from a bilingual text in interlinear format, possibly a temple hymn. The reverse is uninscribed.

## 1.1.8.13 VAT 17357

**VAT 17357 = VS 24 72** is a pillow-shaped tablet from Babylon. The obverse has a two-line extract from a bilingual text in interlinear format mentioning Anzu, <sup>d</sup>im-dugud<sup>mušen</sup>, which is glossed as zu-ge-ne<sub>2</sub> on the upper edge. This name is rendered as *a-zi* in Akkadian. The reverse is uninscribed.

## 1.1.8.14 VAT 17563

**VAT 17563 = VS 24 15** is a fragment of a pillow-shaped extract tablet from Babylon. The obverse preserves seven broken lines probably from a monolingual Sumerian hymn. The reverse has a bilingual extract from the lexical list lu<sub>2</sub>=š<sub>2</sub>a.

<sup>359</sup> Veldhuis 2000a, 78.

## 1.1.8.15 IM 13365

**IM 13365 = TIM 9 29** is the upper right corner from a single-column tablet of unknown provenance. The date is uncertain and a NB date is also possible.<sup>360</sup> The text contains Akkadian glosses.

## 1.1.8.16 MS 3362

**MS 3362** is an almost square tablet<sup>361</sup> inscribed with a five-line text in monolingual Sumerian on the obverse whereas the reverse is uninscribed. The nature of the text, included in the publication of the proverbs in the Schøyen Collection, is unclear and according to Alster<sup>362</sup> is possibly partially in Akkadian.

## 1.1.8.17 MS 3405

**MS 3405** is a fragment from a two-column tablet preserving 16 lines of the right column on the obverse whereas the reverse only preserves traces possibly from a colophon. The text, in monolingual Sumerian, is too badly preserved to be identified but according to Alster it may be a proverb or a fable of the cycle of the Fox.<sup>363</sup>

## 1.1.8.18 Unpublished Extract Tablets

A number of extract tablets from Nippur are still unpublished. The following list is taken from DCSL and Veldhuis (2000a).<sup>364</sup> With the exception of 2N-T 345 which has an extract from a Dumuzi/Inana composition, the other texts are unidentified. As mentioned above several school texts from Babylon, including extract tablets, are unpublished.<sup>365</sup>

Excavation Number	Bibliographic Source	Language	Format	Description
2N-T 345 (A 29976)	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	SA	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Dumuzi/Inana
2N-T 348 (IM 58953)	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Literary
2N-T 357 (IM 57961)	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Hymn
2N-T 358	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Lament
2N-T 363 (IM 58955)	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Literary
2N-T 364 (IM 58956)	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Literary
12N 580	OIC 23, 119	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Four-line Extract
12N 587	OIC 23, 120	S	Pillow-Shaped	Rev: Two-line Extract
12N 589	OIC 23, 120	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Three-line Extract
12N 597	OIC 23, 120	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Two-line Extract
12N 599	OIC 23, 121	S	Pillow-Shaped	Rev: Two-line Extract

<sup>360</sup> See Summary Catalogue to TIM 9.

<sup>361</sup> I would tend to regard this source as a square tablet due to its dimensions (65 x 55 x 24 mm), contrary to Alster 2007, 10, who includes it among the Type III tablets (*imgidda*).

<sup>362</sup> Alster 2007, 67.

<sup>363</sup> Alster 2007, 70.

<sup>364</sup> This list is incomplete: in Babylon, Merkes 25n1, more than one hundred exercise tablets have been found, but most of them remain unpublished, see Pedersén 2005, 85-92.

<sup>365</sup> Kassite school texts are the subject of Alexa Barthelmus's PhD dissertation at LMU University, Munich (unavailable to me).



Excavation Number	Bibliographic Source	Language	Format	Description
12N 653	OIC 23, 121	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Proverb (?) Rev: Three-line Extract
12N 655	OIC 23, 122	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Literary Rev: Literary
CBS 7133	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Two-line Extract
CBS 7884	Veldhuis (2000a), 83	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Literary
UM 29-13-322	Veldhuis (2000a), 84	S	Pillow-Shaped	Obv: Literary

### 1.1.9 Emesal Liturgies

Only two MB Emesal texts, BM 78164 and a Sealand tablet, have been edited. Three additional tablets from Sippar, Nippur and Babylon are known:<sup>366</sup>

**BM 83021** is a small fragment, probably from Sippar, preserving only ten lines on one side; the other side is broken away.

**CBS 8547** is a tablet from Nippur; the obverse only preserves the right edge and a few lines of the upper edge but the reverse is fairly well preserved.

**VAT 17119 = VS 24 25**, from Babylon, is a fragment of the central part of its tablet. It preserves eighteen lines on the obverse and eight on the reverse. The text has Akkadian glosses.

#### 1.1.9.1 Eršahuġa to Enki – BM 78164

**BM 78164 = CT 58 70** is a tablet probably from the Sippar collection in the British Museum containing a bilingual *Eršahuġa*<sup>367</sup> to Enki in interlinear format. The Akkadian is written in small script underneath Sumerian lines. The Middle Babylonian date is assured by the form of the sign RU.<sup>368</sup> *Eršahuġa* prayers are mainly attested in late second-millennium and first-millennium copies, but this genre already existed in the Old Babylonian period in a relatively standardized form.<sup>369</sup> Although similar passages are attested in other texts of the same genre,<sup>370</sup> no duplicates are known. A few anomalies are found in the Sumerian version:

- In ši-ba mu-e-ši-[de<sub>6</sub>], ‘He offered his life to you’ (Obv. 13), the non-human possessive suffix is used to refer to a human being.
- In lum-ma ba-zi-ga-an-ni-i[b<sub>2</sub>] = *ina ta-ba-aš-ta-n[i] šu-ut-bi-[š]u*, ‘remove [him] from excrement’ (Rev. 7), the imperative begins with ba- against Sumerian grammar.
- In ka-tar-zu ka-en-si-il-le<sub>2</sub> // *da-li-’li-ka lid<sub>2</sub>-lul*, ‘may he sing your praise’ (Rev. 11), the Akkadian 3sg. precativum corresponds to the Sumerian prefix ka- which seems to be a phonetic writing for the cohortative prefix ga- that in standard Sumerian is confined to the first person. Moreover the cohortative is normally written with the *hamtu* stem but forms with the *maru* stem, as in this case, are not rare from the Old Babylonian period onward.<sup>371</sup> The same expres-

<sup>366</sup> The tablet BM 79037 is likely a Neo Babylonian manuscript, see Gabbay 2015, 72 n. 71.

<sup>367</sup> For this type of text see Maul 1988.

<sup>368</sup> Obv. 5, see BE 14 No. 196.

<sup>369</sup> Michalowski 1987.

<sup>370</sup> See Geller 1992, 531-532.

<sup>371</sup> Attinger 1993, 292 § 190c.

sion with the prefix *ka-* is found in an Assyro-Mitannian incantation from Ḫattuša.<sup>372</sup> As is clear from the context of both texts and from the Akkadian translation in BM 78164 the expected form would be a 3sg. precativ.<sup>373</sup> Several explanations could account for the *ka-* prefix:

1) In the post-Old Babylonian period the cohortative *ga-* perhaps also indicates the 3sg. person. This possibility depends on three factors: first, the opposite use of *ḥa-* instead of *ga-* to indicate the 1sg. is attested, although rarely, already in the third millennium;<sup>374</sup> in Emesal there is a single form for precativ and cohortative;<sup>375</sup> in Akkadian 1sg. and 3sg. precativ are both formed with the prefix *lū*. It is therefore not excluded that under the influence of these factors, particularly the Akkadian form, the difference between the Sumerian cohortative and precativ was no longer perceived and *ga-* was extended to indicate the 3sg. person. In our text *ka-* is a phonetic writing for *ga-*.

2) *ka-* is a phonetic writing for *ḥa* with shift  $k > ḥ$ . This may derive from a possible phonetic similarity between /*ga*/ and /*ḥa*/.<sup>376</sup>

3) It is a case of dittography of the preceding *ka-* in *ka-tar-zu*. However this explanation is highly improbable in view of the presence of the same form in the tablet from Ḫattuša. It seems unlikely that the same scribal mistake was produced independently in two different manuscripts.

Akkadian has a mix of Old Babylonian and later features: mimation is usually lost but is retained in *i-na e-re-em pa-nim* (Obv. 8) and *su-mu-uk-ta-am* (Rev. 8); the possessive suffix is the OB *-šu* throughout the text; the sign *ša* is normally used but *ša<sub>2</sub>* is attested in *iš-ša<sub>2</sub>-ak-nu-šu*; the sign GA is used for /*qa*/ (Rev. 4) instead of the MB *qa*; CvC signs are attested: *piš* (Obv. 13), *ṭir*, *šiṭ* (Rev. 6), *lak* (Rev. 10), *lid<sub>2</sub>*, *lul* (Rev. 11).

As suggested by the provenance of the tablet this text, like the majority of Emesal liturgies,<sup>377</sup> relies on the Northern Babylonian tradition.

### 1.1.9.2 Balaĝ to Enlil

A tablet housed in a private collection has been identified as part of a lot of texts from the Sealand dynasty.<sup>378</sup> The provenance is unknown but it likely stems from the area south of Nippur on the Tigris side. The fragment is from the upper right corner of a two-column tablet containing the monolingual *Balaĝ* *am-e para<sub>10</sub>-an-na-ra* to Enlil that is known from first-millennium duplicates. No OB source is preserved but parallels are known from other Emesal texts. The Sealand tablet contains an abbreviated version of the *Balaĝ*. However it is unclear whether the tablet originally contained the entire composition or whether the text was inscribed on more than one tablet. On the basis of its abbreviated form, Gabbay concluded that the tablet was written as a mnemonic aid for the *kalû*.<sup>379</sup>

This is an extraordinary document as it is the only Sumerian text from the Sealand dynasty published so far.<sup>380</sup> The text is written in standard orthography and is close to the first-millennium duplicates; however, in a few instances it resembles the OB parallels.<sup>381</sup> Gabbay suggests that the

372 KBo 36 11+ Rev. 22, *ka-tar-zu ka-an-[sil]*, § 5.2.1.

373 Note that BM 78164, 5, 10, have 3sg. precativ forms both in Sumerian and Akkadian.

374 Thomsen 1984, 200 § 386, Attinger 1993, 292 § 190a.

375 Thomsen 1984, 200 § 385, 204 § 395.

376 Thomsen 1984, 200 § 386.

377 For an explanation of why Emesal texts were written down in Northern Babylonia see Michalowski 2003, 112, nevertheless note the remarks in Tinney 2011, 587-588; on this point see Introduction.

378 Gabbay 2014a, 148.

379 Gabbay 2014a, 150-151.

380 A *kirugu*-hymn of the king Aadaragalama is unpublished, see Gabbay 2014a, 148 and n. 13.

381 For differences with duplicates and parallels see commentary in Gabbay 2014a, 157-168.

incorporation of the Ninurta toponym litany – the text mentions temples associated with Ninurta in Nippur, Lagaš, Kiš, Kutha and Dilbat – in an Enlil *Balaĝ* is perhaps a step toward the integration of Ninurta into the *Balaĝ* corpus from which the god was virtually absent during the Old Babylonian period. This is the major difference between the Sealand text and the first-millennium *Balaĝs* to Enlil that usually exhibit the sequence Nippur, Sippar and Babylon.<sup>382</sup> Although no OB duplicates are known, it is clear that the Sealand tablet represents an intermediate stage between an OB version of the *Balaĝ* and the first-millennium recension.

### 1.1.10 Incantations

#### 1.1.10.1 Udug-ĥul Tablets VII-VIII

The only tablet of possible MB date that contains *Udug-ĥul* incantations<sup>383</sup> is **Ni 2676 + Ni 2997 + Ni 4017 + Ni 4018**. This is a four-column tablet from Nippur containing a forerunner to *Udug-ĥul* Tablets VII-VIII. Akkadian glosses are written in small script underneath Sumerian lines. This manuscript is here treated with some restraint as its date is uncertain. Nevertheless, some pieces of evidence may point to a Middle Babylonian date:<sup>384</sup> this is the only bilingual manuscript among the tablets containing forerunners to *Udug-ĥul*; its sign forms resemble Kassite ductus; the word for ‘man’ is spelled both  $lu_2-u_{18}$ - $lu$  (779), as is typical of late texts,<sup>385</sup> and  $lu_2-ulu_3$ , the traditional Old Babylonian writing; this manuscript includes lines attested in the canonical recension of *Udug-ĥul*, but not in the OB forerunners; the Marduk-Ea speech is abbreviated as in late sources.

Ni 2676+ (C) duplicates the OB tablets Ni 631 (B), CBS 591 (E), CBS 1532 (F) and BM 92671 (I). Here follows the list of variants according to the columns of C:<sup>386</sup>

Line	C i	B	E	I
655	igi ba-an-si <sub>3</sub>	im-ma-an-si <sub>3</sub>	im-ma-an-[s]i <sub>3</sub>	im-ma-an-si <sub>3</sub>
656	ba-ši-in-ku <sub>4</sub>	ba-ši-in-ku <sub>4</sub>	ba-an-ši-ku <sub>4</sub>	x
656	[...](-)na-an-de <sub>2</sub> -e	[...-u]n- <sup>ˁ</sup> na-de <sub>2</sub> -e	mu-un-na-an-de <sub>2</sub> -e	x
657	sil-a si-ga	<sup>ˁ</sup> sil-a <sup>ˁ</sup> -si-gen <sub>7</sub>	x	x

Line	C ii	B	E
709	lu <sub>2</sub>	lu <sub>2</sub> -zu	lu <sub>2</sub> -[ul]u <sub>3</sub>
710	ba-an-ĝen		x ba-an-teĝ <sub>3</sub> -ĝe <sub>26</sub>
711	ĝeš-ge-en-ge-en-na-na	ĝeš-ge-en-ge-en-n[a ...]	ĝeš- <sup>ˁ</sup> ge-en <sup>ˁ</sup> -na-ni
712	i <sub>3</sub> -bad-bad	i <sub>3</sub> -bad-b[ad]	bad-bad
713	ĝa <sub>2</sub> taka <sub>4</sub> -a	ĝa <sub>2</sub> t[aka <sub>4</sub> ]	ĝa[l] bi <sub>2</sub> -[taka <sub>4</sub> ]
714	š nam-tar-ra-ka-na	š nam-tar-r[a ...]	š[u nam-ta]r-ra-ka
715	niĝ <sub>2</sub> -geg mu-un-š <sub>2</sub> -š <sub>2</sub>	m[i ...]	mu-un-š <sub>2</sub> -š <sub>2</sub>
721	igi ba-an-si <sub>3</sub>		<i>Line Omitted</i> <sup>ˁ</sup> igi im-ma-an-si <sub>3</sub> <sup>ˁ</sup>
722	<i>Sign Omitted</i>	u <sub>3</sub>	u <sub>3</sub>
723	š u <sub>3</sub> -me-e-ti	<sup>ˁ</sup> š u <sub>3</sub> -me- <sup>ˁ</sup> ti <sup>ˁ</sup>	u <sub>3</sub> -me-ni-si
724	u <sub>3</sub> -me-ni-tum <sub>2</sub>	<sup>ˁ</sup> u <sub>3</sub> <sup>ˁ</sup> -me-e- <sup>ˁ</sup> tum <sub>2</sub> <sup>ˁ</sup>	u <sub>3</sub> -me-ni-tum <sub>2</sub>

<sup>382</sup> Gabbay 2014a, 151-153.

<sup>383</sup> For this series and canonization of incantations see Falkenstein 1931, 7-15; for the OB forerunners to *Udug-ĥul* see Geller 1985; for the canonical series see Geller 2007.

<sup>384</sup> Geller 1985, 7-8.

<sup>385</sup> See Geller 1985, 131.

<sup>386</sup> Lines preserved in C = Col. I: 635-675; Col. II: 704-727; Col. III: 739-746, 767-779; Col. IV: 796-808; Col. V: 823-839; Col. VI: 840-856; Col. VII: 857-871; Col. VIII: 872-883, Geller 1985, 18.

Line	C ii	B	E
726	ĝeš-nu <sub>2</sub> -da-ne-ne	ĝeš-nu <sub>2</sub> -ka-na-ba	ĝeš-nu <sub>2</sub> -k[a-na]-ba
726	[...]u <sub>3</sub> -me-ni-su <sub>3</sub>	a u <sub>3</sub> -me-ʾni-su <sub>3</sub> -su <sub>3</sub> ʾ	u <sub>3</sub> -me-ni-[s]u <sub>3</sub> -su <sub>3</sub>

  

Line	C iii	B	E
739	ʾnam-baʾ-k[u <sub>4</sub> ...]	[na]m-ba-k[u <sub>4</sub> -ku <sub>4</sub> ]	nam-mu-un-da-ku <sub>4</sub> -ku <sub>4</sub> -de <sub>3</sub>
740	nam-mu-[...]	x	nam-ba-dur <sub>2</sub> -u <sub>3</sub> -de <sub>3</sub>
742	nam-ba-e <sub>3</sub> -d[e <sub>3</sub> ]	x	nam-[ba-ba]l-le-de <sub>3</sub>
743	e <sub>2</sub> -ki-tuš-še <sub>3</sub>	e <sub>2</sub> -ki-tuš-ʾše <sub>3</sub> ʾ	e <sub>2</sub> -ki-tuš-a-na

  

Line	C iv	F
802	ʾa-nun-na-ke <sub>4</sub> -e-[ne]	ʾa-ʾnunʾ-na-ke <sub>4</sub> -ne
802-803	urugal-la	urugal <sub>2</sub> <sup>gal</sup> -la
802	a-ri-a	ri-a
806	nam-ba-ne-ne	[...b]a-ne-ne-e
807	ur-ra	ur <sub>2</sub> -ra

  

Line	C v	F
828	[hul-ĝa]l <sub>2</sub> -ʾeʾ	hul-ĝal <sub>2</sub>

The OB manuscripts are generally close to one another even though they have different origins; manuscript B is in fact a Nippur tablet, whereas CBS 591 (E) and CBS 1532 (F) belong to the Khabazacollection, therefore they probably stem from Sippar. Variants are limited to orthographic differences. As expected, C agrees with B in most cases and usually differs from E.<sup>387</sup> However, in some instances C adheres to E.<sup>388</sup> As noted above C shares with late duplicates lines which are not included in the OB manuscripts,<sup>389</sup> while in other passages C resembles the OB text: in line 674, C seems to follow the OB recension which has the ambiguous verbal form *zi-zi* against late manuscripts which read differently;<sup>390</sup> C, like the OB manuscripts, reports line 744 that is omitted in the canonical recension. It is clear that Ni 2676+ rely on the Nippur textual tradition<sup>391</sup> but it presents some modifications common to the canonical recension of *Udug-ḫul*. To conclude, the tablet reflects an intermediate stage between the OB and first-millennium recensions even though it is closer to the OB manuscripts.

**387** Note that lu<sub>2</sub>-zu in B, 709, is probably an error for -lu<sub>3</sub>, Geller 1985, 128; in line 726, C has the common form ĝeš-nu<sub>2</sub>,d instead of the unusual ĝeš-nu<sub>2</sub>.k in B and E; note that lines 704-705 are attested in B and C but omitted in E.

**388** Ll. 656, 724, 739; lines 716-20 are attested in B only but omitted in C and E; C and E report line 744 contrary to B and late manuscripts.

**389** Lines 653-654, see Geller 1985, 125; in lines 828-831 C resembles late manuscripts whereas F has a different formula, see Geller 1985, 134-135; C also agrees with late manuscripts in line 742, see Geller 1985, 129.

**390** Geller 1985, 127.

**391** Note that only one unorthographic spelling is attested: ur-ra ~ ur<sub>2</sub>-ra (l. 807).

## 1.1.10.2 Incantation to Utu

The composition *Incantation to Utu*<sup>392</sup> is an incantation-hymn to the god Utu as judge of the dead in the Netherworld.<sup>393</sup> The text survives in several manuscripts from the Old Babylonian period to the first millennium. The oldest known and best preserved manuscript is CBS 563 (A), a LOB two-column tablet containing the whole composition which is dated to the first year of the king Ammišaduqa (1646 B.C.). As it belongs to the Khabaza collection it probably comes from Sippar. CBS 589 (B) is a two-column tablet, probably Neo Babylonian, which contains the complete text. Three manuscripts, all two-column tablets, are possibly Middle Babylonian in date: **AO 7738 + CBS 1521 = TCL 16 79 + PBS 12/1 25 (C+E), CBS 587 + CBS 353 (D) + D fragment**,<sup>394</sup> **CBS 1686 + CBS 1533 (F)**. Like the other two manuscripts all the CBS tablets are probably from Sippar because they are part of the Khabaza collection. The date is uncertain and according to Kramer manuscript C+E could be Neo Babylonian.<sup>395</sup> These tablets are badly damaged and the surface is in many cases effaced, hence a comprehensive paleographical analysis is precluded.<sup>396</sup> As far as the sign forms are concerned there is no clear distinction between CBS 563 and the supposed MB tablets.<sup>397</sup> Neither of them shows the typical Kassite shape of the signs KUR and NE. However, compared to A, manuscripts C+E, D and F share a common ductus: wedges are more slanted and vertical signs are longer. In particular C+E and D show a very similar manner of incision. Although the distinction on paleographical grounds between LOB and MB tablets is generally very difficult, the three possible Kassite manuscripts seem to have common features. To complicate matters further manuscript D bears the same colophon as A. According to the date of the tablet we need to assume that source D is a verbatim copy of an earlier manuscript without any change in the colophon.<sup>398</sup>

Texts closely related to *Incantation to Utu* are: YBC 9875, an OB tablet known as *Incantation to Utu B*;<sup>399</sup> BM 63606 + BM 66888 = CT 58 80, a LB manuscript probably from Sippar<sup>400</sup> known as *Incantation to Utu C*;<sup>401</sup> and the hymn to Utu <sup>d</sup>utu ur-saĝ <sup>d</sup>utu maš<sub>2</sub>-saĝ<sup>402</sup> preserved in several monolingual manuscripts from Meturan, Susa and Sippar and on one OB bilingual tablet from Sippar, BM 78614.<sup>403</sup>

The provenance of the manuscripts indicates that *Incantation to Utu* was likely composed in Sippar, obviously in connection with Utu's cult center in the city, the Ebabbar<sup>404</sup> that is mentioned

392 Manuscripts and lineation follow Alster 1991a. Previous edition with photographs of the manuscripts in Castellino 1969; new photographs are provided in Alster 1993.

393 The purpose of this incantation has been interpreted differently: Alster 1991a, 27, regards this text as an attempt 'to establish the proper funeral cult, which permitted the spirits to find peace in the netherworld, and to cease to be a threat to the living'; on the contrary, Geller 1995, 102-107, sees in the incantation a 'plea to Utu to make a correct judgment regarding the human victim' who has been 'falsely accused by ghosts before Utu, although he is innocent, and as a result the dead have caused him problems'.

394 This fragment has no separate museum number, it belongs to the obverse of D but does not physically join; photograph in Castellino 1969, Pl. XII and Alster 1993, 266.

395 Castellino 1969, 4-5.

396 Photographs in either Castellino 1969 or CDLI are not clear.

397 GI is the only sign with different shapes in A (one *Winkelhaken* under three small *Winkelhaken*, see ll. 47, 57, 63, 250) and the MB tablets (an oblique wedge from the lower left to the upper right under the three small *Winkelhaken*, see C+E, 103, 231, 243; D, 31; F, 145, 225A). Possibly also DA differs between A (ll. 110, 111, 113, 126, 127, 130) and C+E (ll. 111, 113, 129B, 130), D (ll. 39-50) and F (l. 142). TI shows the same shape with a subscribed *Winkelhaken* in all the manuscripts.

398 For a similar case see § 1.1.6.4.

399 Cohen 1977, Geller 1995, 107-109.

400 Geller 1995, 109-114; source G in Alster 1991a. The reverse has a different text.

401 The closest manuscript to CT 58 80 is C+E even though the line order is different: C+E 39-46 and CT 58 80, 4-12, have nu-me-a instead of nu-e<sub>3</sub> in B.

402 Cavigneaux 2009, 7-13, cf. Bonechi 2010.

403 Wasserman 1997.

404 On this point see § 1.1.10.3 and fn. 422.

in the colophon of CBS 563.<sup>405</sup> All the manuscripts are in monolingual Sumerian and no Akkadian translation has been added even in the first millennium copies, although A presents a few glosses. The only known bilingual version is inscribed on a tablet from Ḫattuša, KUB 4 11.<sup>406</sup> Manuscript A is the most complete source and the only one that contains lines 52-64 while manuscripts B, C+E, D and F contain shortened versions. Phonetic writings characterize manuscripts B, C+E and D but a few are also attested in A and F.<sup>407</sup>

According to Alster, two different streams of tradition can be identified: one represented by manuscripts A and F and another one comprising manuscripts B, C+E and D.<sup>408</sup> This picture is confirmed by the distribution of phonetic writings across sources. Manuscripts B, C+E and D usually agree<sup>409</sup> even though they are not exact duplicates since several variants are documented.<sup>410</sup> Phonetic writings show many alterations such as substitution of voiced consonants with the corresponding voiceless consonants and vice versa, vowel alterations, *sandhi*<sup>411</sup> and abbreviations.<sup>412</sup>

*Incantation to Utu* can be considered a product of the Northern Babylonian scribal schools unknown to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. Its grammar shows several anomalies:

- The genitive is indicated by  $-ke_4$  in the following lines:

19	${}^dutu \check{s}a_3 an-na-ke_4 gal-bi zu$
20	$\check{s}a_3 kur-ra-ke_4 buru_3 dagal-bi i_3-zu$

*Utu, you know the expanse of the inner of heaven*  
*You know the depth and width of the inner of the mountains*

Both are cases of anticipatory genitives: \*an-na-ka and kur-ra-ka would be expected.<sup>413</sup>

- /ani/ is used for the genitive /ana(k)/ in gidim ama-ni (l. 111), gidim ad-da-ni (l. 112) kur gi[dim]-a-ni-ke<sub>4</sub> (C+E, 113).<sup>414</sup>
- In lines 70 and 71 -ta is appended to person class substantives.<sup>415</sup>
- u<sub>4</sub>-da-ta (A-F, 142) is probably a late form corresponding to u<sub>4</sub>-da.<sup>416</sup>
- A 142-144 end with the form -gub-be<sub>2</sub> that probably stands for -gub.<sup>417</sup>

405 Castellino 1969, 1.

406 See § 5.3.8.

407 For a complete list of phonetic writings see Alster 1991a, 91-94; note that in line 120 A has the phonetic writing b[a-a] n-gi-a whereas C+E probably has the orthographic form ba-gi<sub>4</sub>?

408 Cf. Castellino 1969, 46-47.

409 C+E appears to have a higher number of phonetic writings compared to B and D, but this is probably due to the fact that the text in these two manuscripts is often not preserved or is omitted in the passages in which C+E presents phonetic writings, see for instance ll. 95 (Alster 1991a, 84: 95), 97, 131, 140, 141, 256.

410 See for instance ll. 7, 8, 10, 14, 17, 16 (see Alster 1991a, 79-80: 16, 79-80: 16), 24 (see Alster 1991a, 79-80: 16, 80: 24), 102, 165, 249.

411 See C 44: a<sub>2</sub>-ġal<sub>2</sub>-la-ba-ġal<sub>2</sub> ~ a<sub>2</sub>-aga<sub>2</sub> la-ba-ġal<sub>2</sub>.

412 See D 10 di ~ diġir.

413 Note that manuscripts B, C+E and E have an-ke<sub>4</sub> and kur-ke<sub>4</sub>.

414 See Alster 1991a, 85: 111, 113.

415 Castellino 1969, 38.

416 Alster 1991a, 86: 142.

417 Alster 1991a, 86: 142-144.



Even though manuscripts C+E, D and F cannot be assigned to the Kassite period with all confidence, the bilingual tablet from Ḫattuša witnesses that this composition was known during the LBA.

### 1.1.10.3 Kiutu-incantation – HS 1512

The tablet **HS 1512** contains a bilingual *Kiutu* incantation,<sup>418</sup> a text type that is mostly known from post-Old Babylonian sources, especially the first-millennium ritual series *Bīt rimki*. According to Krebernik<sup>419</sup> internal evidence indicates either a Late Old Babylonian or a Middle Babylonian date. However, a Middle Babylonian date is assured by the presence of the typical Kassite KUR.<sup>420</sup> This sign is a later trait on a tablet characterized by archaizing signs like those in other Kassite tablets. Signs have different shapes in the Sumerian and Akkadian versions showing a mix of old and late variants. The provenance of this tablet from Nippur, argued by Krebernik,<sup>421</sup> should be probably revised in light of the Northern Babylonian origin of the corpus of the second-millennium prayers, hymns and letters dedicated to the Sun-god, as seen in the case of *Incantation to Utu*. Neither of the manuscripts listed by Krebernik comes from Nippur, on the contrary most of them stem from Sippar.<sup>422</sup> Moreover, according to Krebernik<sup>423</sup> signs in HS 1512 have shapes very close to CBS 1529, a forerunner to the ‘Third and Sixth House’ of the series *Bīt rimki*<sup>424</sup> likely from Sippar.<sup>425</sup>

The tablet probably contains different prayers of the same genre on each side. The obverse has a full Akkadian translation in small script underneath Sumerian lines whereas the reverse shows a script bigger than the obverse and does not contain a full translation but only Akkadian glosses. HS 1512 is probably a forerunner of the ‘First House’ of the series *Bīt rimki*.<sup>426</sup> No duplicates are known thus far, but lines 7-9 of the obverse are close to a *Kiutu* incantation of the ‘Second House’ attested in copies from Ḫattuša (CTH 794 Obv.),<sup>427</sup> Nineveh and Sultantepe. HS 1512 does not exactly duplicate any of the other manuscripts and a few variants are attested in both Sumerian and Akkadian versions. As with the Nineveh manuscript HS 1512 is written in standard orthography contrary to the Sultantepe tablet that is written in phonetic writing. This text is also tied to a *Kiutu* incantation from Alalah, AT 453.<sup>428</sup> The last line of the reverse [e]n gal an-ša<sub>3</sub>-ku<sub>3</sub>-ga-ra e<sub>3</sub>-da-zu-ne finds its closest parallel in the incipit of the Alalah text: eš-ša-an-ku<sub>3</sub>-ga-t[a] e-da-zu-[ne].

The grammar shows late features:<sup>429</sup>

- 2sg. possessive suffix is written -a-zu (Rev. 6) on the model of -a-ni.
- 1sg. verbal forms begin with the prefix a- (Obv. 6-9) probably under the influence of Akkadian; it is worth noting that manuscripts from Nineveh and Sultantepe have the same prefix.
- The verbal form a-ra-ab-dub-dub-bu (Obv. 6) omits the 1sg. personal suffix.

418 For this genre see Kunstmann 1932, 48-53, Krebernik 2001 and Shibata 2008, 191-195.

419 Krebernik 2001, 240.

420 Obv. 4, 9.

421 Krebernik 2001, 238.

422 This reflects the presence of Ebabbar, the temple of Šamaš in Sippar. On the common origin of several compositions related to the Sun-god see Alaura, Bonechi 2012, 17 and n. 72 with further bibliography.

423 Krebernik 2001, 242 n. 15.

424 Geller 1995, 114-126.

425 It belongs to the Khabaza collection.

426 Krebernik 2001, 242 and n. 18.

427 § 5.2.4.

428 Krebernik 2001, 242.

429 Krebernik 2001, 240.



This text was not only drafted in a Kassite scribal school but it was also likely composed during the post-Old Babylonian period. As with *Incantation to Utu*,<sup>430</sup> this composition reflects a Northern Babylonian tradition likely unknown to the Nippur scribal circles.

#### 1.1.10.4 BM 54692

The fragment **BM 54692** is the lower left corner of a tablet from Sippar of uncertain date. According to Lambert,<sup>431</sup> it could be either Middle Babylonian<sup>432</sup> or a LB copy of a MB tablet. This fragment preserves the end of a ritual section followed by an incantation and another ritual section. The incantation is an eight-line text in monolingual Sumerian and is duplicated in K 9041, a NA fragment probably from Aššurbanipal's library. Both manuscripts are badly preserved. The grammar shows some anomalies:

- In line 2 [diġir-n]e-ne-a (BM) and diġir-bi-ne-ne-a (K) are incorrect forms for the expected plural marker -re-(e)-ne; -a at the end is unclear.
- In [ġeš-ġur] an-ki-ke<sub>4</sub>, 'the designs of heaven and earth' (l. 4), -ke<sub>4</sub> is used as the genitive marker.
- In mu-ni-šu-du<sub>7</sub>-da-ta (l. 5) the nominal element of the compound verb šu--du<sub>7</sub> is transferred before the verbal base.

This incantation reflects a late theological tradition. Enki and Marduk/Asalluġi are equated as rulers of the universe in contrast with Asalluġi's portrayal in the Old Babylonian forerunners to the series *Udug-ġul* in which he plays a submissive role to Enki.<sup>433</sup> Marduk's equivalence with Ea is a late development which is accomplished in the *Enūma Eliš* with Marduk's rise as the foremost god of the Babylonian pantheon.<sup>434</sup> Moreover, the nature of the god Enbilulu as described in this text has no parallels.<sup>435</sup>

Both grammar and literary context indicate that this incantation was likely composed or re-adapted in the post-Old Babylonian period. I wonder whether BM 54692 is a tablet from the Second Dynasty of Isin. This date would agree on the one hand with the cultural ideology reflected in the incantation and on the other hand with both paleography<sup>436</sup> and grammar.<sup>437</sup>

#### 1.1.11 Omina

##### 1.1.11.1 UM 29-13-542

**UM 29-13-542** is a pillow-shaped extract tablet containing a monolingual liver-omen on the obverse. This is the oldest example of a Sumerian omen and the only one so far known in the Late Bronze Age.<sup>438</sup> The reverse probably has a lexical text.

<sup>430</sup> For the connection with *Incantation to Utu* see for instance the list of Viziers of Utu, Krebernik 2001, 250-251.

<sup>431</sup> Lambert 2006, 237.

<sup>432</sup> Lambert's dating to the Middle Babylonian period is based on the form of the signs LU<sub>2</sub>, LUGAL and ĤAR.

<sup>433</sup> Geller 1985, 14-15.

<sup>434</sup> See Lambert 2006, 239.

<sup>435</sup> Lambert 2006, 239-240.

<sup>436</sup> Note the form of the sign MU in BM 54692, 8, which according to Lambert's copy seems later than the MB shape, see BE 14 No. 26.

<sup>437</sup> See the bilingual royal inscriptions of the Second Dynasty of Isin, RIMB 2.4.8, 2.4.9, 2.4.10, 2.8.5, Jacobsen 1991.

<sup>438</sup> For other examples of omina see Veldhuis 2000a, 74.

## 1.1.12 Royal Inscriptions

Middle Babylonian Sumerian royal inscriptions are not included in the present work due to their formulaic dedicatory nature. Only one text, the inscription of Kurigalzu, is here addressed for its particular traits which make it close to literary texts.

## 1.1.12.1 Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription

Several fragments of an inscribed diorite statue of King Kurigalzu were recovered in the E'ugal, the Enlil Temple, at Dūr-Kurigalzu during the excavation in the 1940s. An additional fragment (Fragment B) was discovered in the palace on Mound A; even though it looks very similar to the other fragments there is no proof that it belongs to the same statue since none of the pieces physically join. Four fragments are inscribed with a monolingual Sumerian text:<sup>439</sup> **IM 50009** (A), **IM 50140a-b** (Ba, Bb), **IM 50010** (C), **IM 50011** (D).<sup>440</sup> The statue, apparently destroyed in antiquity, provides the longest Kassite Sumerian royal inscription. The king depicted in the statue is probably Kurigalzu I who reigned in the first half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>441</sup>

In the inscription the king presents himself as the traditional Mesopotamian king and heir of the Sumerian tradition. The text mentions the gods of the Sumerian pantheon with Enlil and Ninlil described as supreme deities.<sup>442</sup> The ideology behind the inscription aims to present Kurigalzu as the king who restored the rites of Sumerian gods, the one who 'set up the old days'. By referring to the faraway past the king legitimates his present power. This ideology is reflected even in the style of the inscription. The text is case-ruled and is inscribed in archaizing monumental script imitating the style of royal inscriptions of the third and early second millennium.<sup>443</sup> However, unlike early monumental inscriptions, noun clusters are often divided between cases. The text can be restored as follows:<sup>444</sup> Fragment A concerns Igigi gods and Nanna; Fragments Bb deals with the Moon-god; Fragment Ba describes the duties assigned to an unknown deity; Fragment C lists the powers assigned to the gods Ninisinna and Nergal; Fragment D mentions the goddess Inana.

The text is often hardly intelligible and several passages are still obscure. Many words in the inscriptions are extremely rare. Veldhuis<sup>445</sup> argued that lexical lists were used to compose Sumerian texts in the Kassite period and this inscription in particular. He identified in the lexical list *Nabnitu* one of the sources used to write the Kurigalzu inscription. Several words turned out to be artificial creations and are found in other lexical lists such as *Izi* and *Proto-Aa*. Parallel to the paleography, the orthography also often displays archaisms such as -me-en<sub>3</sub> for the common -me-en.<sup>446</sup> A few unorthographic writings are attested<sup>447</sup> with a very limited number of phonetic alterations.

Line	Phonetic Writing	Orthographic Writing
A ii 9-10	su-ḫu-ul-	suḫul-
A iv 20	[za]-ra-aḫ <sup>1</sup>	zaraḫ
A vii 24-26; D v 10-12	za nu-un-ša-ša-a-de <sub>3</sub>	za <sub>3</sub> nu-un-ša <sub>2/4</sub> -ša <sub>2/4</sub> -a-de <sub>3</sub>

<sup>439</sup> The text was first published by Kramer 1948; a new edition has been provided by Veldhuis 2008 which is the basis of the present work.

<sup>440</sup> There is an additional small fragment whose only legible signs are DA and ŠU, see Kramer 1948, 3.

<sup>441</sup> Veldhuis 2008, 25.

<sup>442</sup> Veldhuis 2008, 25-27.

<sup>443</sup> The possibility that the direction of script was vertical, as in the early monumental inscriptions, cannot be ruled out, Veldhuis 2008, 27.

<sup>444</sup> Kramer 1948, 2-3.

<sup>445</sup> Veldhuis 2008, 28-31.

<sup>446</sup> Veldhuis 2008, 31-32.

<sup>447</sup> Veldhuis 2008, 32, 47-48.

Line	Phonetic Writing	Orthographic Writing
A viii 10	bi <sub>2</sub> -gi <sub>4</sub> -gi <sub>4</sub>	bi <sub>2</sub> -ge-en-gen <sub>6</sub>
A viii 26	za <sub>3</sub> -za <sub>3</sub> -ga	sa <sub>6</sub> -sa <sub>6</sub> -ga (?) <sup>2</sup>
C iii 23	ġeš-zal	ġissal <sup>sal4</sup>
C iii 26-29	NI-NI	nu-nu (?)
C iii 30	šu-ur <sub>2</sub>	sur
C v 19	za-ra	zara <sub>6</sub>
C v 20-22	du <sub>2</sub> -du <sub>2</sub> -da	? <sup>3</sup>
C x 12-13	še gal	eš <sub>3</sub> gal
D iii 1-4	dara <sub>4</sub> -ra-aš	da-da-ra-aš (?) <sup>4</sup>
D iv 2-4	ba-ad-ra	ba-da-ra

1 One might also read [la]-ra-aḥ = 'difficulty', Veldhuis 2008, 46.

2 The phonetic writing is dubious, Veldhuis 2008, 47.

3 Veldhuis 2008, 48.

4 Veldhuis 2008, 48.

The scribe's reproduction of Sumerian grammar is remarkable; however, late features and errors are documented. Examples are: the use of -bi with human class words (A ii, A viii, Bb iii);<sup>448</sup> /ene/ (A viii) and -ra (C iv) incorrectly placed (i.e. not at the end of words);<sup>449</sup> ablative -ta with locative meaning.<sup>450</sup>

*Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription* provides an important attestation of how new Sumerian texts were composed in the Kassite period. This is an outstanding tentative looking back to the bygone days of the classical Sumerian tradition that could be described as mannerist, but which, however, cannot hide the artificial nature of the language. Clearly inspired by the Nippur tradition, the text represents the ideological project of restoring the past pursued by the Kassite kings and Kurigalzu in particular. It is probably not a coincidence that the statue was found in the temple of Enlil built at Dūr-Kurigalzu as a mirror of the one in Nippur.

## 1.2 The Middle Babylonian Sumerian Literary Tradition

This section presents a summary of the Sumerian literary tradition during the Kassite period on the basis of published texts. Because a considerable number of tablets from Babylon are unpublished, the reader must be aware that what is said here is tentative and future studies may substantially change this interpretation.

During the Kassite period the city of Nippur remains the major source for Sumerian literary texts, but the Old Babylonian repertoire is only partially attested in the Middle Babylonian documentation. Old Babylonian curricular compositions have come down to us to a limited extent in MB copies.

448 Veldhuis 2008, 45; see also -bi-ne-ne (A vi) as the plural of -bi typical of the Late Old Babylonian period, Veldhuis 2008, 46.

449 Veldhuis 2008, 47; see also the wrong use of -ke<sub>4</sub> (A ii), Veldhuis 2008, 45, and the unclear function of -ta (B iii).

450 Veldhuis 2008, 45.

Curricular Texts		MB Manuscripts
Composition	Intermediary Phase	
The Fowler and his Wife	Nippur (1)	
The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab (?)	Unprovenanced (1)	
Decad		
Lipit-Ištar A	Nippur (1) Unprovenanced (1)	
Enlil A	Nippur (2)	
House F Fourteen		
Lugal-e	Nippur (2)	
Šulgi B	Nippur (2)	
The Instructions of Šuruppak	Unprovenanced (1)	
Six to ten Exemplars in House F		
Enlil and Sud	Nippur (4)	
Angim	Nippur (1)	
Inana C	Nippur (2) Unprovenanced (1)	
Dialogue 5	Nippur (1)	
Others		
Enlil and Ninlil	Nippur (3)	
Inana's Descent to the Netherworld	Nippur (1)	
Šulgi O (?)	Nippur (2)	
Lipit-Ištar F	Nippur (3)	

Only five out of the twenty-eight literary works included in the Tetrad, the Decad and the House F Fourteen are attested in Middle Babylonian copies. This number increases to nine out thirty-six including the compositions documented in six to ten exemplars in House F. No member of the Tetrad is known from Middle Babylonian sources and only two exemplars of the Decad, *Lipit-Ištar A* and *Enlil A*, are documented. The MB recension of *Enlil A* is preserved in two Nippur tablets while *Lipit-Ištar A* is known from a manuscript from Nippur and from an unprovenanced extract tablet. Of the so called House F Fourteen, three compositions are documented: *Lugal-e*, *Šulgi B*, *The Instructions of Šuruppak*. *Lugal-e* and *Šulgi B* are attested only in copies from Nippur, while the preserved manuscript of *The Instructions of Šuruppak* is unprovenanced. Literary compositions documented in six to ten exemplars in House F preserved in MB copies are *Enlil and Sud*, *Angim*, *Inana C*, *Dialogue 5*.<sup>451</sup> With the exception of one unprovenanced manuscript of *Inana C*, all the MB tablets containing these compositions stem from Nippur. Other OB popular compositions attested in MB copies are *Enlil and Ninlil* and *Inana's Descent to the Netherworld*. Both texts are quoted in literary catalogues and are preserved on MB Nippur tablets. A text that was part of the Intermediary Phase in the curriculum at Nippur, as shown by its recovery on a Type II tablet, is *The Fowler and his Wife*. This is a short wisdom text that must have been quite popular because it also exists as part of proverb collections. Perhaps *The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab* was also used as a curricular text in the Intermediary Phase because it was inscribed on an OB Type IV tablet from Nippur.<sup>452</sup> However, this finding does not imply that this composition was universally adopted in the Old Babylonian Sumerian curriculum, but rather that at a certain point it was utilized as an exercise in Nippur. A further composition quoted in a literary catalogue is the royal praise poem *Šulgi O* although it was scarcely used in pedagogical activities. This hymn is preserved in two possible MB fragments from Nippur. Another royal praise poem that was adopted in the school, even though to a limited extent and only in Nippur, is *Lipit-Ištar F*.

451 CDLI reports the unpublished tablet CBS 9899 as belonging to *Dialogue 5 - Two Women B*.

452 Peterson 2010a, 565.

Proverbs and unidentified literary texts inscribed on extract tablets must be added to the number of Kassite curricular texts.<sup>453</sup>

The curricular texts discussed so far reflect the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition and belong to the core of the Nippur documentation. Indeed, in the Kassite period these compositions are almost exclusively attested in tablets from Nippur.<sup>454</sup> Despite the apparent dearth of OB curricular texts, these compositions are better attested in the Middle Babylonian documentation than in the Middle Assyrian texts or in any other LBA corpus. It is difficult to establish whether the limited survival of OB curricular texts in the MB corpus is due to an accident of discovery or to a process of selection. Pieces of evidence support the co-occurrence of both processes. Among the aforementioned OB curricular texts that survived in MB sources only *Lugal-e*, *Enlil and Sud* and *Angim* are known from the first-millennium documentation.<sup>455</sup> Moreover no member of either the Tetrad or the Decad is attested in the first millennium. Therefore, it seems that a select part of the OB corpus was discarded during the Middle Babylonian period. On the other hand the absence from the MB documentation of *Lugalbanda and the Anzu Bird*, a text of the six-to-ten-exemplar compositions in House F that is attested in Neo Assyrian copies, indicates that some popular compositions of the Old Babylonian period transmitted to first-millennium libraries are by chance not preserved in MB sources or have not yet been found.<sup>456</sup> The same holds true for other literary compositions attested in first-millennium copies but unknown from the MB corpus.<sup>457</sup> The accident of archeological discovery also influenced our knowledge of *Lugal-e* which is only known from two MB extract tablets but is well attested in the Middle Assyrian documentation. The most outstanding piece of evidence that only a limited part of the actual textual production of the Middle Babylonian period survived or has not yet been recovered is provided by the Sumerian literary texts from the Western periphery. Indeed several compositions preserved in first-millennium copies are only known from the Western periphery during the LBA.<sup>458</sup>

A possible MB catalogue of hymnic liturgies (i.e. non-curricular) further shows that we are missing a substantial part of the Middle Babylonian Sumerian literature. HS 1477 + HS 1478<sup>459</sup> is a tablet from Nippur containing incipits of hymns addressed to deities listed according to the praised god and the generic and performative subscripts: *šir*, *tigi* and *adab*.<sup>460</sup> Of over fifty entries only a very limited number of hymns can be surely identified. These are: *A Hymn for Šu-Sîn*,<sup>461</sup> *An adab to Nanna (Nanna H)*,<sup>462</sup> *An adab to Ninurta for Lipit-Ištar (Lipit-Ištar D)*,<sup>463</sup> *An adab (?) to Iškur for Ur-Ninurta (Ur-Ninurta F)*,<sup>464</sup> *An adab to Nergal for Šu-ilīšu (Šu-ilīšu A)*<sup>465</sup> and *An adab to Ninlil (Ninlil A)*.<sup>466</sup> Additionally the incipit in line 39, *ur-saĝ [...]*, in the section dedicated to Lugal-irra and Meslamta-ea, can be perhaps identified with *Nergal B*<sup>467</sup> and the title in line 78, *en eš<sub>3</sub>-maḥ-ta mu-du<sub>10</sub> še<sub>21</sub>-a*, is possibly the missing incipit of

453 *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* are perhaps quoted in a literary catalogue, see § 1.1.6.2.

454 Only *Inana C* and *The Instructions of Šuruppak* are preserved in non-Nippur tablets.

455 See DC SL.

456 Another possible mode of transmission is the rediscovery of lost texts, Hallo 1976, 194; this hypothesis implies that some texts transmitted to the first millennium were not preserved in the Kassite documentation but copied from earlier manuscripts.

457 See for instance *Nintur A*, *Enki and Ninmah* and *Išbi-Erra E*.

458 See for instance *LI-LN* (§ 5.3.4) and *SI-Utu* (§ 6.2.4).

459 TMH NF 3 53 + TMH NF 4 53; see Bernhardt, Kramer 1956-57, 391-393; only HS 1477 is edited.

460 For these terms see Shehata 2009, 227-234, 251-257.

461 L. 35; ETCSL 2.4.4.a; this text is also quoted in the OB catalogue from Nippur (N6), ETCSL 0.2.13, l. 4.

462 L. 62; ETCSL 4.13.8.

463 L. 67; ETCSL 2.5.5.4; this text is also cited in the OB catalogue from Ur (U3), ETCSL 0.2.5, Seg. A, l. 3.

464 L. 69; ETCSL 2.5.6.6; this text is also cited in the OB catalogue from Ur (U3), ETCSL 0.2.5, Seg. A, l. 7.

465 L. 70; ETCSL 2.5.2.1.

466 L. 80; ETCSL 4.24.1.

467 ETCSL 4.15.2.

A *šir-gida to Nuska (Nuska A)*.<sup>468</sup> All these incipits refer to either divine hymns or royal hymns (Type A) that, as expected for non-curricular texts, are poorly documented in the Old Babylonian period. Additional titles are quoted in other OB catalogues but are not identified: line 9, <sup>d</sup>gibil<sub>6</sub> <sup>d</sup>gibil<sub>6</sub> is the incipit of an *adab* hymn to Nanna cited in catalogue N3: 9;<sup>469</sup> line 72, ur-saĝ en-nir-ĝal<sub>2</sub>-[...] is an *adab* hymn to Ninĝešzida quoted in the catalogue U3: 11; line 81, <sup>d</sup>nin-lil<sub>2</sub> nin nibru<sup>ki</sup>, is the title of an *adab* hymn to Ninlil quoted in N3: 14. Although these are non-curricular texts it is outstanding that of all the hymnic liturgies quoted in this catalogue, not one is known from either MB, MA or first-millennium documentation.

In addition to the curricular texts discussed above the Middle Babylonian corpus also preserves non-curricular texts and minor compositions.

Composition	OB Tablets	OB Nippur Tablets	MB Tablets	MB Nippur Tablets
Inana and An	3	0	1	1
Sargon and Urzababa	2	1	1	0
A Praise Poem of Ḫammu-rābi	2	0	1	0
The Song of the Plowing Oxen	3	3	3	3
The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta	3	1	2	1
Counsels of Wisdom	5	2	1	1
The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab	2	1	1	0

The only text that is clearly associated with the Nippur tradition is *The Song of the Plowing Oxen* that was composed to be recited in the *gusisu*-festival at Nippur and is only known from Nippur manuscripts. The other compositions were less popular in the Old Babylonian Nippur documentation. Nevertheless, most of the MB manuscripts of these compositions stem from Nippur. Outstandingly, *Inana and An* which is unknown from the OB Nippur documentation is preserved in the Kassite period in a tablet from Nippur. This indicates that our knowledge of the OB Sumerian repertoire and its curricular setting remains limited. The aforementioned recovery of *The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab* on an OB lenticular tablet from Nippur shows that poorly known compositions could also have been sporadically used as school texts. In the Middle Babylonian period, Nippur also represents the primary source for non-curricular texts and compositions that were likely not associated with the Nippur tradition.<sup>470</sup> It is worth noting that compositions that were not primarily curricular texts are associated with school activities in the Middle Babylonian period.<sup>471</sup>

The only text that can be assigned with confidence to the group of hymnic liturgies is *The Song of the Plowing Oxen* because of the *ululamama* subscript. However, as shown by the aforementioned catalogue many hymnic liturgies were known in the Middle Babylonian period but are not preserved. Perhaps to be associated with hymnic liturgies is the unique praise poem to Šulgi PBS 1/1 11. The remainder of the royal praise poems preserved in MB copies can be classified as Type B hymns<sup>472</sup> in which the praise is centered on the king himself: *Šulgi B* and *Lipit-Ištar A* which end with the za<sub>3</sub>-mi<sub>2</sub> doxology, *Šulgi O* and *Lipit-Ištar F* in which the presence of the za<sub>3</sub>-mi<sub>2</sub> doxology is uncertain and the *Praise Poem of Ḫammu-rābi* which is a self-praise hymn (Type B.II) inscribed on an OB stele (*narua*). Contrary to what was argued by Hallo,<sup>473</sup> this type of hymn did not disappear after the Old Babylonian period but no sources are so far known from the first-millennium documentation.<sup>474</sup> Therefore only three kings, Šulgi, Lipit-Ištar and Ḫammu-rābi, are mentioned in MB royal hymns.

468 ETCSL 4.29.1, see Bernhardt, Kramer 1956-57, 393.

469 ETCSL 0.2.6, see Kramer 1956-57, 389-391.

470 In this regard it is possible that Northern Babylonian compositions were transmitted to Nippur when the city fell under control of the first dynasty of Babylon.

471 The tablet format is evidence for the curricular setting of texts in the Middle Babylonian period.

472 See fn. 191.

473 Hallo 1976, 191-193.

474 According to DCSL only one Type A royal hymn, *Išbi-Erra E*, is attested in the first millennium.



The group of non-curricular texts clearly includes incantations and Emesal liturgies that served practical functions.

Even though the city of Nippur yielded most of the material several tablets stem from other centers such as Babylon and Sippar. The material from Babylon is very scanty because quite a number of tablets are unpublished. There are only nine published tablets among which five contain either unidentified compositions or texts unknown from earlier and later sources. Only four compositions are known from the Old Babylonian documentation: *Sargon and Ur-Zababa, A Praise Poem of Hammu-rābi, The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* and the proverbs inscribed in VAT 17353. None of the compositions attested in the MB tablets from Babylon can be assigned to the mainstream of the Sumerian literary tradition. Nevertheless there are hints that may suggest a connection between the scribal schools in Nippur and Babylon. It is known that in the latter part of the Old Babylonian period Nippur scholars left their city and settled in Babylon.<sup>475</sup> The MB manuscript, possibly from Babylon, of *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta*<sup>476</sup> belongs to the same stream of tradition as the Nippur sources. Furthermore MA manuscripts of the hymn *Ninisina C*<sup>477</sup> are copied from exemplars from Nippur and Babylon as stated in the colophons. Yet, with much of the material from Babylon still unpublished, there is no sufficient ground to state that texts from the two schools represent the same stream of tradition.

Middle Babylonian tablets from Sippar inscribed with Sumerian texts are limited to six or seven exemplars. The only genres preserved in MB Sippar manuscripts are incantations, Emesal texts and an unidentified composition. None of them duplicate any of the extant OB or MB compositions from Nippur. The most outstanding pieces of a literary tradition independent from Nippur are the compositions centered on Utu, because the Ebabbar at Sippar was the main temple of the Sun-god. *Incantation to Utu* and a *Kiutu* incantation are representative of the Northern Babylonian tradition and are unknown in Nippur. Sippar or more generally Northern Babylonia is also the main source for Emesal texts. This probably reflects the tendency of the Emesal OB texts to come from Sippar as a consequence of 19<sup>th</sup> century excavations.<sup>478</sup> Northern Babylonian Emesal texts present several orthographic features that set them apart from the Nippur tradition.<sup>479</sup> The *Eršaḫūga* BM 78164 provides an interesting link to a text from Ḫattuša that, as explained below, is representative of a non-Nippur tradition.

Two Sumerian texts, an Emesal *Balaḡ* and a royal praise poem, are known to be from the period of the Sealand dynasty and likely stem from the area south of Nippur.

New Sumerian texts were composed in the Kassite period as shown by *Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription* and by the Middle Assyrian documentation that yielded two pieces of Kassite scribal art: the *Hymn to Ninurta* (KAR 97) and *A Hymn to Ninurta with Ethical Instructions* (KAR 119) – the latter a MB tablet imported to Assur.<sup>480</sup> The unpublished hymn mentioning the Sealand king Aadaragalam is an additional text composed in the post-Old Babylonian period.

Transmission of texts from the Middle Babylonian period to the first millennium was not influenced by their duplication rate: both those texts with a high a duplication rate – curricular – in the Old Babylonian period and those with but a few exemplars are attested in first-millennium libraries. Only a limited number of compositions from the Middle Babylonian corpus are also known in the first-millennium documentation. But it is likely that several compositions transmitted to the first millennium are no longer preserved or have not yet been found.

475 Pientka 1998, 190-195, Charpin 1999-2000, 324.

476 See § 1.1.6.2.

477 KAR 15 – KAR 16, see § 2.1.2.1.

478 Emesal texts are known from the South as well, see Introduction.

479 See § 2.1.4.2.

480 See §§ 2.1.2.2 and 2.1.2.3.



Composition	Old Babylonian	Middle Babylonian	First Millennium
Enlil and Ninlil	+	+	+
Enlil and Sud	+	+	+
Inana and An	+	+	-
Inana's Descent to the Netherworld	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
Lugal-e	+	+	+
		(Only Extract)	
Angim	+	+	+
Sargon and Urzababa	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
Šulgi B	+	+	-
Šulgi O	+	+	-
Hymn to Šulgi (PBS 1/1 11)	-	+	-
Lipit-ištar A	+	+	-
Lipit-ištar F	+	+	-
A Praise Poem of Ḫammu-rābi	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
Enlil A	+	+	-
Inana C	+	+	-
			(Only lexically)
The Song of the Plowing Oxen	+	+	+
A Litigant's Prayer	-	+	-
The Instructions of Šuruppak	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta	+	+	(+)
Counsels of Wisdom	+	+	+
The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab	+	+	-
The Fowler and his Wife	+	+	? <sup>1</sup>
		(Only Extract)	
SP 1 <sup>2</sup>	-	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
SP 1.84 <sup>3</sup>	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
SP 2.113-114 <sup>4</sup>	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
SP 2.134 <sup>5</sup>	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
SP 3.149 = 14.6 <sup>6</sup>	+	+	+
SP 3.150 <sup>7</sup>	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
SP 7.77 <sup>8</sup>	+	+	-
SP 19 (Sec. E 2) <sup>9</sup>	+	+	-
		(Only Extract)	
Proverb (N 3395)	-	+	-
Proverb (MS 2065)	-	+	-
Proverbs (MS 3310)	-	+	-
Proverb (MS 3323)	-	+	-
Eršaḫuḡa to Enki (BM 78164)	-	+	-
Balaḡ to Enlil	-	+	+

Composition	Old Babylonian	Middle Babylonian	First Millennium
UHF VII-VIII	+	+	+
Incantation to Utu	+	+	+
Kiutu Incantation (HS 1512)	-	+	-
BM 54692	-	+	+
Omen	-	+	-

1 The closely related composition *The Fowler* attested at Emar (§ 6.2.3) is possibly quoted in the catalogue of the series of Sidu.

2 CBS 8039 is probably a variant to Proverb Collection 1, see § 1.1.7.1.

3 § 1.1.7.9

4 § 1.1.7.4.

5 § 1.1.7.5.

6 § 1.1.7.7.

7 § 1.1.7.3.

8 § 1.1.7.7.

9 § 1.1.7.6.

As shown by the table, only a few compositions are unknown in the Old Babylonian corpus.<sup>481</sup> Some of them were perhaps composed by Kassite scribes. To be added to the list of texts unknown in the Old Babylonian period are the aforementioned hymns to Ninurta discovered at Assur (KAR 97 and KAR 119).

Middle Babylonian Sumerian literary texts are usually quite similar to their OB duplicates; variants are attested but they are not different from those found among OB manuscripts. These variants result from variation occurring in textual transmission over time<sup>482</sup> and from the adaptation and modification of OB texts by Kassite scribes. Texts do not display the same degree of variation: in some cases MB copies exactly duplicate the OB models, in other instances they differ to a greater extent such as in *Enlil and Ninlil* and *Angim*.<sup>483</sup> When first-millennium duplicates are available, MB manuscripts are generally closer to the OB recension, but occasionally they share features with late manuscripts.<sup>484</sup> The MB texts represent an intermediate stage between the Old Babylonian and first-millennium corpora. This clearly implies that the process of canonization was not yet accomplished in the Kassite period but occurred later.<sup>485</sup> The Middle Babylonian Sumerian literary texts are usually preserved in only one manuscript, often fragmentary, and when more than one tablet has come down to us, they rarely overlap.<sup>486</sup> As a consequence, in most cases it is not possible to discern whether several different recensions were known in the Middle Babylonian period.

The grammar of the Middle Babylonian Sumerian literary texts from Nippur agrees in terms of morphology, syntax, and orthography with the OB models. Phonetic writings are very limited. As expected, greater divergence from the standard Sumerian grammar is found in texts created in the Middle Babylonian period.<sup>487</sup> In these cases the Sumerian looks artificial and is characterized by rare words often attested only in lexical lists. Therefore, a dichotomy between the use of Sumerian in new compositions and in texts copied from earlier models comes to light.

The addition of an Akkadian translation is one of the major differences from the Old Babylonian texts.<sup>488</sup> Bilingual tablets are attested in both parallel column and interlinear formats, but the lat-

481 Note that some proverbs were probably already attested in the Old Babylonian period on unpreserved tablets.

482 Between the OB texts and the Late Kassite duplicates there are more than four hundred years.

483 For examples of different degrees of variation in Sumerian literature see Hallo 1976.

484 See for instance *Enlil and Ninlil* (§ 1.1.1.1) and *Angim* (§1.1.1.6), see also the case of a manuscript of *Inana C* which is closer to its first-millennium duplicate.

485 This fits the process of canonization of omina, see Heeßel 2011.

486 See *Lipit-Ištar F* (§ 1.1.3.5), *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* (§ 1.1.6.2).

487 See for instance *Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription* (§ 1.1.12.1), the hymn to Ninurta KAR 97 (§ 2.1.2.2) and perhaps N 3395 (§ 1.1.7.2).

488 Only a few examples of bilinguals come from the Old Babylonian period, see Cooper 1971, 7.

ter is more frequent. An Akkadian translation in interlinear format is often written in small script underneath the Sumerian text. Some manuscripts do not give a full Akkadian translation but only have glosses. The exercise tablet Peiser Urkunden 92<sup>489</sup> has the odd format of Sumerian and Akkadian on different sides and MS 2065 has phonetic Sumerian, standard Sumerian and Akkadian arranged in lines from top to bottom.

Composition	Museum Number	Provenance	Format
Inana and An	CBS 3832	Nippur	Columns
Angim	N 6286 (+) CBS 11153	Nippur	Columns
Sargon and Ur-Zababa	VAT 17166 (Extract)	Babylon	Interlinear
Šulgi B	CBS 13509	Nippur	Interlinear
Šulgi O	CBS 10900	Nippur	Glosses
Šulgi O	Ni 13227	Nippur	Interlinear
Hymn to Šulgi (PBS 1/1 11)	CBS 11341	Nippur	Columns
Lipit-Ištar A	CBS 3558 + Ni 9696 (+) Ni 4557	Nippur	Interlinear
Lipit-Ištar F <sup>1</sup>	UM 29-15-399 + Ni 9734	Nippur	Columns
Lipit-Ištar F	N 3498	Nippur	Interlinear
A Praise Poem of Ḫammu-rābi	VAT 19236 (Extract)	Babylon	Interlinear
Enlil A	CBS 10903	Nippur	Glosses
Inana C	CBS 13860	Nippur	Columns
Inana C	KM 89404 (Extract)	?	Interlinear
Inana C	CBS 15203	Nippur	Interlinear
The Song of the Plowing Oxen	UM 29-13-560 (+) N 3529 (+) N 3169	Nippur	Columns <sup>2</sup>
The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta	MM 487b	Babylon (?)	Glosses
Proverb	N 3395	Nippur	Columns
SP 3.149=14.6 SP 7.77	VAT 17353	Babylon	Columns
Proverb	MS 2065	?	Atypical
Proverb	MS 3323	?	Interlinear
Unidentified Text	CBS 13990	Nippur	Interlinear
Unidentified Text	VAT 17224 (Extract)	Babylon	Interlinear
Unidentified Text	VAT 17357 (Extract)	Babylon	Interlinear
Unidentified Text	IM 13365	?	Glosses
Eršaḫuḡa to Enki	BM 78164	Sippar	Interlinear
Emesal Lyric	VAT 17119	Babylon	Glosses
UHF VII-VIII	Ni 2676+	Nippur	Glosses
Kiutu Incantation	HS 1512	?	Interlinear Glosses
Incantation	VAT 1514	Babylon	Interlinear

<sup>1</sup> Possibly also N 3495 is a bilingual tablet in parallel columns.

<sup>2</sup> This is a multicolumn tablet with Sumerian and Akkadian arranged in sub-columns.

Not all the MB manuscripts contain an Akkadian translation and several texts are preserved in a monolingual version.<sup>490</sup> Additionally, monolingual Sumerian texts were composed in the Middle

<sup>489</sup> See § 1.1.5.2.

<sup>490</sup> *Enlil and Ninlil*, *Enlil and Sud*, *Inana's Descent*, *Enlil A* (CBS 10457 only), *The Instructions of Ur-Ninurta* and *Counsels of Wisdom* (UM 29-13-419A only), *The Three Ox-Drivers from Adab*, *The Fowler and his Wife*; to this list are to be added

Babylonian period as the *Kurigalzu's Statue Inscription* clearly shows. Single compositions can be copied in both interlinear and parallel column format<sup>491</sup> or even in monolingual and bilingual format.<sup>492</sup> Transmission of a composition into the first millennium is not ensured by the addition of an Akkadian translation. Texts preserved in the MB documentation only in a monolingual version such as *Enlil and Ninlil* and *Enlil and Sud* were transmitted to the first millennium in bilingual format. Conversely, many of the bilingual texts are unknown in the first-millennium documentation. This is additional evidence that the process of selection and canonization was not fully accomplished in the Kassite period. There was no standardized tablet format as in some of the MA texts. Akkadian versions often display a mixture of old and late orthographic forms.<sup>493</sup> Similarly, some MB manuscripts have an odd mix of earlier and later sign shapes<sup>494</sup> and at times show carelessness in writing.<sup>495</sup>

To sum up, the majority of the published Middle Babylonian Sumerian literary texts stem from Nippur and reflect the Nippur tradition. Nevertheless, tablets from Sippar witness a different tradition typical of Northern Babylonian centers. Sumerian texts from the Middle Babylonian period represent an intermediate stage between the Old Babylonian and the first-millennium corpora, but are closer to the OB recensions.

some proverbs, incantations and exercise tablets among which are those containing *Lugal-e*, *Lipit-Ištar A* and *The Instructions of Šuruppak*.

491 For instance *Lipit-Ištar F* and *Inana C*.

492 *Enlil A*.

493 See for instance *Inana and An* (§1.1.1.3), *Hymn to Šulgi* (§ 1.1.3.3), BM 78164 (§ 1.1.9.1).

494 N 2341 (*Enlil and Sud*), PBS 1/1 11 (*Hymn to Šulgi*), HS 1512.

495 *Enlil and Ninlil*.