THE CONSTRUCTION OF MEANING ON THE CUNEIFORM PERIPHERY*

Mark WEEDEN
SOAS, University of London

Cuneiform writing was used from around 3,400 BC until around 100 AD in ancient Mesopotamia, but it was periodically also used over much of the Near and Middle East, from Iran to Anatolia and Egypt. This logo-phonetic script, based on a combination of signs for sounds (phonograms) and signs for words (logograms) was used to write many languages, from Sumerian initially to Akkadian in Mesopotamia, to Hittite, Hurrian and other languages in Anatolia and Syria during the second millennium BC and Elamite in Iran. Throughout the cuneiform world Akkadian quickly became the written lingua franca while Sumerian, which died out as a spoken language around 2000 BC, was used in some form up until the very end of the cuneiform tradition as a language of scholarship, or at least of hermeneutics, a pool of traditional resources for both generating and hiding meaning. Sumerian word-signs also persisted in use until the end as logographic writings for words in the local languages that used the script, particularly in Akkadian and Hittite. The practice of scholarship by scribes who learned to write and then perhaps became scholars in the various social contexts of the history of this over 3,000 year period in some as yet indistinct sense formed the background or prelude for much of the scribal culture that came after, although it is clear that a significant rupture occurred at the end of the period of cuneiform transmission.

The question of transmission to be addressed in this contribution is not one of legacy, but rather one of adaptation from one geographical area to another. There has been a tendency in modern scholarship to view certain parts of "peripheral" cuneiform scholarship, i.e.that performed outside the Babylonian "centre" in far-flung places such as Anatolia, as basically derivative, bereft of innovation and largely uncomprehending. This perspective is now being countered by a

* Abbreviations for dictionaries and (digital) text-corpora: AHw: *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* by W. von Soden (1959-1981, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz); CAD: *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (1956-2010, Chicago: Chicago University Press); CHD: The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago (1989 - present, Chicago: University of Chicago Press); KBo: *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi* (later *Boğazköy*), H. Figulla *et alii*, (1923 — present, Leipzig: Hinrichs; Berlin: Gebrüder Mann); KUB: *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*, H. Figulla *et alii* (1921 - 1990, Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin). DCCLT: Digital Corpus of Cuneiform Lexical Texts, http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/dcclt/; CDLI: Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative, http://cdli.ucla.edu/.

view which emphasizes the local use and adaptations of apparently traditional Babylonian scholarship.[1] On the one hand it has been suggested that the Hittites made conscious changes to the logograms used in the cuneiform script using a variety of resources.[2] On the other hand some scholars, including myself, have continued to accept, either as a default position or with a thorough theoretical grounding, that deviations from regular "Mesopotamian" traditional scholastic texts are simply mistakes.[3] In this contribution we will review some of the examples of such "mistakes" from the scholastic cuneiform tradition which have been mentioned in modern scholarly literature as pertinent to the debate concerning the status of scribal activity among the Hittites.

The figure of the scribe in ancient Mesopotamia and Anatolia is closely associated with the terminology of the artisan. The scribe is a craftsperson, who goes through a rigorous apprenticeship in order to learn their trade, to become a "master".[4] However, not everyone who could write was necessarily employed as a scribe. One may have taken a job as a scribe doing wealthy families' accounts in Mesopotamia, or taught their children the scribal art so that they could pursue other professions. Professions that needed some acquaintance with cuneiform writing were many and disparate, from ritualists, doctors and astrologers, to accountants, surveyors and merchants.[5] It would be redundant to call these people primarily scribes, however learned they may have been. It is also difficult, as we shall see, to separate the learning of the technique, how to write, from the content of the curriculum which one had to learn in order to reach that goal.[6]

In Anatolia of the late second millennium BC, however, the range of applications that are attested for cuneiform writing is starkly reduced. A lack of personal economic documents beside the restriction of cuneiform finds thus far to sites where a royal presence is attested suggest that the social character of cuneiform writing was rather different in Anatolia to Mesopotamia.[7] The royal and temple archives of the Hittite capital at Hattusa (modern day Boğazkale) and other sites have brought forth thousands of tablets containing a wide variety of text types of native and foreign origin: annals, letters, omens, literature, administrative texts, traditional school texts from Mesopotamia and thousands of tablets detailing home-grown and imported rituals and festivals.[8] All of these

[1] Veldhuis 2014a: 27.
[2] Weeden 2011a: 376-382.
[3] E.g. Weeden 2011a: 100-102; Scheucher 2012: 225-260.
[4] Akkadian *ummânu* "craftsman, scholar" CAD U-W 114-115 *ummânu* 2b.
[5] Veldhuis 2011.
[6] Veldhuis 1997; Veldhuis 2004: 60-80; id. 2014b: 223-225.
[7] Weeden 2011b.
[8] For the online catalogue of Hittite cuneiform tablets with bibliographic, palaeographic and excavation details as well as links to photographs and line drawings see S. Košak's *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln* at www.hethiter.net (last accessed 23.05.2015).

compositions were studied, copied and archived for the sole purpose of protecting the interests of the king and the extended royal family.[9] In this contribution we will consider scribal practice in relationship to the transmission and use of certain Mesopotamian texts associated with advanced stages of scribal education, or rather scholarship, at Hattusa, where they existed in a very different context to that of Mesopotamia, and far away from the centres of scholarship where scribal education and the texts associated with it had been developed.

Scribal education in the second millennium BC

From extensive finds of cuneiform tablets related to school activity from Nippur (modern Nuffar, Al-Qādisiyyah governorate) in southern Mesopotamia it has been possible to reconstruct a fairly coherent picture of what scribal education looked like in that city at one point in the Old Babylonian period of Mesopotamian history, the first half of the second Millennium BC. Especially over the last 20 years close study of the typology of exercise tablets on which cuneiform school-texts were written, particularly the genre known as lexical lists, has led to the secure establishment of a curriculum of compositions through which students would have to proceed in order to learn how to write. Tablets on which the teacher wrote an exercise in the left-hand column to be copied by the students in the right-hand one, which also often contain an extract from a composition that the student had learned previously on the reverse, have helped to unpick this order of learning, largely due to the painstaking work of Niek Veldhuis.[10] This "curriculum" seems to have varied from place to place, and even within the same city of Nippur there appear to have been different curricula in place in different houses of learning with different teaching habits or specializations, but a basic progression from stylus practice to simple sign-lists, to Sumerian word-lists, to more complex syllabaries and other types of lists organized according to acrographic or semantic criteria of various kinds can be observed in those places where these types of tablets are found in Mesopotamia, albeit using different texts. Towards the end of the initial curriculum one practised mathematical problems, metrological texts and Sumerian proverbs, before a second stage dealt with groups of Sumerian literary texts consisting of hymns to kings and deities, literary letters, epic poetry and incantations depending on where you were learning or what kind of scribe you were supposed to become. The initial stage of the curriculum at Nippur was represented by three levels, as Veldhuis has suggested:[11]

[9] Van den Hout 2005.
[10] Veldhuis 1997.
[11] Veldhuis 2014b: 205-207.

Exercise	Educational purpose
1. Wedge practice	Using stylus
Syllable Alphabet B (Nippur) (tu-ta-ti)[13]	syllabic signs and their values[12]
Name lists	introduction to logographic signs
2. Ur_5-ra — thematic word-list	Sumerian vocabulary[14]
3. Metrological exercises	measurements
Ea	phonetic polyvalence of single signs[15]
Lu	vocabulary for human beings
Izi	acrographic[16]
Kagal	acrographic
Nigga	acrographic
Diri	complex logograms
Mathematical Tables	multiplication, reciprocal numbers used in hexagesimal numeration
Proverbs	Simple Sumerian syntax[17]

Similar but much reduced forms of such curricula are found elsewhere, and different texts are preferred to fulfill the same educational functions depending on where the scribe was being educated. The vast majority of Sumerian logograms encountered during this learning process would never be used in writing of any kind, whether in Akkadian as logograms for Akkadian words, or in Sumerian as word-signs. The large amount of prima facie redundancy that the educational content includes has been explained by the role that these texts played in preserving traditional knowledge and their function in the fashioning of a textual community of scribes, or as Veldhuis has more recently preferred to express it, a community of practice.[18]

Earlier attempts to reconstruct the institutions and context of education were based on the depictions of school-life provided by a number of Sumerian compositions which seemed to describe life in a large institution complete with personnel for teaching and discipline much like a modern school.[19] The institution

[12] Outside of Nippur a shorter sign-list known as Syllable Alphabet A was used for this purpose. Veldhuis 2014b: 145-147.

[13] This basic exercise in syllabic writings was not practiced in House F at Nippur, for example. See Robson 2001; Veldhuis 2014b: 147-149.

[14] This collection is also referred to as Ura or Hh (= HAR-ra *ḫubullu*). It is divided into tablets according to the type of vocabulary concerned, 6 tablets in the Old Babylonian period, 15 in the Middle Babylonian period and 24 in the first millennium BC. These would be learned in extracts. Veldhuis 1997; id. 2014b: 147-156.

[15] In the north of Mesopotamia this function was filled by Syllabary A (S^a), not to be confused with Syllable Alphabet A (SA).

[16] Acrographic: words written beginning with the same sign.

[17] Veldhuis 2000.

[18] Veldhuis 1997; id. 2014b: 224-225.

[19] Kramer 1949; Sjöberg 1976; Civil 1985; Vanstiphout 1997.

is supposed to have been called the Edubba, or tablet-house and the compositions describing life at school are known today under the title Edubba-texts. The discrepancy here was that the archaeological context of buildings that had been identified as scribal schools were small domestic dwellings that could not have accommodated such extensive institutions.[20] Attempts have been made to reconcile the picture in the Sumerian school-life compositions with the archaeological reality by hypothesizing that it refers to an earlier period, that of the Ur III dynasty (end of the third millennium BC), when king Šulgi tells us in his praise-hymns that he set up institutions of learning ("tablet-house", Sumerian é dub-ba), which have commonly been interpreted as scribal schools.[21] However, such large-scale and in some sense public institutions associated with education, with the possible exception of one temple context, have also remained elusive in the archaeological record for this period.[22] It may simply be that the Old Babylonian Sumerian school-life compositions appeal to a kind of ideal reality that teachers might have aspired to, where their humble cottage-industry was accorded the material trappings of an institution, concomitant with the grand ideological message that the content of the texts transmitted in their homes appeared to espouse, particularly when these included hymns to kings of a bygone era written in a language that no one had spoken for hundreds of years.[23]

Edubba-texts at Hattusa and the status of Sumerian in the second millennium BC

The Edubba-texts and other school-life related literary compositions have mostly been abandoned as evidence for the form taken by scribal education. However, they still offer interesting perspectives on the perception of scribal education by those who became scribes.[24] Two excerpts from school-life compositions related to these Edubba-texts have been found at Hattusa, the capital of the Hittite Empire, written on clay prisms, themselves a somewhat archaic medium of transmission in the 13th century BC, to which they can be dated by palaeography.[25] A comprehensive study of the exiguous Sumerian textual finds from the city still remains to be published, but it is provisionally clear that knowledge of Sumerian was not common among Hittite scribes.[26] Nevertheless, a passage

[20] Charpin 1986; Robson 2001; Tanret 2002; George 2005.
[21] George 2005; Šulgi Hymn B 308-15 (Castellino 1972).
[22] Veldhuis 2014b: 140-142.
[23] Veldhuis 2014b: 203.
[24] Robson 2002: 348-352 for the use of the school-life texts to deduce the contemporary perception of mathematics and metrology by students.
[25] KUB 4.39; KUB 57.126 (Civil 1987). The heyday of the prism as a medium for writing cuneiform was in the early second millennium BC (Old Babylonian period). However, eight such pieces have been found at Hattusa, all with Mesopotamian compositions.
[26] Klinger 2010; 2012; Viano 2010; id. 2012; id. 2015.

coincidentally partially preserved on one of these prisms (KUB 4.39), but also on later duplicate manuscripts from Mesopotamia and contemporary manuscripts from Ugarit in northern Syria, contains an interesting commentary on the status of the cuneiform learning process, and is even phrased in a relatively comprehensible form of the Sumerian language.[27] The composition takes the form of a literary letter in Sumerian sent from someone in Nippur to someone in Ur (modern Tell al-Muqayyar, Dhi Qar governorate, southern Iraq), giving instructions on how to run a school. It is a common theme in such compositions, that the Sumerian from Nippur is superior to that taught anywhere else:

KUB 4.39:[28]

9-10. nam-dub-sar ki níĝ-galam-galam-[(ma$^{!}$-bi)] mu-un-ne-pà-pà-[dè-en]
11-13. šà-dup-pa šid níĝ-kas$_7$ [(ki-b)]úr-búr-ra-[(bi igi mu-u)]n-na-an-šen-še[n …][29]
14-15. [gu-sum (ul-la k)]i-dul-dul-[(bi dal)la (mu-u)]n-na-a-ʳè¬

You will call out to them the intricacies of the scribal craft, wherever (they are)
You will *show* to him the solutions of the tablets with calculations and accounts
You will illuminate to him the secrets of ancient [cuneiform]

Naturally this passage has more to say about the perception of learning cuneiform in the context of Old Babylonian scholarship some 500 years earlier than it does about contemporary Hattusa, as the composition most likely dates from that period along with the other Sumerian Edubba-texts. These three lines are in fact a direct adaptation from one of those better known texts from Nippur into the context of a letter.[30] This "medley" style of composition, as M. Civil has termed it, is also characteristic of the other Edubba-related text found at Boğazköy, which likely derives from a Late Old Babylonian model.[31] An Old Babylonian scribe may have learned the scribal craft in order to write accounts or perform any number of practical activities. He would also have been joining an elite of scribal practitioners defined by access to a hermeneutic system of

[27] The Ugarit versions have the Sumerian on one tablet and an Akkadian version on another one (Nougayrol *et alii* 1968: no. 15a-15b). It is likely that the Hittite version would also have had an Akkadian column on a broken piece of the prism. One fragmentarily preserved side of the prism contains an Akkadian word (*lippašiṭa* "let it be erased"), but it is not possible to match it with this text.

[28] Restorations are made on the basis of duplicate manuscripts listed at Civil 2000: 100-110 and indicated as [(...)]. This text is a composite from the score transliteration provided at Civil 2000: 110-112, lines 5-7.

[29] This is presumably an attempt (phonetic?) to render whatever also lies behind the phonetic Sumerian writing from Ugarit: i-ki mu-un-sà-an-sà-a […] ʳxʾ-di (Nougayrol *et alii* 1968 no. 15a obv 9'-10b), which corresponds in the Akkadian version to [(x)] *ṣú-ub-bi-šu* (ibid 15b obv. 10) "contemplate it". The text of Edubba A 61 from Nippur has a verb igi — si-g "to show".

[30] Edubba A: 60-62 (Kramer 1949; Civil 2000: 114). The context of the passage in Edubba A involves first person verbs in the perfective, whereas here the verbs appear, although not always transparently, to be imperfective and the context suggests the 2nd person. Interpretation largely follows Civil 2000.

[31] Civil 2000: 113.

Sumerian literary knowledge as embodied in parts of the curriculum of scribal training. It is precisely the practical side of cuneiform writing, calculations, metrology, book-keeping, which does not seem to have made the transfer to the Hittite world from Mesopotamia along with the technology of writing. What of the hermeneutics, the "secrets", literally "hidden places of ancient cuneiform"? In a similar passage from another text of this sort that is attested on more or less contemporary copies from Middle Assyrian Assur, these "hidden things" are specifically associated with the language Sumerian rather than the writing system cuneiform.[32]

Hittite scribes did not select traditional Mesopotamian texts for study in Hattusa at random. Rather, as Christopher Metcalf has suggested, texts were chosen on the basis of their degree of relevance to Hittite culture.[33] This may seem clear when considering the adaptation of Sumerian and Akkadian hymnic compositions to the sun or storm deities, major gods in the pantheon worshipped by the Hittites, or to the goddess Ishtar whose cult was widespread across the north and west of the cuneiform cultural sphere.[34] It is less clear when applied to obscure compositions regarding an institution that may never have existed in a language that few, if anyone, would have understood. Possibly it was a sign of prestige to have texts being studied (i.e. copied) in one's archive or scriptorium that were associated with allegedly grand school institutions belonging to ancient cultures. If modern scholarship has been until recently convinced of the veracity of the Edubba as an extensive institution in spite of the asymmetry of the archaeological remains to such a model, it is quite possible that the Hittites were just as impressed by the idea. However, it is also possible that there is something more at work here than the association of the history-poor Hittite ruling class with the cultural memory of their history-rich neighbours in Mesopotamia, as valid a paradigm as this may be for understanding the Hittite appropriation and adaptation of Mesopotamian cultural goods.[35] Another way of understanding the Hittite interest in this learned and obscure material may be partially connected with the status of Sumerian in the cuneiform world after its demise, even at a peripheral centre such as Hattusa, and the practice of investigating its relationship to other languages as part of the process of cultivating the craft of writing.

An Old Babylonian bilingual composition named by its modern editor "The Scholars of Uruk" relates how knowledge of Sumerian was brought down to earth by the gods specifically for the purpose of use by learned scribes.[36] This

[32] Sum. eme-gi$_7$ a-na ì-zu níĝ-dul-bi ur$_5$-ra bur-ra i-zu-u "as for what Sumerian you know, do you know how to solve its hidden (meaning) thus?" (Akk. *ina šu-me-ri ma-la ta-ḫu-zu ka-tim-ta-šú ki-a-am še*-D[A-x] *ti-de-e*). Examenstext A, 13 (Sjöberg 1975: 140, 152 with further comparanda).

[33] Metcalf 2011; 2015a; 2015b.

[34] Metcalf 2015b: 83.

[35] Gilan 2008; Torri 2009.

[36] George 2009: 78-112.

is framed in the context of a dispute between the two cities Nippur and Ur regarding the extent of their knowledge, which is used to explain how scribal learning came to another city, Uruk. And that dispute is framed within a dispute between a father and son of a scribal family. The literary context is thus similar to that of the Edubba-related texts we saw above.

44. šà ma.da.ĝá.a kù.zu gi_{16} mu.un.ĝál
i-na li-ib-bi ˹ma˺-ti-ia né-me-qá-am da-ri-a-am ú-ša-ab-ši
45. ud.bi.ta.àm abgal [m]u.da.an.e_{11} gašam ĝá.ša ka.bi ba.e.KÍD
iš-tu a-nu-mi-i-šu-ma ap-kál-lum i-li-a-am-ma ḫa-as-sum pí-šu ip-te
46. nam.dub.ˢsar˺.ra é.kur ri.en.šè a.{x}.gíd
tup-šar-ru-˹tum˺ [a-n]a [é.ku]r *˹a-li˺-ia ˹iš-lu˺-ul*
47. en.ˢné maḫ˺ šà ˹lú.mu.ta bi˺.[in].ˢtu˺.ud
šu-me-˹ra˺-am ma-dam i-na li-ib-bi um-ma-na-ti-ia ú-wa-li-id

Translation of the Akkadian:

In the middle of my land he (the god Ea) produced everlasting wisdom. At that point a sage came up and, wise, he opened his mouth. He *plundered* the scribal art for the temple of my city.[37] He gave birth to much Sumerian in the midst of my people.

The primary language of this text is clearly Akkadian, while the Sumerian is a translation from this using learned terms, phrases and abstruse grammatical forms that are not found outside lexical lists. The perception of Sumerian as a language that such a foundation myth entails, when considered along with the Sumerian translation of the Akkadian version that is provided, is quite different from that of a vernacular that was used to communicate, as it clearly was in the third millennium BC. Andrew George comments: "It is almost as if, in the Old Babylonian period, they had forgotten that ordinary people had ever spoken Sumerian".[38]

A further myth of the origins of the scribal craft that was current in the second millennium BC was connected with one of the first exercises learned as part of the scribal curriculum: Syllable Alphabet A, which was mainly used outside of Nippur. Occasionally this Syllable Alphabet, which consists of meaningless sounds to the modern eye, occurs with Akkadian "translations", which sometimes treat the syllables as if they are Sumerian words and provide appropriate Akkadian equivalents, and sometimes seem to make little sense. These versions of Syllable Alphabet A are usually referred to as Syllable Vocabulary A in modern scholarship.[39] As shown by A. Cavigneaux and M. Jacques, the Sumero-Akkadian correspondences may suggest a hermeneutic interpretation, which can on occasion be linked to a myth of scribal origins which is preserved on two

[37] Lenzi 2011 tentatively reads ˹*id*˺-*lu-ul* and translates "he *praised* the scribal art". This follows well from the previous sentence, but does not fit the context of the explanation of the transfer of academia to Uruk. The traces on the photo (P251668 at www.cdli.ucla.edu, accessed 21.04.2015) could fit either sign.

[38] George 2009: 110.

[39] For the manuscripts of Syllable Vocabulary A see Farber 1999: 126-128.

manuscripts.[40] A fragmentary Old Babylonian tablet from Isin and a more complete Middle Assyrian tablet from Assur preserve three columns containing firstly the syllabic signs of Syllable Alphabet A and in the other two columns a creation myth in academic Sumerian and Akkadian respectively.[41] The myth tells how at the moment of creation humanity was separated into the experts and the ignorant. Cavigneaux and Jacques explain it as a charter myth for the scholarly class, associated with one of the first texts that the scribe would have encountered when learning to write. In both this and the text of the Scholars from Uruk, Sumerian assumes the role of a code that only the educated can understand. There is no evidence for the content of either of these stories being preserved at Hattusa, but it is possible that Hittite scholars used Sumerian texts as sources of hermeneutic knowledge in the same way that their Mesopotamian contemporaries did.

Scribal Education and Scholarship at Hattusa

Two features are striking about the collections of Mesopotamian lexical lists preserved in the royal and temple archives at Hattusa. One is that there are virtually no exercise tablets, such as those from Nippur that were used to reconstruct a curriculum of scribal education. Instead all copies are on large multi-columned tablets or prisms, albeit usually smashed into tiny fragments, and where observable containing the whole of a composition or a section thereof. The other is that there is a distinct lack of copies of texts belonging to the more elementary end of the curriculum.[42] The most frequently attested list at Hattusa is Diri (attested on 16 separate manuscripts), the complex word-list which educates the student on the writing and comprehension of complex Sumerian words, rather than single signs.

As noted by G. Farber, there is probably one tiny fragment of Syllable Vocabulary A, the list that provides sometimes speculative Akkadian "translations" to the elementary exercise Syllable Alphabet A.[43] The preserved frame of the right hand column of the tablet appears to have the entries (KUB 3.114 ii): (2) tam-tam-˹x˺, (3) tam-tam-m[a], (4) ug_4-g[a] (5) ug_4-g[a].[44] This would roughly correspond to lines 83-85 (tam-ma, tam-tam-ma, ug_4-ga, ug_4-ug_4-ga) of the composite text of the Mesopotamian version from the first millennium BC, but the traces preserved in line 5 do not correspond to the Mesopotamian version's

[40] Cavigneaux and Jacques 2010: 8-12.

[41] Middle Assyrian Ebeling 1919, no. 4; Isin tablet Lambert 2013: 360 with plate 67. Cavigneaux and Jacques 2010; Veldhuis 2014b: 220-222.

[42] Weeden 2011a: 126-131; Scheucher 2012: 338-339; Veldhuis 2014b: 278-279.

[43] Farber 1999: 127. Scheucher 2012: 351.

[44] Text mistakenly assigned to the lexical series Erimhuš and edited at Civil and Güterbock 1985: 125.

continuation.[45] Furthermore, the remains of column I, four lines all apparently ending in the cuneiform sign *-iš*, strongly suggest that this list was also appended with Hittite translations, as this might represent the Hittite nominative singular in *-s*.[46] Given that Syllable Alphabet A consists largely, but not exclusively, of signs denoting meaningless sounds, it is possible that the manuscript preserved here is one of those that include speculative philological interpretations of the signs, rather similar to the two second millennium BC manuscripts of the composition from Assur and Isin mentioned above which contain the scribal charter myth (Syllable Vocabulary A), although there is no evidence for the transmission of that myth at Hattusa. The elementary educational status of this list in the form found at Hattusa would thus be even more doubtful. Currently, however, this interpretation is no more than a reasonable guess, given that the piece is so fragmentary. Syllable Vocabulary A is also found at the sites of Emar and Ugarit in northern Syria, whereas the elementary exercise Syllable Alphabet A is only found at Ugarit out of the three sites.[47]

It is unclear what texts beginner scribes might have used when learning to write at Hattusa if the main school texts are already in the province of advanced scholarship. It is possible that they were using the same texts as in Mesopotamia, but that they would have been preserved in contexts that have not yet been excavated. It seems rather unlikely that there would be so few possible candidates for scribal exercise tablets among the thousands of Hittite fragments found in the archives if this were the case. It has been suggested that they were using the many copies of other compositions found at Hattusa, especially ritual and festival or literary texts, for more elementary education, but this view may misunderstand the purpose and context of copying tablets at Hattusa, a subject which is in need of its own thorough investigation.[48] The question of elementary education at Hattusa is very hard to answer on the basis of the available evidence, but is not our main concern here. Tobias Scheucher, who has made the most comprehensive and systematic study of the material, referred to the lexical lists at Hattusa as a kind of post-graduate course of study, only for advanced scribes.[49] It has also been suggested that the lists have more the status of reference works when compared to their Mesopotamian counterparts, a characterization which may seem somewhat anachronistic.[50]

[45] For the Mesopotamian text see N. Veldhuis, www.oracc.museum.upenn.edu/dcclt "Syllable Alphabet A (SA)" (last accessed 25.04.2015).

[46] The sign IŠ is only fully visible in one case. In the other three the traces do not exclude a reading [I]Š. Scheucher (2012: 351) also agrees that the left column is "probably Hittite".

[47] Farber 1999: 125; Scheucher 2012: 397-398.

[48] Lorenz and Rieken 2010: 226-230; Scheucher 2012: 346. For a likely scribal practice letter see Torri 2008. A fragment containing medical extracts and part of a hymn has also been thought to be a practice tablet (most recently Rutz 2012).

[49] Scheucher 2012: 345.

[50] Weeden 2011a: 130.

Most of these more complex texts are bilingual, usually with a third Hittite column added and sometimes with an additional column providing a phonetic spelling of the Sumerian. The relationship between the three languages for any one entry is not always clear. The one is not always a translation of the other. Furthermore, it is not always apparent that the Sumerian column has priority, especially in lexical compositions that came into vogue during the Middle Babylonian period. One cannot always treat the Akkadian as a translation of the Sumerian. Indeed we saw above cases where a kind of academic Sumerian appeared to have been generated in a literary text on the basis of the Akkadian. This process was at work in lexical texts as well.

The lexical list Erimḫuš

The earliest exemplars of Erimḫuš are those preserved at Hattusa, but this does not mean that the composition originated there. It almost certainly came from Mesopotamia, where lexical remains from the second half of the second millennium BC have been unevenly preserved. In the first millennium BC the text consisted of six tablets in Mesopotamia.[51] Content corresponding only to the first two of these is preserved at Hattusa. In format various arrangements are attested, combining orthographic Sumerian, phonetic Sumerian, Akkadian and Hittite columns.

Erimḫuš is a so-called group vocabulary. The relationships in the group vocabularies are not necessarily one-to-one equivalences between Sumerian and Akkadian elements on the horizontal axis, but rather also between words from a similar semantic sphere on the vertical axis. The criteria for grouping words together could be semantic, based on Akkadian or Sumerian synomyms or antonyms, phonetic or morphological similarities, or could be inspired by other factors, such as co-occurrence in literary texts.[52] In both Sumerian and Akkadian columns extremely rare words are attested. The list Erimḫuš also typically employs elements of meta-language that appear to describe semantic or morphological processes or to mark unusual meanings, and are not wholly understood.[53]

Where the meaning of the Hittite column diverges from the apparent meaning of the Akkadian (and Sumerian) columns, it has been standard to interpret these divergences as mistakes rather than as conscious manipulations of the Akkado-Sumerian material.[54] For example, one manuscript of one passage from Erimḫuš gives the following two entries:

[51] Cavigneaux *et alii* 1985: 9-93.
[52] Veldhuis 2014b: 235-236; Michalowski 1998; Weeden 2011a: 134-135.
[53] Scheucher 2012: 219-222.
[54] Weeden 2011a: 100; Scheucher 2012: 225-260; Systematic catalogue of errors ibid. 253-260.

Ms Ab (KBo 1.35 (+) KBo 26.25 iv)[55]:

	Sum.	Ph. Sum	Akk.	Hitt.
6’	[(bar)]	pa-ar	*ṣí-du*	*pa-ra-a-kán pa-a-u-ar*
7’	[(bar-r[e])]	pa-re	*bi-ir-du*	*ne-wa-la-an-ta-aš a-ša-*[(*tar*)][56]
8’	[lú-kúr][57]	lu-gur	*na-ak-rù*	^{LÚ}KÚR-*aš*
9’	[šúš-a?]	šu-uš-ša-a	*ma-an-na šu*	*ku-en-zu-um-na-aš*
6’	outsider		exit	departure/going forth
7’	split		fort	seat of the *powerless/innocent*[58]
8’	enemy		enemy	enemy
9’	[…]?[59]		who is he?	where does he come from?

The version of Erimhuš known from the first millennium BC in Mesopotamia has the following entries at this stage (Erimhuš II):[60]

132	bar	*ṣi-in-du*}	mob/ riffraff/ all and sundry
133	bar-bar-re	*bi-ir-tú* }	
134	ur	*nak-ru*	enemy
134	ur-ur-re	*a-hu-u*	stranger

The Akkadian of the first two entries is to be understood as a single expression: *ṣiddu ù birtu* “mob/riffraff”.[61] The Hittite has then misinterpreted Akkadian *ṣiddu*, in accordance with the possibilities afforded by the spelling norms of Hattusa-Akkadian, as *ṣītu* “exit”, and following from this *birtu* has been separately interpreted as the apparently homophonous Akkadian word for fort.[62] The first re-analysis has some semantic correspondence with the Sumerian word bar, meaning “outside, outer”. It is difficult to see how the second re-interpretation relates to the Sumerian, although the meaning of the Hittite is itself not obvious.

[55] Restorations from duplicate manuscripts are marked with [(…)]. Edition at Civil and Güterbock 1985: 117 (entries B 6’-9’); Scheucher 2012: 642-643 (ms. Ab; entries 265-268).

[56] Civil and Güterbock 1985: 117.

[57] Variant manuscript Abc (KBo 1.37) has ùr-ra, see first millennium Mesopotamian version, Cavigneaux *et alii* 1985: 33, line 134. The phonetic Sumerian column shows that the Hittite ms. Ab has innovated here, probably under influence of the logogram in the Hittite column. However, first millennium Erimhuš VI 197-198, not preserved at Hattusa, has kúr = *na-ak-ru*, kúr-ra = *a-ḫu-u*.

[58] For analysis see Weeden 2011a: 100-101 fn. 473; Contrast Kloekhorst 2008: 949, although without mention of this term.

[59] This entry appears at first sight to be located three lines later in the first millennium version: 138 Sum. [šu-ús]-sa, Akk. *su-um-šú*. It is not known what *sumšu* means in Akkadian (CAD S 381). The correspondences preserved in the Akkadian and Hittite columns on the Hattusa Erimhuš appear to have more in common semantically with the content of the first millennium line 135 *aḫû* “stranger” at this point. One other correspondence for *aḫû* “stranger” that is only attested in commentaries is Sumerian šú(š). See CAD A/1, 210. Perhaps this might be cautiously restored here.

[60] Cavigneaux *et alii* 1985: 117.

[61] CAD Ṣ 172; B 263-4; Lambert 1967: 286-287. *ṣindu* for *ṣiddu* shows a dissimilation that occurs frequently from the Middle Babylonian period on.

[62] Weeden 2011a: 100; Scheucher 2012: 258, 642-643.

In two recent publications N. Veldhuis has criticized the assumption that the Hittite divergences from the normal understanding of the Akkadian, and of the Sumerian where transparent, are to be understood as mistakes.[63] He rather suggests that the Hittite scribes were, perhaps uniquely in the history of these lexical series, engaging with and modifying the texts in an experimental fashion. Veldhuis compares the techniques of learned commentaries on literary, lexical or omen texts from the first millennium BC, which frequently use the phenomenon of homophony in order to explain, uncover or create deeper meaning.[64] Usually this practice is manifested with reference to Sumerian words and their homophones, whether in Akkadian or Sumerian, but the example outlined above involves Akkadian words which are written similarly (*ṣiddu* vs. *ṣītu*, both spelled *ṣí-du*). Instead of assuming that these are cases where the Hittite scribes have not understood the Akkadian, or mistaken it for something else, and thus do not have any idea either what the Sumerian means or what relationship the Akkadian has to it, the idea would be that we should see these Hittite interpretations as a form of semantic exploration, a learned probing of the possibilities of expression. Veldhuis trenchantly points out that we have assumed that homophonic word-play is learned scholasticism for first millennium Babylonia, but that it has to be seen as a mistake when attested for second millennium Anatolia.[65]

The problem with this theoretically enlightening approach, which undoubtedly gives agency to the scribes and scholars on what is sometimes referred to as the Babylonian periphery, is that it becomes difficult to decide when a writing is a mistake or not; or rather that the category of mistake itself becomes less useful. While we can control our data to a certain extent within a theory of mistakes, especially as Scheucher does within the framework of the notion of the theory of second language acquisition, it becomes much more difficult to account for and to quantify such phenomena if we include the possibility of conscious innovation using obscure hermeneutic procedures. It is also more difficult to see how we could ever be sure that we had found the motivation for a specific case of semantic experimentation. Why would it be of any significance to anyone that part of the phrase *ṣiddu ù birtu* "mob" is partially homophonic and can be homographic with Akkadian *ṣītu* "departure"? Here we run the risk of becoming lost in semantic speculation and association of our own. Any answers to such a question have to be thoroughly rooted in an appreciation of the social and cultural background of the use of Hittite lexical lists as well as of the particular lexical items under examination.

[63] Veldhuis 2014a; 2014b: 275.
[64] Frahm 2011.
[65] Veldhuis 2014a: 29.

In order to understand the motivation for the entries it is also important to try to understand what the Mesopotamian version of the lexical list is doing in any particular passage. It is not at all necessary that either Mesopotamian or Hittite users of Erimḫuš in the second millennium BC, when the composition is not currently attested outside of Anatolia and Assyria, would have been using the list in the same way as they were in the first millennium. Nor is it at all legitimate to assume that the first millennium BC text as attested on tablets from Mesopotamia is in any sense more original or more reliable than the second millennium BC text from Hattusa, although in places this may seem to be a defensible position. However, an understanding of how the entries were understood in the first millennium may help, if only in a typological sense, to comprehend the type of activity being pursued in other versions.

The first millennium version of this group of words starts with the obscure phrase *ṣindu* (*u*) *birtu* "mob/ riffraff / all and sundry", which is attested in two first millennium literary texts and otherwise only in lexical texts such as this and a grammatical text from the Old Babylonian period.[66] The literary texts use the phrase in the context of one's self or possessions being passed on to all and sundry and not remaining one's own.[67] Erimḫuš associates these isolated words with Sumerian bar "outside" and bar-bar-re "setting apart, splitting". These are then further associated on the vertical level with Akkadian *nakru* "enemy" and *aḫû* "stranger", which themselves are put opposite Sumerian ur and ur-ur-re. None of these Akkado-Sumerian juxtapositions could be said to be regular. The sign UR occurs juxtaposed to *nakru* in few lexical lists, including one from the Old Babylonian period, as well as very occasionally in the learned Sumerian of first millennium bilingual Sumerian-Akkadian texts.[68] The more usual Sumerian correspondent for Akkadian *nakru* is kúr. *nakru* is also occasionally given as an equivalent to BAR. The usual equivalent to *aḫû* "stranger" in lexical lists is in fact BAR, only in Erimḫuš is it given as an equivalent to UR.[69] Thus first millennium Erimḫuš presents the Sumerian-Akkadian equivalences in precisely the unexpected order. *nakru* "enemy" and *aḫû* "stranger" explain the literary term *ṣindu* (*u*) *birtu* on the vertical level, while bar and bar-bar-re give ad hoc Sumerian equivalences, which then cannot be used for *nakru* and *aḫû*. For these a learned and obscure equivalence is used. The sign UR has multiple readings, including téš "together", which may or may not have disrupted the semantic homogeneity, producing a further semantic tension.

[66] CAD Ṣ 172.

[67] *nišī āšib qerbīšu ana ṣinde u birte zu"uzū illikū rēšūtu* "the people living in its (Babylon's) midst, divided up among the (foreign) mob, went into slavery" Esarhaddon 106 i 32 - ii 3; See also Esarhaddon 105 vii 20-21; 111 vi 1'; 104 v 17-18 (Leichty 2011). Ludlul I, 99 *ana ṣindi u birti uza"izū*[1] *mimmā'a* "they divided up my possessions among the (foreign) mob" (Lambert 1967: 35 *zu"uzū* emended from ms. *ú-zu-'u-zu*; CAD Ṣ 172 *uza"izū*).

[68] CAD N/1, 190 — see Proto-Aa 476 (CDLI P333149, rev. i 42).

[69] CAD A/1 210.

Something rather similar seems to be going on in the other part of first millennium Erimhuš where this group appears, although here it is taken a step further. Erimḫuš VI (not attested in the second millennium BC):[70]

195	umbin	(wheel)	*ṣi-in-du*
196	bir-bir-re	(scattering)	*bi-ir-tú*
197	kúr	(enemy/stranger	*na-ak-ru*
198	kúr-ra	(enemy/stranger)	*a-ḫu-u*

In this version of the group the two terms *ṣindu* and *birtu* have been split up in a learned exploration of antonymy: *ṣindu* (dissimilated from *ṣiddu*) would appear to have been folk etymologized as derived from *ṣamādu* "harness, yoke", which associates with the Sumerian term umbin "wheel". On the other hand bir-bir-re means "scatter" in Sumerian, precisely opposite of *ṣamadu*, and is put next to *birtu* doubtless partially on homophonic grounds, but also to indicate a contrast with the meaning of an Akkadian word that also sounds similar: *birītu* "space between; bond, fetter".[71] The Akkadian words *nakru* and *aḫû* appear juxtaposed to the more regular Sumerian correspondent kúr. One thus has a series of contrasts and identities at the level of semantic analysis between the Sumerian and Akkadian: join ≠ scatter, fetter ≠ scatter, fetter = join. At the same time the phrase *ṣindu* (*u*) *birtu* in its primary sense is explained regularly as belonging to the same semantic area as "enemy" and "stranger" on the vertical level.

If the above account remotely approaches what is going on in this passage in the first millennium BC, then Veldhuis is correct to alert us to the possibility that a similarly learned analysis may lie behind the Bronze Age Hittite reinterpretation of *ṣiddu* (i.e. without the dissimilation that produced *ṣindu*) as *ṣītu* "exit, going forth". The Hittite re-analysis of *birtu* as "fort" introduces a contrast between the "exit", rendered *parā=kan pāwar* "going forth" in Hittite and the "fort" as the "seat of the *powerless*/*innocent*": going vs. sitting. Regarding the next line, we do not know the Hittite word for "enemy", as it is always written logographically: ^{LÚ}KÚR. The final line of the group also appears to relate to strangers: "a person from where?" It is very unclear what relationship these last two Hittite entries could possibly have with the previous two entries, apart from belonging to a semantic area possibly associated with warfare, as well as being imported from the same textual context, one in which the mention of enemies and strangers made sense. It is rather difficult to work out any further semantic implications from this. However, the "intellectual investment", as Veldhuis calls it, that is required to create these Hittite correspondences, is considerably more than a mechanical if erratic creation of translations.[72]

[70] Cavigneaux *et alii* 1985: 86-87.
[71] Scheucher 2012: 643.
[72] Veldhuis 2014a: 29.

The phrase *parā=kan pāwar* "going forth" occurs once more in the Hittite version of Erimḫuš, this time in quite a different group.

Ms Aa KBo 1.44+KBo 13.1+KBo 26.20 iv

	Sum	Ph Sum	Akk	Hitt.
15'	KA-zu(-)kal-la	: qa-zu-gal-la	*šu-up-pu-u*	*šu-up-pí-ia-u-wa-ar*
16'	pà-è-a	: pa-e	*uṣ-ṣú-du*	*pa-ra-a-kán pa-a-u-wa-ar*
17'	gú-gilim-an-na	: da-l[a][73]	*šu-uq-qú-u*[74]	*gul-ku-le-eš-ki-iz-zi*
15'	your mouth (is) special?		make manifest	purify
12'	make manifest		exit	going forth
13'	illuminate		raise?	

For this section the first millennium version has the following comparable group of entries:

278	˹su˺-KAL-KAL[75]	*ak-ṣu*	"wild" var. *šu-ku-ṣu* "very wild"
279	[pa]-è[76]	*šu-pu-u*	"make manifest"
279a[77]	dalla-è	*ud-du-ú*	"make known"

Of the four manuscripts of this passage of Erimḫuš from the first millennium BC, the Hittite one bears most similarity to an unprovenanced Neo-Babylonian exercise tablet possibly from Sippar near Babylon, CBS 328. At Hattusa the Akkadian element *šūpû*, "to make manifest" has become dislodged from its more usual Sumerian correspondent: pa — è, "to make/become manifest", a compound verb consisting of the noun pa ("branch") and the verb è ("to come out, arise"). Furthermore this element pa has been written pà, literally meaning "called", but probably being used here as an over-complicated phonetic writing. In one manuscript the Akkadian element *šūpû*, spelled *šu-up-pu-u*, appears as a correspondent to Hittite *suppiyawar* ("purification"), in the other it corresponds to Hittite *gulk*[*uleskizzi*] ("?"). In the first case this may have been a phonetic attraction to the similar sounding Hittite word. In this group the first

[73] This reading, which fits the cuneiform traces as well as the context, is suggested in the online edition of the DCCLT (previous suggestions da-˹na˺ Scheucher; da-˹ri˺ Civil and Güterbock). However, the Sumerian word dalla "bright" is usually written MAŠ.GÚ.GÀR (see below fn. 79).

[74] The variant manuscript Aaf (KBo 26.23) lines 4' and 6' switch the order of the Akkadian words *šu-up-pu-u* and *šu-uq-qú-u*. This makes slightly more sense, as Sumerian dalla is a good correspondent for Akkadian *šūpû*, and alternation in the order of the entries may be evidence for a process of experimentation on the part of the scribes.

[75] Possibly also ˹šu˺-KAL-KAL. The exercise tablet, possibly from Sippar, has KA.KA-kal-BAD corresponding to *šu-ku-ṣu* (Cavigneaux *et alii* 1985: 20, CDLI P257774). Further lexical correspondences to Akkadian *akṣu* are also found in Erimḫuš II 6 (Cavigneaux *et alii* 1985: 26), and those few beyond Erimḫuš are collected at CAD A/1, 281.

[76] The reading pa —è is supplied in an exercise tablet possibly from Sippar, and is not contained in the main manuscript (Cavigneaux *et alii* 1985: 20).

[77] This line is only preserved in the exercise tablet possibly from Sippar.

millennium text seems to preserve material that makes more sense according to familiar associations between Sumerian and Akkadian lexemes and it is also possible to detect motivations for changes that might have been made by the Hittite redactors.

In place of *šūpû* as a correspondence to Sumerian pa (written pà) — è-a is Akkadian *uṣṣûtu*, a synonym for *ṣītu* "exit". Once again the phrase *parā=kan pāwar* "going forth, exit" has been provided as a translation for this, once again corresponding to a Sumerian phrase with which it shares an initial syllable (bar-re :: *parā=kan pāwar*; pà — è-a :: *parā=kan pāwar*). The Akkadian *uṣṣûtu* also shares semantic identity with the verbal part of the compound: è "to come out". The introduction of the writing GÚ.GILIM.AN.NA in the orthographic Sumerian column, which has the meaning "upper foliage", but spells the word dalla[!] "bright" in the phonetic Sumerian column, has the function of vertically reinforcing the arborial associations of the compound verb element pa "branch" (obscurely written as pà, literally "called") and is also probably partially responsible for phonetically suggesting the Hittite equivalent *gulkulezzi*, of which we do not know the meaning.[78] The relationships are thus complex between these elements. They range between horizontal and the vertical associations on phonetic and semantic levels between three languages. The inclusion of GÚ.GILIM.AN.NA as a writing of dalla[!] may even point to borrowing from a separate lexical list where ^{ĝiš}gú-gilim an-na is one of very few plant-related terms written with the sign GÚ, like the regular writing of dalla (= MAŠ.GÚ.GÀR).[79] Such tension between the meaning of the writing of a word and the meaning of the word itself has been referred to using the terminology of Piercean semiotics as a form of "indexical iconicity".[80] The Hittite is

[78] A word [*k*]*ulkulimma*-, also a hapax, is found in KUB 33.120 i 8, as the last of the list of addressees for the "Song of Going Forth" in its proem. Translated "peace, rest", also "sheen": Discussion at Rieken *et alii* 2012; van Dongen 2010: 60-61.

[79] The Sumerian word dalla "bright" is usually written MAŠ.GÚ.GÀR. The term ^{ĝiš}gú-gilim an-na "upper foliage" is preserved in the list of objects made of wood (Middle Babylonian Ura 1) as found at Emar (Msk 74163b obv. v 13, Arnaud 1985: 415) and slightly differently at Ugarit (^{ĝiš}níĝ-gú-gilim [an-na] RS 02.017+RS 02.020 obv. iv 23', Thureau-Dangin 1931: Plate 46). The version from Hattusa (KBo 26.5+6) is broken at this point. In the Old Babylonian version of Ura 1 from Nippur, the form ^{ĝiš}gú-gilim an-na is only preserved on one variant manuscript (CBS 06098 rev. ii 8), the other three legible Nippur manuscripts having the form ^{ĝiš}gilim an-na (OB Ura 1, 137, Veldhuis 1997: 223). The first millennium version, by now Ura 3, 498-504, has ^{ĝiš}gú-gilim an-na (Landsberger 1957: 138). The only element shared by the two writings MAŠ.GÚ.GAR and GÚ.GILIM.AN.NA is the sign GÚ. Possibly gú-gilim an-na has been attracted into Erimḫuš here as a logogram related to plants and trees (like Sumerian pa "branch" in pa — è-a) that also contains the sign GÚ. Notably this ^{ĝiš}(gú-)gilim an-na occurs only three entries separated from ^{ĝiš}pa "branch" at OB Ura 1, 140. At Emar and Ugarit the entry ^{ĝiš}pa is missing from this particular passage (see Ugarit ibid. obv. iii 35), although there is a ^{ĝiš}pa-kud-da, "cut branch" at obv. v 17 (Emar) and obv. iv 29 (Ugarit).

[80] See Johnson 2013 for illustration of such indexically iconic relationships between words and writing in medieval Chinese and literary Sumerian texts.

certainly playing a role in this process, and the scribes manipulating this material are using all registers: the relationships between Hittite, Akkadian and Sumerian lexemes and graphemes on both the vertical and horizontal axes of the layout, between complex logograms and their pronunciation, as well as their knowledge of lexical lists from Mesopotamia.

Erimḫuš and Literary Texts at Hattusa

We have focused on the passages containing the Hittite phrase *parā=kan pāwar* "going forth" because this example had been singled out by N. Veldhuis in order to criticize the notion that deviations from standard Akkadian meanings in Hittite translations are solely a matter of Hittite scribes making mistakes due to poor understanding of the languages of scholarship. In order to establish that this critical view pertains on a more substantive level, detailed investigation of the cases of alleged mistakes would need to be carried out on a more thorough and systematic basis, which cannot be achieved in this contribution.[81] However, there may be more to this particular case. As a partial answer to the question of the meaning of this manipulation of the Akkadian and Sumerian, beyond its simply being a mistake, we might recall the recent discovery of the title of a literary composition known from Hattusa: "The Song of Going Forth". Carlo Corti found a join to a broken tablet-colophon, which indicated that the title of the composition referred to by modern scholarship as the "Theogony" or the "Kingship in Heaven Myth" was in fact the "Song of Emergence/Going Forth" to Late Bronze Age Hittite scholars.[82] This piece of work, which is likely to be a Hittite version of a Hurrian epic, is preserved in two copies at Hattusa and tells the story of how the kingship of the gods devolved upon the storm-god, Teššub.[83] One of the key leitmotivs is that the god Kumarbi has to give birth to the god Teššub, who will eventually displace him as king of the gods, and the words *parā eḫu* "come forth" (imperative) are repeated several times during the narrative.[84] It was clearly a well-known story in the Eastern Mediterranean, as very similar story-elements turn up in the Theogony of Hesiod. The Hittite version appears to be in poetry and is clearly a grand epic tale, albeit with grotesque satirical aspects, depending on one's interpretation. Corti's join makes it clear that the name of the composition was written using a logogram that is attested nowhere else either in Hittite or Mesopotamian cuneiform:

[81] The collections made by T. Scheucher (2012) provide an excellent basis for such research.
[82] Corti 2007.
[83] Güterbock 1946; Most recent edition Rieken et al. 2012. Translation see Hoffner 1998: 42-45.
[84] KUB 33.120 obv. ii 2,3, 27, 28.

DUB.1.KAM *ŠÁ* SÌR GÁxÈ.A NU.TIL [
Tablet one of the song of "going forth", not finished

Figure 1: drawing of GÁxÈ.A by C. Corti, reproduced with kind permission.

According to Corti's analysis, the box-like sign GÁ acts as a semantically empty sign-element, inside which the semantic content is filled: È.A "going forth", referring to genesis or beginning. This is a typical semantic extension shared by Akkadian *ṣītu* "exit" and its root (*w*)*aṣû* "come out, arise". There are several other signs in Hittite cuneiform which are similarly formed with box-shaped sign-elements inside which meaningful elements are fitted.[85] According to Corti, the name of the song would thus be (genitive) *parā=kan pāuwas* in Hittite, a name which may be written phonetically in the broken colophon to a Hurrian-language version of the epic also found at Hattusa.[86] This phrase *parā=kan pāuwas* would thus have been well known to the scholars of Hattusa. Corti even suggests that the writer of the colophon, the late imperial Hittite scribe Aš̬hapala, had used the lexical list Erimḫuš to create this logogram.[87] Admittedly we do not have è-a in Erimhuš, we have pà — è-a standing for pa — è-a (pà for pa is understood as hypercorrection or as a learned writing). However, it is the segment è-a that the scribes who copied Erimhuš have focused on, dislodging Akkadian *šūpû* "make manifest" from its regular correspondent pa — è(-a) "make/become manifest", and providing instead the Akkadian equivalent of Sumerian è(-a) "to go forth".

Ultimately the hypothesis that the logographic writing of the name of the "Song of Going Forth" was inspired by Erimḫuš cannot be proved. Particularly it cannot be easily demonstrated that the influence was not the other way round, that the need to include *parā=kan pāuwar* was what motivated the introduction of the phrase into Erimḫuš. The list Erimḫuš is not being used as a dictionary, where one can look up translations, but as an exercise in testing the relationships between Sumerian, Akkadian and Hittite. The Hittite version of Erimḫuš may have been constructed with the constraint of having to include local literary material, and thus embed it in the Mesopotamian scholastic tradition, a well-known Hittite tactic of cultural appropriation.

[85] See Weeden 2011a: 32, 102. These involve the sign KA as the box-like casing, rather than GÁ.

[86] KUB 47.56, Corti 2007: 111, 119.

[87] Corti 2007: 119. Enthusiastically accepted at Weeden 2011a: 103; I take a more cautious view of the relationship between the texts in this contribution.

Corti points out two further rare logograms that are used in the same manuscript of the "Song of Going Forth": ^{d}A$^{?}$.GILIM and ^{d}KA.ZAL, both of which are used as logographic writings of gods' names or epithets.[88] The former contains the element GILIM, which we saw in the peculiar writing of dalla$^{!}$ "bright". However, the logogram in Erimḫuš seems to be fulfilling quite a different function in its direct context to anything related to creating a writing for a divine name. The logogram ^{d}KA.ZAL, however, is only attested otherwise in Erimḫuš at Hattusa:

Ms Aa (KBo 1.44+KBo 13.1+KBo 26.20) ii

27'	KA-zal[89]	*mu-ti-el-lu*	*wa-al-li-u-ra-aš*
28'	KA-zal [x]	[x]-*lu-u*	2-*an ḫa-ad-*ʳ*da*ˀ*-an-za*
29'	KA-zal [x]	*a-wa-*ʳ*nu*$_4$ˀ$^{?}$	*ud-da-na-la-aš*
	noble	noble	glorious, praiseworthy
	noble	?	doubly clever
	noble	chatterer	talker

The Chicago Hittite Dictionary speculates that the use of ^{d}KA.ZAL-*aš* in the "Song of Going Forth" is supposed to express the Luwian/Hittite word *muwattalla/i-* "overcoming/conquering" and is meant as an epithet of the storm-god.[90] This word is usually represented by the logogram NIR.GÁL. The Dictionary further speculates that the use of the two logograms for this word is owed to phonetic similarity between *muwattalla/i-* and the Akkadian word *muttellu* "noble", which both KA.ZAL and NIR.GÁL can express, without necessarily implying a shared meaning for the Akkadian and Hittite words.[91] Interestingly, in Erimḫuš *muttellu* in the Akkadian column does not correspond to *muwattalla/i-* in the Hittite column, but to *walliura-* "famous, glorious".[92] This is difficult to

[88] The reading of the first of these names at Güterbock 1946: 37 and in the latest edition of the text (Rieken *et alii* 2012) is ^{d}A.GILIM, which is the form also cited by Corti (2007). This name has been associated since Güterbock with a name of the Babylonian god Marduk known from the Babylonian creation myth Enuma Eliš VII 82-83, although it is difficult to see how this identification could be possible (Lambert 2013: 129, 487). However, collation of a photo (BoFN02280) and the drawing in KUB 33.120 ii 4 indicate rather ^{d}NÍG$^{?}$.GILIM. Sumerian níĝ-gilim(-ma) can indicate a "rodent", but is also used in the bilingual Examenstext A, 15 (Sjöberg 1975: 142) to indicate "confused, perverse" Sumerian language (Sum. níĝ-gilim-gilim-bi = Akk. *egirta*). It is not transparent whether either of these meanings can help with identifying the god referred to using this logogram in the "Song of Going Forth". One is reminded of ^{ĝiš}níĝ-gú-gilim [an-na] at Ugarit MB Ura 1 obv iv 23', which occurs as a variant reading to ^{ĝiš}(gú)-gilim an-na "upper foliage" (see fn. 79 above).

[89] The sign KA is left in capitals to indicate uncertainty as to the Sumerian reading. With the reading giri$_{17}$ "nose", for example, the compound KA-zal has the meaning "joy, celebration", literally "shiny nose". See Sjöberg 1963 for discussion. It is unclear whether this meaning is appropriate here.

[90] CHD L-N 316-317: "awe-inspiring(?), terrifying". In Luwian the verb *muwa-* means "to overcome, conquer".

[91] CHD L-N 317.

[92] If a Luwian word *walli-* "strength" is accepted, then *walliura-*, which is only attested here, could mean "great in strength". For this controversy see Kloekhorst 2008: 949. The Anatolian

relate to the story of Teššub in anything but the most general fashion. Indeed, the Mesopotamian lexical list An = *Anum*, a part of which is fragmentarily preserved at Boğazköy, contains a designation of the Mesopotamian storm-god Adad as ^{d}lugal-KA-zal-la, "the noble king".[93] If the learned logographic writing ^{d}KA.ZAL-*aš* in fact refers to the Hurrian storm-god Teššub in the "Song of Going Forth", this god-list would appear to be a more fitting place to look for the origin of the use of the logogram than directly in the list Erimḫuš, however tempting this may be.

The local context of KA-zal in this passage of Erimḫuš, the focus of contemporary scholarly interest, seems to be connected with speaking. A facility for speaking is also attested in other lexical interpretations of KA-zal, "noble" from Mesopotamia.[94] Of the two preserved and identifiable lexemes in the Akkadian column of Erimḫuš at Hattusa, one at least (*āwânû*) is also certainly connected with speaking, "chatterer". This word, in the form *āmânû*, is only attested in Mesopotamia in learned bilingual texts, including one of the Edubba Texts concerning school-life, and in late lexical lists and synonym lists.[95] In at least two bilingual contexts it appears to have a negative connotation, denoting one who talks emptily[96]. It is unclear whether the Hittite word *uddanallas* had similarly negative associations, as it is a *hapax legomenon*. However we conceive the semantic nexus pertaining between the members of this group, we have a progression from a positive use of KA-zal to a negative one, from the noble to the ignominious.

The following group continues the theme of speaking. In these lines the Hittite interpretation of Akkadian **awû* "to speak", which is spelled *amû* in contemporary Middle Babylonian texts, seems to refer to a dog's in the Hittite version. Scheucher lists this under misinterpretations that have occurred as a result of contamination with West Semitic languages, adducing a Hebrew root *hmy* "to make noises (of animals)".[97] This would presumably mean that the text had

Hieroglyphic sign used for the word *muwatalli-* is an arm holding a spear (Laroche 1960: 21 no. 28).

[93] An = *Anum* III 237 (Litke 1998: 142). KBo 26.1+KUB 3.118 from Hattusa is the only manuscript thus far identified of this text in the western periphery (Veldhuis 2014a: 27 fn. 16). This particular entry is not preserved.

[94] YBC 09968 iii 47: ka zal^{za-al} = *pu-ú mu-ta-lum* "noble mouth", re-interpreted in the context of the OB acrographic list Kagal in the section concerning words beginning with the sign KA, which can, among other things, mean "mouth". CAD M/2 306 (CDLI P310404).

[95] CAD A/2, 3.

[96] *nullānu āmânû* "good-for-nothing, gossiper" K 7645, 3 (Meek 1920: 154); [*lišān ām*]*ânê ša ana šāri ballat* "the talk of a chatterer that is dissolved in the wind" Examenstext A 26 (Sjöberg 1975: 144, CAD A/2, 3).

[97] Scheucher 2012: 210, 259, 624. The range of sounds covered by the Biblical Hebrew root *hmy* can vary from the cooing of doves (Ezekiel 7:16 "moan, mourn") to the growling of bears (Isaiah 59:11 "growl") or dogs (Psalm 59: 6, 14 "howl"), and can also be used of the roaring of the sea (Psalm 46:3 "roar"). It is thus not specifically nor even primarily used of barking. In fact, with the exception of the roaring sea, all the above attestations of the root *hmy* refer to noises

been transmitted through an area where a West Semitic language similar to Hebrew was spoken, and is one of a number of such features that Scheucher adduces as examples of West Semitic involvement in the transmission of the texts from Babylonia. The consequences of this analysis are thus historically significant.

Ms Aa (KBo 13.1 + KBo 26.20 ii)[98]

30'	KA-ʳxʾ[99]	*a-mu-u*	UR.GI$_7$-*aš ku-iš*$^{!}$ *wa-ap-pé-eš-k*[*i-iz-zi*]
31'	KA-š[u-b]al	*a-mi-id-du*	MUNUS-*za ku-iš* UR.GI$_7$-*aš i-wa-a*[*r* KI.MIN]
32'	KA-š[u-ba]l-ta-a	*ši-it-lu-u*	ʳxʾ-*ke-ez-zi ku-iš*
	…	talking	(m.) a yapping dog
	exchange words	talking (f.)	a woman who (yaps) like a dog[100]
	in an exchange	deliberating	one who becomes/does …[101]

Again, we cannot tell precisely what is happening here on the level of semantic connections between the members of the group due to uncertainties in the readings. The regular Akkadian root for "to speak" (**awû*) always appears in the Gt-stem (*atwû*), except in the nouns *awātu* "word" and *āwânû* "chatterer", and appears next to the regular Hittite word for "speak" elsewhere in Erimḫuš.[102] Here it appears in the G-stem, and is thus an artificial Akkadian form. The Sumerian (KA = inim "word") ensures that *āmû* and *āmittu* are conceived of as

made by humans connected with mourning, which can be compared to sounds made by animals. See Levine 1993: 102-3. However, this caveat does not amount to a straightforward rejection of the proposed West Semitic connection, which is most intriguing.

[98] I am grateful to J. Hazenbos, R. Reichenbach and W. Sallaberger for providing a photograph of the large fragment (KBo 26.20) of this tablet, which is held by the University of Munich.

[99] The traces of the second sign in the copy resemble the sign D[U], which does not give a clear meaning. Scheucher (2012: 624) reads inim.b[al?] "converse".

[100] Text after Scheucher 2012: 624. Güterbock and Civil: 31' inim-ĝál, 32' inim-ĝál-ta-a (Güterbock and Civil 1985: 108). The reading GÁL is excluded by the traces (photo collation). Translation of Hittite after Güterbock and Civil (loc. cit.). Scheucher (2012: 624) 118: "(male) dog which keeps barking"; 119: "(female) dog likewise", interpreting the use of *iwar* as the phonetic equivalent of Sumerographic KI.MIN, which is used to indicate repetition of a previously mentioned element in a list (Scheucher 2012: 223). This is insightful and explains why the verb is not repeated, but is the only case cited of *iwar* being used in this function. *iwar* is usually a postposition governing the genitive meaning "like". Güterbock and Civil (loc. cit.) thought KI.MIN would have been written after *i-wa-a*[*r* …] on the edge of the tablet. I have followed Güterbock and Civil here. The use of MUNUS-*za* to indicate a female version of a previous entry in col. i 58 and 60 of the same tablet does not appear with quite the same construction, and has thus been understood by me as indicating a "woman who …", rather than a "female ….".

[101] To my eye the sign SAR (Güterbock and Civil 1985: 108) is excluded by photo collation, as is the reading *ḫur-za-ke-ez-zi* (Hoffner *apud* Güterbock and Civil 1985). The traces most resemble *t*[*u*]-*ke-ez-zi*, but I am unable to make sense of this. Hittite *tuk* means "you", thus something like French *tutoyer*? This is a desperate guess and completely unparalleled.

[102] Kouwenberg 2010: 372 fn. 62. In ms. Aa ii 23 (Scheucher 2012: 622-623) *atmû* "to speak" is written alongside Hittite *mekki memiyauwar* "to speak much".

equivalents to "speaking". This passage, which does not occur in the first millennium version of Erimḫuš, may function here as an explanation or comment on the use of *āwânû* "chatterer" in the previous passage. The group entry may indicate that the word for "speak" can also be used in the sense of dogs barking, not just people chattering. This may have made sense in a Hittite context. The most frequent use of the verb *wappiya-* "bark" is in ritual texts, where a group of people characterized as the "dog-men" ($^{LÚ.MEŠ}$UR.GI$_7$) bark (*wappiyanzi*) as part of the ritual action.[103] Here we have a dog rather than dog-men. If people can "bark", then dogs can "speak"!

Analysis of the direct textual context of the use of the logograms in Erimḫuš at Hattusa may occasionally provide more understanding of the use of a graphic or lexical item, especially when comprehended in the context of the type of techniques known elsewhere from Erimḫuš both at Hattusa and in other times and places. It cannot be excluded that Erimḫuš was in some way associated with the creation of the logogram used for the title of the "Song of Going Forth", and it is possible that one group of Hattusa Erimḫuš (KBo 1.44+ iv 15'-17') is in some sense a meditation on the writing of this literary composition. It is less likely that the other logograms cited here, ^{d}A$^{?}$.GILIM and ^{d}KA.ZAL, were derived from this lexical list directly, although it is possible that they grew out of a similar kind of activity to that practised in Erimḫuš.

Towards Hittite Hermeneutics?

In Mesopotamia of the first millennium BC, the practice of learned analysis through appeal to (mainly) homophonic Sumerian and Akkadian lexemes or morphology was well established as part of the method used, for example, to work out the correct interpretation of omens, a facility that belonged very much to the highest levels of statecraft. The identification of elements of protasis and apodosis of the omen by means of hermeneutic procedures was something that Neo-Assyrian scholars, who have left us extensive correspondence, were clearly well acquainted with.[104] This practice was clearly at work as a principle of omen composition in the second millennium BC as well. Far from being lists of observations and predictions, preserved Mesopotamian omen texts have been shown by recent investigations to be conceptual explorations rooted in language and writing.[105] However, less work has been done on whether the Hittites engaged in this kind of investigation. This would doubtless present a fruitful field for inquiry.

[103] Pecchioli Daddi 1982: 377; Kloekhorst 2008: 958.
[104] Veldhuis 2007.
[105] Winitzer 2006.

Practising Erimḫuš would have been of help in acquainting oneself with the kind of relationships that can exist between Sumerian and Akkadian words and phrases, whether for divination or other learned pursuits. The focus of Erimḫuš as a composition appears to have been high Sumerian literature rather than omens, given the literary motivation behind some of the word-groupings. We have seen that the Hittite adaptations to Erimḫuš may at points also bear some relationship to literary compositions known from Anatolia and northern Syria. Thus it appears that Hittite scholars were aware of the kind of sphere of application that the list Erimḫuš could be validly used for. More significantly it appears that the Hittite interest in Sumerian and Akkadian as scholarly languages corresponds to the contemporary interest in Mesopotamia in using Sumerian as a code that makes meaning as expressed through writing more complex and difficult to comprehend. The Hittites may not have developed their own academic Sumerian texts, as far as we can yet see, nor do we have evidence for any scribal charter myths explaining a perception of Sumerian of the type we saw in Mesopotamia, but the Hittite scholars were certainly prepared to "meddle with", as Veldhuis puts it, imported Mesopotamian learning in order to create their own meanings.[106] There is still a great deal of work to be done to elucidate what those were.

Bibliography

Arnaud, D. 1985: *Mission archeologique de Meskene-Emar. Recherches au pays d'Astata. Emar VI, 2: Textes sumériens et accadiens*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.

Castellino, G. 1972: *Two Shulgi Hymns (B, C)* (Studi semitici 42) Rome.

Cavigneaux, A. and Jacques, M. 2010: Peut-on comprendre le Silbenvokabular? In D. Shehata, F. Weiershäuser and K.V. Zand (eds) *Von Göttern und Menschen: Beiträge zu Literatur und Geschichte des Alten Orients. Festschrift für Brigitte Groneberg*. CM 41. Leiden: Brill. 1-14.

Cavigneaux, A., Güterbock, H.G. and Roth, M.T. *The Series Erim-ḫuš = anantu and An-ta-gál = šaqû* (With the help of G. Farber). Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.

Charpin, D. 1986: *Le clergé d'Ur au siècle d'Hammurabi*. Geneva and Paris: Droz Librairie.

Civil, M. 1985: Sur les 'livres d'écolier' à l'époque paléo-babylonienne, in J.-M. Durand and J.-R. Kupper (eds), *Miscellanea Babylonica: Mélanges offerts à Maurice Birot*. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisation. 67–78.

— 1987: An Edubba Text from Boghazköy. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Actuelles* 25-27, no. 47.

[106] Veldhuis 2014a: 29.

— 2000: From the Epistolary of the Edubba, in: A.R. George and I.L. Finkel (eds) *Wisdom, Gods and Literature: Studies in Assyriology in Honour of W.G. Lambert*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 105-118.

CORTI, C. 2007: The so-called "Theogony" or "Kingship in Heaven". The name of the song. In A. Archi and R. Francia (eds) *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia, Roma, 5-9 settembre 2005. Parte I Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 49, 109-121.

DONGEN, E.W.M. van 2010: *Studying external stimuli to the development of the ancient Aegean. The 'Kingship in Heaven' theme from Kumarbi to Kronos via Anatolia*. PhD Thesis. UCL Department of History. London.

EBELING, E. 1919: *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

FARBER, G. 1999: Kleiner Leitfaden zum Silbenvokabular A. In B. Böck, E. Cancik-Kirschbaum and Th. Richter (eds) *Munuscula Mesopotamica. Festschrift für Johannes Renger*. AOAT 267. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag. 117-33.

FRAHM, E. 2011: *Babylonian Text Commentaries. Origins of Interpretation*. Guides to the Mesopotamian Textual Record 5. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

GEORGE, A.R. 2005: In Search of the É.DUB.BA.A: the Ancient Mesopotamian School in Literature andReality. In Y. Sefati, P. Artzi, Ch. Cohen, B. L. Eichler and V.A. Hurowitz (eds) *An Experienced Scribe Who Neglects Nothing. Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein*. Bethesda, MD: CDL. 127-37.

— 2009: *Babylonian Literary Texts in the Schøyen Collection*. Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology 10. Bethesda: CDL Press.

GILAN, A. 2008: Hittite Ethnicity? Constructions of Identity in Hittite Literature. In: B. J. Collins, M. Bachvarova & I. Rutherford (eds.) *Anatolian Interfaces: Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbours*. Oxford: Oxbow Books. 107-115.

GÜTERBOCK, H.G. 1946: *Kumarbi. Mythen vom churritischen Kronos aus den hethitischen Fragmenten zusammengestellt, übersetzt und erklärt*. Istanbuler Schriften 16. Zurich-New York: Europaverlag.

GÜTERBOCK, H.G. and CIVIL, M. 1985: The Series Erim-ḫuš in Boghazköy. In A. Cavigneaux, H.G. Güterbock and M.T Roth (with the help of G. Farber) *The Series Erim-ḫuš = anantu and An-ta-gál = šaqû* 97-128.

HOFFNER, H.A. 1998: *Hittite Myths*. 2nd Edition. SBL Writings from the Ancient World 2. Atlanta: Scholar's Press.

HOUT, Th. van den 2005: On the Nature of the Tablet Collections at Ḫattuša. *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 47, 277-289.

JOHNSON, J.C. 2013: Indexical Iconicity in Sumerian *belles lettres*. *Language and Communication* 33, 26-49.

KLINGER, J. 2010: Literarische sumerische Texte aus den hethitischen Archiven aus paläographischer Sicht. Teil II. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 37, 306-340.

— 2012: Literarische sumerische Texte aus den hethitischen Archiven aus überlieferungsgeschichtlicher Sicht. Teil I. In: E. Devecchi (ed.) *Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age. Papers Read at a Symposium in Leiden, 17-18 December 2009*. PIHANS 119. Leiden: Instituut van het Nabie Oosten. 79-94.

KLOEKHORST, A. 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary. Leiden: Brill.

KOUWENBERG, N.J.C. 2010: *The Akkadian Verb and Its Semitic Background*. Languages of the Ancient Near East 2. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Kramer, S.N. 1949: Schooldays: A Sumerian Composition Relating to the Education of a Scribe (Philadelphia); also in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 69, 199–215.

LAMBERT, W.G. 1960: *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
— 2013: *Babylonian Creation Myths*. Mesopotamian Civilizations — MC 16. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
LANDSBERGER, B. 1957: *The Series HAR-ra = ḫubullu Tablets I-IV*. Materialien zum sumerischen Lexikon 5. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
LAROCHE, E. 1960: *Les hiéroglyphes hittites. Première partie: L'écriture*. Paris: Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique.
LEICHTY, E. 2011: *The Royal Inscriptions of Esarhaddon, King of Assyria (680-669 BC)*. Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period — RINAP 4. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
LENZI, A. 2011: Review of A.R. George *Babylonian Literary Texts in the Schøyen Collection* (CUSAS 10, Bethesda: CDL, 2009). *Review of Biblical Literature* 01/2011. Society for Biblical Literature.
LEVINE, B. 1993: Silence, Sound and the Phenomenology of Mourning in Biblical Israel. *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 22, 89-106.
LITKE, R.L. 1998: *A Reconstruction of the Assyro-Babylonian God-Lists, AN: A-nu-um and AN: Anu ša Ameli*. Texts from the Babylonian Collection 3. New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection.
LORENZ, J. and RIEKEN, E. 2010: Überlegungen zur Verwendung mythologischer Texte bei den Hethitern. In J. Fincke (ed.) *Festschrift für Gernot Wilhelm anläßlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 28. Januar 2010*. Dresden. 217-234.
METCALF, C. 2011: New parallels in Hittite and Sumerian praise of the sun. *Die Welt des Orients* 41, 168-176.
— 2015a: Old Babylonian Religious Poetry in Anatolia: From Solar Hymn to Plague Prayer. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 105/1, 42-53.
— 2015b: *The gods rich in praise. Early Greek and Mesopotamian religious poetry*. Oxford: OUP.
MEEK, T.J. 1920: Some Explanatory Lists and Grammatical Texts. *Revue d'Assyriologie* 17, 117-206.
MICHALOWSKI, P. 1998: Literature as a Source of Lexical Inspiration. In J. Braun, K. Lyczkowska, M. Popka and P. Steinkeller (eds) *Written on Clay and Stone. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Krystyna Szarzynska on the Occasion of Her 80th Birthday*. Warsaw: Agade. 65-73.
NOUGAYROL, J., LAROCHE, E., VIROLLEAUD, Ch., SCHAEFFER, Cl. F. A. 1968: *Ugaritica V. Nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques des archives et des bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit. Commentaires des textes historiques (Première Partie)*. Paris: Geuthner.
PECCHIOLI DADDI, F. 1982: *Mestieri. Professioni e dignità nell' Anatolia ittita*. Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo.
ROBSON, E. 2001: The Tablet House: a Scribal School in Old Babylonian Nippur. *Révue Assyriologique* 95: 39-66.
— 2002: More than metrology: mathematics education in an Old Babylonian scribal school. In J.M. Steele and A. Imhausen (eds.), *Under One Sky: Mathematics and Astronomy in the Ancient Near East*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 297. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag. 325-65.
RIEKEN, E., LORENZ, J., BAUER, A., GÖRKE, S. and ESSER, F. 2012: CTH 344 — "Das Lied vom Ursprung": Das Königtum im Himmel oder die Theogonie. www.hethiter.net/: CTH 344 (TX 2012-06-08, TRde 2009-08-31).
RUTZ, M. 2012: Mesopotamian Scholarship in Ḫattuša and the *Sammeltafel* KUB 4.53. *JAOS* 132.2, 171-188.

SCHEUCHER, T. 2012: *The transmissional and functional context of the lexical lists from Ḫattuša and from the contemporaneous traditions in Late Bronze Age Syria*. PhD Dissertation. Leiden University. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/1887/19986. Last accessed 27.05.2015.

SJÖBERG, Å.W. 1963: $giri_x$(= KA)-zal. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* N.F. 21 (55), 1-10.

— 1975: Der Examenstext A. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 64, 137-176.

— 1976: The Old Babylonian Eduba. In *Sumerological Studies in Honor of Thorkild Jacobsen*. AS 20. Chicago: Chicago University Press. 159–79.

TANRET, M. 2002: *Per aspera ad astra. L'apprentissage du cunéiforme à Sippar-Amnanum pendant la période paléobabylonienne tardive*. MHET I/2. Ghent: University of Ghent.

TORRI, G. 2008: The Scribes of the House on the Slope. In A. Archi and R. Francia (eds) *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia, Roma, 5-9 settembre 2005. Parte II. Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 50, 771-782.

— 2009: Sargon, Anitta, and the Hittite Kings against Purušḫanda. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 36, 110-118.

THUREAU-DANGIN, F. 1931: Vocabulaires de Ras-Shamra. *Syria* 12, 225-266.

VANSTIPHOUT, H.L.J. 1997: Sumerian Canonical Compositions. C. Individual Focus. 6. School Dialogues. In Hallo, W. W. (ed.) *The Context of Scripture, I: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill. 588-593.

VELDHUIS, N. 1997: *Elementary Education at Nippur. The Lists of Trees and Wooden Objects*. PhD Dissertation, University of Groningen. URL: http://irs.ub.rug.nl/ppn/30177613X.

— 2000: Kassite Exercises: Literary and Lexical Extracts. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 52: 67-94.

— 2004: *Religion, Literature, and Scholarship: The Sumerian Composition "Nanše and the Birds," With a Catalogue of Sumerian Bird Names*. CM 22. Leiden: Brill-STYX.

— 2010: The Theory of Knowledge and the Practice of Celestial Divination. In A. Annus (ed.) *Divination and the Interpretation of Signs in the Ancient World*. Oriental Institute Seminars 6. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. 77-92.

— 2011: Chapter 4. Levels of Literacy. In K. Radner and E. Robson (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*. Oxford: OUP. 68-89.

— 2014a: Intellectual History and Assyriology. *Journal of Near Eastern History* 1, 21-36.

— 2014b: *History of the Cuneiform Lexical Tradition*. Guides to the Mesopotamian Textual Record 6. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

VIANO, M. 2010*: La tradizione letteraria sumerica negli archivi siro-anatolici durante il Tardo Bronzo*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Università degli Studi di Trieste.

— 2012: A Sumerian Hymn from Boğazköy. *Welt des Orients* 42, 231-237.

— 2015: Writing Sumerian in the West. In A. Archi (ed.) *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 57th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Rome, 4-8 July 2011*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 381-392.

WEEDEN, M. 2011a: Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship. *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 54. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

— 2011b: Chapter 28. Adapting to New Contexts: Cuneiform in Anatolia. In K. Radner and E. Robson (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*. Oxford: OUP. 597-617.

Winitzer, A. 2006: *The Generative Paradigm in Old Babylonian Divination*. PhD Dissertation. Harvard University.