The transmissional and functional context of the lexical lists from Ḫattuša and from the contemporaneous traditions in Late-Bronze-Age Syria

Scheucher, T.S.

Citation

Scheucher, T. S. (2012, October 18). *The transmissional and functional context of the lexical lists from Ḫattuša and from the contemporaneous traditions in Late-Bronze-Age Syria.* Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/19986

Cover Page

PART A: General outline, methodological and theoretical presets

Chapter 1: Scope of the study, methods, and history of research

1.1. [Scope of the study and research questions – lexical lists and Ancient Mesopotamian scribal education] Scribal education in Ancient Mesopotamia, i.e., the training of Mesopotamian future scribes in cuneiform writing and cuneiform scribal culture, apparently comprised two subsequent curricular phases, at least in those historical periods of the 2nd and 1st millennium BCE in which the materials and methods used in scribal education are recoverable with some certainty.

These two phases differ from one another in a number of aspects, such as in the contents and formats of the scribal materials used, in the training methods, and in the educational goals. Regarding the materials studied, the first curricular phase primarily builds on lexical lists, lists of signs and words that impart the basic principles of cuneiform writing and the stock vocabulary necessary to comprehend and study Sumerian and Akkadian traditional literature. Within the second curricular phase students are almost exclusively concerned with literary texts.

Reconstructing the first phase of Mesopotamian scribal education from its material basis, thus, is strongly tied to the study of lexical lists, i.e., the study of the individual lexical compositions that were in use, of their curricular sequence, and of their individual functional scope within the education process.

1.2. [Scope of the study and research questions – the export of scribal culture to LBA Syria and Anatolia] Ever since the invention of cuneiform writing in Southern Mesopotamia in the late 4th millennium BCE, scribal techniques have been conferred to neighboring regions. This export of cuneiform writing into – from a Mesopotamian perspective – peripheral regions did not only involve the export of cuneiform as such, but also the export of the Sumerian and – later – of the Akkadian language, which both shaped the writing system and formed their cultural background. Moreover, it involved the export of a whole system of scribal education along with Sumero-Akkadian literature and the scribal culture of which it was a part. After Mesopotamian scribes had brought cuneiform writing to Syria and Anatolia in the Late Old Babylonian (OB) and the Middle Babylonian (MB) period (which make up the Late Bronze Age, LBA), i.e., within the roughly 400 years between 1600 and 1200 BCE, the Syrian and Anatolian scribal trainees not only studied cuneiform writing, but they apparently returned to the same training materials which their Mesopotamian 'colleagues' used, and studied Sumerian and Akkadian lexical lists and literary texts.

LBA Anatolian and Syrian scribes, speaking native languages that were in part, fundamentally different from the languages of the training materials, had to master exceptional difficulties in this

respect. They therefore annotated part of the curriculum with additional translations into the local native languages, i.e., Hittite, Hurrian, and Ugaritic.

1.3. [Scope of the study and research questions – function and transmission] Since – apart from the additional columns with translations into local languages – the lexical lists found in the LBA Syrian and Anatolian sites appear principally identical with those of the Mesopotamian heartland, one may also assume that the training procedures were basically the same as those employed in the Mesopotamian scribal schools (see sect. 4.5.). Yet, the particular 'peripheral' situation of the Syrian and Anatolian scribes not only required some adjustments to be applied to the physical training materials, but also to the training procedures and educational concepts. The cardinal goal of the present study is to reconstruct the specific functional context in which the lexical lists were embedded in Ḫattuša and in other sites in peripheral LBA Syria and Anatolia; it thereby envisages potential alternative educational methods and materials used in LBA western peripheral scribal education.

The second main goal of the study concerns the question of how the lexical lists, as likely essential training materials, were being transmitted. The study addresses two separate transmissional processes: (1) the transmission of the materials, together with their functional context, from Mesopotamia to the periphery and among the individual peripheral sites ('long-distance transmission') as well as; (2) the transmission of these materials, once having been established at a given site, from one generation of scribes to the next ('short-distance transmission'). The study attempts to clarify the specific degree to which oral and memory-based techniques on the one hand, and writing-based techniques on the other, were involved in these transmission processes.

1.4. [Scope of the study and research questions – Ḫattuša as an exemplary find spot] Due to the natural limitations which beset investigations of the present case, this study primarily concentrates on one of the main find spots of lexical lists in the LBA western periphery, i.e., on the corpus of lexical lists excavated in Ḫattuša, the capital of the Hittite Empire in Central Anatolia. It treats this textual corpus as an exemplary case, investigating how scribes particularly made use of lexical lists in this scribal center, how they guaranteed the persistence of the texts through time and space, as well as how the textual materials were transferred from Mesopotamia.

Especially with regard to the latter question, the study of course cannot avoid taking into account the 'parallel traditions' from contemporaneous peripheral sites, since the scribal traditions of the whole area were interrelated and individual sites potentially played an important role within the transfer of textual materials to other sites. Yet, regarding not only questions of long-distance transfer, the study draws extensively on evidence from parallel sites, predominantly from Ugarit and Emar; wherever possible, it adduces parallel philological data as a kind of comparative

evidence against which the specific characteristics of the functional and transmissional context of the lexical lists in Ḫattuša can be made more transparent.

2.1. [The chronological, geographic, and historical setting – chronological delimitation] 'Late Bronze Age' is originally an archaeological periodization. With regard to the Mesopotamian and Syrian area, it denotes the period ranging from the downfall of the Old Babylonian Empire in the late 16th century BCE until the great political, economic (and possibly environmental) crisis that affected large parts of the Ancient Near East (ANE) around 1180 BCE; it thus involves a time span of roughly 400 years. It is principally identical with what is in the historical periodization denoted as the Late-OB and MB period.

As will be seen, the manuscripts that make up the material basis of the present study were produced during the last two centuries of the LBA. Within the last century of this period, i.e., between 1280 and 1180 BCE, the quantity of manuscripts produced allows for a deeper and more thorough investigation of the texts.

2.2. [The chronological, geographic, and historical setting – geographical delimitation] The geographical region denoted as the western periphery is not exactly defined. Being a relative notion, the exact outline of the region it denotes is dependent on the region to which it is related. In the ANE 'western periphery' may thus denote: (1) the region in the west and north-west of Babylonia, thus also regarding Assyria as a part of the periphery; (2) the region west of Mesopotamia proper, i.e., roughly west of the Ḫabur river; or (3) the region west of the Euphrates, which delimits the maximum expansion of Assyrian power in that historical period. For the most part, sites that yield lexical tablets in the period under investigation are either situated directly at the banks of the Euphrates (Emar) or west of it (Ḫattuša, Ugarit, Alalaḫ, El-Amarna, Ortaköy, and the Levantine sites of Tell Aphek, Hazor, and Ashkelon). Other contemporaneous peripheral scribal centers in which excavations have brought to light larger collections of lexical tablets involve Assur and, quite easterly Nuzi. Since Assur played a potential role within the transmission of scholarly traditions to the West, the study will also, more occasionally than regularly, fall back on textual materials from this site in the form of complementary evidence; the corpus from Nuzi, in contrast, will not be used.

Tarḫuntašša, Karkamiš, and Ḫalab form further scribal centers situated directly at or west of the Euphrates. They are either unidentified (Tarḫuntašša) or (almost) completely untouched by excavation work (Ḫalab and Karkemiš), and are known to be of major political and administrative importance in that historical period. They are scribal centers which potentially – if not definitely – played an important role in the transfer of scribal traditions and which therefore have to be taken into consideration theoretically as well.

2.3. [The chronological, geographic, and historical setting – brief historical outline] During the LBA, the western periphery as defined in the preceding section is alternately dominated by three major political powers, the Hurrian-dominated Mittani Empire, centered in the Ḫabur area east of the Euphrates, the Neo Hittite Empire with its core area in Central Anatolia, and the New Middle Egypt Empire. The crucial historical pivot point within the period occurred during the annexation of great parts of the Mittanian sphere of influence by the Hittite King Šuppiluliuma I. around 1350 BCE, which finally led to the disappearance of the Mittani Empire as an independent political entity. Both within the periods before and after Šuppiluliuma's conquest, two rivaling powers struggled for hegemony over Syria; i.e., Mittani and Egypt before 1350 BCE, Egypt and the Hittites after that date.

Both periods include a first, longer phase of political and military confrontation between the respective rivaling powers and a second, shorter phase of political balance and coexistence. In the second period, this point of political relaxation is clearly marked by the peace treaty between the Hittite King Ḫattušili III and the Pharaoh Ramesses II that the two powers assented to around 1260. As to the first phase, this point can, mostly due to the lack of respective historical sources, not be defined exactly; a dynastic marriage between the Mittani King Artatama I and the Pharaoh Thutmosis IV around 1400 BCE and the start of diplomatic exchange between both powers, however, clearly signals their political arrangement.

The natural-environmental borders of this area of political and military battle are the Euphrates in the East, the Mediterranean in the West, and the mountain range of the Taurus in the North. To the South, the area is roughly confined by the line Sidon - Damaskos. Politically, it is partitioned into a number of small city-state like entities, which were not directly integrated into the respectively dominating hegemonial states, but were under obligation to them by various modes of dependence – ranging from a loose association to vassal-like subjection. Attempting to preserve as much of their political independence as possible, the local powers, particularly the states of Amurru and of Ugarit, directly on the border between Egypt and the Mittanian/Hittite sphere of influence, often tried to pit the hegemonial states as well as the neighboring city states against each other. The area was repeatedly overrun, and often devastated, by military campaigns with which the hegemonial states sought to confirm or expand their sphere of influence.

As has been mentioned above (sect. 2.1.), almost the complete textual basis for the present study was produced during the second historical phase, after Mittani's defeat; only the manuscript from Ortaköy has an earlier date of production. The later sources, with the exception of the few manuscripts that stem from Egyptian Aḫetaten (El-Amarna) and the smaller Egyptian-dominated Palestinian centers of Tell Aphek, Hazor, and Ashkelon, were produced at sites that belonged to the Hittite sphere of power at the time of production, either directly (Ḫattuša) or indirectly as vassal states (Ugarit, Emar, Alalaḫ).

3.1. [The material basis available and the problems encountered – Ḫattuša] Ḫattuša, located within the great loop of the river Kızıl Irmak in Central Anatolia, in close vicinity to the modern village Boğazköy, was the capital of the Hittite Empire, with a short and intermittent period at the beginning of the 13th century, when King Muwatalli II had passed the royal residence to Southern-Anatolian Tarḫuntašša. Except this intermittent period, Ḫattuša housed the royal administration and was not only the political, but also the religious and cultural center of the empire.

The corpus of lexical lists found at Ḫattuša comprises 131 manuscripts, which, with a single exception, are all published – at least hand copied, but often photographed and transliterated as well. Compared to the more than 25.000 textual finds at this site, the number of lexical tablets is marginal and this scarcity calls for further explanation. The general state of preservation of the manuscripts moreover is relatively poor. Many of them show fragmentary preservation only, thus there is hardly any textual overlap among them.

A significant problem affecting the study of the Ḫattuša tablets in general is the insufficiently documented, and in some cases, completely undocumented archaeological context. Since the stratigraphy of the three archives that contained the lexical lists was not recorded during the excavations, it is impossible to decide in most cases whether or not the manuscripts represent in-situ finds.

As can be demonstrated by paleographic observations, the period of production in which the lexical tablets preserved were written down is exceptionally long at approximately 150 years. Probably for this reason, the corpus appears rather diverse and heterogeneous, with manuscripts showing many formal peculiarities and apparently adhering to (diverse) concurring scribal traditions. Their functional and transmissional context was presumably not uniform. Actually, the diversity of scribal traditions manifest in the corpus does not allow for general assertions concerning the whole corpus, rather only regarding (smaller) groups of manuscripts.

3.2. [The material basis available and the problems encountered – Ugarit] Ugarit, modern Ra's Šamra, is situated at the North-Syrian coast of the Mediterranean, close to modern Latakia. Until Šuppiluliuma's I military campaigns in northern Syria, Ugarit was a loose member of the Egyptian sphere of power. After Šuppiluliuma's annexion of large parts of northern Syria, Ugarit King Niqmaddu II agreed to conclude a treaty with the Hittite overlord. It established Ugarit's political and military dependence, which it maintained until the end of the LBA. As in the relationship with Egypt, the Ugarit rulers were granted a certain degree of political independence. Possibly due to the economic importance of the site, which was situated at integral trade routes (leading from south to north, as well as from east to west), the hegemonial rulers acted more cautiously towards their protégé, accepting less dependence and seeking to avoid direct military attacks.

The corpus of lexical tablets found in Ugarit comprises 384 manuscripts. The general state of preservation being much better than in Ḫattuša, the textual material available from this site is not only three (as suggested by the mere number of manuscripts), but even four or five times as rich as in Ḫattuša. Yet, only 159 manuscripts of the corpus are published, and many of them in the shape of (composite) transliterations only. This sample possibly is – regarding the archival context, it definitely is – imbalanced and not representative of the whole corpus, as may be the case with any picture resulting from an investigation of this sample.

The archival and archaeological context of the manuscripts is generally well-documented, however not published for every archive. In remarkable contrast to the other sites dealt with in the study, the number of archives containing lexical lists in Ugarit is exceptionally high, with five distinctively larger corpora and at least three additional smaller ones. Since synchronisms of the scribes with datable persons are scarce and since it is not possible, as is the case of Ḫattuša, to provide paleographic dates for the tablets, their period of production cannot be assessed with certainty. This strongly besets a sensible diachronic investigation of the corpus.

3.3. [The material basis available and the problems encountered – Emar] Emar, modern Tell Meskene, situated at the Middle Euphrates, provides a corpus of 260 manuscripts,[1] which are all published (most of them as hand copies).

In contrast to the corpora from Ḫattuša and Ugarit, which is a similar middle-sized corpus, the Emar manuscripts all stem from the same, principally well-documented archival context. Also, the corpus reveals quite a few names of scribes, which, through prospography, can be linked amongst each other to whole scribal families, and which thus can be embedded into a broader historical framework. It is moreover possible to assign a great portion of manuscripts to the two concurring scribal traditions of the site, the Syrian (Em-Syr) and the Syro-Hittite (Em-SH) tradition, which in turn enables the researcher to establish a relative chronological sequence of manuscripts.

3.4. [The material basis available and the problems encountered – the smaller corpora] Apart from the three major corpora introduced in the previous sections, there are a number of smaller corpora of lexical lists preserved from various sites, comprising from one to ten manuscripts each. Excavations undertaken in Ortaköy, a major administrative center of Hittite Central Anatolia situated approximately 70 km northeast of ancient Ḫattuša, brought to light approximately 3500 manuscripts. Only a single piece, a trilingual lexical list, has as yet been published, and it

---

1   According to the re-vised edition by M. Gantzert (2008), which includes quite a number of joins disregarded in the primary edition by D.Arnaud (1985-87).

is unclear whether or not the corpus contains additional manuscripts of that genre. The published manuscript apparently is an unstratified stray find. According to paleography, it was written in the Late Middle Hittite (MH) period.

Excavations at Alalaḫ (modern Tell ʾAṯḫana/Açana), the main site of a city-state which was situated south to the Taurus mountain range in North Syria, and which is similar in political and economical structure and importance to Ugarit, yielded approximately 500 manuscripts (all published). Four pieces among these contain lexical lists; like the bulk of the material, they were found in and within the surroundings of the palace (with exact find spots undocumented); in contrast to the bulk of epigraphic finds, which turned up in levels VII (OB period) and IV (15th century), the three manuscripts were unearthed in levels I/II/III, which is roughly contemporaneous with the early 13th century, when Alalaḫ stood under Hittite rule.

Among the altogether 380 epigraphic findings from El-Amarna (ancient Aḫetaten), the temporary residence of Egyptian rulers founded by the Pharaoh Amon Hotep IV Aäenaten, there are ten lexical lists. They are part of a larger group of scholarly literature, which is opposed to the main group of manuscripts, the pharaoh's international royal correspondence. Both the diplomatic and the scholarly tablets were unearthed in the royal scribal offices or within their surroundings, with the exact find spot(s) undocumented. Together with the royal letters found in the archives, the lexical lists may date between 1340-1300 BCE.

A few manuscripts also stem from the three Levantine sites of Ashkelon, situated at the Mediterranean north to Gaza, Tell Aphek at the upper Yarkon River, and Hazor, north of the Sea of Galilee. All three cities are well known from the Amarna diplomatic letters and stood more or less permanently under the pharaoh's rule in the LBA. The epiraphic finds made at these sites are generally little; in the case of Ashkelon, the trilingual lexical list found is the sole epigraphic find. The two lists from Aphek (one trilingual, one bilingual) belong to a lot of eight manuscripts. Both the lexical tablets from Ashkelon and from Aphek were unearthed in the very last LBA layers. In contrast, the unilingual fragment from Hazor is an unstratified, and thus undatable surface find.[2]

From a principal quantitative perspective, all six smaller 'corpora' do not form the kind of representative sample which is required for extensive paleographic, linguistic, or textual-traditional investigations; within the present study, the manuscripts can be adduced as very complementary evidence only. On the other hand, the small number by which they are attested, particularly at the Levantine sites, *per se* is a peculiar fact and calls for further investigation and explanation.

---

2   H. Tadmor (1977), basing himself not on paleographic observations but on the relative grade of extension of the composition in comparison to the parallel version from Ugarit, proposes an OB date for the production of the tablet. Within the catalog in Horowitz / Oshima / Sanders 2002, it is ascribed to the LBA / MB period without explanation. Among the 15 inscriptional finds in Hazor, the catalog assigns nine pieces to the OB, and five pieces to the MB (with one piece indeterminate).

3.5. [The material basis available and the problems encountered – summary] The individual textual corpora thus, strongly differ from one another with regard to size, the period of production, the find context and its documentation, and the political and economic importance of the historical sites where they were excavated. Cf. the following overview:

	Political importance	No of manuscripts	Approximate period of production	No. of archives/ find spots	find context
Ḫattuša	imperial	130	1370-1180	3	stratified and non-stratified layers, (almost) no in-situ finds
Ugarit	regional	385	?-1180	5+3+?	mostly stratified and mostly in situ
Emar	regional	271	1330-1180	1	mostly stratified and mostly in situ
Alalaḫ	regional	4	1300-1180	1	stratified, but not exactly documented, probably in situ
El-Amarna	imperial	12	1340-1300	1	not stratified and probably not in situ
Ortaköy	local	1	1400-1350	1	not stratified and not in-situ
Aphek	local	2	1250-1180	1	stratified, probably in situ
Ashkelon	local	1	1250-1180	1	stratified, probably in situ
Hazor	local	1	unclear	1	not stratified and not in situ

4.1. [The methods applied – philological reconstruction] For the most part, the material information that the present study builds on is provided by cuneiform tablets and the texts written on them. Philological reconstruction therefore, is the basic instrument of research employed. Since much in the study depends on identifying and comparing scribal traditions, the philological reconstruction undertaken mostly seeks to restore the textual-traditional relations among the texts and manuscripts, and not so much to disclose and interpret their contents in full detail. Unraveling these textual-traditional relations mainly implies the reconstruction of textual versions and their comparison.

The identification of scribal traditions, however, not only concerns the primary level of text. A good deal of the philological investigations of the study is epigraphic or paleographic in character, thus dealing with the peculiarities of the writing, i.e., of the ductus, of sign forms, and the individual scribes' hands, as well as with the peculiarities of the writing surface, i.e., of the layout and the physical characteristics of the tablets. A specific area of philological investigation in this respect concerns the relations between these textual, paleographic and epigraphic levels, which may prove not to match in all cases.

In order to avoid circular argumentation in further analyses and in regard to the general richness of the material, the edition deviates from common Assyriologist (and Hittitologist) practice and largely avoids restoring broken-off or damaged pieces of text according to context (internal reconstruction) or according to parallel sources (external reconstruction).

4.2. [The methods applied – historical reconstruction] The textual sources of course are not only philological but also historical sources. The colophons which some of the manuscripts contain provide information about the identity of the scribes as the historical persons who have produced the material basis of the study. The archives in which the lexical tablets were found contain additional textual materials – often in huge amounts – that provide information about: the function of the buildings, their potential owners, and the users/owners professional and private activities. In the case of Emar, it is even possible, through prosopographical observations, to link the actors of the scribal school into a broader historical framework.

Altogether though, the amount of historical information obtainable from these sources is patchy, and (strictly) historical reconstructions effectively play a subordinate role within the study.

4.3. [The methods applied – quantitative comparison] Quantitative comparisons take a prominent position within the study. They owe this position to a very specific peculiarity of the textual genre: The lexical lists are quantifiable not only externally, on the level of the manuscript, but also internally, on the level of lexical entries (as for the structure of lexical lists, cf. chapter 2, sect. 3.). For almost every entry takes exactly one line on the respective manuscript, regardless of the size or format of the latter. In contrast to literary texts, the length of a recension of a specific lexical text can thus be counted, and it can be quantitatively compared to the length of parallel recensions and versions. In this respect, quantitative comparisons are mostly employed as part of philological reconstruction.

Principally, the internal quantificability of lexical texts makes it possible to balance the unequal state of preservation of the manuscripts. Thus, when e.g., quantifying specific paleographic traditions, the picture can be more informative when comparing the quantities of entries that are preserved in the respective tradition(s), and not just quantities of manuscripts, quite in analogy to the archaeologist practice of quantifying pottery according to weight and not according to the number of individual sherds. If practicable, thus, quantitative comparisons will be given both with regard to the number of manuscripts and with regard to the number of entries in the present study.

4.4. [The methods applied – qualitative methods and the theoretical framework] Qualitative methods assume a wide variety within the present study. They finally link the data gathered through philological and historical reconstruction, as well as through the quantitative assessments with the questions of research. Since the 'gap' between these questions and the data is not inconsiderable in many points – culture-historical problems are approached almost exclusively by philological and quantitative evidence – the application of qualitative methods of investigation requires a well-considered theoretical framework.

Both the functional and transmissional mechanisms underlying scribal education are manifest as specific scribal activities, and the actors performing them are the scribes. As mentioned above, the scribes of the LBA peripheral lexical lists can hardly be grasped as historical persons. They only become concrete in the shape of the traces their manual and mental activities have left on the tablets and in the texts. The respective theoretical framework that helps to link the textual features to these mental and physical (here: particularly mental) activities, is mainly generated from linguistics and psycholinguistics as well as from anthropological studies in orality-literacy research. Needless to say, the theories have to be adjusted to the quite specific characteristics of the sources, which naturally sets certain limits to their applicability.

4.5. [The methods applied – cultural-typological analogy] Cultural-typological analogy is a method frequently employed in Assyriology. The relative conservatism and uniformity of the cuneiform tradition and its institutions on the one hand, and the spotlight-like distribution of archaeological and philological evidence on the other hand, has repeatedly led scholars to transfer results that are valid for a specific geographical region and a specific historical period to other geographical and historical contexts. Taken into consideration the vast geographical and chronological dimensions of the ANE and its history, and the often, considerable spatial and temporal gaps between the cultural entities which serve as the model pattern within such analogies and the entities which are the actual subject of investigation, the cultural-typological approach must be met with the utmost caution.

To be sure, already one of the research questions put into the present study derives from some sort of cultural-typological analogy, since it would hardly be obvious without adducing parallel evidence, such as from the OB period, that the Ḫattuša lexical lists were embedded into a context of scribal education. Cultural-typological analogy, thus, is predominantly used in reconstructing the functional context of the textual materials, i.e., in reconstructing the procedures Hittite scribes employed when using, preserving, and transmitting lexical lists. The relatively broad absence of archaeological and historical sources that can be used in this regard, makes it practicable to take the relatively well-explored institution of OB scribal education as a model and deduce hypotheses from it which the extant material of the Ḫattuša tradition, but also those of the other LBA western peripheral traditions, can be checked against.[3]

While this method itself is generally applicable, it is important to be aware of the hypothetic character of the models resulting from it; for the temporal gap between the OB and the LBA schools is at least 300-400 years and Emar, which is the closest to Babylonia among the western peripheral sites, is a linear distance of about 740 km away. Whether or not the model of scribal education derived

---

3   To a limited degree, also MB traditions from Babylonia proper may serve as models; however, the anyway scarce textual materials are either badly documented (Nippur) or largely unpublished (Babylon); see chapter 2, sect. 4.4.

from the OB period forms a valid basis for the reconstruction of the functional context of the lists in Ḫattuša eventually becomes a valuable indicator for the validity of the method itself.

5. [The structure of the study] The study follows a three-step design. The first main part (part A) consists of conceptual and theoretical preconsiderations. It includes a historical and structural description of the genre of lexical lists and of its specific functional embedding in other historical periods (chapter 2), a diversification of the various aspects that make up textual and cultural transmission, in particular regard to the question of orality and literacy and the processes of short-distance transmission (chapter 3), as well as a theoretical concept of long-distance transmission that displaces conventional linear and unidirectional models of textual tradition in favor of an interferential, areal-based model (chapter 4).

A detailed description of the textual corpus forms the sizable second part of the study (part B). In a series of chapters, the textual material is surveyed according to various aspects, i.e., according to paleographic and epigraphic aspects (chapter 5 & 8), archival and archaeological (chapter 6 & 7), linguistic (chapter 9 & 10), and textual-traditional aspects (chapters 11 & 12). The description thereby attempts to be as complete as possible, cursorily including also aspects that are not of immediate relevance for the main research questions. Wherever possible, it makes use of comparative evidence gathered from the parallel LBA Syrian corpora.

The third part (part C, chapter 13) links the data derived in the second part with the research questions on basis of the theoretical and conceptual guidelines that have been established in the first part. It summarizes and evaluates the evidence that can be adduced for a reconstruction of the functional and the transmissional context of the lists. When possible, it proposes some eventual historical scenarios.

The appendix gives a description of the manuscripts used (part D) as well as a re-worked edition of the Ḫattuša lexical list (part E). It further includes a list of references (part F) and a list of abbreviations (part G).

6.1. [Brief history of research – lexical lists in general] The following history of research concentrates on the philological research on lexical lists and on the cultural studies that explore their social and cultural context. For systematical reasons, aspects which do not directly concern lexical lists as philological sources but which concern the broader transmissional and functional context is deferred to chapters 2-4, which deal with the wider theoretical framework of the study.

The history of research of Mesopotamian lexical lists, their functional, cultural, and transmissional context has been elaborately discussed by N. Veldhuis in his study on scribal education in the OB site of Nippur (1997). The two major innovations Veldhuis' seminal study establishes are (1) to make extensive use of formal characteristics of the manuscripts within their study and interpretation

as well as (2) to (re-)site the study and investigation of the lists into their historical context, which is the context of scribal education. It in this respect positions itself in the fore of two 'scientific turns' that have reached Assyriology in the late 1980s; they regard the 'text' as a kind of material (and not just mental) evidence and approach it from the circumstances of its production. The present study conceives of itself as standing in clear continuity with this tradition, making as much use as possible of formal aspects of the manuscripts and focusing on the functional interfaces of the texts with their context(s).

Substantially new contributions having appeared since Veldhuis' account are limited in number: P. Gesche (2000), in many respects following the method put forward by Veldhuis, reconstructs the scribal education in the Neo Babylonian (NB) and the Late Babylonian (LB) period. Again N. Veldhuis (2004) explores in detail the relationship between lexical lists and literary texts in scholarly traditions. M. Gantzert (2008 & 2011), apart from giving a refurbished edition of the lexical texts from Emar and a detailed structural description of the individual compositions preserved, attempts to theoretically interpretet the lists as specific representations of an epistemic system by applying specific anthroplogical/social-scientific models to them (M. Foucault, J. Goody, Cl. Lévi-Strauss). So similarly proceeds M. Hilgert (2009), who also describes the lists as part of an epistemic system and further attempts to introduce post-structuralistic perspectives into the analysis.

6.2.1. [Brief history of research – the Ḫattuša corpus – 1st phase of research] The initial phase of research on lexical lists unearthed in Ḫattuša was strongly coined by the philologists' interest in the Hittite-Akkadian lexical equations that these texts provided. As the lexical and linguistic structure of Hittite was largely unknown, lexical lists promised to provide the initial clue. In this respect, it is surely not by chance that among the 59 manuscripts published in the first volume of *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköy* (KBo.) by H.H. Figulla in 1916, there were no less than 27 representative lexical texts. Before these manuscripts were made available in copy, F. Delitzsch (1916) had treated them in a lengthy article, also providing an extract of the grammar and lexicon of the Hittite language as it appeared from the lists. A reply to this work was given by H.A. Sayce (1914), giving further comments on individual entries. H. Holma (1916) equally refers to Delitzsch's reconstructions, however approaching the texts by the question of the linguistic affiliation of the Hittite language.

It was to E. Weidner's merit to offer the hitherto most comprehensive study of the corpus (1917), attempting to get beyond the results by Delitzsch (1914) by deciphering additional equations and expanding Delitzsch's glossary and grammatical outline. Many of the interpretations given in these accounts appear somewhat naive to the modern researcher, since they (necessarily, but mistakenly) presuppose the reliability and the exact one-to-one correspondence of the lexical equations in the lists; yet, the studies are no doubt to be appreciated and credited as impressive, pioneering works.

6.2.2. [Brief history of research – the Ḫattuša corpus – 2nd phase of research] When the philological knowledge of Hittite had become more solid and the Mesopotamian parallel tradition had been studied more profoundly, the research on the lexical texts from Ḫattuša entered a second phase, which also included the cultural and historical embedding of the lists into the investigation. Individual textual parallels with the Mesopotamian tradition were already pointed out by F. Delitzsch (1914). H.S. Schuster (1938) was the first scholar to identify individual lexical compositions as parallel to compositions that were already known from the Mesopotamian tradition. After additional yields of lexical tablets had been unearthed in the 1930s, H.G. Güterbock established a catalog of all series and sources preserved (as part of Laroche 1957), and it was as well Güterbock who – since then – treated the Boĝazköy sources in the individual volumes of *Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon* (MSL). Due to the conceptual restrictions of this publication series, translations were often provided only for the Hittite column and commentary was only given occasionally. A recent revision of the corpus, with many detailed annotations to individual manuscripts is provided by M. Weeden (forthc.), who also surveys the lists as to their potential role as sources for the Hittite logograms inventory.

More intrinsic studies, which also take into account the cultural and textual-traditional background of the texts are von Soden / Otten 1986, von Weiher 1972, and Wilhelm 1989, which in any case only address single texts and thus small fractions of the whole corpus. Besides that, various scholars use the lists as a basis for shorter lexicographic studies and treat the relevant passages in their cultural studies or for commentary on other texts. The question of textual transmission of Hittite scholarly literature has only come more into the focus of research in recent decades with, again, most prominently Wilhelm 1989, but also Beckman 1983a and Klinger 2005, which mainly concentrate on the question of possible intermediaries involved in the transfer from Mesopotamia to the West. A systematic and comprehensive philological treatment of the corpus is still missing, as is a study of the transmissional and functional aspects which build onto a whole set of available textual materials. The present study aims at bridging this gap.

6.2.3. [Brief history of research – the Ḫattuša corpus – scribal culture] Within the last decade, the thematic field of scribes, of scribal culture, scribal practices, and their organization, has come to the very fore in Assyrioligist and, particularly, in Hittitologist studies. Scholars thereby expand on two main thematic complexes, i.e., (1) the question from which source the 'Hittites' adopted cuneiform and the scribal craft, and (2) the question of how the scribal activities were organized within and around the scriptoria of ancient Ḫattuša. Scribal education plays an important role in both thematic complexes.

The discussion about the origin of Hittite cuneiform and Hittite scribal practice (cf. most recently Klinger 1998, Klinger 2005, van den Hout 2009a, van den Hout 2009b, and Weeden

forthc.) is a controversial one – a feature which is mostly on account of the general scarcity of the textual sources from the relevant historical period. Since the attestation of lexical lists concentrates within the last historical phase of the Hittite Empire, the potential contributions of this genre to the debate are virtually nil. The present study thus excludes questions concerning the origin of Hittite cuneiform writing.

Studies concerned with the organization of the Hittite scribal craft and the Hittite scriptoria involve Torri 2008, Gordin 2010, Weeden 2011, and Gordin forthc. The issue of scribal education plays a minor role in these studies. Where it is touched upon (Torri 2008 and Weeden 2011) it is dealt with on the cultural-typological assumption that it worked more or less the same way as in Mesopotamian schools. The present study aims at dissociating itself from this analogy as far as possible. It takes alternative functional contexts into consideration in which the lists could have been embedded, and surveys alternative educational procedures and textual materials as potentially involved in Hittite scribal education.

6.3.1. [Brief history of research – the parallel corpora – Ugarit] Following the dates of the relevant archaeological campaigns, lexical lists from Ugarit have been published in three phases, with main publications in Viorellaud 1929, as well as Thureau-Dangin 1931 and 1932 (1st phase, mainly involving the finds of the 1920s, from 'Maison du Grand-Prêtre' Ug-GP), Nougayrol 1968 (2nd phase, involving the tablets unearthed in the 1960s, mainly from 'Maison de Rap'aanu' Ug-Rap, but also from 'Maison aux tablettes littéraires' Ug-MT and from the 'Lamaštu archive' Ug-Lam), as well as Arnaud 1982, André-Salvini 1991, André-Salvini 2004, and André-Salvini / Salvini 1998 & 1999 (3rd phase, involving tablet finds from the 1970s until the 1990s, from 'Maison de Urteenu' Ug-Urt and from 'Centre Ville' Ug-CV). Quite a number of manuscripts have been dealt with in the volumes of *MSL* (mostly by D. Kennedy and M. Civil); a good deal of Ugarit lexical tablets, however – particularly from the 2nd and 3rd phase – still await publication.

A comprehensive study of the functional and transmissional context of the Ugarit lexical lists has to be postponed until their complete publication, as the volume of unpublished material is too great; however, cf. the preliminary studies: Krecher 1968b, van Soldt 1995, and passages in van Soldt 1991. The present study attempts to reach beyond these preliminary studies by making use of the whole corpus of hitherto published texts, and by systematically adducing parallel material from other sites and integrating the material into a consistent theoretical framework.

Of complementary use thereby are Hawley 2008, Hawley forthc. and, again, van Soldt 1995, which deal with scribal education in Alphabetic-Ugaritic writing and attempt to reconstruct its relation to the scribal education in syllabic cuneiform as represented by the lists.

6.3.2. [Brief history of research – the parallel corpora – Emar] The corpus of lexical lists from Emar has in its entirety been published by D. Arnaud (1985-87), together with the remaining documents in Sumerian and Akkadian and comprising hand copies as well as composite transliterations. Further comments and additions to individual manuscripts are given by M. Civil (1989). M. Gantzert (2008) provides a re-edition of the material on basis of the copies in Arnaud 1985-87, providing transliterations of each manuscript, giving new textual interpretations, and proposing additional joins. References given in the present study refer to the manuscripts as reconstructed in Gantzert 2008.

In his (mainly prosopographical) study on the scribes of Emar, Y. Cohen (2009) in greater extent also deals with scribal education and with the lexical lists as a part of the scholarly texts, assigning the individual manuscripts to the two concurring scribal traditions present at the site (Syrian and Syro-Hittite) as well as reconstructing the scholarly tradition (separately for each scribal tradition). The present study adds a further perspective on the Emar material by systematically confronting it with its LBA Syrian and Anatolian context.

6.3.3. [Brief history of research – the parallel corpora – the smaller corpora] Lexical lists of the smaller corpora have mainly been dealt with in the respective primary editions, as for which cf. Süel / Soysal 2003 (Ortaköy), Wiseman 1953 and Lauinger 2005 (Alalaḫ), Huehnergard / van Soldt 1999 (Ashkelon), Tadmor 1977 (Hazor) and Rainey 1975 and 1976 (Aphek); as for El-Amarna, see below. An isolated LBA lexical text of unknown, probably Syrian provenance, has been edited by W.H. van Soldt (1993). A large selection of the manuscripts from Alalaḫ and El-Amarna have been included into the respective volumes of *MSL*.

The functional and transmissional context of the lexical lists of the smaller corpora was rarely subjected to scrutinizing treatment. In his revised edition of the scholarly tablets from El-Amarna, Sh. Izre'el (1997) also includes a synopsis of scribal-training activities as recoverable from these epigraphic sources. Investigations of scribal activities and of scribal education in the Syro-Palestinian area are Demsky 1990 and van der Toorn 2000, basing their hypotheses on analogies with the traditions of El-Amarna, Ugarit, and Babylonia, however. An evaluation of the material that is more cautious with regard to overall hypotheses is Edzard 1985. The present study attempts to (re-) evaluate the smaller corpora from the viewpoint of the three main corpora, also taking aspects of the broader theoretical framework into consideration.