



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The transmissional and functional context of the lexical lists from Hattuša 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 Hattuša and from the contemporaneous traditions in Late-Bronze-Age Syria*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/19986>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/19986>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/19986> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Scheucher, Tobias Simon

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

Issue Date: 2012-10-18

Part E: A revised edition of the Ḫattuša lexical lists

The following edition of the lexical lists from Ḫattuša is based on the copies as edited in KBo. and KUB. The manuscripts stored at the *Vorderasiatische Museum Berlin* were additionally read from the original tablets; the manuscripts stored in the *Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi Ankara* were additionally read from the photographs as in the possession of the *Akademie der Wissenschaften Mainz*.

The sequence of manuscripts follows the sequence as in the catalog in part D.

The numbering of the errors and mistakes given in the footnotes refers to the respective list in chapter 10, sect. 4.

SVo Bo. A = KUB 3,114 (Bo. 7346)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
l.	1'	[] [] [] []	[] [] [] []
		(break)	
r.	1'	ṛtam ¹⁷ -[ma]	[]
		tam-tam-m[a] tam-tam-m[a]	[] []
		ug ₄ -g[a]	[]
	5'	ug ₄ -g[a]	[]
		[ug ₄ -u]g ₄ -g[a]	[]
		(break)	

SaV Bo. A = KBo. 26,34 (902/z)

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
i'	1'	[I] [I] [I]	[I PAD] [I PAD] [I PAD]	[] [] []
		[I]	[I ḪAR]	[]
	5'	[I] [I] [I] [I] [I]	[I ḪAR] [I ḪAR] [I ḪAR] [I ḪAR] [I ḪAR]	[] []-ṛx ¹ [] [a-ra]-ru [e-ru]-ú
		[I]	[I AḪ]	[ki-iš-pu]
i'	10'	[I]	[I AḪ]	[]

i' 2'f. The sign which precedes <ḪAR> in the usual sign order of S^a is <PAD>. Possible Akkadian counterparts to Hitt. ar-ṛx¹-a-aš thus are Akk. *šutuḫū* “reed-hut” and *kurummatu* “food allocation” (cf. can. Ea 3 225ff.). Hitt. *walluwanza* “praised, blessed” could result from a paralexia pād for pad, as Sum. pād is usually set against Akk. *nabû* “to nominate, invoke”.

i' 4' The confusion between <ḪU> and <RI> (No. 053) in (5) is particularly plausible as <ḪU> is the euphonic continuation of preceding <AḪ>.

i' 5' The Akkadian equivalent to Hittite *dankuli-* should be *annaku* “tin”, as to which there is no ready link with Sum. ḪUR.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]-iš	-	-
[i]š	-	-
[i]š	-	-
[i]š	-	-
<hr/>		
[]	-	-
<hr/>		
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
<hr/>		
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
<hr/>		
[]	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]- ^r aš ¹	-	-
^r ar ¹ - ^r x ¹ -a-aš	-	-
wa-al-lu-wa-an-za	-	“praised, blessed”
<hr/>		
ḫa-aḫ-ri(HU) ¹	-	“lung”
da-an-ku-li-iš	-	a metal
ḪUR.SAG-aš	-	“mountain”
ḫur-da-iš	“miller ^{to curse} ”	“curse”
^{NA4} ARA ₅ -aš	“millstone”	“millstone”
<hr/>		
al-wa-an-za-tar	-	“sorcery”
YA- ^r Ú ¹² -I-IŠ ¹	-	see note

- i' 6' If the Hittite is correct Sum. ḫur is used in taxilexis for ḫur-saḡ. However, since ḪUR.SAG is a very prominent logogram in Hittite cuneiform, it may be the result of an ad-hoc translation.
- i' 7'f. (2) possibly contained reduplicated <ḪAR>; see note to SaV Bo. B = KBo. 1,45 obv. 6'f.
- i' 7' Like in the parallel entry SaV Bo. B = KBo. 1,45 obv. 6, Akk. *ararru* “miller” has been confused with Akk. *arāru* “to curse” according to the Hittite translation (No. 217a). However, note that, while the parallel uses the verbal noun Hitt. *ḫurzakiawar*, the present manuscripts translates Akk. /parās/ by a common Hittite noun.
- i' 10' According to the parallel SaV Bo. B = KBo. 1,34 obv. 9' the (obviously mistaken) sequence of signs in (5)

col.	I.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
i'	11'	[I]	[I AḪ]	[]- <i>na-bu</i>
		[I]	[I ḪU]	[<i>pa-ra-s</i>]ú [?]
		[I]	[I ḪU]	[<i>na-ap-ru-š</i>]u [?]
		[I]	[I ḪU]	[]- ^r x ¹
	15'	[I]	[I ḪU]	[]
		[I]	[I SED _{1/3}]	[]
		[I]	[I SED _{1/3}]	[]
		[I]	[I SED _{1/3}]	[]
		[I]	[I SED _{1/3}]	[]
			(break)	
ii'	1'	I e[l]- ^r x ¹ -[] <i>na-aš-^rš^u¹-ul-pa-ak-ku</i>	[I GEŠPU [?]]	[]
		I pa-a-da <i>i-ki-iš-pa-ak-ku</i>	I PÀ[D]	[]
	5'	I ḫa <i>wa-i-si</i>	I ḪA	[]
		I za-aḫ <i>ḫa-i-s[i]</i>	[I Ḫ]A : za-aḫ	[]
		I ku <i>qa-i-[x]</i>	[I ḪA]	[]
		I za-ḫa-an	[I ḪA-A]	[]

must represent Hitt. *iššalli* “spittle” (No. 242). The sign read <Ú>[?] could therefore also be identified as <AL>[?], which is possible according to the photo.

i' 11' The Hittite can either be linked to CLuw. *walanti-* “dead” or CLuw. **wallanti-* “fit, capable” (as reconstructed from privative *niwallant(i)-* “incapable, unskilled”); both interpretations more or less fit the vertical context. Possible restorations in (4) are Akk. *ḫanābu* “to sprout” (to Hitt. *wallanti-* “capable”), Akk. *ḫanāpu* “to act impiously” or Akk. *ṭanāpu* “to be/become dirty” (according to the vertical context).

i' 12' According to the Hittite translation, the root Akk. *prš* has been confused with the root *prs* (No. 199).

i' 14' Hitt. *kappuwar* is very probably based on an erroneous interpretation of the Akkadian. There is no Akkadian counterpart known to Sum. ḪU, which would fit the Hittite translation.

i' 15' As noted by W. von Soden / H. Otten (1968: 40), Hitt. *šuwai-* is hapax legomenon, but may be the word hidden behind the logogram MUŠEN. Also see Rößle 2004.

ii' 1'f. Since <ḪA> is preceded by <ŠUB> in the usual sign order of S^a, and since the following sign <PÀD> is a compound based on <ŠUB>, the present entry must contain a compound which is based on this sign. The sign name seems to contradict this on first sight; However, accepting the reading of the third sign, which rather appears like <KU> on the photo, and regarding as an insertion or as a mistake for <UB>, one could identify the name as *ḡeš-šub-ak-ku*, which denotes the sign <GEŠPU>. The interpretation would be confirmed by the traces preserved of the reading in l. 1': the first sign is very likely to be restored as <SIKIL>, thus matching the initial parts of the known readings [illar], [illuru], [illuli].

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>wa-al-la-an(MAŠ)¹-ti-iš</i>	-	see note
<i>kar-¹ša¹-u-wa-ar</i>	“to flutter ^{to cut} ”	“to cut”
<i>wa-at-ku-wa-ar</i>	“to fly”	“to flee, jump”
<i>kap-pu-u-wa-ar</i>	-	“to count, check”
<i>šu-wa-iš</i>	-	see note
<i>SÈD-an-za</i>	-	“winter”
<i>ta-ri-ya-aš-ḥa-aš</i>	-	“weariness”
<i>wa-ar-ši-ya-tar</i>	-	“to calm down, be content”
<i>¹wa-ar-ši¹-[x]</i>	-	-
 []	-	-
 []	-	-
 []	-	-
 []	-	-
 []	-	-
 []	-	-

Due to the blank space in l. 2' (2), the entry probably contained a single Akkadian equation only (see following note).

ii' 3'f. The sign name must be analyzed as Akk. *igi-šub-akku*. In the ordinary sign sequence of S^a, the sign <PÀD> is missing. Interestingly, it has been inserted after <ŠUB>, and not after <IGI>. Since PÀD is not repeated in l. 4' (2), the section probably contained a single Akkadian equivalent only (cf. the repetition in ll. 13'ff.).

ii' 5'-7' Note that, other than suggested by l. 6', the reading [zaḥ] is not attested for <ḤA>. The sign actually reading [zaḥ], i.e., <ḤA-A>, is treated in the following section.

As to the terms following the reading in (1), i.e. wa-i-si, ḥa-i-si, and qa-is-[si]², there seems to be no ready interpretation. According to the preceding and following entries, they should actually represent sign names. However, the name of the sign <ḤA> invariably appears as *ku-u_{1/2}-a* (cf. Gong 2000: 149f.). Probably, the second and the third sign of the three peculiar expressions are identical (this is certain for the second one, which is <I>, whereas the third one, <SI>, is broken in l. 7'; the interpretation of l. 6 is tentative); and it is therefore the initial element which is varied: wa / ḥa / qa. Possibly the elements must be interpreted as reflecting the respective readings (ḥa = ḥa-i-si; a-a = wa-i-si; ku = qa-i-si; with positions 1 and 2 inverted, then).

ii' 8' Although the reading [zaḥan] is otherwise not attested for <ḤA-A>, but only the readings [zaḥa] and [zaḥ], it is very likely this (compound) sign which is to be restored in (2): <ḤA-A> is the sign to follow <ḤA> in the *Ea* sequence (cf. can. Ea 4 113), and the sign in question must be based on <ḤA>, since the following section equally deals with a compound based on <ḤA>.

col.	I.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
ii'	10'	I ḥa <i>kiš-ki-qa-nu</i>	I [G]I[R]	[]
		I kar 'kiš ¹ -ki-qa-nu	I GI[R]	[]
		I li	I LI	[]
		I la	I LA : l[a-a]	[]
	15'	I lu-ub <i>lu(KU)'-mu</i>	I LUM : lu(KU)'-u[m]	[]
		I lu-ub <i>lu(KU)'-mu</i>	I LUM : lu(KU)'-um	[]
		'I' [x-x] <i>lu-mu</i>	I LUM : ḥu-ub	[]
		[x-x] 'x ¹	'x ¹	[]
		(break)		
iii'	1'	[I] 'x ¹ -[]	[]	[]
		I 'x ¹ -[]	[]	[]
		'en ¹ -[]		
		I 'x ¹ -[]	[]	[]
	5'	'x ¹ -[]		
		[I] [?] 'x ¹ - ¹ az ¹ -[]	[]	[]
		<i>te-eš</i> []		
		I []	[]	[]
		(break)		
iv'	1'	[I]	[]	[]-'x ¹
		[I]	[]	[]-'x ¹ - <i>im-mu</i>
		[I a-an]	[I AN : a-an]	[ša-m]u-u
		[I]	[I AN]	[ša-q]ú-ú

ii' 9f. Although the readings which this section preserves do not match those which are usually given for the sign <GIR>, and although the sign name also poses some interpretative problems, the present section very likely addresses this sign. This strongly suggests itself from the traces in ii 10' (2) and from the fact that <GIR> is a compound based on <ḤA>. In *Ea*, <GIR> usually follows <ḤA> and <ḤA-A> (can. Ea 4 117).

The usual readings of <GIR> are [peš] and [g/kir]. While present [kar] may correspond to the latter, [peš] is remarkably missing. The reading preserved instead may represent ḥa₆, which is, according to Borger 2010, not attested in lexical lists.

Within the sign name, the final sequence *-qa-nu* very likely represents the element *-gunû*, whereas the meaning of the initial sequence *kiš-ki* is opaque. The name of the sign <GIR> actually is ḤA-*gunû*, implying then that *kiš-ki* should somehow represent *ku-u_{1/2}-a*.

ii' 13'-16' The present section shows a series of inconsistencies. Despite the fact that <LU> appears as <KU> in most cases (No. 055), the readings in (1) do not correspond to those in (2) (SyllSum. lub vs. lum), and the readings with final [b] (lub, ḥub) are otherwise not attested. Note in this respect that the reading SyllSum. ḥub can also be found in SaV Em. 537A+ ii 18', which apparently represents a textual version very close to the present one.

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	5'	[I ti-in-ki-ir] [I]	[I AN : ti-in-ki-ir] [I AN : i-il]	[i]-lu ₄ ʿelʷ-lu ₄
		[I mu-ul]	[I NAB]	zap(NAB)ʹ-pu
		[I mu-ul]	[I NAB]	nap-pa-aḥ-ḥu
		[I mu-ul]	[I MUL]	kā-ak-ka ₄ -bu
iv	10'	[I šu-ḥu-ub]	[I (ŠÚ.)MUL :]	ša-ḥu-pa-tu ₄
		[I ḥa-al]	[I ḪAL :]	[LÚ]ḪAL
		[I ḥa-al]	[I ḪAL :]	[pí-r]i-eš-tu ₄
		[I ḥa-al]	[I ḪAL :]	[ša-mu-u _{1/2}]
		[I ur]	[I UR]	[UR]
	15'	[I]	[I UR :]	[]
		[I]	[I UR :]	[]
(break)				

SaV Bo. B = KBo. 1,45 (VAT 7434a)

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
obv.ʹ	1'	[]	[ḪAR]	[x]-ʿxʷ-rù
		[]	[ḪAR]	[a-r]a-rù
		[]	[ḪAR]	ʿZAʷ-a-u
		[]	[ḪAR]	ša-a-rù

- iv' 6' The restorations in (3) and (4) are tentative; according to the photo they are possible. The alternative restoration Akk. *awīlu* = Hitt. *LÚ-iš* appears less probable. Note that, if the restorations are correct, the Akkadogram used in (5) is not fully matching the meaning of the Akkadian (No. 231).
- iv' 7' Due to the Hittite translation, the interpretation offered by H. Otten / W. von Soden (1968: 40), i.e., regarding Akk. *NAB-pu* as a mistake for *zap(ERIM)-pu* (No. 056), is convincing, although the parallel version from Emar preserves the entry *NAB = nab-bu* in this position. The mistake is quite notable, as <NAB> seems to be attracted by the occurrence of the same sign in the following line, being thus a typical textual-interference error.
- iv' 8' The equation Sum./Akk. *mul = napāḥu* is restricted to the verbal aspect of *nph* “to blow, light up, rise” (and does not apply to the nominal forms “smith” and “bellow”) and herein, to the meaning “to light up, rise” (as opposed to “to blow”). Strikingly, the Hittite scribe based his translation on the incompatible meaning “to blow (an instrument)” (No. 238).
- iv' 10' Akk. *šaḥuppātu* is a variant of *šuhuppātu*, only attested in the present manuscript. The usual Sumerian counterpart of Akk. *šuhuppātu* is ŠÚ.MUL. The only lexical attestation is in OB Aa 140 (set against Sum MUL). Since writing out the sign name of the compound variant would require more space than is available, the tablet either contained the single variant or had dropped the sign name.
- iv' 13' The equation Sum./Akk. *ḪAL = šamû* is otherwise not attested. It may therefore derive from interference between <ḪAL> and <AN>.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
DINGIR ^{LIM} -iš	“god”	“god”
LÚ[EL-L]U [?]	“pure, holy”	“pure, noble, free”
ku[r-t]a-a-al	“the pleiades”	“the pleiades”
pa-ri-pa-ri-ya-u-wa-ar	“to blow ^{an instrument} , light up”	“to blow an instrument”
[h]a-aš-te-er-za	“star”	“star”
[i]š-tap-pa-an-da	“(a pair of) shoes”	“(a pair of) shoes”
LÚHAL-aš	“divination priest”	“divination priest”
zi-[]-x ¹ -x ¹	“secret”	-
ʿne ¹ -pi-[i]š	“sky”	“sky”
UR.GI ₇ -[x]	“dog”	“dog”
hu-u-it-[]	-	-
x ¹ -[]	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
ʿx-x-x ¹ -[]-eš ^{1?} -[]	-	-
hu-u-wa-ar-ʿza-ki-u-wa ¹ -ar	“miller ^{to curse} ”	“to curse”
pa-aḥ-ḥi-eš-ki-u-wa-ar	see note	hapax leg.
ku-ru-ur ap-pa-tar	see note	“(to be) hostile”

- iv' 15' The 'second' Akkadian equivalent of Sum. UR, following Akk. *kalbu*, is Akk. *bāšu* “to be ashamed” with its derivations *bāštu* “dignity”, and *būštu* “shame”. There is no Hittite equivalent to these terms which is based on a root *hui(t)*-. The Hittite is rather to be interpreted as derivation of *huittiya*- “to draw, pull” than as *huitar* “animals, creatures” due to the orthography. H. Otten / W. v. Soden (1968: 41) read *hu-u-da-[ak]* “suddenly”.
- obv. 2' According to the Hittite translation, Akk. *ararru* “miller” has been confused with *arāru* “to curse” (No. 216b). Hitt. *huwarzaki*- (/huwart-ske-/) is the *-ške*- extended form of Hitt. *huwart*-; however, the durative-iterative meaning seems to have been lost, both forms being interchangeable. The use of *-ške*- therefore does not have a morphological counterpart in the Akkadian column. Also note the contrast between the *ablaut* variants Hitt. *huwart*- and *hurt*- (l. 6') which occur side by side within the same section.
- obv. 3' The term Akk. *ZA-a-u* is unclear. CAD quotes it as *za'u* “resin”. Also note the entry SyllSum./OrthSum./Akk. *za-an-ga* = NI = *za'u ša ī* “exudation, said of oil” (can. Ea 2 22), which connects the term to the semantic field of grinding. A quite similar interpretation emerges when connecting the entry with Akk. *šāhu*, which denotes something like an oil maker's oven.
- As for a short discussion of the Hittite, cf. CHD sub *paḥḥeški*- (with further references).
- obv. 4' As to Akk. *ZA-a-ru*, the following two interpretations are possible on the basis of Sum. *ḪAR*: (1) It could represent a West Semitic cognate of Akk. *šemeru* (Assyrian variant *šawiru*), whereby /m/ or /w/ is weakened to /'/ or even assimilated: cf. Syr. *še'ro* and Hebr. *šer* (possibly loaned from Akkadian; NA *sa'uru/sa'iru* also belongs

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
obv. ¹	5'	[] [] []	[ḪAR] [ḪAR] [ḪAR]	<i>ša-ra-ru-u</i> [a-r]a-ru [e-ru]- ^r ú ¹
		[u _{1/2} -uh] [u _{1/2} -uh]	[AḪ] [AḪ]	[ki-iš-pu] [ru-'tu _{3/4}]
obv. ¹	10'	[u _{1/2} -uh] [u _{1/2} -uh] [] []	[AḪ] [AḪ] [AḪ] [AḪ]	[] [] [] []
(break)				
rev. ¹	1'	[] [] [] []	[KU] [KU] [KU] [KU]	^r eb ¹ -lu ₄ aš-lu ₄ li-iḫ-mu el-lu _e
	5'	[]	[KU]	ú-te-eq-qú

to this group). Akk. *šemeru* is generally equated with Sum ḫar. (2) It may represent a parallel to the terms listed in can. Urta 5 90f., where one finds the entries Sum./Akk. ḡeš-UD-SAR-mar-gíd-da = *sarru* “crescent- or half-moon-shaped segment of a wheel” and ḡeš-kak-UD-SAR-mar-gíd-da = *sarrāru* “peg fastening the two segments of a wheel”. Although neither of the terms is set against Sum. ḪAR, both also denote a circular-shaped object. Moreover, the suggested reconstruction could also account for the equation in the following entry.

Regardless of the reconstructed original meaning of the Akkadian – according to the Hittite it seems to have been confused with either Akk. *šrr* “to be hostile” or *z'r* “to dislike”. As for Akk. *šrr*, which in regard of semantics seems to be the better interpretation, note that this root is only present as adjective *šerru* “enemy, hostile” in Akkadian. The Hittite translation as infinitive only makes sense if the Akkadian was analyzed according to a weak pattern (*šarr* or *šār*), which is frequent in West Semitic languages (chapter 9, sect. 2.3.4.).

obv. 5' Like in the preceding entry, there are several possible interpretations of the Akkadian based on Sum. ḪAR: It may represent (1) a previously unknown derivation of Akk. *šemeru* “ring”, cf. the previous note, (2) Akk. *sarrāru* “peg fastening the two segments of a wheel”, which must be considered more likely (cf. the argumentation in the previous note), or (3) Akk. *sarrarû*, once attested in can. Urta 8 170 and possibly denoting a reed bundle. This is the only variant which preserves a lengthened final /u/.

The Hittite translation is possibly based on Akk. *šarāru* “to flow, drip”, which would fairly suit the meaning of Hitt. *šalliya-* “to melt down”.

obv. 6'f. Possibly, there has to be restored reduplicated ḪAR in (2). Otherwise ll. 2' and 6' would contain identical equations; the Sumerogram used in the Hittite column, also points into this direction. However, Akk. *erû* appears to be far more often set against single ḪAR, and obv. 2' and 6' could theoretically have been differentiated according to contrasting readings assigned to <ḪAR>.

obv. 6' Like in l 2', Akk. *ararru* “miller” has according to the Hittite translation been confused with *arāru* “to curse” (No. 216b). Moreover note the different root variants of Akk. *ḫu(wa)rt-* used in ll. 2' and 6'.

obv. 8'.13' That the present section deals with the sign <AḪ> is very likely since <AḪ> is the sign to follow <ḪAR> in S^a. This raises the problem that none of the sememes given in (4), i.e. [sorcery] and [spittle], is usually identified

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>šal-la-u-wa-ar</i>	see note “to flow, drip”?	“to melt down”?
<i>hur-za-ki-u-wa-ar</i>	“miller ^{to curse} ”	“to curse”
^{NA4} ARA ₅ -aš	“millstone”	“millstone”
<i>al-wa-an-za-tar</i>	“sorcery”	“sorcery”
<i>iš-ša-al-li</i>	“(poisonous) spittle”	“spittle”
<i>ma-an-za</i>	-	see note
[iš-š]a-al-la-an-za	-	“spitting / spat at”
[x]- ¹ x ¹ -ša-an-za	-	-
[x-x]- ¹ x-x ¹	-	-
¹ iš ¹ -hi-ma-na-aš	“rope”	“rope”
<i>šu-ma-an-za</i>	“rope, tow rope”	“rope”
<i>i-šu-wa-ni-it wa-a-tar</i>	“mud”	“water with dirt”
<i>a-ra-u-wa-ni-iš</i>	“pure, holy”	“free, noble”
<i>iš-ta-ma-aš-šu-u-wa-ar</i>	“to wait, pay attention”	“to listen, perceive”

with this sign. Note however, that the Sumerian word for “spittle”, Sum. úḫ, is a homophone of AḪ, and may thus form the basis for a phonetic paralexism here. The equation with Akk. *kišpu* can then be regarded as a further semantical paralexism to AḪ = *rūtu*.

The alternative restoration would be a ligature based on <KA> (cf. Sum. KAXBAD-zu, KAXME-ḡar, set against Akk. *kišpu*, and Sum. KAXLI and KAXIM, which are set against Akk. *rūtu*). However, the insertion after <ḪAR> would be quite unusual

- obv. 10' Hitt. *manza* is hapax legomenon, very likely to be connected with more frequently attested Hitt. *mantalli-*, which presumably is a derivation of it. The meaning of the term, however, is not quite clear. From its position between Hitt. *iššalli-* and *iššalanza*, it very probably denotes a quality perceived as negative.
- rev. 1'-6' The present section actually deals with the sign <ŠÈ>, although the sign in l. 6 clearly is <KU>. As for the disregarding of this distinction, which is a general characteristic of the manuscript, see the problematical entry in rev. 4' (with note), and also the entries 7'f.
- rev. 1' The nominative of Hitt. *išḫiman(a)-* usually shows the form *išḫimāš*, while the accusative and the oblique case endings take the extended stem *išḫimana-*. The present form is unique.
- rev. 3' Akk. *liḫmu*, which is hapax legomenon, is to be connected with Akk. *luḫummû* and its variant *luḫmû*.
- rev. 4' The equation cannot be properly explained in connection with the sign <ŠÈ>. Possibly it forms a semantical paralexism to the equation Sum./Akk. ŠÈ = *rubû*. More likely, however, it is based on the phonetic paralexism <KU> for <KÛ>, thus implying that the present section was actually taken to deal with <KU> and that the distinction between <ŠÈ> and <KU> is generally disregarded in the present manuscript.
- Hitt. *arawanni-* “free” only gives a specialized meaning of Akk. *ellu*. Note in this respect that the Akkadogram *ELLU* is almost exclusively used in this meaning, Hitt. *ELLU* possibly even representing Hitt. *arawanni-* (cf. Hittite Laws 2:91: *takku*^{LU}*ELLUM arauwanniuš ... wenzi* “If a free man rapes free women...”; No. 231).
- rev. 5' The present equation can be linked to can. Ea 1 175, whereby ŠÈ (reading ḫun) is set against Akk. *nāḫu*, which is semantically close to Akk. *ūteqqû*.

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	6'	□	KU	<i>ru-bu-ú</i>
		□	KU	<i>lu-bu-uš-tù</i>
		□	KU	<i>šú-u-bá-tu₄</i>
		[]- ^r x ¹ - <i>du-gul-la-ag-ga</i>	KUxLÁL	<i>zu-u</i>
rev.!	10'	[k]u	KUxIGI	<i>ší-in-ḫu</i>
		□	LU	<i>ša-ba-tù</i>
		□	LU	<i>kà-mu-u</i>
		□	LU	<i>re-'-ú</i>
		□	LU	<i>ri-tù-ú</i>
	15'	□	LU	<i>du-uš-šú-ú</i>
		□	LU	<i>ma-a-du₄</i>
		□	[L]U	<i>ma-du-tu₄</i>
		□	[LU]	<i>LÚ-lu₄</i>
		□	[LU]	<i>ni-i-šu</i>
rev.!	20'	□	[LU]	<i>te-ni-šu</i>
		□	[LU]	<i>^rtá¹-ya-ru</i>
(break)				

rev. 7'f. The short section actually deals with the sign <TÚG>, although the sign given in (2) clearly is <KU>. Strikingly, the scribe uses the correct logogram Hitt. TÚG in 8' (5).

rev. 7' The nomen concretum Akk. *lubuštu* “garment” is rendered by a Hittite verbal substantive with final *-war*. The pattern Akk. /purust/ can also assume functions which are similar to the pattern /pirist/, i.e. forming infinitives and verbal abstracts,

rev. 9'f. The logograms listed in (2) can not be identified exactly. B. Landsberger / R.T Hallock (1955: 59) render them as <rectangle + ME> and <U + rectangle>, CAD as <DÚRxME>(?) and <UxDÚR>. For the frequent equations of Akk. *zû* (for Akk. *šinḫu*, see following note) with Sum. *še₁₀*, there is no doubt that both signs are extensions of the sign <KU>. The two signs thus appear as <KU> with the inner horizontal wedge dropped, and the signs <LÁL> and <IGI> inscribed instead.

To their left hand, there are apparently the traces of the names of both signs continuing from the first column, identifying the first sign as *x-tukul-ak-ku* (thus proving the basis <KU>); the second name is almost completely broken,

rev. 10' Akk. *šinḫu* is hapax legomenon, but can clearly be linked to *šanāḫu* “to void (excrement)”, which is set against Sum. KU^{se}-bar-ra (can. Erim 3 67).

Hitt. *šalpi-* is a stem variant of more frequently attested *šalpa-*.

rev. 13'f. Both entries form one of the typical /parās/ - /pirist/ couples ('polygrammatic variation'). The first one thus is likely to be interpreted as Akk. *re'û*, and not as *rē'û*, as suggested by the Hittite translation (No. 153). As to Akk. *rītu*, note the erroneous hyper-plene spelling of the final vowel, which is probably inferred from the preceding entry (No. 112).

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
LUGAL- <i>uš</i>	“ruler, prince”	“king”
<i>wa-aš-šu-u-wa-ar</i>	“clothing, garment”	“to clothe”
TÚG- <i>aš</i>	“garment”	“garment”
<i>za-ak-kar</i>	“excrement”	“excrement”
<i>šal-pí-iš</i>	“excrement”	“dung”
<i>ap-pa-tar</i>	“to seize”	“to seize”
KI.MIN	“to capture”	“ditto”
LÚ SIPA	“to pasture ^{shepherd} ”	“shepherd”
<i>ú-e-ši-iš</i>	“pasture”	“pasture”
<i>da-me-e-da</i>	“(to make) fertile, abundant”	“abundance, power”
<i>me-ek-ki</i>	“much, plentiful”	“much”
<i>me-eḫ-ḫa-e-eš</i>	“many”	“many”
LÚ- <i>iš</i>	“man”	“man”
<i>an-tu-uḫ-ša-tar</i>	“people, population”	“population, mankind”
KI.MIN	“people, mankind”	“ditto”
EGIR- <i>pa wa-aḫ-nu-ma[r]</i>	“turning back”	“to turn back”

rev. 15' The Hitt. stem **damētar-* is only attested through its derivation *damētarwant-*. The nominative forms invariably read *damēta*.

rev. 18'-20' <LU> here is used paralectically for <LÚ>.

rev. 18' Note that, according to the phonetic complement, the expression behind the logogram LÚ is Luw. *ziti-* and not Hitt. *antuḫša-*.

rev. 20' Except the present one, there is only one additional attestation of Akk. *tenišu*, according to AHW (a manuscript from OB Nippur containing parts of Atram-hasīs [*la-a ta-ša*]*ka-la-[n]im te-ni-še-šu* “[do not fe]ed his peoples”; v. Soden's remark “nur Bo.!” is thus not correct).

rev. 21' Akk. *tāru* never appears equated with Sum. LU. The logograms by which it is usually represented are NIGIN and GUR. Note that <LU> and <NIGIN> are quite similar-shaped, while similarities between <LU> and <GUR> are as well present, but less striking. The equation, thus, either is a kind of graphic paralexia or, more likely, a mistake.

Akk. *tāru* strikingly occurs as *tay(y)āru*, either representing a /parrās/ form or, more likely, a strong-inflecting infinitive /parās/. The same form can be found in SaV Bo. G = KBo. 13,5: 9' (written *tá-a-ya-a-[ru_{1/3}]*), where it is accompanied by Akk. *tāru*, and in Unid Bo. 4-4 = KUB 3,93: 7'; the only certain attestation of Akk. *tāru* is the aforementioned one (a second one may be identified in SaV Bo. I = KUB 3,95: 4'), so *tayāru* seems to represent the more convenient inflection.

SaV Bo. C = HT 42 (BM 108563)

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
obv.	1'	[]	[ḪU]	[]
		[]	[ḪU]	[iṣ-ṣu-u-ru]
		[]	[ḪU]	[na-ap-ru-šu]
		[]	[ḪU]	[iṣ-ṣu-u-ru]
	5'	[]	[ḪU]	[]
		[]	[SED _{1/3}]	[ku-u-ṣú]
			[SED _{1/3}]	[]
			[SED _{1/3}]	[]
			[SED _{1/3}]	[]
obv.	10'		[SED _{1/3}]	[]
			[SED _{1/3}]	[]
			(break)	
rev.	1'	[še]	[KU/ŠÈ]	[]
				[x] 'x' []
		[du-ur]	[KU]	[šu-b]ur-rù
				[x]-IB-rù
	5'			[š]ur ² -ru-u
				[š]u-ub-tu ₄
				[a-š]a-bu
				[mu-u-š]a-bu
				[mu]-ur-ṣú
rev.	10'	[tu-uš]	[KU]	[šu-ub]-tu ₄

obv. 5' H.G. Güterbock apud B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 55) segmentize the Hittite as MUŠEN-ŠÚ MUŠEN *tiyauar*, translating “approaching of one bird to another”.

obv. 6'-11' The present section has tentatively been assigned to the sign <RI> by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 55), who propose to read the first sign in l. 6' (5) <É> or <NUN>. According to the Hittite translations and according to the parallel in SaV Bo. A = KBo. 26,34 i 16f., it is clear that the section deals with the sign <SED> or <SÈD>.

obv. 6' Note that <SÈD> used as a logogram in Hittite, mostly has the very specialized meaning “winter“. It corresponds only partially to the Akkadian and Sumerian equivalent (No. 232).

obv. 7'f. As several lines of the present manuscript are marked as *ḥarran* “broken” (cf. note to rev. 3'-11'), the blank space in (5) can either be interpreted as PAP (broken) or <KI.MIN> (“ditto”). Accepted the latter interpretation, terms likely to be restored in (4) are Akk. *ḥalpû* and *šurîpu* “frost, ice” (cf. can. Aa 8/1 178f.); according to the former, Akk. *nāḫu* and *pašāḫu* are possible restorations.

obv. 9' A possible restoration in (4) is Akk. *mānaḫtu* according to Izi Bo. A = KBo. 1,42 i 19, as has already been noted by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 55f.). However, there is no parallel attestation for an equation Sum./ Akk. *še₄ = mānaḫtu*.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
'MUŠ/SUKKAL ¹ -aš	-	-
MUŠEN-eš	“bird”	“bird”
wa-at-ku-ar	“to fly”	“to flee, jump”
MUŠEN-eš	“bird”	“bird”
MUŠEN ŠÚ MUŠEN ti-ya-u-ar	-	see note
SÈD ¹ -an-za	“cold (weather)”	“winter”
(vacat)	-	(vacat)
(vacat)	-	(vacat)
[t]a-ri-aš-ḥa-aš	-	“weariness”
[wa]-ar-ši-ya-za	-	“calming”
[wa-a]r-ši-ya-za	-	“calming”
[x x a]š?	-	-
'ku-it ¹ -ma-an	-	“while”
PAB	“bottom”	“destroyed”
(vacat)	-	(vacat)
(vacat)	“to begin”	(vacat)
(vacat)	“seat, throne”	(vacat)
a-še-šu-u-wa-ar	“to sit”	“to sit (down)”
(vacat)	“dwelling, seat”	(vacat)
GIG-an	“illness”	“illness”
PAB	“seat, throne”	“destroyed”

obv. 10f. Possible restorations in (4) are Akk. *nūhtu* “calm, peace” and *tapšuhtu* “pacification”.

rev. 1f. Hitt. *kuitman* is very likely the translation of a preposition or of a conjunction. The only sign of the KU-family which can have served as basis for this translation is <ŠÈ>. Note that this sign is actually treated in a separate position in the general sign order of S^a.

rev. 3'-12' Note that the reading Sum. *tukul* is strikingly absent in this section dealing with the sign <KU/DÚR>.

rev. 3'-11' With regard to the PAP-mark in (4) and the following blank space, which comprises rev. 3'-9', if not 3'-11', B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 56) already suggest “that the Hittite equivalents were destroyed [...] on the tablet from which our tablet was copied, and that only ll. 7' and 9', easy to restore, were restored by the copyist”.

rev. 5' The traces in (4) quite clearly point to the restoration of Akk. *šurrû*. However, none of the signs of the KU-family fit the meaning of this term.

rev. 8'/12' Note that the scribe did not restore Hitt. *zahḫartiš* in l. 8', although it is preserved in equation with Akk. *mūšabu* in l. 12'.

rev. 9' Sum. *dūr* (KU) substitutes for *dur₁₁* in phonetic paralexia here (cf. SyllSum/OrthSum./Akk. *du-ur* = TU = *muṣu*; can. Aa 7/4 62).

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
rev.	9'			[a-š]a-bu [mu-u-š]a-bu
		[zi-id]	[KU/ZÌ]	[qé-e-m]u [ma-aš-ḥa]-tù [x-x]-ṛx¹
	15'			
		[]	[]	[]
			(break)	

SaV Bo. D = KBo. 1,34 (VAT 7426)

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
obv.	1	[za-la-ag]	[UD]	[]
		[]		[]
		[]		[]
		[]		[]
	5	[]		[]
		[]		[]
		[]		[]
		[]		[]
		[ad]	[AD]	[]
obv.	10	[]		[]
		[]		[]
			(break)	
rev.	1'	[]	[]	[]
			(end of tablet)	

rev. 13' The phonetic complement indicates that Hitt. *memal-*, which is usually represented by the logogram ZÌ.DA, is not the term behind this logogram.

rev. 14' As has already been noted by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 59), “the Hitt. translator considered *mašḫatu* to be derived from *šaḫātu* ‘to jump’.” Note moreover that – if the form to be restored in (4) really follows the pattern /mapras/ – the scribe additionally considered the *m*-prefixed form to represent an infinitive (Nos. 163/200).

obv. 1-8 The restoration in (1/2) is very probable as it reflects the usual sign order of S^a, with <UD> preceding <AD>.

obv. 2-5 Note that the Hittite column seems to list highly specialized meanings of the sign <UD> (even the very extensive section in can. Aa 3/3, numbering over 120 entries, does not list a single one of the expected terms). If

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>a-še-šu-u-wa-ar</i>	“to sit”	“to sit (down)”
<i>za-ḫar-^rti¹-iš</i>	“dwelling, seat”	a specific kind of seat
<i>ZÌ.DA-an</i>	“flour”	see note
<i>wa-at-ku-u-wa-ar</i>	a kind of flour “ jumping ”	“to flee, jump”
<i>ŠA^{GIŠ}GIŠIMMAR mu-e-[]</i>	-	“[] of a date palm”
<i>^rx x x x x¹</i>	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>ZALAG.GA-aš</i>	-	“bright, splendid”
<i>LUGAL-uš</i>	-	“king”
<i>šal-li-iš</i>	-	“great, big”
<i>EN-aš</i>	-	“lord”
<i>[UGU]LA-aš</i>	-	“supervisor”
<i>^rx¹-ša-a-aš</i>	-	-
<i>[x]-iš</i>	-	-
<i>[^{GI}]šḫa-an-za-na-aš</i>	-	a tool
<i>ad-da-aš</i>	-	“father”
<i>šal-li-[i][?]-uš</i>	-	“great ones, parents”
<i>[LU]GAL-[u]š</i>	-	“king”
<i>[]-^rx¹-šar-ru KU₇</i>	-	-

they are to be explained in terms of a semantic paralexis they more likely origin in an association with Akk. *ellu/ebbu/namru* (especially with *ellu*, which directly refers to persons) than with Sumerian UD. It is also possible that the terms origin in a specialized or erroneous interpretation of the Akkadian. The equation with Hitt. *UGULA-aš* could result from a graphical commutation or paralexis of <UD> for <PA>.

obv. 10 As for the ending Hitt. *-uš* (actually accusative plural) used for the nominative, cf. chapter 9, sect. 1.3.3.

obv. 11 Note that Akk. *šarru*, likely to be restored in (4), is not among the known meanings of <AD> (the respective section in can. Aa is unfortunately broken). The present equation thus either is a semantic paralexis, or the Hittite merely gives a specialized reading of a more convenient Akkadian term (e.g. Akk. *rabû*); also see note to ll. 2'-8'.

SaV Bo. E = KBo. 13,9 (60/t)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[I] [TU]	ṛta¹-[x]²	[]
		[I] [TU]	uz	[]
		[I] [T]U		[]
		[I] [T]U		[]
	5'	[I] TU		[]
		I TU		[]
		I TU		[]
		I T[UM]		[]
			(break)	

SaV Bo. F = KBo. 1,52 (VAT 7453)

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[]	UL x X UL x X	Z[A] ZA-[]
		[I] [pí]-ri	PIRIG PIRIG PIRIG	ri-m[u] né-e-š[u] la-bu-ú
	5'	I az I uk I ni-ib	AZ (PIRIGxZA) UG (PIRIGxUG) NIB (PIRIGxKAL)	a-sú-u² mi-in-de₄-mu ni-im-ru
		I ki-ri	GÌR GÌR	ši-pu ga-aš-ru
	10'			

E 1'f. The meaning of the signs in (2) is not completely clear. They possibly reflect the reading Sum. ḥuduš (which is for its infrequency very unlikely to count at least seven meanings) or the sign name, which is *ḥu-du-uš*-(*šu*). Also note that the sign <UZ> precedes <TU> in the common S^a sign sequence.

F 1'f. The sign in (2) appears as with two verticals and one small oblique stroke additionally inscribed (is the sign to precede the PIRIG-section in the usual sign order of S^a. Neither in Hittite nor in Mesopotamian cuneiform, variants of with inscription are attested (and the same is true with regard to <AMAR> or <SISKUR>). Note yet that there is a infrequently-attested MB variant of with three instead of one vertical inscribed, and as noted by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 64), similar forms of this sign are attested in Amarna. However, the remaining signs of the tablet appear in the typical Hittite paleography (e.g. <AZ> and <PIRIG> with subscription). Also, the initial traces of the Akkadian translations cannot be brought into agreement with the known meanings of .

	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
	-	
	-	
	-	
	-	
	-	
	-	
	-	
<hr/>		
(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	-	-
<hr/>		
𐎶	“wild bull”	-
𐎶	“lion”	-
𐎶	“lion”	-
<hr/>		
𐎶	“bear”	-
𐎶	“tiger”	-
<i>pár-š[a-na-aš]</i>	“leopard”	“leopard”
<hr/>		
GÌR- <i>aš</i>	“foot”	“foot”
: <i>a-ra-an-za š[A]</i>	“strong”	“standing []”
<hr/>		

- F 3'-5' Note that <PIRIG> and <GÌR> are clearly distinguished here through their position (GÌR follows in ll. 9'f.) and also graphically (<PIRIG> with two short horizontal wedges, <GÌR> as usual with two small oblique strokes). This distinction is most notable as it is not carried out in the other preserved versions of S^a. The arrangement in combination with the following section is very logical, since <AZ>, <UG> and <NIB> are originally variants of <PIRIG>. Note that in Hittite paleography, <PIRIG> is indistinguishable from <UG = piriḡ> in the cases in which the latter is written without the subscript of <UD>. As for a short treatment, cf. chapter 12, sect. 5.2.5.
- F 3' The equation Sum./Akk. *piriḡ* = *rīmu* is unique; possibly, it forms a semantical paralexis.
- F 5' Note the shifting of the plene writing in Akk. *lābu* (No. 113).
- F 9'f. See note to ll. 3'-5'.
- F 10'f. The Hittite term is unclear. H.G. Güterbock apud B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 64) tentatively translate “strong standing”, thus connecting the form to Hitt. *ar-* “to stand”. Possibly restore *a-ra-an-za-š[a-an]*

col.	I.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[I] [a-l]i ² -im	ALIM [A]LIM	<i>kar-ša-nu</i> <i>ku-ša-ri-iḫ-ḫu</i>
		[I] [ḫu-uš]	[ḪUŠ]	<i>pal-ḫu</i>
		[I] [an-še]	[ANŠE]	<i>ʾi¹-mi-ru</i>
15'		[I] [na-ar]	[LUL]	[n]a-a-ru
		[I] []	[LUL(xBALAG)]	[na-a]-ru / [za-ma]-ru
		[I] [li-ib]	[LUL] [LUL]	[] []
			(end of tablet; reverse uninscribed)	

SaV Bo. G = KBo. 13,5 (290/t)

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
1'		[I] []	(pap)	[x-x]-ʾZU ^{1?} -ú
		[I] []		[x]-ʾA/ZA ¹ -ru
		[I] [PAP]		a-ša-re-du ₄
		[I] [PAP]		ša-aq-qú-ú
5'		[I] [PA]P		re-ša-tù
		I PAP		ra-bu-ú
		[I] PAP		du-da-a-t[ù] [?]
		[I] [G]UR	gur	tá(BA) ¹ -a-[ru _{1/3}]
		[I] [G]UR		tá-a-ya-a-[ru _{1/3}]
10'		[I] [GUR]		na-as-ḫu-[ru _{1/3}]

according to Diri Bo. D = KUB 3,109 rev. 13.

- F 11'f. Both Hitt. *tišanu*- and *liḫša*[are hapax legomena. HED sub *lihsa*[- proposes a connection with Akk. *tišānu* and Hebr. *dšwn*, which both denote a kind of buffalo.
- F 12' The spelling of Akk. *kusarikku* with <Š> and <Ḫ> is remarkable, especially because the latter suggests a spirantization of /k/ to /ḫ/ even though /k/ is geminated.
- F 13' According to the Hittite translation, Akk. *palḫu* was erroneously regarded as a substantive (/pars/) and not as an adjective (/paris/) (No. 154)
- F 15'f. The restoration of the second entry of this section is unclear. A reading of <NAR> different from *nar* and denoting a singer is as yet unattested. Possibly, 16' (2) contained an extended variant of <NAR>, e.g., <NAR-BALAG>, which is likely since it would explain, why the scribe did not use again a logographic spelling in the Hittite column (logographic spellings are mainly restricted to those cases where the logogram given in the Sumerian column is identical, like in I. 15'). B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 64) assume a variation in the Akkadian column, thus restoring Akk. *[za-am-ma]-ru*, which is as yet not attested in equation with Sum. NAR.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>ti-ša-nu-u[š]</i>	“bison”	“bison”
<i>li-iḫ-ša-^rx¹-[]</i>	“bison”	-
<i>na-aḫ-ša-ra-az</i>	“frightened”	“fear”
ANŠE- <i>aš</i>	“donkey”	“donkey”
^{LÚ} NAR- <i>aš</i>	“musician, singer”	“musician, singer”
^{LÚ} <i>ki-nir-tal-la-aš-pát</i>	“musician, singer”	“musician, singer”
<i>ka-ru-uš-ši-ya-wa-ar</i>	-	“to be silent”
KI.MIN- <i>pát</i>	-	“also ditto”

translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
-	
-	
“first, pre-eminent”	
“high”	
“first, prime”	
“great”	
see note	
“to turn back”	
“turning back”	
“to run back, come back”	

- F 17'f. The restorations proposed for (4) by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 64), are Akk. *kāru* “to be dazed” and *kūru* “depression” (probably this suggestion is based on SyllSum./OrthSum./Akk. li-[ib] = [LIB] = *k[a-a-rum]* in can. Ea 7 293).
- G 2' A possible restoration in (4): Akk. *māru*.
- G 3'-6' The entries in this section are all variants of the basic equation Sum./Akk. PAP = *aḫu*; referring particularly to the “eldest brother / brother first in rank”. Except for Akk. *šaḫû*, the equations are all more or less paralleled by other sources. Akk. *šaḫû* could be a semantic paralexia.
- G 7' There is no Akkadian term restorable. A possible basis is WSem. *dwdt* “father's sister”; the meaning fairly suits the given vertical context.
- G 9' Akk. *ta-a-ya-a-ru* supposedly reflects *tayyāru*. Note that this form occurs three times in the lexical lists from Ḫattuša (SaV B = KBo. 1,45 rev. 21 and Unid Bo. 4-4 = KUB 3,93: 7'; spelled *ta-ya-a-ru* in both instances), whereas the simplex *tāru* is limited to the preceding entry of the present manuscript. So one may suggest that *ta-(a-)ya-a-ru* represents the regular form of *tāru*, thus that it follows a /parās/ pattern with strong inflection.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
11'		[I] [GUR] [I] [GUR]		<i>up-p[u-qu]</i> <i>kùr-r[u]</i>
		[I] [BUR] ² [I] []	[]	<i>pu-ú-[ru]</i> ² <i>ni-¹x-[]</i>
15'		[I] []		¹ HUR ¹ -[]
			(break)	

SaV Bo. Gb = KBo. 13,8 (124/t)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	¹ T GUR ¹ T GUR ¹ T GUR [I] GUR	¹ x ¹	[] [] [] []
	5'	[I] [G]UR		[]
			(break)	

SaV Bo. H = KUB 3,105 (Bo. 3571)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
l.	1'	[I] [GAR] [I] [GAR] [I] [GAR] [I] [GAR]	[ni-ig] [ni-in-da] [] [ga-ar]	[] [a-ka-lu] [] [ša-ka-nu]
	5'	[I] [GAR] [I] [GAR]		[] []
		[I] [AL]	[al]	[al-lu]

G 11' The Interpretation of (4) according to can. Erim 6 12-14, where Akk. *epēqu* is listed as quasi-synonym to Akk. *tīrānu* and *nashuru*.

G 13'-15' The sign following <PAP> in the general sign sequence of S^a is <BUR>. The first entry could then be restored to Akk. *pūru*. As for the following two entries, however, the situation is more difficult; Akk. *ni-¹x-[]* in l. 14' could represent *ni-i[p-ta-nu]*, an as to yet unattested phonetic variant of Akk. *naptanu*; as for l. 15', there is no ready explanation.

Gb 1' The broken sign in (2) is apparently neither <GUR>, <KUR>, nor <KU>.

	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
	“turned over, overgrown”	
	a capacity measure	
	a surface measure	
	-	
	-	

	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
	-	
	-	
	-	
	-	
	-	

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
¹ <i>ku-it im-ma</i> [<i>ku-it</i>]	-	“whatsoever”
NINDA- <i>aš</i>	“bread, food”	“bread”
<i>na-ak-ki-i-iš</i>	-	“heavy, important”
[x <i>t</i>] <i>i-ya-tar</i>	“to place, set”	“to place, set []”
<i>kar(LA)</i> ¹ - <i>pu-u-wa-ar</i>	-	“to lift, take away”
<i>a-ra-u-wa-ar</i>	-	“to rise”
GIŠ _{AL}	“hoe”	“hoe”

- H 1. 3' CHD sub *nakki*- lex sect. suggests that Akk. *aklu* “meal”, which must probably be restored in (4), might have been confused with (*w*)*aklu* “overseer”, leading then to the Hittite translation “important person” (No. 218).
- H 1. 4' There is space for one additional sign in front of Hitt. *ti-ya-tar*, very probably denoting a preverb. Possibly restore GAM (= *katta*), as already proposed by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 69).
- H 1. 5'f. Possible restorations in (4) are Akk. *garānu* and *kamāru*, both “to pile up”, which however, correspond but vaguely to their supposed Hittite translations.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[I] [AL]		[šar-ru]
		[I] [AL]		[at-ta]
l.	10'	[I] [AL]		[a-na-ku]
		[I] [IL]	[il]	[KA.KA.SIG.GA]
		[I] [IL]	[]	[šu]
		[I] [Ú]	[u]	[šam-mu]
			(break)	
r.	1'	'T [LAL]	[la-al]	[]
		'T 'LAL'		[]
		[I] LAL		[]
		I LAL		[]
	5'	I LAL		[]
		I LÁL	l[a-al]	[šu-qa-lu-lu]
		I LÁL-SAR		[še-et-tu _{3/4}]
		I LÁL-SAR		[]
		I LÁL-DU		[la-ap-nu]
r.	10'	I LÁL-KAK	na-an-ga	na-[gu ₅ -u _{1/2}]
		I LÁL-LAGAB		ri-bá-'a ¹ -[tu _{3/4}]
		I LÀL	la-al(KA) ^{1?}	dì-iš-[pu]
		I LÀL		'ta ¹ -a-[bu]
		[I] 'LÀL'		ma-at-[qú]
			(break)	

l. 8' This entry very probably derives from the reading Sum. máḥ, which is synonymous to maḥ.

l. 9'f. The meanings Akk. *atta* and *anāku* very likely reflect the pronominal 'meanings' of the Sumerian stative prefix al-. Strikingly, these equations are not attested in any other lexical and, in particular, grammatical lists. Supposed the interpretation is correct, the entries (together with uncertain l. 12') form the sole instances of meta-lectic equations in the present corpus (cf. chapter 9. sect. 5.3.).

l. 11' As has already been noted by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 69), the restoration in (4) is supported by MA S^a Q 5', S^b 2 225 and can. Aa 7/4 30. Thus, Hitt. *memmuwar* must probably be interpreted as *memi-yawar* "to speak", then in the metalinguistic meaning "to pronounce phonetically".

l. 12' Hitt. *apāš* "he" is very peculiar as a translation of Sum. il. There are two possible interpretations, which both are not fully compelling: First, Sum. il could be taken as a pronominal element; however, the only formative which comes into consideration, i.e. Sum. al-, has the allomorph ul-, but not -il. Second, the Hittite may be

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
LUGAL- <i>uš</i>	“king”	“king”
<i>zi-ik</i>	“thee”	“thee”
<i>am-mu-uk</i>	“I”	“I”
<i>me-em-mu-u-wa-ar</i>	phonetic value	see note
<i>a-pa-a-aš</i>	see note	“the aforementioned, he”
𐎶𐎵- <i>an</i>	“plant”	“plant”
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	“to hang (down)”	-
𐎶	“remnant”	-
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	“poor”	-
𐎶	“district, province”	-
𐎶	“remnant, remainder”	-
𐎶	“honey”	-
𐎶	“sweet, good”	-
𐎶	“sweet”	-

an erroneous translation of Akk. *šū*, which had originally served as a repetition mark (probably indicating that the pronunciation [el] to be restored in (1) is like [il] to be taken as syllabogram and not as logogram). If Sum. IL stands for the conjugation prefix Sum. al-, the present entry (together with l. 9'f.) represents the sole instance of metalectic equations in the present corpus (also cf. chapter 9, sect. 5.3.).

- r. 6'-11' A section with compound based on <LÁL> is as yet not attested in any version of SaV. The present section shows similarities with OB Ea 74-80. Although those 'parallel' sections are not quite matching, it seems possible that SaV took up some material from *Ea*, particularly since the latter is more extensive but absent in the peripheral west (also cf. chapter 12, sect. 5.2.4.).
- r. 10' The sequence of Sum. LÁL-KAK and LÁL-LAGAB seems to be inverted, since the latter is usually read niġin, and translated by Akk. *nagû*, while the former is set against Akk. *ribbatu*.

SaV Bo. I = KUB 3, 95 (Bo. 2123)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[BAL]	□	[e-be-ru]
		[BAL]	□	□
		[BAL]	□	[]-tu ₄
		[BAL]	□	[ta-a]-ru
	5'	[BAL]	□	[e-lu]-ú
		[BAL]	□	[]-ú
		[BAL]	□	[]- ^r x ¹ -um
		[BAL]	□	[]- ^r x ¹
		[BAL]	□	[l]u- ^r x ¹ -ú
	10'	[BAL]	□	[x]-ru-u
		[BAL]	□	[x]-PU-u
		[BAL]	□	^r x ¹ -AK-KU-u
		[BAL]	□	[bu]-ú-du ₄
		[BAL]	□	^r x ¹ -ul-lu-u
	15'	[BAL]	□	^r x ¹ -e-PU
		[BAL]	□	[pí-l]a-aq-qú

(break)

- 1'-17' Quite a number of the restorations in (4) which B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 79), for the most part following A. Götze (1925: 78), suggest are not in accordance with the respective Hittite term. The authors argue that these are “not necessarily excluded by the Hittite, since the translations generally are inexact.” While this statement may be generally true, most aberrant translations can be explained very plausibly as rooting in misinterpretations of the respective Akkadian terms – which is not the case for most of the restorations proposed by Landsberger / Hallock and Götze.
- 1' Ther restoration is according to B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 79); Akk. *etēqu* and *nabalkutu* are equally possible.
- 2'f. The restorations are as suggested by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 79): Akk. *etēqu* and *nabalkutu*.
- 3' H.A. Hoffner (1997: 192) proposes the restoration of Akk. *nabalkutu* in (4), which is possible with regard to space, but, as remarked by Hoffner himself, does not suit the Hittite translation. Regarding such a common Akkadian expression as Akk. *nabalkutu*, one would expect the Hittite translation to be correct, actually.
- 6' Restoration suggested by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 79): Akk. *enû*.
- 7' <ḪU-U> may also be read as mistaken <ḪA> (cf. the sign form of <ḪA> in the preceding line). Resulting Hitt. *ḫappinanza* “rich” would fit the restoration proposed by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 79) for the Akkadian column: Akk. *šūbiltum*. A. Götze (1925: 78) tentatively suggests Akk. *nakrum*, thus interpreting the Hittite as deriving from Hitt. *ḫu(wa)pp-*. Both suggestions are not fully compelling, Landsberger's and Hallock's due to the semantic gap between the Akkadian and the Hittite, Götze's in that there would be a number of better

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
ʿza-a¹-u-[ar]	“to cross over”	“to pass, transgress”
ti-ya-u-[ar]	-	“to step, take a stand”
ti-ya-u-a[r]	-	“to step, take a stand”
EGIR-pa ti-ya-u-[ar]	“to turn back”	“to step back”
UGU-zi-[iš]?	“upper; to arise”	“upper, superior”
ḥa-li-ya-tar	-	“to bow down”
ḪU-U-ap-pí-na-an-za	-	see note
du-wa-ar-nu-wa-ar	-	“to break, crush”
BAL-u-wa-ar	-	“to libate”
ku-na-tar	-	“to beat, kill”
i-im-mi-ya-an-ʿza¹	-	“to mingle, mix up”
i-im-mi-ya-[an-za]	-	“to mingle, mix up”
ḥa-an-za	“shoulder ^{forehead} ”	“forehead”
ar-ʿx¹-[]	-	-
ʿpár¹-[]	-	-
[]	“spindle”	-

suiting Hittite translations to Akk. *nakrum*, e.g., Hitt. *kurur-* or logographic ^{LU}KÚR. Also note the quite unusual preservation of the mimation, rather pointing to a preposition or to an adverb.

- 8' The restoration is as suggested by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 79): Akk. *napālu* (cf. can. Ea 2 106); the last sign, however, does not seem to be <LU>.
- 9' Following A. Götze (1925: 78), B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 79f.) restore Akk *dalū* in (4). Though conceding that the reading “is uncertain because, first, -lu- stands too far to the left, second, there is a trace of a sign between lu and u, and, third, this equivalent does not fit the Hittite” (as already remarked by Götze).
- 10'f. The restorations are as suggested by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 79f.): Akk. *herû*, *ḥabû*, *itaqqû*.
- 12' The restoration suggested by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 79f.), i.e., Akk. *itaqqû*, is unlikely due to space. An alternative restoration is Akk. *raqqu* “turtle” (in equation with Sum. *ba1-gi* in can. Urta 14 220ff.), which could be the basis for the Hittite translation via WSem. *rqh* “to mix, mingle” (No. 227)
- 13' The Akkadian must rather be read *būdu* (not *pūtu* as suggested by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 79f.) due to the parallel equation Sum./Akk. BAL = *bu-du-um* (Secondary branches of OB Ea and OB Aa 13 i 22), in which the spelling strongly points to a media /d/. According to the Hittite translation, thus, there is a commutation between Akk. *pūtu* and *būdu* (No. 201). The same error is also found in Izi Bo. A = KBo. 1,42 ii 12' and iv 30'.
- 14' The restoration is as suggested by B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock (1955: 79f.): Akk. *bullū*.

SaV Bo. J = KBo. 13,3 (34/s)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1	[I] [ŠE] [I] [Š]E I ŠE I ŠE	ša-i	še(I) ¹ -ú uṭ-ṭa-a-t[u ₄] ma-ga ₅ -a-[ru _{1/3}] ^D aš-na-[an]
	5	I ŠE I ŠE I ŠE	[ni-ga] [?]	[m]a-ru-[ú] [] []
		I ŠÈ I ŠÈ	[še]	[] []
	10	[I] 'ŠÈ'		[]
			(break)	

SaV Bo. K = KBo. 1,43 (VAT 7438)

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
obv. ¹	1'	[]	G[UL] G[UL] G[UL]	[] [] []
	5'	[]	[ÁŠ] [ÁŠ] Á[Š] Á[Š] Á[Š] [ÁŠ] [ÁŠ]	[] [] [] [] [] [] []
obv. ¹	10'	[I] a-ga	[AGA]	[]
	15'	[I] il-la-al	[ÍLA] [ÍLA] [ÍLA] [ÍLA]	[] [] [] []
			(break)	

J 1 The mistake in (4) is apparently induced by preceding <I> in (1) (No. 060).

K obv. 11' In the usual sign order of S^a, <ÁŠ> is immediately followed by <ÍL>. The restoration of Sum. AGA in the

translation of the Akkadian

“barley, grain”

“barley, grain”

“to consent, agree”

PN

“fat, fattened”

-

-

-

-

-

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

present line makes sense, since this sign is not treated otherwise in S^a, and since the graphical similarities to <ÁŠ> and <ÍL> are undeniable.

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
rev. ¹	1'	[]	ʾNIM ¹	[]
		[]	TÙM	ʾx ¹ -[]
		[]	NIR	<i>i-ti-i[l-lu]</i>
			NIR	<i>tù-kùl-tù</i>
	5'		NIR	<i>ta-kal-tù</i>
			NIR	<i>tá-ra-šú</i>
			NIR	<i>pít-hu</i>
			NIR	<i>tu-dì-it-[tù]</i>
rev. ¹	10'	[]	ZAG	<i>pát-tù</i>
			ZAG	<i>i-DU</i>
			ZAG	<i>mi-iš-ru</i>
			ZAG	<i>a-hu</i>
			ZAG	<i>i-mi-i[t-tù]</i>
	15'		ZAG	<i>iš-tu</i>
			ZAG	<i>a-di</i>
			ZAG	<i>iš-hu</i>
			ZAG	<i>al-la-[]</i>
			ZAG	<i>ša-na-[nu]</i>
rev. ¹	20'		ZAG	<i>ŠU-u[k-ku]</i>
			ZAG	<i>i-še-e[r-tù]</i>
			ZAG	<i>še-e[r-re-tù]</i>
			[ZAG]	<i>ši-i[m-tù]</i>
			(break)	

SaV Bo. L = KBo. 1,53 (VAT 7418)

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[]	[]	[]
		[I ti-ir]	[TIR]	<i>[qī]-il₅-tù</i> <i>šu-ub-tu₄</i>

rev. 10' The spelling *i-DU* either represents Akk. *idu* “arm, flank” or *itû* “boundary, neighbour”; according to the vertical context, the latter is the more probable interpretation. The spelling as preserved favors Akk. *idu*.

rev. 15'f. Sum. *zag* is actually not used as a preposition in literary sources. From its basic meaning “boundary”, Akk. *ištu* and *adi* of course are logical derivations, since both preposition refer to a fixed point in time or space. They are thus semantical paralexes. Cf. also l. 18', which provide a similar instance with the preposition/adverb Akk. *alla/allân(u)* “beyond”/ “from there”.

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

“lord”

“trust, support”

“trust, support”

“to stretch out, erect”

“perforation”

“dress pin”

“border, territory”

see note

“border, territory”

“arm, flank”

“right, right arm/side”

“from, since”

“until, as long as”

“arm”

-

“to equate, rival”

see note

“sanctuary”

“nose-rope”

“painting mark, brand”

(5) = Hittite

[x x] ʿxʿ []

translation of the Akkadian

-

translation of the Hittite

-

GIS^STIR-šar

“forest”

“forest”

GIS^SDAG-za

“seat, throne”

“throne”

rev. 18' Possible interpretations of (4) are Akk. *alla* “beyond” or *allân(u)* “from there”. As for an explanation, see previous note.

rev. 19' Sum. ZAG (zà) here is a phonetical paralexia for Sum. *sá* “to rival”.

rev. 20'f. Provided the restorations are correct, Akk. *sukku* and *išertu* are based on taxilectic ZAG, representing Sum. *zag-ĝar-ra*. Further note that <ŠU> would then render /su/ in Akk. ŠU-*uk-ku*.

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	5'			<i>a-ša-bu</i> <i>URU-lu₄</i> <i>[KUR]-tu₄</i>
		[I tu-uk]	[TUKU]	<i>[i]-šu</i> <i>[še]-mu-u</i> <i>[ra]-šu-ú</i> <i>[a-ḥa]-zu</i> <i>[uḥ-ḥu]-zu</i>
	10'			
			(end of tablet)	

Urta Bo. 1A = KBo. 26, 5 (+) KBo. 26, 6 (1434/u (+) 1201/z)

A ii	1'	[] 'x ¹
		[]
		[] 'x ¹
		[] 'x ¹
	5'	[]
		(end of tablet)

B i	1'	[]-'x ¹	B ii	1'	[^{ḡeš}]ga-me-el-lá
		[]			[^{ḡe}] ^s -I-'TAR/GAM ¹
		[]-'x ¹			[^{ḡe}] ^s pa-kud [?]
		[]-ZA			[^ḡ] ^{es} 'x ¹ -lum
	5'	[]-'x ¹		5'	[^ḡ] ^{es} áš(PA) ^{1?} -lum
		(break)			^{ḡeš} li-um

- L 3'-6' The Akkadian equivalents in this section are very uncustomary. Equations with Akk. *ašābu* and *šubtu* are attested in can. Aa 7/4 85f. and Antagal 3 254; Akk. *alu* and *mātu* are as to yet unattested as equivalents of Sum. *tir*. Akk. *ašābu* and *šubtu* possibly are abstractions of *qīštu* “forest”, interpreting it as a “place to stay”, whereas Akk. *alu* and *mātu* could form further generalizations based on this interpretation
- L 7' The Hittite translation of Akk. *išū* is quite notable. Hitt. *ešzi*, 3. pers. sg., reflects the possessive construction with dativus possessionis (cf. HW² sub *eš*-; it is surprising in this respect, that HW² prefers the restoration of Akk. *bašū* in (4), which is improbable both with regard to the Sumerian equivalent and with regard to orthography).
- L 8' In the meaning Akk. *šemū*, Sum. TUKU is taxilectic for Sum. ^{ḡeš}--tuku.
- L 9' According to the Hittite translation, Akk. *rašū* was (erroneously) conceived of as in the (special) meaning “to acquire wisdom, to experience, attain” by the Hittite translator (No. 239).
- L 10' Hitt. MUNUS-*aš dāuwar* “to marry” is intrapolative translation of Akk. *aḥāzu* “to take, seize”. The same

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>a(MIN)¹-ša-a-tar</i>	“to sit”	“to sit (down)”
<i>URU-aš</i>	“city”	“city”
<i>KUR-e</i>	“land”	“land”
<i>e-eš-zi</i>	“to have, possess”	“he is”
<i>GEŠTUG-ar</i>	“to listen, hear”	“to listen, hear”
<i>ka-ni-eš-¹šu-wa¹-ar</i>	“to acquire, get ^{to attain} ”	“to recognize”
<i>MUNUS-aš da-¹a-u-wa¹-ar</i>	“to seize, take, hold ^{a woman} ”	“to take a woman, marry”
<i>ḫa-li-eš-ši-ya-<wa>-ar</i>	“to marry”	“to mount (with metal)”

A iii 1' ¹ḡešimmar-]
^{ḡeš}ḡešimmar-x-x¹
^{ḡeš}ḡešimmar-U-SUM-¹x¹
^{ḡeš}ḡešimmar-ka₅-a
5' ^{ḡeš}ḡešimmar-áb-šà-ra-ra
^{ḡeš}ḡešimmar-sukud
^{ḡeš}šà-ḡešimmar
^{ḡeš}šà-a-¹ḡešimmar¹
(end of tablet)

B iii 1' [^{ḡeš}gu-za]-ḡešgi[gir]?
^{ḡeš}gu-za-ki-¹uš¹
^{ḡeš}gu-za-gidim
^{ḡeš}gu-za-anš[e]
5' ^{ḡeš}gu-za-¹x¹
^{ḡeš}gu-za-š[aḫ-šum-ma]?
translation occurs in Diri Bo. Aa = KBo. 7,12 i 2' (No. 240).

L 11' Akk. *uḫḫuzu* probably was originally meant to represent the meaning “to marry”, and not, as indicated by the Hittite translation, the more general meaning “to mount (with metal)”, since Sum. *tuku* is not attested in combination with it (No. 241).

A iii 4' The entry probably has to be connected with can. Urta 3 344 ^{ḡeš}ḡešimmar-lu¹. In Hittite paleography, <LUL> is commonly used in the logogram KU₅.A “fox”.

A iii 8' Sum šà-a, otherwise not attested with following ḡešimmar may reflect reduplicated šà-šà, which follows the entry Sum. šà in can. Urta 3 352.

B ii 3' The interpretation of the last sign is tentative; it rather looks like <GAM>

B ii 4' Possibly read Sum. ^{ḡeš}PA-lum.

B ii 5' The reading is tentative; it would be a phonetic spelling of Sum. ^{ḡeš}aš₄-lum as preserved in OB Urta 1 142.

					ĝeš ¹ maš-tar
					ĝeš ¹ dib-dib ¹
					ĝeš ¹ ki-lá-bi
		B ii	10'		ĝeš ¹ ZA-NI
					ĝeš ¹ GAN-BAD
					ĝeš ¹ GI-KUŠ
B i	21'	[ĝeš ¹ x]-r ¹ x-x ¹			ĝeš ¹ r ¹ x-x ¹
		[ĝeš ¹]r ¹ sa ¹ -ma-LUM			r ¹ ĝeš ¹ x ¹
		[ĝeš ¹]-r ¹ sa ¹ -am-ḥa-ṣum		15'	ĝ[e ¹]š[x]-r ¹ x ¹
		[ĝe ¹]peš ₇ -kal			(break)
	25'	[ĝe ¹]š _u -di-in-nu-um			
		[ĝe ¹]si-zar-tum	B ii	25'	[ĝeš ¹ x]-r ¹ x ¹
		[ĝe ¹]si-zar-tum			ĝeš ¹ ba-šu-bar
		ĝeš ¹ zar			ĝeš ¹ ba-šab
		[ĝe ¹]eš ¹ zar-r ¹ si(GADA) ¹ ? ¹			ĝeš ¹ hub
		[ĝe ¹]š _u -zar-uš/raš(DU) ¹ -tum			ĝeš ¹ na-rú-a
B i	30'	[ĝe ¹]šà-GAR-GIŠ-NAB	B ii	30'	ĝeš ¹ ĝìri-šu-du ₇
		[ĝeš ¹]šušin(MUŠ-ERIN)			ĝeš ¹ níĝ-na-UD
		[ĝeš ¹]gi-zú-lum-ma			ĝeš ¹ gu-za
		[ĝeš ¹]u-zú-lum-ma			ĝeš ¹ gu-za-sig ₅ -ga
		[ĝeš ¹]dal-r ¹ bu ¹ -um			ĝeš ¹ gu-za-gíd-da
				35'	ĝeš ¹ gu-za-kéš-da
					ĝeš ¹ gu-za-munus-e-ne-r ¹ x ¹
					ĝeš ¹ gu-za-zag-bi-uš
					ĝeš ¹ gu-za-i-zi-GAM
					ĝeš ¹ gu-za-aratta ^{ki}
					(end of tablet)
C i	1'	[ĝeš ¹ gir]-gub-d ¹ [làma]	C ii	1'	r ¹ ĝeš ¹ []
		[ĝeš ¹ gir]-gub-zu ₉ -a[m]-si-ga			ĝeš ¹ bu[gín]?

B i 22' A possible parallel is Sum. ĝeš¹sa-ma-ná; accordingly read the last sign -núm.

B i 29' The present entry very likely has to be connected to can. Urta 3 456 ĝeš¹zar-raš-tum; <DU> therefore must either be regarded as a mistake for <UŠ>, presuming then a phonetic spelling, or as a direct commutation with <KASKAL> (No. 102).

B i 34' Sum. dal(RI)-bu-um very likely reflects dili-bu-um, as preserved in OB Urta 1 12.

B ii 26' The entry possibly reflects Sum. ĝeš¹ba-šu in can. Urta 4 37.

B ii 30' Sum. ĝìri is an unorthographic (phonetic) spelling for ešgiri (ŠIBIR) attested in OB Urta 1 158 and in can. Urta 4 55.

B ii 36' The last, inexplicable sign probably belongs to the next subcolumn.

B ii 38' According to can. Urta 4 75, one would expect the entry Sum. ĝeš¹gu-za-zag-gú-uš-sa instead.

B iii 1' The restoration is tentative, however supported by the OB and can. parallel. Note that <GIGIR=LAGABxBAD>

		ĝešgu-za-ĝeš-ʾkiĝ ¹ -ti
		ĝešgu-za-NA-ʾx ¹
		ĝešgu-za-[x]-ʾx ¹
B iii	10'	ĝešgu-za-ʾx-HUR ¹
		ĝešgu-za-ʾx-x ¹
		ĝešgu-za-kaskal
		ĝešgu-za-gàr-[ba]
		ĝešgu-za-g[àr-ba]-gušk[im]
	15'	ĝešgu-za-g[àr-ba]-ʾkù-babbar ^{1?}
		(break)
B iii	25'	ĝe[^s]
		[ĝeš]
		ĝ[^s]
		[ĝeš]
		ĝ[^s]
B iii	30'	[ĝeš]
		ĝešʾx ¹ -[]
		ĝešʾx ¹ -[]
		ĝešʾx ¹ -[]
		ĝešʾx ¹ -[]
35'		ʾĝeš ¹ []
		ĝešʾx ¹ -[]
		ĝe[^s]
		ʾĝeš ¹ []
		ĝešʾx ¹ -[]
B iii	40'	ʾĝeš ¹ []
		(end of tablet)

would then appear in the sign form that is used in Mesopotamia (with initial vertical wedge, which is missing in the Hittite variant).

- B iii 5' Possibly the last sign is <GARZA=PA-AN> according to OB Urta 1 171; in the can. version, there is no entry between Sum. ĝešgu-za-anše and ĝešgu-za-šaḥ-šum-ma.
- B iii 6' Although there are only small traces visible of the sign interpreted as <ŠAH>, the restoration of this entry is highly probable, since it covers two lines, therefore must be quite long, and since the same entry is in direct anteposition to Sum. ĝešgu-za-ĝeš-kiĝ-ti in can. Urta 4 98.
- B iii 9' Possibly restore Sum. ĝešgu-za-ʾmá-gan¹.
- B iii 12' Note that this entry occurs in a much earlier position both in the OB (1 170) and in the can. (4 79) version.
- C i 2'f. Note that Sum. zú is rendered by the typically Hittite sign <ZU₉>.
- C i 2' The present spelling probably is haplological for Sum. ĝešgìr-gub-zú-am-si-si-si-ga.

		[^{ĝeš} gì]r-gub-z[u ₉ -am-si]-d[un-dun]		^{ĝeš} []
		[^ĝ]ešn[ú]		^{ĝeš} r ^{tukul} 1'-[]
C i	5'	[^{ĝeš}]nú-[aš-nú]	C ii	5' ^{ĝeš} gan-[na]
		[^{ĝeš}]nú-k[i-nú]		^{ĝeš} g[irah]
		[^{ĝeš}]nú-zi-d[a]		^{ĝeš} r ^x 1'-[]
		[^{ĝeš}]nú]-r ^{gú} -zi-ga ¹		^{ĝeš} []
		[^{ĝeš}]nú-um[bin]		^{ĝeš} []
C i	10'	[^{ĝeš}]nú]-umbin-[gu ₄] [?]	C ii	10' ^{ĝeš} r ^x 1'-[]
		[^{ĝeš}]nú-umbin-s[al]-la		^ĝ [eš]
		[^{ĝeš}]nú-šà-an-tuku		[^{ĝeš}]
		[^{ĝeš}]r ^{nú} 1'-šà(AN) ¹ -an-tuku-		[^{ĝeš}]
		[s]i-ga-zum-ak		^{ĝeš} []
	15'	[^{ĝeš}] {nú} -šà-an-tuku		15' ^{ĝeš} []
		[x] ^r x x x ¹		^{ĝeš} []
		[^{ĝeš}]nú-uri ^{rki} 1'-ma(DA) ¹		^{ĝeš} []
		[^{ĝeš}]nú-UD-DIRI		(break)
		[^{ĝeš}]r ^{zag} 1'-gu-la-nú		
C i	20'	[^{ĝeš} e]rin [?] -nú		
		[^{ĝeš}]r ^x 1'-nú		
		[^{ĝeš}]di ₅ -nú		
		[^{ĝeš}]ba]d-nú		
		[^{ĝeš} i]-zi-nú		
	25'	[^{ĝeš} um]bin-nú		
		[^{ĝeš} díl]im		
		[^{ĝeš} díl]im]-gal		
		[^{ĝeš} díl]im-t]ur		
		(break)		

C i 5' The restoration is according to the OB (I 215) and the can. (4 147) version.

C i 10' As the entry Sum. ^{ĝeš}nú-umbin is only given once even in the canonical version, it is unlikely that it appears doubled in the present manuscript. Therefore likely assume an extension with <GU₄>, although there is not much space left after <UMBIN>.

C i 12'-16' Neither in the parallel entries of the OB nor of the canonical parallel, the peculiar element Sum. -an-, which must possibly be interpreted as verbal prefix, occurs. Further note the phonetic spelling <SI> for Sum. sík, which possibly is due to space.

C i 15'f. The entry actually to be restored according to can. Urra 4 159, reads Sum. ^{ĝeš}nú-šà-tuku-sík-ùz-ak-a; the sign traces, however, do not agree with this term.

- C i 18' The entry which would be expected in this position according to can. Urri 4 164 is Sum. ġešnû-ka-muš .
- C i 19' The entry probably reflects Sum. $\text{ġešsaġ-an-du}_{1/3}\text{-nû}$, preserved at this position in OB Urri 1 223 and can. Urri 4 165. The strong deviations rather point to an error than to an alternative phonetic spelling. However, also note that ePSD gives a lemma ġešnû-gu-la , unfortunately without reference to the source.
- C i 21' Possibly read Sum. ġešbâr-nû according to ġešbar-si-nû (OB Urri 1 224) and ġešbar-da-nû (can. Urri 4 168).

Urta Bo. 4A = KBo. 1, 57 + KUB 4, 96 + KBo. 1, 47 + KBo. 26, 3

(VAT 7437a + Bo. 3668 + VAT 7434c + 1168/z)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
i'	1'	[anzud ^{mušen}] [nunuz-anzud ^{mušen}] [amar-anzud ^{mušen}] [amar-te ₈] [?]	[] [KI.MIN] [am-m]ar-KI.MIN amar-rat-ti	[an]- ^r zu ¹ -u <i>pé-el an-ze-e</i> <i>a-tám an-ze-e</i> <i>a-am-mar-[t]ù-u</i>
	5'	[] [zú-péš ^{muš}] ^{en} [ka-sukud-du ^{mušen}] []-tir ^{MIN} [amar-MIN]-tur-ra ^{MIN}	^r KI ¹ .MIN ^r šu ¹ -pí-iš qa-x-ud-du du-um-pí-tar-ra amar-MIN-dur-ra	^r x x x ¹ [] PI- ^r in ¹ -GU TA-ra-nu <i>ur-ša(TA)¹-a-nu</i> <i>a-UD-ša-^rnu¹(UN)¹</i>
i'	10'	[šu-lú] ^{mušen} [gam]-gam [?] ^{mušen} [mušen-zí] ^b ^{mušen} [mušen-ḥul]-a ^{mušen}	šu-lu qa-am-{qa}-am-ma mu-ši-zi-pa mu-uš-ḥu- ^r la ¹	<i>ma-¹-u</i> <i>ma-¹-u</i> <i>qa-du-^rú¹</i> <i>qa-^rdu-ú¹</i>
	15'	[buru ₅] ^{MIN} [MIN-x ^{MI}] ^N [MIN-tur-ra ^{MIN}] [MIN- ^{MIN}] [MIN-gi-za ^{MIN}] [MIN- ^{MIN}] [MIN- ^{MIN}]	bar bar-x bar-turur-ra [b]ar-ki- ^r tar ¹ -ra [b]ar-ki-iz-za [b]ar-A-ZI-NI(AŠ) ¹	<i>iš-šú-ru</i> MAŠ ^r x TA x x x ¹ MAŠ ^r ZU <i>ur ni ni¹</i> MUŠ[EN] ^r x x ¹ <i>e</i> MUŠEN <i>ki-iz-za</i> MUŠEN <i>ni-a-ZU'</i>
i'	20'	[MIN- ^{MIN}] [MIN-kar-kid] [M]IN-bú-bú MIN-ugu-dù-a	[b]ar-[n]a ² -bu-ru [] [] ^r x ¹ []	MUŠEN ^r x x ¹ ^r ḥa ¹ -ri-im-tù <i>muš-tar-ri-iš-tù</i> AP-PA-nu
		te ₈ ^{mu} [^{šen}]	[]	<i>e-ru-ú</i>

- i' 4' The restoration in (2) has already been proposed by B. Landsberger / A.D. Kilmer (1962: 159). The Akkadian is hapax legomenon, possibly an ad-hoc formation shaped according to the Sumerian.
- i' 5' B. Landsberger / A.D. Kilmer (1962: 159) read Akk. *qa-qa-^rda¹-nu* “with large head” in (4), restoring Sum. saĝ-du in (2). However, the KI.MIN mark would then – quite uncustomarily – refer to the preceding column and not to the preceding line.
- i' 7' The restoration in (2) is according to OB Urta 4 Seg.6:94. The sign transcribed x in (1) looks like the late form of <ŠID> or <ŠUB>. Judging from (2), one would expect the phonetic value [š/suk]; possibly the sign represents ill-formed <PAD=ŠUK>, thus.
- i' 9' The Akkadian should actually read *amuršanu*. The scribe wrote UD probably since Sum. amar is usually translated as *atam(u)* (here *a-tám*), which he confused with phonetically similar *ama/ur*.
- i' 12' The entry i' 13' has very probably to be connected with Sum. iri-ḥul-a^{mušen} (OB Urta 4 Seg.6:96), which is the entry following Sum. šu-lú^{mušen}. One may generally assume therefore that initial <MUŠEN> originally read

translation of the Akkadian

“anzû bird”

“egg of an anzû bird”

“young of an anzû bird”

“young of an eagle”

see note

hapax leg.

hapax leg.

“wild dove”

“wild dove”

hapax leg.

hapax leg.

“owl”

“owl”

“bird”

-

hapax leg.

-

hapax leg.

hapax leg.

-

see note

hapax leg.

see note

“eagle”

<URU> – a confusion which then must have taken place quite early, as it also affects the Syllabic Sumerian. Note that specific Hittite variants of <URU> are quite similar in shape as <MUŠEN>.

- i' 17' A possible restoration according to B. Landsberger / A.D. Kilmer (1962: is) OrthSum./SyllSum./Akk. *buru₅-geškir₆*^{mušen} = bar-ki-i-ra = MUŠEN *gi-re-e*. The third sign in (1) is rather <TAR> than <I>, and the third sign in (4) does not seem to be <RI>; yet, these deviations may represent scribal mistakes.
- i' 18' The entry appears as Sum. *buru₅-gi-zi*^{mušen} in OB Ur-ra 4 seg.6:120.
- i' 19' Judging from the Akkadian, which seems to be based on a loan from the Sumerian, one may tentatively assume that the signs in (1) are misordered, and that <AŠ> is a mistake for <NI>.
- i' 21'-23' As all three entries lack the determinative <MUŠEN>, <BURU₅> probably serves as a determinative here.
- i' 21' It is questionable if Akk. *ḫarimtu* is the correct translation of the Sumerian. Rather, it appears as an ad-hoc formation based on Sum. *kar-kid*.
- i' 23' Akk. *appanu* appears as *abbunnu* in Hg. B to can. Ur-ra 18 279.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
i'	25'	te ₈ -úš ^{mu} [^{šen}]	□	ʾna ² -ad ^{ʔ1} -ru
		te ₈ -úš ^{mu} [^{šen}]	□	[z]i-b[u]
		: ʾMIN ¹ -gu-l[a ^{mušen}]	□	[na]-ʾe ^{1ʔ} -r[u]
		uz ^m [ušen]	□	[u-sú]
		uz-gi[^{mušen}]	□	□
i'	30'	ʾuz ¹ -t[ur ^{mušen}] [?]	□	□
		ʾx ¹ []	□	□
		x ¹ []	□	□
(break)				
ii'	1'	ʾx ¹ -[]	□	□
		ʾx ¹ -[]	□	□
		ʾx ¹ -[]	□	□
		BAR-ʾx ¹ -[]	□	□
	5'	DIŠ-BAR-[]	□	□
		ʾgu ₄ [?] -du ^{ʔ1m} [ušen]	□	□
		ʾigi [?] -gu ₄ [?] -du ^{ʔ1m} [ušen]	□	□
		ʾigi [?] -gu ₄ ^{ʔ1} [du ^ʔ] ^m [ušen]	□	□
		[ig]i [?] -ʾx ¹ [^m uš ^[en]]	□	□
ii'	10'	i[gi [?] -] ^{mu} [^{šen}]	□	□
		ʾx ¹ [] ^{mušen}	□	□
		ʾx x ¹ -[x] ^{mušen} ʾx ¹	□	□
		ġeš ₆ kiri ₆ -ġeš ₆ [kiri ₆ ^{mušen}]	□	□
		ʾnú ^{1ʔ} ZA [x x] ʾx x ¹ ZA	□	□
	15'	U DUG ʾA ZA ¹ [x] ʾx x x ¹	□	□
		ga-n[u ₁₁ ^{mušen}]	□	□
		nunuz ^{1ʔ} -[ga-nu ₁₁ ^{mušen}]	□	□
		[amar-ga-nu ₁₁ ^{mušen}]	□	□
		ʾx-x ^{1mušen}	ʾx ¹ -[]	□
ii'	20'	a-ra ^{ámušen}	a-ra-ʾx ¹	□
		su-din	šu-ut-tin	[sú-ut-tin-nu]

i' 26' As for a short discussion of akk. *zību* as denoting animals, cf. B. Landsberger / A.D. Kilmer (1962: 129)

i' 27' The gloss wedges in (2) are due to some signs ranging into the slot from an additional (broken) column to the left hand.

ii' 6'-10' All restorations are very tentative and follow OB Urra 4 seg. 6:149-151: Sum. gu₄-du₇^{mu}šen, igi-gu₄-du₇^{mu}šen, igi-geštin-na^{mu}šen.

ii' 13' There are three or four almost illegible signs which precede the entry, but which seemingly do not belong to it.

ii' 17' The sign transliterated as Sum. *nunuz* appears as <MUNUS-UD>. It reoccurs as <NU-UD> in ii 22'. Both

translation of the Akkadian

“raging, furious (eagle)”

“vulture”

“raging, howling (eagle)”

“duck”

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

“bat”

variants are not in agreement with the usual form of <NUNUZ>. The standard form of this sign in Hittite paleography can be described as <ERÍN+ 4 horizontals>; in Mesopotamian paleography it appears as <ERÍN-gunû>. The present form could have been influenced by <NUMUN>, which is close with regard to the pronunciation and with regard to semantics.

ii' 20' According to (1), there is a sign missing in (2). According to OB Urra 4 seg. 6:188, one may restore SyllSum. a-ra-ak.

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
ii'		nunuz ²¹ -su-din amar-su-din	nunuz ¹² -šu-ut-tin am-mar-{\u}u-tin]	'x ¹ [x]'x x ¹ 'a ¹ -[tám su-u]t ¹ -tin-ni
		tu ^{mušen}	du-U[G]	sú-ma-tù
	25'	tu-gur ^{mušen} tu-gu-la ^{mušen}	tu-u-gur tu-gul-la	sú- ¹ kán ¹ -ni-nu : ur-tu-u
		dar(U.DAR) ¹ m[ušen]	[ta]r	tar-ru
		[d]ar ^{mu} [šen]	[tar]	it-ti-id-du
		[d]ar-luga ^{mu} [šen]	[tar-l]u-u-gal	tar-lu-gal-lu
ii'	30'	[dar]-luga ^{mu} [šen]	[tar]-lu-u-gal	tu-ru-un-nu
		[dar]-gi ^{mušen}	[tar]-ki	zi-ik-rù
		[dar-gi-ta ^{mušen}	[tar]-ki-ta	hu-lu-up-pu
		[dar-gi-ta ^{mušen}	[tar]-ki-ta	bi-ri-mu
		[dar- ^{mušen}	[tar]- ¹ x ¹ -gul-la	né-e-ru
	35'	[dar- ^{mušen}	[tar-x-t]i-ra	a-ru
		[dar- ^{mušen}	[tar-x-d]u-du-ma-az	hu-u-la-lu
		[dar- ^{mušen}	[tar-x]- ¹ x ¹	hu-u-la-lu
		[]	[]	'x ¹ -u
ii'		[]	[]	[x] ¹ x x ¹
			(break)	
iii'	1'	MIN(siki)-[]	[]	[]
		MIN-[]	[]	[]
		MIN-i[gi [?] -]	[]	[]
		MIN-i[gi [?] -]	[]	[]
	5'	MIN-bar-[]	[]	[]
		MIN-ba[r]	[]	[]
		MIN-b[ar]	[]	[]
		MIN- ¹ x ¹ -[]	[]	[]
		MIN- ¹ x ¹ -[]	[]	[]
iii'	10'	MIN(siki)-šà ¹ []	[]	[]
		MIN-šà-sig- ¹ x ¹ -[]	[]	[]
		MIN-šà-sig- ¹ x x ¹	[]	[]

ii' 22' As for the proposed reading Sum. nunuz and the corresponding sign, cf. note to ii' 17'.

ii' 24' The second sign in (1) quite clearly appears as <UG>; one would expect <UM> or <Ú> instead.

ii' 25' As has already been remarked by H.G. Güterbock (Introduction to KBo. 26), the signs interpreted as <GUR> erroneously appear as <GAN> in the copy (collated on the photo).

ii' 26' The corresponding entry in OB Urta 4 seg. 6:182 is Sum tu-i-bí^{mušen}. While a graphical commutation of <I> and <GU> principally seems possible, it is virtually excluded with regard to <NE> and <LA>.

translation of the Akkadian

“egg of a bat”^{sic!}

“young of a bat”

“dove”

“turtle-dove”

hapax leg.

a bird

“francolin”

“hen”

“hen”

“male”

hapax leg.

see note

hapax leg.

hapax leg.

hapax leg.

hapax leg.

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

ii' 31'-33' Neither Sum. dar-gi^{mušen} nor dar-gi-ta^{mušen} are otherwise attested. One or the other of the three entries may therefore be due to a confusion with more frequently attested Sum. dar-gi-zi^{mušen}.

ii' 33' Akk. *birīmu* can be etymologically connected with the root *brm* “multicolored”; thus, possibly translate “multicolored (hen)”

iii 12' Possibly restore OrthSum. siki-ša-sig-tab-ba according to OB Urta 4 seg. 6:211.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		MIN-gu-kešeř	[]	[]
		MIN-gu-kešeř- ¹ x ¹	[]	[]
iii'	15'	MIN-gu-kešeř- ¹ x-x ¹	[]	[]
		MIN(siki)-gu- ¹ la ^{1?}	[]	[]
(break)				

Urra Bo. 5A = KUB 37,146 (+) KUB 37,145 (164/h (+) Bo. 4251)

obv. ¹	1'	[a-šà-ga]ba	rev. ¹	1'	a-šà-[]
KUB 37, 146		[a-šà-x-x]-ŠE	KUB 37, 146		a-šà- ¹ x x ¹
		[a-šà-x]- ¹ x ¹ -GUR ₈			a-šà-níĝ- ¹ x ¹
		[a-šà-alim-m]a			a-šà-níĝ- ¹ šu ^{1?}
	5'	[a-šà-igi-ni]m-ma		5'	a-šà-nin
		[a-šà-igi-ni]m-ma-an-ta			a-šà-é-ninnu
		[a-šà-igi-ni]m-ma-ki-[ta]			a-šà-ŠID-ri-ri-ga
		[a-šà-x]-AB/AT-[x]			a-šà-kur-ri-ri-ga
		[a-šà-x]- ¹ x x ¹			a-šà- ^{ĝeš} geštin-na
		(break)	rev. ¹	10'	a-šà- ^{ĝeš} kiri ₆
					a-šà-ú-s[al] [?]
					a-šà-x-x-[]
					a-šà-níĝ-[]
					¹ a-šà-luĥ ¹
					(break)

Urra Bo. 5B = KBo. 26, 7 (839/z)

1'	a-š[à]	7'	¹ a ¹ -šà-tú[]-[]
	a-šà-[]		¹ a ¹ -šà- ¹ x ¹ -[]
	¹ a ¹ -šà-ga-[]		[a-š]à- ¹ x ¹ -[]
	¹ a-šà ¹ -a-[]	10'	[a-šà]- ¹ x ¹ -[]
5'	¹ a ¹ -šà-[]		(break)
	¹ a ¹ -šà-gu ₄ -[]		

iii' 15' Possibly restore OrthSum. siki-gu-kešeř-tab-ba according to OB Urra 4 seg. 6: 217.

obv. 2' Possible parallels are the entries Sum. a-šà-^{ní}daba (ŠE-NAGA) or a-šà-é-ninnu (OB Urra 5 2/4), the latter however being attested in rev. 6' already.

obv. 3' The last sign is definitely not <ALIM> as interpreted by E. Reiner / M. Civil (1974: 170), but <GUR₈/UNU₅>. According to that, the sign preceding it is best to be interpreted as <MÁ> (cf. Sum. má-gur₈-ra, a term which is however not attested in combination with fields as yet).

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

-

-

rev. 1' [a-šà-x]-ṛx¹-[x]
 KUB 37, 145 a-šà-da-u[sar]
 a-šà-an-t[a]
 a-šà-ki-ta
 5' a-šà-^den-líl-ĝar-ra
 a-šà-^den-líl-ĝar-ra
 a-šà-^den-líl-igi-bar-[ra]
 a-šà-pa₅-é-ṛx¹
 [a-šà-p]a₅-ṛé¹-[x]
 (break)

obv. 8' Possible restorations are Sum. a-šà-ḫa-at-núm (according to OB Ur-ra 5 10; also proposed by E. Reiner / M. Civil (1974: 170), or more likely, Sum. a-šà-da-ab-ta (cf. OB Ur-ra 5 11; can. Ur-ra 20 sect. 1:8).

rev. 8' E. Reiner / M. Civil (1974: 170) read Sum. a-šà-še¹-ri-ri-ga.

rev. 12' The signs given as x both appear as <SUM> with <A> subscribed.

Urta Bo. 6A = KBo. 26,8 (122/v)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[kaš-igi-x]	ga-aš-igi-[]	[]
		[kaš-igi-x]	ga-aš-igi- ^r x ¹	[]
		[kaš-du ₁₀]	ga-aš-du	[]
		[kaš-nu-du ₁₀]	ga-aš-nu-du	[]
	5'	[]	ga-aš-ku-ub	[]
		[]	ga-aš-ḫa	[]
		[]	A-AN	[]
		[]	ḫu-ur-ḫu	[]
		[sa-ḫi-in]	ša-ḫi	[]
	10'	[sa-ḫi-in]	[š]a-ḫi	[]
			(break)	

Urta Bo. 6B = KBo. 1,32 (VAT 7434f)

i'	1'	[]- ^r x ¹	ii	1'	ninda-[]
		[ninda-i-dé]-a			ninda-pa'-a[n]
		[ninda-i-dé]- ^r a ¹ -sig ₅			ninda-pa'-an-[du-nu-um]
		[ninda-i-dé]- ^r a ¹ -ḡe ₆ (GÌR) ^{1?}			ninda-pa'-na-[ni-kum]
	5'	[ninda-i-dé]- ^r a ¹ -ḡen(IŠ) ^{1?}		5'	ninda-NI
		[ninda-i-dé]- ^r e-x-x ¹			ninda-É []
		[ninda-i-dé]- ^r a ¹ -ḡeš(TAB) ^{1?} - ^r i ^{1?}			ninda-ŠUR []
		[ninda-i-dé-a]- ^r i ¹ -udu(DU) ^{1?}			ninda-AL-[]
		[ninda-i-dé-a]- ^r i ¹ -šaḫ			ninda-pad- ^r d ¹ [inanna]
i'	10'	[ninda-i-dé-a]- ^r i ¹ -nun	ii'	10'	ninda-pad- ^r d ¹ [inanna]
		[ninda-i-dé-a]-lāl			(break)
		[]			
		[]			
		(break)			

6A 1'-6' As it is clear from the entries following this section, SyllSum. ga-aš must represent OrthSum. kaš "beer". Yet, none of the attributes qualifying the term can be found in any parallel text; for SyllSum. du, probably read Sum. du₁₀, SyllSum. ši- probably complete to ši-ik and read OrthSum. sig₅.

6A 7' SyllSum. A-AN points to Sum. ulušin (ÁŠ-A-AN) or ulušin (PA-AN), both "beer", which follows the kaš-

lo.ed. 1' [DI]NGIR DING[IR]
 [] 'x x' ar ši D[U]
 [] d'r x' dti[r-an-na]?
 [] den-líl 'x'
 5' [] 'x'
 (break)

section in many parallel sources; why the item, however, is written in Orthographic Sumerian, remains unclear.

6A 8' A possible interpretation is Sum. ^{kaš}ḫu-ru-um, attested in SLT 019 11' and SLT 017 iii 6' (OB Ur-ra 6).

6A 9' SyllSum. ša-ḫi points to Sum. sa-ḫi-in "yeast", the entry which directly follows the section on beer.

Lu Bo. A = KBo. 26,53 (73/85)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(2) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[]- ^r x ¹	[]	[]
		[]-LU	ú- ^r AN ¹ - ^r x ¹ -[]	[]
		[šita- ^d inan]na	ši-ba-an-ni-na- ^r na ¹	[]
		[luku]r	lu(Ú)-ku-ur	[]
	5'	[lukur]-gal	lu(Ú)-ku-ur-gal	[]
		[lukur]- ^r d ¹ utu	lu(Ú)-ku-ur-u-du	[]
		[ama]- ^r x ¹ -ra	am-ma-ti-kar-r[a]	[]
		[am]a-lukur	am-ma-lu(Ú)-ku-u[r]	[]
			(end of tablet)	

Lu Bo. Ba = KBo. 26,36 (684/u)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
i'	1'	[sipa-]	[re]-'-ú T[I-]
		sipa-gukkal(UDUxHÚL) ¹	re-'-ú ku-kál-l[i]
		sipa-zeḫ(ÁŠ-MUNUS-GÀR) ¹	re-'-ú ú-ni-qí
		sipa-sila ₄ -nim	re-'-ú ḫu-ra-pí
	5'	^r sipa ¹ -sila ₄ -sig	re-'-ú PU-ul-ti
		na-gada	na-a-qí-du
		na-gada	na-a-qí(KU) ¹ -du
		utul	ú-túl-lu
		utul	re-'-ú

- A 2' M. Civil (1987: 4f.) restores [ÚH.^dIN]ANNA in (2), referring to a supposed parallel entry in OB Lu . However, the traces following the break in (2) are not compatible with <INANNA>. Consequently, Civil proposes the restoration of SyllSum. uruḫ in (1).
- A 3' As rightly pointed out by M. Civil (1987: 4f.), <BA> in (1) must be a mistake for <DA>/<TA> (with regard to the sign forms, preferably for <DA>) according to (2). Further note that the determinative <DINGIR> is integrated into the pronunciation as SyllSum. -an-.
- A 6' As noted by M. Civil (1987: 4f.), Sum. lukur-^dutu corresponds to Sum. lukur-^dnin-urta in the OB parallel from Nippur (OB Lu 259). That Ninurta is replaced by the sun-god Utu very likely indicates that the text (but not the manuscript!) derives from a North-Babylonian tradition, possibly originating in Sippar.
- A 7' Possibly read <QA> after the break in (2). The entry remains unclear (as for possible interpretations, cf. M. Civil [1987: 4f.]).
- Ba i 2' The (partly destroyed) sign for Sum. gukkal here appears as a ligature <UDUxHÚL> instead of usual <UDU-HÚL>. As for another deviating variant of this sign in Hattuša, cf. Rüster / Neu 1989: No. 252.

translation of the Akkadian

“shepherd of []”

“shepherd of fat-tailed sheep”

“shepherd of lambs”

“shepherd of spring lambs”

see note

“stock-breeder, herdsman”

“stock-breeder, herdsman”

“chief-herdsman”

“shepherd”

Ba i 3' The regular sign sequence within the compound <ZEḪ> is <MUNUS-ÁŠ-GÀR>.

Ba i 5' As to the Akkadian, M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1969: 84) propose a sandhi writing for Akk. *rē'û uppulti* “shepherd of late-born lambs”. CDA establishes a lemma *pultu* instead, assuming it to represent an as to yet unattested sort of sheep. Also, an erroneous feminine derivation of Akk. *būlu* “livestock” seems possible.

Ba i 7' Note that this entry is an exact repetition of the preceding entry. M Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1969: 82) try to avoid this problem by transliterating Sum. [gá]b-bar in (2). The signs, however, clearly render na-ga-da (colated on the photo), with Sum. gáb-bar very probably to be restored in i 10' instead. One therefore wonders if the supposedly mistaken <KU> has been written by purpose in order to make the entries distinct; another account would be reading *na-a-qí-tù*, with a female **nāqittu* however not attested otherwise. Possibly, thus, the repetition simply is a mistake. Can. Lu 3 i 18f. also lists two entries with Akk. *nāqidu*, with the Sumerian counterparts unfortunately not preserved.

Ba i 8' Note the different appearances of <KU> in <UTUL>. In 8' it appears in its MA form, in 9' it appears as usual Hittite <KU>.

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
i'	10'	[gáb-ba]r	<i>ka₄-a-pár-ru^{sic!}</i>
		[tùr]	<i>tar-bá-ṣú</i>
		[u ₈ -anše/gu ₄] [?]	<i>bu-ú-lu</i>
		[]	¹ x ¹ -[x]- ¹ x ¹ -DU
		(break)	
ii'	1'	¹ x x GIBIL x ¹	[]
		bur-u ₅	[<i>bur-ru-u_{1/2}</i>]
		bur-u ₅ -gal	<i>bur-r[u-ú ra-bu-u_{1/2}]</i>
		bur-u ₅ -tur	<i>bur-ru-ú [ṣé-eḥ-ru]</i>
	5'	bur-u ₅ -dumu-zi	<i>bur-ru-ú ¹dumu^{1?}-zi</i>
		munus-bur-u ₅	<i>bur-ru-ut-t[u₄]</i>
		saĝ-bur	<i>ra-ab b[u-ur-re-e]</i>
		bur-saĝ	<i>bur-šá-nu</i>
		¹ bur ¹ -[gi ₄] [?]	<i>bur-[gú-u_{1/2}]</i>
ii'	10'	GÉ[ŠTUG [?]]	[]
		a- ¹ x ¹ -[]	[]
		a-[]	[]
		(break)	

Lu Bo. Bb = KUB 3,106 (Bo. 4033)

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[]	: e-[]
		[]	GA-at-nu-[]
		[]	GA-at-nu-um
		[]	<i>bu-ur-ru-u</i>
	5'	[]	<i>bu-ur-ru-u</i>

Ba i 10' <RU> clearly appears in its Babyolian form (collated on the photo), with two additional oblique strokes between the verticals.

Ba i 12' M Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1969: 82) restore Sum. maš-anše in (2) instead. According to OB Lu 487f., the terms u₈-anše or u₈-gu₄ seem equally possible – and even more likely as they closely follow the entries Sum. utul and túr (481f.).

Ba ii 1' The sign traces in (2) can neither be brought into accordance with the entries preceding the *burrú*-section in the OB and canonical version (Sum. (šá)-gada-lá) nor with the Akkadian counterpart *qatnu* of the supposed

translation of the Akkadian

“shepherd-boy”

“animal courtyard”

“livestock”

-

-

a *burrû* temple servant

a *burrû* temple servant of high rank

a *burrû* temple servant of low rank

a *burrû* temple servant of Dumuzi

a female *burrû* temple servant

chief of the *burrû* temple servants

a kind of offering

a kind of offering

-

-

-

translation of the Akkadian

-

see note

see note

a *burrû* temple servant

a *burrû* temple servant

duplicate Lu Bo. Bb = KUB 3,106.

Ba ii 8' Akk. *bur-šá-nu* is an otherwise unattested spelling for Akk. *bursaggû*.

Ba ii 9' The restoration is according to OB Lu 561, which is the entry preceding Sum. *bur-saĝ*. Although not confirmed through a lexical equation, Sum. *bur-gi₄* must be the source for the Akkadian loan *burgû*.

Bb 2'f. Akk. *qatnu* and its usual Sumerian equivalent *sig* are not attested in the parallel OB and canonical versions. OB ^{lu}*azlag* = *ašlaqu* A 86 preserves an entry Sum./Akk. *lu-al-sig-ga* = *qatnu*; yet, assuming a relation between both these series is not very compelling. Perhaps, Akk. *qatnu* is related to Sum *gada-lá* or *šà-gada-lá*,

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[]	<i>bu-ur-ru-u ra-bu-[u]</i>
		[]	<i>bu-ur-ru-u še-e[h-ru]</i>
		[]	<i>bu-ur-ru-u tu-u-m[u-zi]</i>
		[]	<i>bu-ur-ru-u-tù</i>
10'		[]	<i>ab-[ru/lu]</i>
		[]	<i>ʽx¹-[]</i>
		(break)	

Lu Bo. C = KBo 26,37 (524/v)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
obv.	1'	[]-ʽx¹	[]
		[]-ʽx x¹	<i>ʽx¹-[]</i>
		[]-ʽx x¹	<i>la-ŠA-mu</i>
		[]	<i>mu-ni-IK-[]</i>
5'		[]	<i>ʽx¹-aš-ša-[]</i>
		[]	<i>ʽha²-x¹-šu</i>
		[]	<i>[x]-ʽx¹-šu</i>
		(break)	
rev.	1'	g[i-en-gi-en]	[]
		zi-[zi-i]	[]
		ĝá-ĝ[á]	[]
		kam-ma	[]
5'		kam-ma-sig₅-ga-ʽx¹	[]
		kam-ma-sig₅-ʽga-x¹	[]
		kam-ma-lú-ʽza-x¹	[]
		ʽx x x¹	[]
		(break)	

which can be found in OB Lu as preceding the entries which are parallel to the following *burru*-section. The term *gada-lá* also occurs in can. Lu 4 206, in the same position before *bur*, and there it is set against Akk. *egû*, which, however, seems to have mistakenly been taken over from the preceding equation (with Sum. *še-be-da*). Sum *gada-lá* and especially *ša-gada-lá* denote a special class of people who wear linnen clothes (Akk. *lābiš kitê*). Akk *qatnu* in turn, often serves as an attribute to linen clothes (Akk. *GADA qatnu*).

Bb 10' The restoration is supported by the equation Sum./Akk. *bur* = *abr/lu*, attested in SaV M 11, S^b I 13 as well as

translation of the Akkadian

a *burrû* temple servant of high rank

a *burrû* temple servant of low rank

a *burrû* temple servant of Dumuzi

a female *burrû* temple servant

a temple official

-

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

“to run, hasten”

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

in can. Lu 4 209, which must stand in a close relation to the equation Sum./Akk. bur-u₅ = *burrû* in the preceding section.

C obv. 4' Possible roots fitting the traces are Akk. *nyk* “to have sexual intercourse”, which is neither attested in the D stem nor would fit the context, and the various *e*-inflecting roots with I-' and II-K, which, however, do not preserve participle forms in the N stem.

Lu Bo. D = KUB 3,112 (Bo. 6646)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
obv.	1'	[] [] []	[x-x]- ^r x ¹ -AḪ [qár-na]-nu-u [qár]-na i-nu-[u]
		[]	qár-na-nu-u
	5'	[]	qár-na i-nu-u
		[]	qár-nu ŠU BAL []
		[nar]	na-a-ru
		[nar-ga]l	na-ar-gal-lu
		[nar-tur]	^{LÚ} NAR ṣ[é-eh-ru]
obv.	10'	[nar-x]	^{LÚ} NAR []
		(break)	
rev.	1'	[] []	^r x ¹ - ^r x ¹ ^r x ¹ -a-ú
		[kar-kid]	[h]a-a-ri-im-tù
		[kid-kar]	ki-ti-e-ga-ru-u
	5'	[kar-kid-mu-gub] [?]	ša ma-an-za-zi
		[]	ša še-na- ^r x ¹ -[]
		[]	[x] MI AŠ []
		(break)	

Lu Bo. E = KBo. 26,44 (991/v)

1' si-i[l-lá]
si-il-[lá]
si-il-[lá]

(break)

obv. 2'-6' While the term Akk. *qarnānū* is rather well attested, the terms *qár-na i-nu-u* and *qár-na ŠU BAL []* are opaque. Following CAD sub *qarnu* lex.sect., the latter may be restored to *qarnu šubalkutu* “to overturn the horns” or, better, “with horns overturned” (also cf. CAD sub *nabalkutu* 5.b.); the first one may accordingly be analyzed as Akk. *qarna enū* “to change the horn” or “with horn(s) changed”; alternatively, one could also read Akk. *qarna īni* “with horned eyes”.

rev. 4' Akk. *kitekarū* is hapax legomenon, can however be linked to Sum. *kar-kid*. It is apparently formed to an inversive

translation of the Akkadian

-

“horned”

see note

“horned”

see note

see note

“musician”

“chief musician”

“musician of lower rank”

“musician []”

-

-

“prostitute”

“prostitute”

lit. “one of the location”

see note

-

spelling of this term. Inversive writing of Sum. kar-kid can also be found in the logogram KID.KAR.

rev. 5' The restoration in (2) is according to OB Lu 714, which is the entry following Sum. kar-kid. Sum. (mu-)gub would form an appropriate equation to Akk. *manzāzu*, so the Akkadian may be conceived as an attribute to *ḫarimtu*, which then is the term to be substituted at the beginning of the line.

rev. 6' Possibly restore Akk. *ša še-na-ḫ[i-lu]* “one of second class” in (2).

Izi Bo. A = KBo. 1,42 (VAT 7478)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
i	1'	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div>á-ĝál</div> <div>á-ĝál</div> </div>	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div><i>le-e-ú</i></div> </div>
	5'	<div> <div>á-ĝál</div> <div>á-ĝál</div> <div>á-ĝál</div> <div>á-ĝál</div> <div>á-ĝál</div> <div>á-ĝál</div> </div>	<div> <div><i>le-'-ú</i></div> <div><i>le-e-tù</i></div> <div><i>tù-kúl-tù</i></div> <div><i>'ta-kal-tù'</i></div> <div><i>ka[b-tù]</i></div> </div>
i	10'	<div> <div>á-nu-ĝál</div> <div>á-nu-ĝál</div> <div>á-n[u-ĝál]</div> <div>[á-nu-ĝál]</div> <div>'á-nu-ĝál'</div> </div>	<div> <div><i>[la-a le]--'ú</i></div> <div><i>[la-a] i-ša-a-nu</i></div> <div><i>l[a-a] ša-am-du</i></div> <div><i>la-a ták-lu</i></div> <div><i>qal-lu</i></div> </div>
	15'	<div> <div>á-áĝ-ĝá</div> <div>á-áĝ-ĝá</div> <div>á-áĝ-ĝá</div> <div>á-ĝeš-ĝar-ra</div> <div>á-gú-šu</div> </div>	<div> <div><i>te-er-tu₄</i></div> <div><i>ur-tù</i></div> <div><i>mu-u-e-ru</i></div> <div><i>iš-kà-ru(GAR)'</i></div> <div><i>ma-na-aĥ-tù</i></div> </div>

- i 4'-6' The Akkadian forms must be interpreted as *lē'ú* (/pāris/), *le'ú* (/parās/), and *lītu* (/pirist/) (Nos. 148f.). The latter has apparently been confused with Akk *lētu* (/pārist/). Feminine forms of adjectives hardly ever occur in lexical lists, and the /parās/ forms are very often followed by (synonymous) /pirist/ forms (cf. iii 46f. or iv 25'f.).
- i 10' As to (4), see the preceding note. Notably, the Hittite terms differs from the three subsequent terms in inserting the relative pronoun Hitt. *kuiš*. While the present one forms a sentence negation, thus, the others are word negations. A further contrast can be found between i 10' and i 11'f.: The negated term in i 11'f. are *-ant-* participles, whereas the negated term in i 10' is an adjective. Since participles may also function as verbs, the respective expressions can as well be interpreted as sentence negations. This 'paradigm' suggests that word negation was either generally excluded or allowed in restricted environments only in Hittite.
- i 12' Akk. *šamdu* is used with the special meaning “equipped, made ready”, which is, according to CAD, only present in the OB period. It apparently is to be connected with the equation i 7' Sum./Akk. á-ĝál = *tukultu* “support”, and serves as a kind of antonym to this expression, with the meaning “not equipped / supported”. This nuance in meaning had obviously been lost when the Hittite translations was appended (No. 235).
- i 13' Three suggestions have been offered concerning probable restorations at the end of (5): *ḫa-pa-an-zu-a[r]* (M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock [1971: 133]), *ḫa-pa-an-zu-wa-a[n-za]* (H.C. Melchert [1989: 236]), and *ḫa-ap-pa-an-zu-wa-a[š]* (H.A. Hoffner [1967b: 92]). With regard to the grammatical form as expected from the Akkadian (cf. also note to i 10'), Melchert's proposal certainly fits best. Yet, according to collations, there is hardly enough space for another two signs following the trace read *-wa-*. Hoffner restores a genitivus pendens, avoiding the problem which arises from Güterbock's proposal, i.e., that an Akkadian adjective is rendered by a Hittite verbal noun with the suffix *-war-*, which normally corresponds to Akkadian infinitives. However, as to

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[x x x] 'x x x'	-	-
<i>wa-al-ki-iš-ša-ra-aš</i>	-	"experienced, skilled"
<i>w[a-t]ar-na-aḥ-ḥa-an-za</i>	-	"commanding"
<i>wa-al-kiš-ša-ra-aš</i>	"able, skilled"	"experienced, skilled"
<i>wa-al-kiš-ša-ra-aš</i>	"to be able, skilled" <small>able, skilled</small> "	"experienced, skilled"
<i>MUNUS-za wa-al-kiš-ša-ra-aš</i>	"to be able, skilled" <small>able, skilled</small> "	"experienced, skilled (f.)"
<i>EGIR-pa e-šu-u-wa-ar</i>	"trust, support"	"support"
<i>EGIR-pa e-šu-u-wa-ar-pát</i>	"trust, support"	"also support"
<i>da-aš-šu-uš</i>	"heavy, important"	"powerful, important"
<i>Ú-UL ku-iš wa-al-kiš-ša-ra-aš</i>	"not to be skilled" <small>unskilled</small> "	"who is not experienced"
<i>Ú-UL še-ek-kán-za</i>	"powerless, dependent"	"unknown" or "ignorant"
<i>Ú-UL tu-ri-ya-an-za</i>	"not equipped" <small>not harnessed</small> "	"not harnessed"
<i>Ú-UL ha-pa-an-zu-a[r]</i>	"not trustworthy"	see note
<i>mi-li-iš-ku-uš</i>	"little, light, unimportant"	"weak"
<i>ha-at-re-eš-šar</i>	"instruction"	"instruction, decree"
<i>ha-at-re-eš-šar</i>	"instruction, command"	"instruction, decree"
<i>wa-tar-na-aḥ-ḥa-an-za</i>	"commander, director"	"commander"
<i>U₄.KAM-aš a-ni-ya-an ku-iš e-eš-ša-i</i>	"work to be performed"	"who performs daily work"
<i>ta-ri-ya-aš-ḥa-aš</i>	"toil, weariness"	"weariness"

the vast number of translation errors within the texts, it is appropriate to take the reading which is best in accordance with the sign traces, i.e. *ḥa-pa-an-zu-a[r]*. Hitt. *ḥapanzuwai-* is hapax legomenon; but it has frequently been linked to Hitt. *ḥapazuwalātar*, equally hapax legomenon, which has been translated as "confidence" (cf. HW² sub *ḥapanzuwai-* and *ḥapa(n)zuwalatar*); the link is confirmed by HLuv. *ha-pa-zú-wa/i-ti*, an adjective, which can quite well be placed in the same semantic field. For an extensive treatment of the proposed Luvian stem *ḥapanzu-*, cf. Melchert 1989: 236ff. As for a general treatment on Luvianisms in the lexical corpus, cf. chapter 9, sect. 1.4.1.

- i 14' Hitt. *milišku-* is very likely to be connected with *mališku-*.
- i 17' The spelling of Akk. *muwerru* is notable; <U> either spells /u/ or /w/ in the present case, then either giving Akk. *mū'erru* or *muwirru*. <U> rendering /w/ is quite uncommon in the perspective of Hittite orthography. Unfortunately, verba primae Waw et mediae infirmae are too poorly preserved for a detailed analysis.
- i 18' M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 133) read Akk. *iš-ga^{ga}gar* in (4). This would be a highly sophisticated spelling and moreover, an incorrect one. More likely is an interpretation of <GAR> (collated) as mistaken for <RU>; both signs are quite similar in shape, especially with regard to the late form of <GAR>. The commutation probably was additionally inferred from the use of <GAR> in (2) (No. 042).
Furthermore, the relative clause construction used in (5) is very interesting. The Hittite translation to be expected from the Akkadian would either read U₄.KAM-aš *aniyan kuit eššanzi* "daily work which they perform" or U₄.KAM-aš *aniyan kuit kuiški eššai* "daily work which someone performs".
- i 19' Sum. á-gú-šu is an unorthographic spelling of á-kúš-ù. It is probably inferred from the following entry.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
i	20'	á-gú-zi-ga-ra á-zi-ta [á]-gùb-bu	{i-na} še-ri i-mi-it-tù šu-mi-lu
		[á]-ĝu ₁₀ -šè 'á'-zu-šè	a-na i-dì-ya a-na i-dì-ka
	25'	á-bi-šè á-zu-šè-ne-ne á-bi-šè-MIN á-ĝu ₁₀ -ME-EN	a-na i-dì-šú a-na i-dì-ku-nu a-na i-dì-šú-nu a-na i-dì-ni
i	30'	á-mu-bi-šè 'á'-iti-bi-šè [á]-u ₄ -bi-šè	a-na i-dì MU-šú a-na i-dì ITI-šú a-na i-dì U ₄ -šú
		[á-s]ù-sù [á-s]ù'-sù [á-x]-sù	i-da-a-an ra-qa-a-tù ša-ḥa-a-DU kap-pu
	35'	[á-x] [á-x] [á-úr] [á-x] [á-x]	ab-ru ab-ru 'pu'-uz-ru []-'x' []'
i	40'	[] []	[] []

(break)

- i 20' Akk. *šēri* without being related to a nomen regens or a preposition is unexpected. One would expect Akk. *ina* in anteposition (freestanding Akk. *šēra* would also be possible).
- i 21' Sum. *ta* is an unorthographic spelling of *da*.
- i 23'-28' As for the use of the pre-NH pronominal forms in this section, cf. chapter 9, sect. 1.3.1.
- i 32' Akk. *ra-qa-a-tù* can be analyzed both as Akk. *raqqātu* “thin”, and as *rāqātu* “empty”. While “thin” is more appropriate applying to “arms” on first sight, the Sumerian as well as the Hittite counterpart rather point to “empty” (Sum. *sù-sù*, Hitt. *dannara-*). Lexical equations of Sum. *sù(d)* with Akk. *rāqu*, *rīqu*, or *rāqu* are frequently attested. Also note the entry in can. Nabnitu Q 85 which might, according to CAD sub *rīqu* lex. sect., be restored to Sum./Akk. *á-ba-sù-sù* = MIN (*šamātu*) *ša idi* [*rīqāti*]. According to the Hittite translation, the scribe erroneously perceived the Akkadian as a possessive phrase (No. 167).
- i 33' Possible restorations for the second sign in (2) are <MUŠ> and <LUḪ>, which both cannot be explained in combination with the following <SUD>. Perhaps one has to emend the sign equally to <SUD>. The Akkadian term is supposedly erroneous, the second and the third root consonant being switched. None of the terms given by CAD sub *šaḥātu* and *šahātu*, can in any way be linked to the Sumerian and, equally, to the Hittite. Yet, Akk. *šadāḫu* “to march along, move in procession” is quite appropriate. The Hittite translation *kutti piran* is a phrase which often appears in (standardized) formulas of house rituals (often with genitive: *kuttaš prian*); it denotes a

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>ka-ri-wa-ri-wa-ar</i>	“{in the} morning, dawn”	“in the morning”
ZAG-aš	“right”	“right”
GÜB-la-aš	“left”	“left”
<i>ku-uš-ša-ni-mi</i>	“for my wage”	“for my wage”
<i>ku-uš-ša-ni-ti</i>	“for your wage”	“for your wage”
<i>ku-uš-ša-ni-iš-ši</i>	“for his wage”	“for his wage”
<i>šu-um-me-en-za-an ku-uš-ša-an</i>	“for your wage”	“your wage”
<i>a-pé-en-za-an ku-uš-ša-an</i>	“for their wage”	“their wage”
<i>an-zé-el ku-uš-ša-an</i>	“for our wage”	“our wage”
MU.KAM-aš <i>ku-uš-ša-an</i>	“for the yearly wage”	“yearly wage”
ITI-aš <i>ku-uš-ša-an</i>	“for the monthly wage”	“monthly wage”
U ₄ .KAM-aš <i>ku-uš-ša-an</i>	“for the daily wage”	“daily wage”
NÍ.TE ^{HLA} -uš <i>ku-e-da-ni dan-na-ra</i>	“two empty arms ^{empty-armed} ”	“who has empty limbs”
<i>ku-ut-ti pí-ra-an</i>	“to march along ^{house corner} ”	“in front of the wall”
<i>pát-tar</i>	“wing, arm”	“wing”
<i>pár-ta-a-u-wa-ar</i>	“wing”	“wing”
<i>pár-ta-a-u-wa-ar</i>	“wing”	“wing”
<i>ḫar-wa-a-ši pé-e-da-an</i>	“secret”	“hidden place”
<i>ḫa-ap-pu-wa-la-aš-ḫa-aš</i>	-	hapax leg.
UMMEDA-za <i>ku-iš TUR-an kar-pa-an ḫar-zi</i>	-	“a nurse who has picked up a child”
10-an-ki	-	“ten times”
[ḫ]u-wa-ar	-	-

place of libation and offering. As noted by V. Haas (2007), the use of this term is a remarkable case of intertextuality between the ritual literature and the lexical texts (also cf. chapter 9, sect. 1.4.2.; a collection of attestations is given by J. Miller [2005: n27]).

- i 34'-36' Note the two allomorphs, Hitt. *pattar* and *partawar*, which, entirely synonymous, are apparently employed for differentiating the Akkadian couple *kappu* and *abru*.
- i 34' A Sumerian term á-x-sud is attested neither as equation for Akk. *kappu* nor as an equation for one of its synonyms.
- i 35'f. The restorations proposed by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 134) and by CAD, i.e., Sum. á-tir and á-bur, are quite uncertain.
- i 37' (2) is restored from Igituḫ I 178 Sum./Akk. á-úr = *puzru*.
- i 38' Hitt. *ḫappuwalašḫaš* is hapax legomenon; according to the affixes -(w)al- and -ašḫa-, it is probably a Luvian loan word; as for a general overview of the share of Luvian vocabulary within the corpus, cf. chapter 9, sect. 1.4.1.
- i 39' The translation offered by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 134) “a nurse who has lifted (abducted?) a child for herself” is presumably based on the interpretation of Hitt. -za in UMMEDA-za as a reflexive particle. Provided the *t*-stem Hitt. *ḫarwant-* to be represented by the logogram UMMEDA, -za may simply denote the nominative.

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
ii	1'	[á-x] [á-x] [á-lá] [á-lá-x]	[] [] [ka-mu]- ¹ ú ¹ [x x]- ¹ x-ú ¹ -tù
5'		[Á]-GE ₆ á-bàd	¹ GISSU ¹ ši-il ₅ -lu-lu
		á-dù á-aš á-sal	a-ad-dú-ú it-tù ¹ šar _x ¹ -bá-tu ₄
ii	10'	gú gú gú gú gú	GÚ-du ₄ re-e-šú bu-du a- <u>hu</u> šu-ub-tù
	15'	gú gú-si gú gú- ¹ si ¹ ?	nap- <u>ha</u> -ru nap- <u>ha</u> -ru ki-il ₅ -la-tù ki-il ₅ -la-tù
		gú-tuku	gi ₅ -it-ma-lu

- ii 1' The phrase Hitt. GABA-*it wall*- can also be found in Unid Bo. 1-1 = KBo. 26,29: 4'. There, most of the surrounding entries belong to the semantic field of lamenting.
- ii 2' Note the use of the particle =*šan*, the use of which is considered as outdated for the NH, and especially for the LNH period, in which the manuscript was written down; also cf. chapter 9, sect. 1.3.2.
- ii 3'f. According to can. Izi Q 57f., Akk. *kasû* is equally possible as restoration in (4).
- ii 5' In (2) a restoration [á-gis]su ([á-GIŠ]-¹GE₆¹) is also possible.
- ii 6' Akk. *ši-il₅-lu-lu* probably spells *šullūlu*, the *i/e*-vowel being probably inspired by preceding *šillu*. Also note the spellings in ii 17'f. As to (5), M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 134) tentatively propose a restoration *iš-[tap-p]i-na-a-u-[wa-ar]* “to shut, close”. However, for lexical and morphological reasons, it is not very compelling.
- ii 7' Akk. *addû* has apparently been confused with the root *'hd* “one” (No. 212). The error rather traces back to WSem. *'hd* than to Akk. (w)*ēdu* because of the vowel quality, which invariably has *e*-color in the Akkadian variant. Notably, the spelling does not express the phoneme /h/ explicitly, not even by an Aleph sign. Actually, there is no weakening of WSem. /h/ attested for this period, and it is normally rendered by the <Ḫ>-series in cuneiform; yet, note Erim Bo. Aa = KBo. 1,44+: 37, where Akk. *re-e-ú* very likely reflects WSem. *hry*, and where /h/ is also not rendered by the spelling. Since Akk. *addû* never shows plene spelling for the initial *a*, the spelling *a-ad* probably reflect /h/. Whereas geminated /dd/ and lengthened /ū/ are relics of the original Akkadian term *addû*.
- ii 8' The equation Sum./Akk. á-aš = *ittu* is rather unique (but note [x]-aš = MIN (= *ittu*) in OB Nabnitu 1 237). The equation á-áš = *ittu*, given by ePSD, could not be verified.
- ii 9' Sum. á-sal is an unorthographic spelling for asal.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
GABA- <i>it</i> GUL- <i>ar</i>	-	“to hit with the chest”
<i>an-da-aš-ša-an ti-ya-u-wa'-ar</i>	-	“to step in”
<i>iš-ḫi-ya-^rmar¹</i>	“to bind”	“to bind”
<i>iš-ḫi-ya-a[n-x-x]-^rx¹</i>	-	[binding]
GISSU- <i>aš</i>	“shadow”	“shadow”
<i>iš-[x]-^rx¹-na-a-u-[wa-ar]</i>	“cover protection”	see note
1- <i>aš</i>	“work quota per day one ”	“one”
GISKIM- <i>iš</i>	“sign”	“sign”
<i>ḫa-ra-a-ú</i>	“poplar”	“poplar”
GÚ- <i>tar</i>	“neck, throat”	“shoulder, chest”
<i>ḫa-la-an-ta</i>	“head”	“head”
SAG.KI- <i>an-za</i>	“shoulder ^{forehead} ”	“forehead”
<i>pal-ta-na-aš</i>	“arm, flank”	“shoulder”
^{GIŠ} DAG- <i>za</i>	“seat, throne, site”	“throne”
<i>ta-ru-up-pé-eš-šar</i>	“all, totality”	“totality”
<i>ta-ru-up-pé-eš-šar-pát</i>	“all, totality”	“also totality”
<i>ḫu-u-ma-an</i>	“all, totality”	“all”
<i>ḫu-u-ma-an-pát</i>	“all, totality”	“also all”
<i>a-bal-ta-za</i>	“perfect, equal”	hapax leg.

- ii 10' Note that Sum. gú is translated by Akkadian and Hittite terms which are based on the respective logogram GÚ, although, this logogram does not have the same meaning in Akkadian and Hittite (No. 230).
- ii 11' The equation Sum./Akk. gú = *rēšu* is unique; very likely, it is a semantical paralexia for saĝ = *rēšu*. Hitt. *ḫalanta* is hapax legomenon. The morphology marks it as an nom-acc. pl.; it seems to be somehow connected with. Hitt. *ḫala-* which also denotes a part of the body, either close to or within the head (it is hardly understandable for what reason these two words should be strictly kept separated, as supposed by HW²). Terms denoting parts of the body which are formed with the formative *-ant-* are frequently attested in Luvian (cf. Starke 1990: 153f.), and regarding one instance, also in Hittite (Hitt. *iškiš-ant-*; KUB 30,45 ii 18). Nominative-accusative plural is also attested for other terms denoting parts of the body (cf. note to ii 24'; so it is not necessary to suggest that *ḫalanta* may be erroneous for *ḫalanza*, as assumed by HED sub *ḫala-*), and this may be interpreted as Luvian influence. In this respect, it is remarkable that Akk. *rēšu* is not translated through Hitt. *ḫaršar*, the common and frequently attested word for “head”.
- ii 12' Akk. *būdu* has been confused with *pūtu* according to the Hittite translation (No. 183). The same error reoccurs in iv 30'; it is also attested in SaV Bo. I = KUB 3,95: 13'.
- ii 14' Sum. gú probably is paralectic for KU according to the Akkadian translation.
- ii 15'f. Note that there is an alternative Hittite translation of Akk. *naḫharu* in iii 39ff., an alteration which may suggest that the text was compiled out of different sources (also see chapter 12, sect. 5.5.2.).
- ii 17'f. Akk. *killatu* reflects *kullatu*. As for a similar spelling cf. ii 7'.
- ii 18' Although the sign traces do not fully agree with it, the restoration given in (2) is the most probable one with regard to the preceding entries 15'f.

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
ii	20'	gú-tuku	<i>a-ša-re-du₄</i>
		gú-zal	<i>hi-is-sí-tu₄</i>
		gú-zal	<i>pí-ri-EŠ-tù</i>
		gú-zal	<i>gu₅-uz-za-al-lu</i>
		gú-tál	<i>ku-tal-lu</i>
	25'	gú-gùn-a	<i>er-re-tù</i>
		gú-URU.GU	<i>za-a-ru-ú</i>
		gú-dù	<i>za-a-ru-ú</i>
		gú-dù-a	<i>za-a-ru-ru</i>
ii	30'	gú-gilim	<i>mu-un-daḥ-ṣu</i>
		gú-gilim	<i>mu-de₉-ek-ku-ú</i>
		gú-gilim	<i>ḥa-a-bi-lu</i>
		gú-šub-ba	<i>a-ḥu na-dú-ú</i>
		: <i>a-wa-an kat-ta ki-ya-an-ta-ri</i>	
		gú-šub-ba	<i>zé-nu-ú</i>

- ii 21' AHW books the Akkadian word *sub ḥissatu* “intelligence, mention”, thus reading *ḥissetu*. CAD partly follows in suggesting a connection between both words, though determining a separate lemma. However, there is not a single instance attested in which Akk. *ḥissatu* is spelled this way. Instead, a connection with Akk. *ḥesû* “to mistreat” (treated as *ḥesû* 3 by CAD together with *ḥesû* “to cover” by AHW) seems more likely regarding the spelling, the vertical context, as well as the translation into Hittite. In this respect, also note the NA term *ḥisi'ātu* “mistreatment”. As to (5), the only way the Hittite phrase can be appropriately translated is treating Hitt. *tarnanza* as an active participle ruling the object *ištanzanan*.
- ii 22' Akk. *pīrištu*, is hardly to be connected with *prš* “secret”. The context rather suggests a derivation of the root *prš* “to lie, break an oath”, for which there is only the plural *pīrṣātu* “lies, deceit” attested. The first sign in (5) is most likely to be read <ḤAP>. Hitt. *ḥappu-* – provided the phrase is analyzed correctly – is hapax legomenon.
- ii 23' Hitt. *palaššurimi-* has been interpreted as Luvian participle with suffix *-mmi* by H. Kronasser (1962: 219). He further links it to Luv. *palaššarinuwa-*, a verb with unknown meaning in Hittite context. As for a general treatment of Luvianisms, cf. chapter 9, sect. 1.4.1.
- ii 24' The *a*-ending of Hitt. *išša* – if not taken as directive case, which is aberrant – must be regarded as nominative-accusative plural. As a matter of fact, this is not the only instance of Hitt. *iškiš* with ending *-a* in NH (cf. F. Starke [1990: n253]). E. Rieken (1999: 214) explains the plural by presuming a collective meaning, probably in the sense of “the parts of the back”. Note however, that in Luvian, terms denoting parts of the body frequently occur in the plural: cf. CLuv. *ašša* “mouth” (Starke [1990: 99ff.]) and CLuv. *ḥanza* “forehead” (Starke [1990: 125ff.]; if accepting Starke's disputable theory concerning Hitt./Luv. *ḥant-*); also note Hitt. *ḥalanta* in ii 11', which denotes a part of the body as well.
- ii 25. Sum gú-DAR-a, literally “cut neck” or – with DAR read gùn – “colored, sprinkled neck”, is otherwise not attested, especially not with the meaning implied by the Akkadian translation.
- ii 26'-28' The stem vowel of *zēru* is subjected to dialectal variation. OB and 1st-millennium forms are invariably written with *e*. The forms provided by peripheral texts of the 2nd half of the 2nd millennium show alternation between *e* and *a*. Further note the hyper-plene spelling (No. 110).

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>šar-ku-uš</i>	“first (in rank)”	“excellent, mighty”
<i>ZI-an tar-na-an-za</i>	“to mistreat”	“who has released the 'soul'”
<i>ḥap¹⁷-pu ut-tar</i>	“treachery”	see note
<i>pal-la-aš-šu-ri-mi-iš</i>	“scoundrel”	see note
<i>iš-ki-i-ša</i>	“back”	“back”
<i>hur-ta-iš</i>	“curse”	“curse”
<i>ú-i-šu-ri-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	“to hate, dislike”	“to oppress”
<i>ú-i-šu-ri-iš-kat-tal-la-aš</i>	“hating, enemy”	“who continually oppresses”
KI.MIN- <i>pát</i>	see note	“also ditto”
<i>hu-ul-hu-li-ya-wa-ar</i>	“fighter” ^{to fight} ”	“to fight, wrestle”
<i>an-da ha-pa-ti-ya-wa-ar</i>	“instigator” ^{attending to} ”	“to obey”
<i>dam-me-eš-ḥi-iš-ki-zi ku-iš</i>	“oppressor”	“who oppresses continually”
<i>pal-ta-nu-uš ku-e-da-ni</i>	“to neglect”	“whose shoulders are laid down”
<i>ša-an-za</i>	“angry”	“angry”

- ii 26' Sum. gú-URU.GU is otherwise not attested. CAD proposes to read gú-gur₅ instead, but this reading also remains unparalleled.
- ii 28' Akk. *zāruru* is hapax legomenon. It is clearly a derivation of the root *z'r*; however, it is unclear whether it is an artificial ad-hoc formation or a regularly-used form. Note that the pattern /qātul/ is rare in Akkadian, but more frequent in West Semitic, forming nomina agentis. Further note that extending roots mediae infirmae by reduplicating the third consonant is not uncommon in West Semitic as well.
- ii 29' Akk. *mundaḥṣu* results from *muntaḥṣu*, derived from the root *mhṣ*, with lenition of the dental stop, which follows partly assimilated *m*; thus, showing MB phonology.
- ii 30' There are three reasons for deriving the Akkadian word rather from *dekû* than from *dāku*: (1) the plene spelling of the final vowel, (2) the *e/i*-colour of the second vowel (which would rather be *u* in case of *dāku*), and (3) the fact that *dāku* is not attested in the D stem. Deriving the word from Akk. *etēqu* is virtually excluded by comparison with the adjacent entries, which all of them denote persons committing wrongs, as pointed out by K. K. Riemschneider (1970: 65f.; who in his turn, however, favors *dāku*). The meaning of *mudekkû* thus is “one who causes to stand up”, “instigator”. The only other attestation available (cf. CAD sub *mudekkû*) shows an *a*-vowel.
- Hitt. *ḥapatiya-* is solely attested in the present manuscript and in a hardly comprehensible divination text. Yet, accepted the etymological connection with Hitt. *ḥapp-* “to obey, submit” (univerbalized *ḥap=a tiya*) as put forward by H.C. Melchert (1989: 237ff.), one may conclude that Akk. *mudekkû* “instigator” has been confused with *mūteqqû*, a participle derived from *uteqqû* “to attend to” (No. 185).
- ii 32'f. The idiomatic phrase Akk. *aḥū nadû* “to be negligent, careless” has obviously been taken literally by the Hittite scribe (No. 167/173). The Hittite construction is further peculiar, as the patiens/subject of the passive/stative (“Zustandsmedium”, see Neu 1968: 93f.) verb *ki-* is in the accusative case. An active meaning of that verb must be rejected in comparison with its other attestations. The whole construction is similar to constructions with verbs that denote an illness: cf. *nu=war=an irmaliattat* KBo 3, 4+ i 13 contrasting with *nu=war=aš irmaliyattat* KUB 14, 21+ i 20 both “he fell sick”, cf. Neu 1968: 101f.).

col.	i.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	35'	gú-šub-ba	ša-bá-a-tù
		gú-gíd	IB-ZU
		gú-gíd	šab-sú
		gú-SI-da-a-ri	ša-bá-a-šu
		gú-gíd	ha-an-qú
ii	40'	gú-gíd	ha-na-a-qú
		gú-gíd-gíd	hi-it-nu-qú
		gú-gíd-gíd	hi-it-nu-ZU
		gú-ĝar	kà-na-a-šu
		gú-ĝar	pu-uh-ĥu-ru
	45'	gú-ĝar-ĝar	kà-na-a-šu
		[g]ú-ĝar-ĝar	pu-uh-ĥu-ru
		[gú-ĝ]á-ĝá	kà-na-a-šu
		[gú-ĝá-ĝ]á	uh-ĥu-ru

- ii 35' The equation Sum./Akk. gú-šub-ba = *šabātu* is quite inconvenient. Follow CAD one may take Akk. *šabātu* as an error for *šabāšu* “to be angry” (No. 186), which is often equated with gú-šub-ba and is frequently listed in combination with its synonym *zenû*. There are some interesting implications with regard to phonology arising from this error: The sibilant rendered by <Z> was confused with the one represented by <Š>, while <Š> must have been confused with <T>. The first change can only have taken place after the deaffrication of [tʃ] to [s]. The second change can be explained by assuming spirantization of [t] after [ā], with [t] confused with [s] then.
- ii 36' Akk. IB-ZU is best to be interpreted as mistake for *šab-sú*. However, there would be two identical subsequent entries, then.
- ii 37'f. According to the Sumerian, Akk. *šbš* “to be angry” is contrasted here with the homonymous root Akk. *šbš* “to gather, collect”, which is not taken account of in the Hittite translation (No. 213, but also see the note to ii 38'). Note also the distinct phonetic realization of final /š/, which seems to be position-bound. The same phonetic contrast is to be found in iii 10ff. and in Sag Bo. D = KBo. 1,38 obv.¹ 3'/5'.
- ii 38' Akk. *ša-bá-a-šu* has apparently been regarded as adjective/participle by the Hittite scribe, as evident from his translation (No. 151). The same interpretation can be found in iii 13. Notably, the Sumerian shows the peculiar, unexplainable formative -da-a-ri appended in both instances. A meta-linguistic element -ri frequently occurs in the series *Erimḫuš*, where it has the function to indicate secondary meanings or secondary morphological forms, so that Akk. *šabāšu* is possibly marked as a secondary variant of *šabšu* (cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.2.). However, it would then be expected that *šabāšu* and *šabšu* are derivations of the same root, which is the case in iii 13, but not here. Therefore, gú-si-da-a-ri is possibly a mistake for gú-šub-da-a-ri.
- ii 39'f. Sum. gú-gíd is not attested with the meaning “to strangle”, as it is suggested by Akk. *ḥanāqu*. Note that Aram. *ḥnq* has the additional meaning “to hang”, which would suit the literal meaning of the Sumerian (“long/lengthened neck”), and “to oppress”, which better suits the Hittite translation. The use of Hittite free standing participles with neuter gender is very uncommon in lexical texts. Thus, the term must probably be taken as a mistake for *wešuriyanza*.
- ii 41'f. Regarding the Sumerian as well as the Hittite, it is clear that the spelling in (4) must reflect the Gtn, and not the Gt stem (Nos. 138f.).

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>ap-pa-tar</i>	“angry ^{to seize} ”	“to seize”
<i>ḫar-ša-la-an-za</i>	see note	“angry, enraged”
<i>ḫar-ša-al-la-an-za</i>	“gathered, collected ^{angry} ”	“angry, enraged”
<i>ḫar-ša-al-la-an-za</i>	“to gather, collect ^{hater?} ”	“angry, enraged”
<i>ú-e-šu-ri-ya-an</i>	“strangled, constricted”	“to oppress”
<i>ú-e-šu-ri-ya-wa-ar</i>	“to strangle, constrict”	“to oppress”
<i>ú-e-šu-ri-iš-ga-tal-la-aš</i>	“to strangle continually”	“who continually oppresses”
<i>ú-e-šu-ri-iš-kat-tal-la-aš-pát</i>	“to flourish ^{strangle continually} ”	“also who continually oppresses”
<i>ka-ni-ni-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	“to gather, collect ^{to bow down} ”	“to submit, bow down”
<i>an-da ta-ru-up-pu-ar</i>	“to assemble, gather	“to assemble, gather”
<i>ka-ni-ni-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	“to gather, collect ^{to bow down} ”	“to submit, bow down”
<i>an-da ta-ru-up-pu-ar</i>	“to assemble, gather	“to assemble, gather”
<i>ka-ni-ni-ya-wa-ar</i>	“to gather, collect ^{to bow down} ”	“to submit, bow down”
<i>iš-ta-an-ta-u-a[r]</i>	“to reserve ^{to delay} ”	“to delay, hesitate”

ii 42' According to collation, the second sign in (2) is <BU>, and not <ŠE> as given in the copy. In (2), Akk. *ḫi-it-nu-ZU* is very likely mistaken for *ḫit(an)nubu*. This mistake has already been identified by CAD and AHW on semantics grounds. The reconstruction suggested here is based on the equations Sum./Akk. gú-gi-^{id}gíd = *ḫanābu* and gú-gi-id-MIN^{gid-gid} = *ḫitannubu* (can. Izi F 112 & 122). Nonetheless, the Hittite translation is apparently based on Akk. *ḫitnuqu*, so <ZU> may have (additionally) been confused with <KU>.

ii 43' With one single exception (one of eight attestations), the interpretation of Akk. *kanāšu* according to Hitt. *kaniniya-* “to submit, bow down” must be considered erroneous throughout the whole text (No. 214). Both the corresponding Sumerian term and the vertical context strongly suggest the meaning “to gather, collect”. In ii 43', 45', 47', iii 9, 29 Akk. *kanāšu* is set against Sum. gú-ġar “to pile up” or one of its derivations. Additionally, it is preceded or followed by Akk. *puḫḫuru* “to assemble, gather” in ii 44', 46' and 49'. In iii 42, 43, the Sumerian counterpart is gú-gúr “to stack, pile on”. And in iii 48, again followed by Akk. *paḫāru*, it matches Sum. *si*, a submeaning of which is “to fill, load up” (usually set against Akk. *mullū*). The only exception can be found in iii 8, where Akk. *kanāšu* translates Sum. gú-ki-šè, which is only attested in lexical texts; the meaning of term is, however, self-evident and can additionally be confirmed by OBGT iii 11, where, if the restoration is correct, it is set against Akk. *qù-[ud-du-du-um]* “to make bow down, to subject”.

Akk. *kanāšu* with the meaning “to gather, collect” can either be connected with Akk. *kamāsu* “to pile up” or with WSem. *knš* “to gather”. The possible origin of the error, thus, is two-fold. Either original Akk. *kamāsu* “to pile up” was substituted by its West Semitic counterpart *knš*, which was then reinterpreted as Akkadian *kanāšu* “to bow down”, or Akk. *kamāsu* “to pile up” was confused with Akk. *kamāšu* “to kneel down”, which was then replaced by its quasi-synonym Akk. *kanāšu*. Note in this respect that Kagal Bo. C = KBo. 16,87 i 13'f., which is a parallel to iii 42 of the present manuscript, gives both variants gú-gúr = *kanāšu* and *kamāšu*; however, this parallel does not contribute much to a solution, for the both terms can either be regarded as synonymous Akkadian terms or as West Semitic/Akkadian variants of the same root.

ii 45' See note to ii 43'.

ii 47' See note to ii 43'.

ii 48' Akk. *uḫḫuru* is probably used with the special meaning “to reserve, store” here. The Hittite translations refers to

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[gú-ĝá-ĝá]	[p]u-uh-hu-ru
ii	50'	[]	[kà-na-a-š]u
		(break)	
iii	1	[gú-TAR] [gú-TAR] [gú]-ku ₅ [g]ú-TAR	[] 'GIŠ SI' KI TUM GÚ-du ₄ na-ak-sú GÚ-du ₄ et-qú
	5	gú-ḥaš	GÚ-du ₄ šab-ru
		gú-bal gú-ĝiri	te-lu pi-il ₅ -šú
iii	10	gú-ki-šè gú-ĝar-ĝar gú-ki-šè-lá gú-šub 'gú ¹ -šub-da-a-ri	kà-na-a-šú kà-na-a-šú šab-sú šab-sú ša-bá-a-šu
		gú-[KI/E]-NE gú-[x] gú-x- ¹ x ¹ gú-udun gú-imšu-NÍG- ¹ rin ¹ -[na]	me-lu-ul-tù ur-du- ¹ LU ¹⁷ -du []- ¹ x ¹ [] []
iii	20	gú-i ₇ gú-i ₇ -meš gú-gissu	[a-aḥ na-ri] [] []

the basic meaning “to hold back, delay” (No. 236).

ii 50' See note to ii 43'

iii 6 As for the restoration in (5), cf. Hitt. *ḫaniššuwat=ma=kan kuit awan katta mummiatta* “the plaster, which is crumbling” (KUB 13,2 ii 16f.). The restoration proposed by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 137) URU-aš 'DU₆⁷¹ seems unlikely, because there is virtually no space between <AŠ> and <DU₆> (collated).

iii 8f. See note to ii 43'.

iii 9 Regarding the Sumerian of the preceding and of the following line, the present entry has probably been inserted erroneously, attracted by homonymy with Akk. *kanāšu* in the preceding entry. However, the two items are not synonymous as erroneously suggested by the Hittite translator.

iii 10-12 Note the contrast between Akk. *šabsu* and *šabāšu*, which is also detectable in ii 37f (see note there).

iii 12 As for Akk. *šabāšu* interpreted as adjective/participle, and as for the Sumerian formative -da-a-ri, cf. note to ii 38'.

iii 13 According to the Akkadian translation, the Sumerian had to be restored as gú-[e]-ne (cf. can. Diri 4 273:

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>an-da ta-ru-u[p-pu-ar]</i>	“to assemble, gather	“to assemble, gather”
<i>ʿka¹-ni-ni-y[a-wa-ar]</i>	-	“to submit, bow down”
<i>t/g[a]</i>	-	-
<i>la-[]</i>	-	-
<i>GÚ-t[ar]</i>	“cut neck”	“[] shoulder/chest”
<i>GÚ-ta[r]</i>	“bend neck”	“[] shoulder/chest”
<i>GÚ-tar []</i>	“cut neck”	“[] shoulder/chest”
<i>URU mu-[um-mi-ya-an-za]ʷ</i>	“ruin mound”	“decayed city”
<i>pát-te-eš-[šar]</i>	“breach”	“excavation, hole, breach”
<i>ka-ni-ni-[ya-u-wa-ar]</i>	“to bow down”	“to submit, bow down”
<i>ka-ni-ni-[ya-u-wa-ar]</i>	“to gather, collect ^{to bow down} ”	“to submit, bow, down”
<i>ḫar-ša-al-la-[an-za]</i>	“angry”	“angry, enraged”
<i>ḫar-ša-al-la-a[n-za]</i>	“angry”	“angry, enraged”
<i>ḫar-ša-al-la-an-z[a]</i>	“to be angry ^{hater?} ”	“angry, enraged”
<i>ḫi-in-ga-ni-ya-wa-[ar]</i>	“play, game”	“to play”
<i>GÚ.ḪAL-iš</i>	“windpipe, throat”	a part of the neck
<i>iš-ki-ša-aš-ʿḫa/za¹-[]</i>	-	see note
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	“river bank”	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-

SyllSum./OrthSum./Akk. e-še-me-en = KI.E.NE.DI.ᵀINANNA = *mēlultu ša Ištar*). According to the vertical context and to the parallel section in Late-OB Kagal I, however, gú-[di]nig (gú-[KI].NE) “side of an oven” is the more appropriate restoration.

- iii 14 As noted by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 137), Akk. *ur’udu* is the only term available which suits the semantic field denoted by the Hittite translation. In this respect note the equation Sum./Akk. ^{uz}gú-mur = *ur’udu* in can. Urta 15, 32. However, the vertical context does not support this interpretation.
- iii 15 The second sign in (2) must possibly be read *mur*₇ (SIG₄), as proposed by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 137), with *mur*₇ usually set against Akk. *arkatu* “backside”; however, also the reading sig₄ is possible, coinciding with the vertical context ‘oven’. Güterbock’s suggestion to restore Hitt. *iškišaḫ ḫastaiš* “bone of the back” in (5) and consequently Akk. *eṣenṣēru* “backbone” in (5) is probably too fargoing.
- iii 17 The restoration in (2), as also suggested by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 138), is based on the equation Sum./Akk. gú-im-šu-rin-na = *a[ḫ tinuuri]* (Late-OB Kagal I 368). Yet, the sign read rin (<GIŠ>) rather looks like <KU> (collated).

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		gú-šub-gíd-da	[]- ^r x ¹
		gú-z[i-ga]	[]
		gú-z[i-ga]	[]
		gú-z[i-ga]	[]-la-lu
	25	gu[n]	[bi-il-t]ù
		gu[n-dugud]	[bi-il-t]ù kab-bi-tu ₄
		gu[n-bi]	[bi-lat-s]ú
		gú-m[e-er]	[x x h]a-na-bu
		gú-ĝ[á-ĝá]	[kà-na-a-š]ú
iii	30	gú-r[e-a]	[ul-li-k]a ₄ -a
		gú- ^r e ¹ -[a]	[an-ni-k]à-a
		gú-[še-a]	[a-na-m]u-kà-a
		gú-r[e-x]	[an-ni-i]š
		gú-[e-x]	[ul-li-iš]
	35	gú-š[e-x]	[a-na-mi-iš]
		gú-r[e-x]	[]
		gú- ^r e ¹ -[x]	[]
		gú-še- ^r x ¹	[]
iii	40	gú-si	[nap-ḥ]a-rù
		gú-si-si	[nap-ḥar n]ap-ḥa-ri
		gú-si-kur-r[a]	[nap-ḥar] KUR-ti

- iii 21 Sum. gú-šub-gíd-da (alternative reading: gú-šub-bu-da), being otherwise not attested, may be artificially compounded out of gú-šub(-ba) and gú-gíd(-da). The traces in (5) best fit the sign <ḪAR>, and may be completed to Hitt. *ḫaršalanza* “angry”, thus. According to the photo, the final sign of (4), given as <SILIM> in the copy, can also be <ŠU>. One could then restore Akk. [ša-ba-a]-šu in (2).
- iii 22-24 M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 138) restore Sum. gú-b[ar-ra]. With regard to iii 24 (Hitt. *kariwariwar* “dawn, morning”), restoring Sum. gú-z[i-ga], which is also in agreement with Hitt. *ḫaluwauwar* in iii 23, seems more plausible.
- iii 24 Strikingly, the only restoration fairly suitable in (4) is Akk. *mušlālu*, which actually means “noon, midday”.
- iii 25-27 Note the variation in gender between Hitt. GUN-aš (c.), GUN-an (n.), and GUN-aš=šiš (c.).
- iii 27 The restorations in (2) and (4) are according to (5).
- iii 28 The restoration in (2), also proposed by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 138), is according to Sum./Akk. gú-me-er-me-er = *ḫutannubu* (Antagal 3 273, can. Urta 2 286). Yet, the lacuna preceding <NA-BU> provides space for at least two, if not three signs. Thus, there must either be restored another word in front of *ḫanābu*, or (2) must read Sum. gú-m[e-er-me-er], ranging then into the Akkadian column. Following A. Goetze (1938: 80) and HEG sub *ḫuwalliš*-, one may further restore Hitt. *ḫu-wa-li-ya*-[wa-ar], which Goetze and HEG derive from Hitt. *ḫuwalliš* “pine cone” and, presuming the Akkadian equivalent to be *ḫutannabu*!, translate

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
¹ har ¹ -[]- ¹ x ¹	-	-
ši-e-et-ti-iš	-	hapax leg.
ḫal-lu-wa-u-wa-ar	-	“to quarrel, fight”
ka-ri-wa-ri-wa-ar	-	“(in the) morning”
GUN-aš	“load, talent”	“load, talent”
da-aš-šu GUN-an	“heavy load/talent”	“heavy load/talent”
GUN-aš-ši-iš	“his load/talent”	“his load/talent”
ḫu-wa-li-ya-[]	“to grow abundantly []”	-
ka-ni-ni-ya-[u-wa-ar]	“to gather, collect ^{to bow down} ”	“to submit, bow down”
[]	“here”	-
[]	“there”	-
e-ni-[]	“yonder”	-
an-ni-iš	“hither”	“that one”
ka-a-aš	“thither”	“this one”
e-ni-iš-pát	“yonder”	“that one over there”
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	“all, totality”	-
¹ kar ¹ -p[é ² -]	“totality of the totality”	-
KUR-aš kar-pé-eš-šar	“totality of the land”	“rising/lifting of the land”

as “to bend, curl” (referring to the 'bending' structure of cones). Since the presumed restoration in (4), however, seems unlikely, this interpretation probably is aberrant as well.

iii 29 See note to ii 43'.

iii 30-43 This section is paralleled by Kagal Bo. C = KBo. 16,87 i 1'-15'; it is extensively dealt with chapter 12, sect. 5.5.2.

iii 30-35 Hitt. =pat in iii 35 apparently refers to the preceding section and not to the preceding entry (in this respect, see chapter 9, sect. 6.4.). Thus, the expressions to be restored in (5) of 30-32 are probably the same as in 33-35; in this case, the Hittite translations lack a corresponding element not only to the Akkadian terminative in 33-35, but also to the locative in 30-32.

iii 30 The pronominal stem Hitt. an(n)i- is otherwise not attested. According to the Hittite three-fold deictic system, one would actually expect the form apaš. Possibly, Hitt. an(n)i- is in fact artificial, resulting from interference with Akk. anniš.

iii 40 The restoration in (4) is according to following entry.

iii 41 Hitt. karpeššar “rising” can only with severe difficulties be brought in agreement with Akk. napharu “totality”. HED sub kar(a)p- suggests that “karpessar probably meant 'levy, census, stock-taking, sum’”, which would also correspond to the basic meaning of Akk. pḫr “to assemble, gather”. Note however, that in ii 15f., Akk. napharu

col.	i.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		gú-gúr	<i>kà-na-a-šu</i>
		gú-gúr-gúr	<i>kà-na-a-šu</i>
		si	<i>qár-nu</i>
	45	si	<i>sa₂₀-pár-tu</i>
		si	<i>la-mu-ú</i>
		si	<i>ʿliʿ-mi-tù</i>
		si	<i>kà-na-a-šu</i>
		si	<i>pa-ḥa-ru</i>
iii	50	si	<i>ša-pa-ku</i>
		ʿsiʿ	<i>ma-lu-ú</i>
		ʿsiʿ	<i>še₂₀-mu-ú</i>
		[si]	<i>a-ša-šum</i>
		[si]	<i>a-ša-KAR</i>
	55	[si]	<i>a-ra-mu</i>
		[si]	<i>uḥ-ḥu-uz-zu</i>
		[si]	<i>ʿse₂₀-bu-úʿ</i>
		[si]	[]
		[si]	[]
iii	60	[si]	[]
		[]	[]
		(break)	
iv	1'	[]	[]
		[]	[x x x Z]U?

is equally set against Sum. gú-si and translated quite appropriately by Hitt. *taruppeššar*. An alternative, but equally not fully compelling explanation is relating the Hittite directly to the Sumerian; it is discussed in greater detail in chapter 11, sect. 2.6.2. The different Hittite translations for Akk. *napharu* possibly indicate that the text was composed out of different sources (further see chapter 12, sect. 5.5.2.).

iii 42f. See note to ii 43'.

iii 45 Both CAD and AHW book the Akkadian sub *sappartu*, suggesting a connection with Akk. *sappāru*, which denotes a kind of bovid. The dictionaries differ in the meaning they establish, AHW proposing “Kopffell”, CAD mainly referring to the present entry, thus favoring “tip of the horn”. Anyway, the evidence is inconsistent. As for a detailed discussion, cf. Güterbock 1964: 99f.

iii 46f. The equation Sum./Akk. si = *lamû*, *lamītu*, though also attested in later sources (Idu 2 92: SyllSum./OrthSum./Akk. [s]i-i = SUM = *lamû ša* [nīti]; Nabnitu O 272: [x-x]-x = si-ga = *nītu lawû*; Antagal 3 207: si = *lamû ša limēti*), is not supported by literary sources. It must probably be interpreted in connection with Sum si, then constituting a paralectic equation. The variation between Hitt. *anda* and *araḥzanda* appears as an (artificial) over-differentiation.

iii 48f. The equations Sum./Akk. si = *kanāšu*, *paḥāru* are taxilectic for Sum. gú--si.

iii 48 See note to ii 43'.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>ka-ni-ni-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	“to gather, collect ^{to bow down} ”	“to submit, bow down”
<i>ka-ni-ni-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	“to gather, collect ^{to bow down} ”	“to submit, bow down”
SI-ar	“horn”	“horn”
SI-aš <i>al-pu-i-mar</i>	see note	“tip of the horn”
<i>an-da wa-aḥ-nu-mar</i>	“to surround, encircle”	“to turn inside”?
<i>a-ra-aḥ-¹za¹-an-ta wa-aḥ-nu-mar</i>	“to surround, encircle”	“to turn outside”?
<i>ka-ni-ni-ya-wa-ar</i>	“to gather, collect ^{to bow down} ”	“to submit, bow down”
<i>an-da ta-ru-up-pu-ar</i>	“to assemble”	“to assemble, gather”
<i>la-a-ḥu-u-wa-ar</i>	“to heap up, pour”	“to pour”
<i>šu(KU)¹-un-nu-mar</i>	“to be full, to fill up”	“to fill”
<i>iš-dam-ma-aš-šu-wa-ar</i>	“to listen”	“to listen”
<i>an-da-kán im-pa-u-wa-ar</i>	“to become worried”	“to be burdened, depressed”
<i>an-da-kán im-pa-u-¹wa-ar-pát¹</i>	-	“also to be burdened, depressed”
<i>ti-ya-la-w[a-ar]</i>	“to cover, plate”	see note
<i>ḥa-li-iš-[ši-ya-u-wa-ar]</i>	“to mount (in precious metal)”	“to mount (in precious metal)”
<i>¹mu¹-ga-a-u-[wa-ar]</i>	“to brew beer ^{to wish, desire} ”	“to pray, invoke”
[x] ¹ x ¹ y[a]	-	-
[x] ¹ x ¹ []	-	-
[x] ¹ x ¹ ¹ x ¹ ¹ la ¹ a[n]	-	-
[x x NÍ]G.SI.SÁ-an-[za]	-	-
[x x x a]n-za	-	-
<i>u-UḪ-ḥu-wa-ar</i>	-	see note

- iii 50 The reading si is paralectic for sî.
- iii 52 The reading si is paralectic for še.
- iii 53 The reading si is taxilectic for dîriġ (SIA).
- iii 54 <KAR> collated.
- iii 55f. Akk. *arāmu* and *uḫḫuzu* are probably to be linked with Akk. *šapāku*, thus being semantic paralexes, themselves based on the phonetic paralexes sî for sî.
- iii 55 HEG links Hitt. *tiyalawar*, hapax legomenon, to the term Hitt. *tiyalan*, which, being commonly attested in inventory texts and denoting a certain quality of textiles there, would fit the meaning suggested by the present equation with Akk. *arāmu* “to cover”.
- iii 57 According to the Hittite translation, there is a commutation of Akk. *šebû* “to wish” and *sebû* “to brew beer” (No. 187).
- iii 60 M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 139) suggest the reading Hitt. [x x NÍ]G.SI.SÁ-a[n-za] in (5) like in l. 61. However, the sign identified as <SILIM> rather looks like <LA>, and the sign preceding it is hardly identifiable (collated).
- iv 2' Note that Hitt. *weḫzi* is spelled *u-UḪ-zi* in KUB 11,34 vi 53 (NS) and KBo. 21,90 Vs. 13' (MS). The present interpretation is tentative, thus; moreover since (2) and (4) are broken.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		níĝ-X níĝ-X	[]-tu ₄ []-pu
	5'	níĝ-gig níĝ-gig níĝ-gig	[mu-u]r-šú [ma-ru-u]š-tù [ik-ki-b]u
		i-bí-za x¹-[]	[i-bi-sú]-x¹ []
iv	10'	x¹-[] []	[]-x¹ []-x¹-lu
		zag zag zag	[i-t]u [pa-t]ù [im-mi-i]t-t[ù]
	15'	zag zag zag zag zag zag	[]-x¹ [] [] [] [] []
iv	20'	zag	[a-ši-ir-tu ₄]
		[zag-ĝar-ra] [zag-x] [zag-l0] [zag-x]	[a-ši-ir-t]u ₄ []-x¹-pu [e]š-ra-a-tù ra-bá-a-tù
	25'	[zag-tag-ga] [zag-tag-ga]	sà-ka ₄ -pu sí-kip-tù

- iv 3'f. Regarding the second sign in (2) (which is according to collation rendered correctly in the copy), both M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 140) and CHD sub *pukk-* do not make an attempt of identification; the sign is also missing in Rüster / Neu 1989. The sign <GIG> must be excluded, as it occurs in its usual form in the following section. Possible restorations in (4) are Akk. *lemuttu* and *ikkibu*. Akk *lemuttu*, however, is improbable as it is an feminine adjective, Akk *ikkibu* is improbable as it is given with a differing translation in l 7'.
- iv 4' Hitt. *kušduwantauwar* is a nomen actionis derived from *kušduwai-*, via the participle *kušduwant-* and the unattested denominative verb **kušduwantai-*.
- iv 7' This entry is extensively dealt with in Cohen 2002: 25-27.
- iv 8' Except the present one, there is no further instance which attests a neuter-gender variant of Hitt. *luri* besides the common communis-gender stem. That the ending *-i* represents the dative-locative is unlikely in the present context (Note however that the ending of the Hittite term in the following entry is equally *-i*). With regard to that, Hitt. *luri* is best to be interpreted as a mistake for *luriš* (No. 003).
- iv 9' Remarkably, there is some empty space at the beginning of (2), at least for one sign (collated). The Hittite term for “silver” is unfortunately not identified as yet, nor is its stem ending. Complementing *-i* probably denotes the

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>pu-uk-kán-za.</i>	-	“hatred, disgusting”
<i>ku-uš-du-wa-an-ta-u-wa-ar</i>	-	“defamation”
GIG- <i>aš</i>	“illness”	“illness”
<i>ir-ma-ni-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	“evil, distress”	“to become ill”
Ú-UL <i>a-a-ra</i>	“interdicted, reserved”	“not right, interdicted”
<i>lu-u-ri</i>	“financial loss/damage”	“(in/for) loss, comedown”
DINGIR ^{LIM} - <i>aš</i> KÙ.BABBAR- <i>i</i>	-	“(for) the silver of the deity”
<i>la-a-ḫu-wa-ar</i>	-	“to pour”
KAR- <i>ar</i>	-	“to find, encounter”
ZAG- <i>aš</i>	“border, territory”	“border, area”
ZAG- <i>aš</i>	“border, area”	“border, area”
<i>pal-ta-[na-aš]</i>	“right arm, side ^{shoulder?} ”	“shoulder”
<i>an-da []</i>	-	-
<i>š[a]</i>	-	-
[]	-	-
[<i>x</i>] ¹ <i>x</i> [<i>x</i>] ²	-	-
[<i>G</i>] ¹ Š ¹ <i>X</i>	-	-
GIŠ ¹ <i>iš-ta-na-na-aš</i>	“sanctuary, private altar”	“altar”
GIŠ ¹ ZAG.GAR.RA- <i>aš</i>	“sanctuary, private altar”	“altar”
DINIGRMEŠ- <i>aš</i> MIN	-	“the deity's altar”
10- <i>an-ki</i>	“tenth”	“ten times”
<i>šal-la-i</i>	“greatness ^{great ones (f.)} ”	“great ones (n.)”
<i>pa-aš-ga-u-wa-ar</i>	“to thrust, repulse ^{to plant, impale} ”	“to stick in, plant”
<i>pa-aš-ga-wa-ar-pát</i>	“to thrust, repulse ^{to plant, impale} ”	“to stick in, plant”

neuter nominative-accusative (however, see also previous note).

- iv 12' The Akkadian can equally be read *idu* “arm, side”. Yet, compare the Hittite of the present entry to the translation of Akk. *idu* in iv 31'.
- iv 14' The restoration in (4) assumed to be correct, the Hittite translation is apparently based on the quite peripheral meaning “shoulder” of Akk. *imittu*, which applies to the animal body only.
- iv 20'f. Note that Hitt. *ištanana-* is alternately written syllabographically and logographically.
- iv 24' The equation Sum./Akk. *zag-x* = *rabû* is otherwise not attested. Possibly, it is a phonetic paralexia for *saĝ* = *rabû* (Idu I 115), similarly as in l. 28'. Akk. *rabātu* here is, otherwise than indicated by the Hittite translation, used as an abstract noun (cf. CAD sub *rabātu*); feminine plural adjectives in isolated positions are very uncommon in lexical lists.
- iv 25'f. In (2) the restoration [*zag-saĝ*] is also possible. Hitt. *pašgauwar* derives from the root *pašk-* “to stick in, plant”, and not from *pašku-* “to reject, ignore”, which would better fit Akk. *sakāpu* “to push off”, but as for which the form **paškuwar* would be expected. Thus, Akk. *sakāpu* has apparently been confused with Akk. *zaqāpu* “to plant, impale” (No. 188; already noted by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock [1971: 141]).

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[zag-dīlī]	<i>i-de-ek-ku</i>
		[zag-íl-la]	<i>dī-na-a-nu</i>
		[zag-šú]	<i>še-im-tù</i>
iv	30'	[zag-šè]	<i>bu-du</i>
		[da]	<i>i-du</i>
		[da]	<i>a-ḫu</i>
		[da]	<i>te-ḫu</i>
		[da]	<i>iš-tu</i>
	35'	[da x]	[]
		[da x]	[]
		[da x]	[]
		d[a x]	[]
		da-da	[]
iv	40'	da-[x]	[x x]- ^r x ¹ -tù
		d[a-rí]	<i>da-ri-tù</i>
		[da-r]í	<i>la-bi-ru</i>
		[d]a-rí	<i>še₂₀-e-bu</i>
		da-rí-an-IGI	<i>me-gu₅-ú</i>
	45'	da-rí-an-IGI	<i>bá-ṭa-NU</i>

- iv 27' Akk. *i-TI-IK-ki* is to be analyzed as *edēn=ki*. Akk. *edēnu* accomplished by a genitive suffix always appears in the locative-adverbialis. When preceded by the preposition *ina*, it is in the genitive. Suffixed nominative forms, like the present one, are otherwise not attested, as is the suffix *-ki* in combination with that stem.
- Sum. *zag-dīlī*, thus, is very probably paralectic or unorthographic for *saĝ-dīlī*.
- iv 28' Since virtually all lexical attestations of Akk. *dinānu* are set against Sum. *saĝ* or *saĝ-íl(-la)*, the term very likely to be restored in (2), is *zag-íl(-la)*. The equation then forms a paralexia or an unorthographic spelling.
- iv 29' The identification of Akk. *še-im-tù* as *šimtu* “mark”, against *šimtu* “destiny”, builds on Sum. *zag*, which is very likely to be restored as the initial sign in (2). For the second sign, there are two possible parallels: Sum. *zag-šú* and *zag-dīb* (can. Nabnitu 4 354ff.). Note that the vowel in Akk. *šimtu* invariably shows *i*-color (with just one ambiguous NB spelling ŠEN-*du*, GCCI 300:2). Also note the MB variant *šindu* occurring in l. 46'. Hitt. *wašši* possibly – but not very likely – results from a commutation of Akk. *šimtu* and *šammu* “herb, medicinal plant”; a feminine derivation of *šammu* is however not attested, neither in Akkadian nor in West Semitic.
- iv 30' According to the Hittite translation, Akk. *būdu* has apparently been confused with *pūtu* (No. 184). The same error is also attested in ii 12' as well as in SaV Bo. I = KUB 3,95: 13'
- iv 33' Due to the vertical context, the Akkadian is rather to be interpreted as *teḫū* “side” than as *teḫū* “to approach”, though there is no spelling with an explicit *e*-vowel among the few attestations of Akk. *teḫū*.
- iv 34' Sum. *da* is paralectic for *ta*. As to Akk. *ištu* and its spelling with final <TU>, cf. chapter 9, sect. 2.1.2.1.
- iv 39' <TAR> in (5) is confirmed by collation.
- iv 40' (5) is collated.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
1-aš	“you alone”	“one”
tar-pa-al-li-iš	“substitute”	“substitute”
wa-aš-ši	“painting mark, brand ^{plant, herb ?} ”	“(medical) herb”
SAG.KI-an-za	“shoulder ^{forehead} ”	“forehead”
NÍ.TE-aš	“arm, side”	“limb”
ʽpal-taʽ-[na-aš]	“arm, flank”	“shoulder”
[]	“side, flank”	-
[]	“from, since”	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
ʽxʽ-ʽtar-kuʽ-w[a-ar]39'	-	-
ták-ša-at-te-ša-x	-	-
UMMÈDA-an-za	“everlasting, enduring ^{nurse} ”	“keeper, nurse”
ú-iz-za pa-a-an	“old”	“year passed”
LÚŠU.GI-an-za	“old person”	“old person “
ši-ip-pa-an-du-ar	“negligence ^{offering} ”	“to pour, libate”
ma-al-ki-ya-wa-ar	“to stop, interrupt ^{to plait, twist} ”	“to plait, twist”

- iv 41' According to the Hittite translation, Akk. *darītu* “eternity” has been confused with *tārītu* “nurse” (No. 189).
- iv 42' It was not possible to identify an additional attestation of the expression Hitt. *wezza pan* (apparently, the entry in Hoffner 1967b is solely based on the present attestation). Notably, the two components *wett-s* “year” (c.) and *pan* “passed” (n.) are not congruent as to gender. The Hittite word actually expressing the state of being old, is **miyaḥḥuwant-*, which exclusively attributes persons, however.
- iv 44'-45' This (highly erroneous) passage has been extensively dealt with by H. Hoffner (1967a: 300-303). If not indicated otherwise, the interpretations and arguments given follow Hoffner's suggestions.
- iv 44'f. <IGI> is mistaken for <ŠUB> (No. 046)
- iv 44' According to the Hittite translation, Akk. *megû* has been confused with *maqqû* (No. 190), itself a derivation of Akk. *naqû*. Moreover note that the *m*-prefixed Akkadian term is translated into Hittite by an infinitive (No. 159).
- iv 45' According to the frequently attested equation Sum./Akk. *da-ra-an-šub* = *baṭālu*, Akk. *ba-ṭa-NU* very likely represents *baṭālu*. H. Hoffner (1967a: 301) traces the commutation of /nu/ and /lu/ back to the polyphony of the sign <LUM>, which also reads [núm], and which was probably the sign used for writing the present syllable in word final position in the OB period. Accepting this explanation, the mistake is one of the few instances that definitely point to a written *vorlage* (No. 102).
- According to the Hittite translation, Akk. *baṭālu* has additionally been confused with Akk. *paṭālu* “to plait, twist” (No. 191). Note that this error must have been committed before the above-mentioned confusion between /lu/ and /nu/.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		še-be-da	ši-in-du
		še-be-da	e-gu ₅
		še-be-da	pé-ṭù-ú
		še-be-da	bá-ṭá-NU
iv	50'	[x x d]a	ap-pu-tù
		[]	[x x]-ú
		[]	[]
		(break)	
v	1'	[]	[x]-ra-lu ₄
		dag	na-qa-a-ru
		bàr	ša-dá-du
		bàr	me-eš ₁₅ -ṭú-u
	5'	bàr	me-el-ṭú-u
		dag	GIŠDAG
		aš-ti	GIŠDAG
		tuš	GIŠDAG
v	10'	šú-šú	GIŠDAG
		LÁL [?] -ERÍN	GIŠDAG
		LÁL [?] -ERÍN-ŠÚ	GIŠDAG

iv 46' Akk. *ši-in-du* “paint, mark, marking” does not well agree with Sum. *še-be-da* “(to be) negligent”, H.A. Hoffner (1967a: 87) assumes Akk. *šētu* “sin, crime” or *šeṭu* “to neglect, commit a crime” as original entry; he thereby refers to the quite uncustomary form of the sign <IN> in the present entry, tentatively assuming an original spelling *ši-i'-ṭù* (No. 192).

Hitt. *puwattiš* is hapax legomenon; Hoffner *ibid.* attempts to link it to Ug. *pwt* “a dyeing substance”, which would then quite aptly correspond to Akk. *šindu*. However note that Akk. *šindu* also occurs in iv 29', there, however, in its OB from *šimtu* and provided with a different translation (also cf. chapter 12, sect. 5.5.2.).

iv 47' According to the Hittite translation Akk. *egû* has been confused with *ikû* (No. 193).

iv 48' According to the vertical context, the Akkadian is very likely to be analyzed as *peṭû* “to delay”. According to the Hittite translation, then, Akk. *peṭû* has been confused with Akk. *padû* “to spare, release” (No. 194).

iv 49' Cf. note to iv 45'.

iv 50' As to (4), two interpretations are possible, Akk. *abbuttu*, denoting a specific hair style, and *apputtu*, an interjection mainly occurring in letters, which expresses the feeling of urgency. Following H.A. Hoffner (1967a: 302), the latter solution seems more preferable, since the entries in the preceding section are mainly terms denoting delay or negligence, and thus match the semantic field quite well.

It is however difficult to reconstruct the word which the Hittite translation – if restored correctly – is based upon. H. Otten (1952-53:70) and H.A. Hoffner (1967a: 302) propose Akk. *ṭub-bu-tù*, an otherwise unattested derivation of the root *ṭ(a)b*.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>pu-wa-at-ti-iš</i>	“to neglect, commit a crime	painting mark, brand ” see note
<i>GÁN-aš</i>	“to be careless, negligent	field ” “field”, a field measure
<i>pí-iš-ga-t[al-la-aš]</i>	“to delay	to spare, release ” “sparing, delivering”
<i>ma-al-ki-[ya-wa-ar]</i>	“to stop, interrupt	to plait, twist ” “to plait, twist”
<i>la-az-z[i-ya-wa-ar]</i>	“please; it is urgent”	“happiness, friendliness”?
<i>GUL-a[r]</i>	-	“to hit”
<i>iš-¹x¹-[]</i>	-	-
<i>¹x¹-[]</i>	-	-
<i>ku-ru-ri-y[a-u-wa-ar]</i>	“to demolish, tear down	to be different/hostile ” “to behave hostile”
<i>SUD-u-wa-ar</i>	“to spread out for drying	to pull ” “to pull”
<i>iš-pár-ri-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	“drying place”	“to spread out”
<i>KI.MIN-pát</i>	“drying place”	“also to spread out”
<i>GIŠDAG</i>	“seat, throne”	“throne”
<i>GIŠDAG</i>	“seat, throne”	“throne”
<i>GIŠDAG</i>	“seat, throne”	“throne”
<i>GIŠDAG</i>	“seat, throne”	“throne”
<i>GIŠDAG</i>	“seat, throne”	“throne”
<i>GIŠDAG</i>	“seat, throne”	“throne”

- v 2' According to the Hittite translation, Akk. *naqāru* has been confused with *nakāru* (No. 195; already noted by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 297).
- v 3' As noted by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 308), the Sumerian and the Akkadian do not match, and the Akkadian has to be reconstructed as *šeṭû* “to spread out for drying”, which forms the basis for the two following entries (No. 196). Note that in West Semitic; verba mediae geminatae often have the second root consonant geminated, and not reduplicated like in Akkadian, which may provide an explanation for the mistake.
- v 4'f. Note that Akk. *mešû* and *melû* constitute phonetic and diachronic/dialectal variants. The grouping of such variants in lexical lists is quite an uncommon phenomenon. Note moreover that Akkadian *m*-prefixed derivations, forming nomina loci in the present case, are rendered into Hittite through infinitives (No. 160).
- v 6'-12' Note that the meaning of the Sumerogram DAG is not identical in Akkadian and Hittite. In Hittite it is invariably confined to the meaning “throne”, whereas it has retained all its original polysemic variants in Akkadian (No. 233). Further note that it is virtually never accompanied by the determinative GIŠ in Akkadian writing, whereas the combination with GIŠ is quite usual in Hittite writing. The Sumerogram in the Akkadian column, thus, is used according to Hittite writing practice.
- v 9' Sum. *tuš* is used as taxilexis for *ki-tuš*.
- v 11'f. The identification of the first sign in (2) is difficult. It is actually not shaped like <LÁL>, the two horizontals appearing as oblique strokes. The sign, thus, rather looks like inverted <ERÍM>. It is also possible that the first two signs must be regarded as one sign. Also note the striking similarity with the sign <KIB> in the following l. 13'.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		kib	<i>kib-bu</i>
v		máš	<i>šu-ut-tù</i>
	15'	máš	<i>bé-e-ru</i>
		máš	<i>pu-ḥa-du</i>
		máš	<i>er-bu</i>
		dar	<i>er-bu</i>
		MI	<i>er-bu</i>
v	20'	máš-dar	<i>er-bu</i>
		máš-NE	<i>er-bu</i>
		máš-da-a-ri	<i>er-bu</i>
		máš-da-a-ri	<i>iš-de₄-ḥu</i>
		U	U
		U	U
(rest of column uninscribed)			
vi	1'	'X'. 'KAM' [x x (x)]	
	2'	ŠU ^m Ša-bu-ḥa-za	

Izi Bo. Ab = KBo. 26,42 (772/z + 69/582)

obv ^l . l.	1'	[s]i	obv ^l .r.	1'	[níĝ]-NE-'RU'
		[s]i			'níĝ'-NE-RU
		[s]i			níĝ-NE-RU
		[s]i			níĝ-NE-RU
		(end of tablet)			(end of tablet)

- v 13' As for an interpretation of both the Akkadian and the Hittite, suggestions diverge widely. CAD and AHW regard Akk. *kibbu* as denoting a kind of metal-made or wooden object. HED sub *kank(a)-* connects it with Hebr. *kap* and Ug. *kp*, which in addition to “hand” can also mean “weigh(scale)”, thus interpreting Hitt. *gangala-*, a derivation of the root *gank-* “to hang”, equally as “weighscale”; however, in all the other attestations, Hitt. *gangala-* denotes a kind of textile, possibly a curtain.
- v 14' Sum. *máš* is here used as taxilexis for *máš-ĝe₆*.
- iv 15' The spelling of Akk. *bé-e-ru* is unique. According to CAD, it is never spelled with an *e*-vowel, and plene writings are very rare.
- iv 18'-23' In the present section, Sum. *dar* (v 18'), *máš-dar* (v 20'), *máš-da-a-ri* (v 22'f.), and probably also *máš-NE* (v 21', when read *máš-dè*), all reflect Sum. *máš-da-re₆-a*.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>ga-an-ga-la-aš</i>	a wooden or metal object	a textile
<i>U-aš</i>	“dream”	“sleep, dream”
<i>a-ri-ya-še-eš-šar</i>	“divination”	“oracle”
<i>SILA₄-aš</i>	“lamb”	“lamb”
<i>ar-kam-ma-aš</i>	“income, gift (to a deity or king)”	“tribute”
<i>ar-kam-ma-aš</i>	“income, gift (to a deity or king)”	“tribute”
<i>ar-kam-ma-aš</i>	“income, gift (to a deity or king)”	“tribute”
<i>ar-kam-ma-aš</i>	“income, gift (to a deity or king)”	“tribute”
<i>ar-kam-ma-aš</i>	“income, gift (to a deity or king)”	“tribute”
<i>iš-^lx-x^l-e-u-wa-ar</i>	“profitable business”	
U		
U		

rev^l. r. 1' ^lx^l-ri-a
[x-x]-a
(break)

- iv 19' The only possible explanation regarding the equation MI = *erbu* is to interpret Akk. *erbu* as *erpu* “dark”, then matching Sum. *ĝe₆*. Yet, there is no parallel attestation to this equation.
- vi 1f. The colophon is discussed as Col.A. in chapter 8, sect. 6. As to l. 1', note the following graphic remarks: The traces of the first sign, the left half of which is broken away, involve one vertical wedge and, at its lower left hand, a horizontal one. The preserved parts of the second sign consist of four quite small oblique strokes forming a rectangle and, to its right hand, the trace of another, slightly bigger oblique stroke. Large parts of the upper half of both signs are destroyed. While the second sign very probably represents <KAM>, the reading DUB.X.KAM is virtually excluded (collated)
- rev. r. 1'f. The present passage probably corresponds to the section v 18'ff. in Izi Bo. A = KBo. 1,42.

Izi Bo. B = KBo. 1,31 (VAT 7434d)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
obv. ¹	1'	[IDIM]	[]	[]
			[]	[]
			[]	[]
			[]	[]
	5'		[]	[]
			[]	[]
			[]	[]
			[]	[]- ^r x ¹
		[BAD]	[]	[be-lu]
			[]	[šar]-ru
obv. ¹	10'		[ti-il ₅]	[g]a-ma-a-ru
			[ti-il ₅]	qa-a-tù
			[]	BA-šu-ú
			[]	i-pé-šu
			[pa]-ad	i-pé-šu
	15'		[pa]-ad	né-e-šu
			[pa]-ad	ru-ú-qú
		[BAD-BAD]	[pa-a]d-pa-ad	dáb-dú-u
		[BAD]	[u]š ²	zu-um-ru
				ša-lam-t[u ₄]
obv. ¹	20'			mu-ú-t[u ₄]

(break)

obv. 1'-7' That the present section deals with <IDIM> is suggested by the following section, that deals with <BAD>, but also by Hitt. *dudduwanza* “deaf” and *arpallimiš* (probably with a similar meaning). Many of the Akkadian equivalents to Sum. IDIM represent the same semantic field (cf. Akk. *saklu* “handicaped”, *sukkulu* “deaf”, *ulālu* “weak”; can. Aa 2/3 8'ff.). Note that in all other lexical series dealing with the sign <IDIM/BAD>, the BAD-section precedes the IDIM-section. The order in the present manuscript, thus, appears to be inverted (also see the introductory remarks in part D).

obv. 4'f. Provided the present entries cover the same semantic field as the two following entries, possible restorations in (5) are Hitt. *merrant-* “disappeared, lost” or *harrant-* “spoiled”.

obv. 6' Hitt. *dudduwant-* can either be connected with Hitt. *duddu-* “to behave merciful, gracious” or with Hitt. *duddumi-* “deaf, quite” (cf. HEG 479+482). Taken into account that the logogram treated in the present section probably is <IDIM>, the second interpretation (“deaf, quiet”) is more appropriate.

obv. 7' Hitt. *arpallimmi-* can be analyzed as *arpa-alli-mmi-*, possibly deriving from Hitt. *:arpa-* “defeat”. The suffixes mark it as of Luvian provenance. The complex derivational suffix *-alli-mmi-* is otherwise attested, as well; cf. Luv. *waškuwallima*.

The traces at the end of (4) are best completed to <MU>, since one expects a nominative ending. However, a small bit of a vertical wedge, visible at the left hand (collated), apparently contradicts this suggestion.

obv. 8'-17' Like the over-all sequence of signs, the general arrangement of the polysemes in this section seems to be inverted, as well, according to the sequence which is usually found in parallel sections; cf. note to 1'-7'.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]-iš	-	-
[x-x-x]-wa-li-i[š]	-	-
[x-x]-wa-an-za	-	-
[x-r]a-an-za	-	-
ʿx¹-ra-an-za	-	-
du-ud-du-wa-an-za	-	“deaf”
ar-pal-li-im-mi-[išʷ]	-	see note
iš-ḫa-a-aš	“lord”	“lord”
LUGAL-u[š]	“king”	“king”
zi-in-nu-m[ar]	“to finish, complete”	“to finish, complete”
ŠU-[aš]	“to become finished ^{hand} ”	“hand”
wa-ar-ši-ʿx¹-[]	“to exist ^{to dissolve, relax} ”	“to calm down, dissolve”
i-ya-u-wa-[ar]	“existence ^{to do, make} ”	“to do, make”
i-ya-u-wa-[ar]	“existence ^{to do, make} ”	“to do, make”
an-tu-u-uh-[ša-a-tar]	“to depart, remove ^{people} ”	“mankind, people”
tu-u-wa-l[a-aš]	“distant, remote”	“distant, remote”
ʿx¹-[]	“defeat”	-
[]	“body”	-
[]	“corpse”	-
[]	“death”	-

- obv. 8'f. The equations Sum./Akk. BAD = *šarru*, *bēlu* are otherwise not attested. As implicitly suggested by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 144), they possibly derive from IDIM = *kabtu* “heavy, important (person)” (thus forming semantic paralexes) and were transferred from the preceding into the present section.
- obv. 11' According to the Hittite translation, Akk. *qatû* has been confused with *qātu* (No. 225).
- obv. 12' The Hittite is best to be restored to *waršiyawar* “to cast/slip off, to calm down, be content”. Akk. *bašû* can of course not be the basis for this translation. Akk. *pašāḫu* “to tranquilize” would fit the Hittite; Aram. *pšš* “to dissolve, relax” even shares both submeanings with the Hittite (No. 198/223).
- obv. 13'f. Akk. *epēšu* is never set against Sum. BAD, nor does it ever appear written with initial <I>. Due to the vertical context, it is quite obvious that I-BI-ŠU is to be linked to the root *bšy*. Thus, <I> and <BI> result from a misordering of original Akk. *bi-i-šu*. Interestingly, the mistake, one of the few definite instances that are based on a written *vorlage* (cf. chapter 10, sect. 3.1.), also affected the Hittite translation (No. 224).
- obv. 15' According to the vertical context, Akk. *nesû* “to be remote” has been confused with *nešû* “people” (No. 226).
- obv. 17' Akk. *dabdu* appears set against Sum. IGI.IGI in Igituḫ short version 73 and in the Izbu Commentary 402, where it is glossed by SyllSum. ba-ba-ad. The present equation, thus, very likely is paralectic or an unorthographic spelling.
- obv. 12'-20' Note that, like in the preceding section, the order of polysemes is inverted compared to the order actually expected, with the isolexes *mūtu* and *šalamtu* coming after the paralexes *zumru*.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
rev.!	1'	(MUD)	(mu-ud)	ʿx ¹ -[] BA-[] <i>bi-ni</i> -[<i>tu</i> ₄] <i>nab-ni-t</i> [<i>u</i> ₄] KI-BI- <i>il</i> ₅ - <i>tu</i> ₄ <i>gi</i> ₅ - <i>li-it-tu</i> ₄ <i>ni-di-it-tu</i> ₄ <i>pí-ri-tu</i> ₄ <i>pa-ra-du</i> ₄ <i>gi</i> ₅ - <i>ta-al-lu</i> -ʿ <i>ut</i> ¹ - <i>tu</i> ₄
	5'			
rev.!	10'	[M]UD.MUD	mu-ud-mu-ud	
		[pu]-luḥ	pu-lu-uḥ	<i>gi</i> ₅ - <i>li-it-tu</i> ₄
		[pu-lu]ḥ	MIN	<i>ga-la-a-tu</i> ₄
		[MIN-pu-lu]ḥ	ʿMIN pu ¹ -lu- uḥ-pu-lu-uḥ	<i>gi</i> ₅ - <i>ta-al-lu-ut-tu</i> ₄
		[pu-luḥ-igi-lá]	[pu]-lu-uḥ-igi-lá	<i>ma</i> -KU-ú
	15'	[MIN]	[MIN]	<i>ma</i> -KU-ú- <i>tu</i> ₄
		[]	[x]-ʿx ¹ -ma-az-za	<i>ḥu</i> -UK-KU
		[]	[]	KU-TA- <i>ru</i>
		[]	[]	<i>ma-ga</i> (TA) ¹ - <i>ru</i>
		[]	[]	<i>mi-ta-gu</i> ₅ - <i>ru</i>
rev.!	20'	[]	[]	<i>la-a ma-ga-ru</i>
		[]	[]	ʿx ¹
		[]	[]	[x]- <i>tu</i> ₄
		[]	[]	[x-x]-ʿ <i>tu</i> ₄ ¹
			(break)	

rev. 2' According to the following entries, the Akkadian root to be reconstructed should be *bny* “to form, build”.

rev. 5' The interpretation of the Akkadian is difficult. There are no roots with pattern KPl or KPš in Akkadian or West Semite which match the semantic fields <<fear>> or <<forming>>. Akkadian roots which generally come into consideration are *qbl* “to receive” and *gpš* “to be massive”; there is however no /pirist/ form of these roots attested.

rev. 7' Akk. *nidittu* very likely derives from WSem. *ndd* “to flee, abhor, turn from”, which fits the vertical context very well. According to that, a possible restoration in (5) would be Hitt. *pitteyawar* “to run, flee”.

rev. 10' Note that the Akkadian Gtn stem (perhaps erroneously) corresponds to the formans -*nu*- in Hittite here. Further note the hyper-geminate spelling (No. 120).

rev. 13' See previous note. Also note the mistaken reduplication in (1).

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
□	-	-
□	-	-
□	“creation, shape”	-
□	“creation”	-
□	see note	-
‘ú¹-[e-ri-te-em-ma-aš]	“fear”	“(to) fear”
B[I-]	“to flee, abhor”	-
ú-e-ri-[te-em-ma-aš]	“fear, terror”	“(to) fear”
ú-e-ri-t[e-em-ma-aš]	“to be fearful”	“(to) fear”
ú-e-ri-te-nu-m[ar]	“to fear constantly to make fear ”	“to frighten”
ú-e-ri-te-em-[ma-aš]	“fear”	“(to) fear”
MIN	“to fear”	“(to) fear”
ú-e-ri-te-nu-m[ar]	“to fear constantly to make fear ”	“to frighten”
ši-nu-ú-r[a-aš]?	see note	see note
MUNUS-za [ši-nu-ú-ra-aš]?	see note	see note
‘ú¹-[]	see note	-
P[U²-]	see note	-
□	“to consent”	-
□	“to be gracious repeatedly”	-
□	“not allowed”	-
□	-	-
□	-	-
□	-	-

- rev. 14f. The root most likely to be restored in (4) is Akk. *makû/mekû* with the two homonymous meanings “to neglect, disregard” and “to be lacking”. Both roots are but scarcely attested in lexical texts, so there are only few equations with Sumerian. Unfortunately, the Hittite is hapax legomenon. The Hittite translations in 15' suggests that Akk. *makû/makûtu* are adjectives or participles; however, the occurrence of feminine forms as complements to masculine bases is very rare in lexical texts, so the Hittite interpretation may be erroneous.
- rev. 16' The Syllabic Sumerian is best linked to Sum. *ma-a-z* “to swell”, with nominalization morpheme *-a*, and, consequently, with a noun to be restored in anteposition. However, none of the possible interpretations of the Akkadian fit this meaning. Possible Akkadian roots involve Akk. *ḥuāqu*, a verb of motion, which is only attested in lexical lists, and *ḥiāqu* “to mix mingle”, which is not attested in the D stem. Akk. *ḥūqu* “step, rung” is equally possible.
- rev. 17' Possible interpretations of the Akkadian are *qutāru* “incense” or a word to be connected with the roo *kdr* “to delimit”

Izi Bo. C = KBo. 1,33 (VAT 7442)

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
1'		[nam]- ¹ á-da ^h ¹ [na]m-sipa [na]m-gáb-bar [nam]-utul ⁵ ¹	[] <i>re-¹'-ú¹-ut-tu₄</i> GÁB.BAR- <i>ut-tu₄</i> <i>ú-tù-lu-ut-tu₄</i>
5'		[nam-g]áb-šar [nam-mu-s]ar	^{LÚ} GÁB.ŠAR- <i>ut-tu₄</i> <i>mu-uš-šar-ut-tu₄</i>
		[nam-dub-sar] [] []	[<i>t</i> u]p- ¹ šar-ut ¹ -tù [x x š/t]a e ut-[tù] [x-x-u]t-tù
10'		[]	[x-x]-x-u[t-tù]
		(break)	

Izi Bo. D = KBo. 1,40 (VAT 7441)

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
1'		[ùĝ] [ùĝ-daĝal-lá] [ùĝ-šár]- ¹ ra ¹ [ùĝ]- ¹ da'-gan ¹ ¹	[u]n-ki un-ki-ta-gal-la un-ki-ša-a-ra un-ki-da-ga-an(PA) ¹	[ni-šu] [ni-šu ra-ap-ša-a-tù] k[i-e]š-[ša-at ni-ši] kúl-la-[at ni-ši]
5'		[e-sír] [e-sír-sig-ga] [e-sír-daĝal-lá] [e-sír-saĝ-gi ₄ -ga]	e-šir ₉ e-šir ₉ -zi-ig-[g]a e-šir ₉ -ta-gal-la e-šir ₉ - ¹ ša-an ¹ -ki-ga	<i>sú-u-qú</i> <i>sú-u-qá-qú-u</i> <i>sú-u-qú ra-pa-aš-tù</i> <i>sú-u-qú la a-šú-ma</i>
10'		[sila] [sila-sig-ga] [sila-daĝal-lá]	[ši-la] [ši-la-z]i-ig-ga [ši-la]-ta-gal-la	<i>sú-u-qú</i> <i>sú-u-qá-qú-u</i> <i>sú-u-qú ra-pa-aš-tù</i>

C 1' Possible restorations in (4) are Akk. *rešūtu* and *nārāru*.

C 3' Note the pseudo-logographic spelling in (4), which can also be interpreted as *kap-pár-ut-tu₄*; also cf. l. 5'.

C 4' The sign read <UTUL₅>¹ appears as <E-KISIM₅xGU₄>. According to quite similar forms occurring in SSgL Bo. E = KUB 3,94, this is apparently the usual form in Hattuša.

C 5' Note the pseudo-logographic writing in (4), which can also be interpreted as *kap-šar-ut-tu₄*; also cf. l. 5'.

D 1'-4' SyllSum. un-ki most likely reflects OrthSum. uĝ. Apparently, the sound [ĝ] was considered most characteristic, so the scribe preferred to render it accurately on the expense of adding a hypothetical vowel (also see chapter 9, sect. 4.2.)

D 4' According to the Akkadian translation, the phrase expected in (2) is Sum. ùĝ-da-gan (alternative spelling:

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>šar-di-y[a-tar]</i>	-	“help, alliance”
^{LÚ} SI[PA- <i>tar</i>]	“craft of the shepherd”	“craft of the shepherd”
^{LÚ} x-[]	“post of the <i>kaparru</i> -shepherd”	-
<i>š[a]</i>	“post of the chief herdsman”	-
^L [^Ú]	“craft of the jeweler”	-
^L [^Ú]	“craft of the engraver”	-
[]	“craft of the scribe”	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-

translation of the Akkadian

“people, population”
 “the wide population”
 “totality of the people”
 “totality of the people”

“street”
 “narrow street”
 “wide street”
 “street without exit”

“street”
 “narrow street”
 “wide street”

ûĝ-da-ga-an). The final two damaged signs in (2), however, do apparently neither look like <DA-GAN> nor like <GA-AN>. Final <PA> in (1) (collated) very likely reflects <AN> according to the Sumerian.

D 5'-13' The two sections dealing with Sum. e-sír and síla appear inverted in comparison with the parallel sections in OB Izi.

D 8'/12' M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 260), followed by CAD sub *sūqu* lex.sect., transliterate *zu-ku la-a zu-ku* in (4). Especially with regard to the Sumerian expression (Sum. saĝ--gi₄) the term must be analyzed as Akk. *sūqu lā āšû=ma*, with sandhi *sūqu lāšû=ma*. This expression is not uncustomary in Akkadian and also, Akk. *lā āšû* not rarely appears in the spelling *la-šu-ú* (cf. CAD sub *āšû* 2). However, the enclitic particle =*ma* added to the Akkadian is never attested in this context. Güterbock's transliteration may thus be correct in reflecting

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		sila-[saĝ-gi ₄ -ga] sila-[ka-lím-ma]	ši-la-ša-an-ki-ga ši-la-ka-lum-ma	<i>sú-u-qú la a-šú-ma</i> <i>sú-u-qú ar-bi-tá</i>
		tílla	ti-il-la	<i>sú-u-qú</i>
	15'	tí[lla]	KI.MIN	<i>šu-lu-ú</i>
		tíll[a]	KI.MIN	<i>ri-i-bu.</i>
		tíll[a]	KI.MIN	<i>ri-ba-tu₄</i>
		tí[lla]	KI.MIN	<i>a-šú-u</i>
		tí[lla]	KI.MIN	<i>ši-tu₄</i>
	20'	t[ílla]	KI.MIN	<i>še-e-^rx¹</i>
		[tílla]	KI.MIN	[]
		[tílla]	KI.MIN	[]
			(break)	
le.ed.	1'	[]	[]- ^r x ¹ -bu	<i>ša-pí-ku</i>
le.ed.	2'	[]	[]- ^r x-bu	<i>šu-up-pu-ku</i>

Izi Bo. E = KBo. 26,49 (1250/z)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
l.	1'	[]	[]- ^r x ¹
		[]	[]
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹
			(break)
r.	1'		^r a ¹ -[] a-[]
		a-mar-uru ₅ '(TE)	<i>iš-[pa-tu_{3/4}][?]</i> <i>a-bu-[u-bu][?]</i>
	5'	a-mar-uru ₅ '(TE)-kam	<i>a-ša-a[m-šu-tu_{3/4}][?]</i> PU-ul-[]

the expression as the scribe misinterpreted it, reanalyzing Akk. *sūqu lā āšû* as *sūqu laa sūqu*.

If the interpretation is correct and the sequence was segmentized not correctly, the entry forms one of the rare instances of a mistake definitely based on a written *vorlage* (No. 171; also cf. chapter 10, sect. 3.1.).

D 16'f. Akk. *rību* is hapax legomenon with regard to the meaning “street”. It is thus probably due to erroneous reanalysis of the plural *ribātu* in the following line.

D 20' The restoration of the last sign in (4) is uncertain. <TUM> would fairly suit the little traces preserved; however, there is no phonetic variant *še₂tu* attested of Akk. *šītu*.

E r. 3'-6' <TE> here substitutes for <URU₅>, which actually is <TE-gunû>; yet, the sign <URU₅> was apparently known

translation of the Akkadian

“street without exit”

“crossroad”

“street”

“street”

see note

“square”

“to go out, leave”

“exit”

see note

-

-

“heaping/piling up”

“to make heap/pile up”

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

-

-

-

“quiver”

“deluge”

“storm”

-

in Ḫattuša (cf. Rüster/Neu: 1989: No. 315). As <TE> and <URU₅> are shaped quite differently in Ḫattuša, the confusion probably took place before the text was transferred to the Hittites. As for the textual tradition of the series, see the introductory remarks to the manuscript in part D.

E r. 3'-5' The restorations in (4) are as suggested by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 147). The equation with Akk. *iš-pa-tu* is also quoted by ePSD (without reference). An equation with Akk. *abūbu* is attested in Igituḫ I 304, the equation with Akk. *ašamšūtu* is tentative.

E r. 6' Possible restorations in (4) are Akk. *pulḫu* “fear” or *pulluḫu* “to frighten”, or – closer to the semantic field of the preceding entries – Akk. *bullū* “to extinguish, destroy”.

col.	i.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		me	èl-lu ₄ pár-šú li- ^r x ¹ -[]
r.	10'		^r ba ¹ -[aš-tu _{3/4}] ^r x ¹ -[]
		(break)	

Izi Bo. F = KBo. 26,48 (1802/u)

i'	1'	[]- ^r x ¹ []- ^r KIN ^{1?} []- ^r KIN/AK ^{1?} []- ^r DU ^{1?}	ii'	1'	^r ma-an ¹ -[x] ma-an-x ma-an-x ma-an-du ₁₁
	5'	[]- ^r LA/DU ^{1?} []-SIG [?] []- ^r SIG ^{1?} (break)		5'	ma-an-gi-na
					<hr/>
					ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR
			ii'	10'	ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR ḪUR [Ḫ]UR ḪUR ḪUR ḪU[R] (break)

Izi Bo. G = KBo. 1,55 (VAT 7516b)

1' A[N-X]
AN-^rX¹

IŠ

IŠ

E r. 9' A possible restoration in (4), also proposed by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 147), is Akk. *li-š[a-a-nu]* (cf. can. Izi E 15).

E r. 10' The restoration in (4) is as proposed by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 147).

F i 1'-7' The present section may have dealt with the Sum. *kíĝ* and its compounds: Many entries of the corresponding section in the OB forerunner end with signs which fit the traces preserved in the present text quite well, involving <LA>, <AK>, <DU>, <NIM> and <SIG>.

translation of the Akkadian

“pure, sacred”

“rite, custom”

-

“dignity”

-

iii' 1' g[ir]
 gîr
 ħuš
 ħuš
 5' ħ[uš]
 (break)

iv' 1' 'x'
 'x'
 (break)

F ii 2' A possible reading of the broken sign according to the OB forerunner is <GI₄>.

F ii 3' Possible readings of the broken sign according to the OB forerunner are <BA>, <ZU>, or even <GUR> (instead of original <GÚR>).

F iv 1'f. According to the traces, theses signs equally belong to the <GÎR>/<ĤUŠ>/<ALAN>-family.

G 2' Possible restorations are: <NA> and <AN>. According to OB Izi 1 285-288, one would expect <DÙL> and <TA>.

5' IŠ
 IŠ
 IŠ
 IŠ
 IŠ
 10' IŠ
 IŠ
 IŠ
 IŠ
 IŠ-IŠ-LAL
 15' IŠ-IŠ-LAL
 IŠ
 IŠ
 (break)

Izi Bo. H = KBo. 26,47 (1986/u)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
obv.	1'	IŠ IŠ	[] []
		IŠ IŠ	'x ¹ -[] 'x ¹ -[]
	5'	IŠ IŠ IŠ 'IŠ'	šu-'x ¹ -[] te- <i>hi</i> -[<i>ir-tu</i> _{3/4}] e-pé-[<i>ru</i>] 'x ¹ -[]
		(break)	
rev.	1'	nam-tag-g[a]	[]
	2'	'x ¹ -[]	
		(break)	

H obv. 6' This is the only possible restoration which fairly suits the Sumerian and the vertical context.

H rev. 2' There is space for at least three lines between the ruling and the present line. For this reason and also since the ruling is double, the traces very likely mark the beginning of the colophon; also cf. chapter 8, sect. 6.

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

-

-

-

“residue”

“earth, dust”

-

-

Kagal Bo. A = KBo. 1,59 (VAT 7440)

obv.	1'	[abul]- ^r en-líl'-[la] [abu]l-dnin-l[íl] [abu]l-AN-dumu-nun-[na] [ab]ul-AN-sud-ra-[x]	obv. 15'	[k]á-tílla [k]á-tílla [k]á-é-gal [ká]-ir [ká]-munus
	5'	[a]bul-AN-á-si[kil-la] [a]bul-níĝ ₅ -ku ₅ -d[a] [e]še[b] [ḫ]u-da-d[a] kis[al]	obv. 20'	[ká]-nin [ká]-IG (break)
obv.	10'	[kis]al'-m[aḫ] [kis]al'-bar-ra [kis]al'-di[m] ká [k]á-bar-ra	rev. 1'	[] ^r x ¹ -nir ^d [] [] ^r x ¹ ^d A-A-A [e]médu ^d ḪÉ-[] []- ^r x ¹ ? ^d DALḪAMUN ₄ (rest of tablet uninscribed)

Kagal Bo. B = KUB 30,8(+) (Bo. 5067)

- Section A = KUB 30,8 (Bo. 5067)
 Section B = KUB 3,102 (Bo. 1520)
 Section C = KBo. 2,28 (Bo. 46) col. i'
 Section D = KUB 30,6 (1749/c) obverse
 Section E = KBo. 2,28 (Bo. 46) col. ii' (+) KUB 30,7 (605/b)
 Section F = KUB 30,6 (1749/c) reverse

sect.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
A	1'	[é-] [é-] [é- ^{ĝes} bal-la]	[e-] [e- a]t ² -ta [e-ba-al]-la	[] ^r x ¹ [] : bi-tù ZU-[] : bi-it pí-la-aq-qí

obv. 3'-5' Note that the expressions following <AN> do not represent deities. It is thus likely that the determinative was erroneously maintained from l. 2' (No. 048). Also see the following note.

obv. 3' Sum. abul-dumu-nun-na actually appears in a more rear position in OB Kagal. As the sequence of both the present text and OB Kagal strongly correspond to each another, the entry might be a conflation of Sum. abul-^dda-mu or abul-^ddumu-zi and abul-dumu-nun-na (OB Kagal 6, 13, 19).

obv. 4' M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 149) read Sum. [ká]-gal-^diškur-ra-[x]; The sign <IM>, however, never appears with three vertical wedges; an identification as <SUD> is more likely (collated).

obv. 7' The reading Sum. ešeb for <KI-IB> is suggested by can. Diri 4 299 and by Antagal G 190.

translation of the Akkadian

-

“[] house”

“house of the spindle; spindle container”

obv. 8' The restoration, also suggested by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 149), is based on the entry Sum. *ḫu-da-du-um* in OB Kagal 21. Note that the present manuscript apparently retains an earlier stage of this loan word, with final -a being characteristic for 3rd-millennium loans. Notably, the present one is the only attestation of Sum. *ḫu-da-du-um* spelled *ḫu-da-da*.

rev. 1'-4' The present section has been transcribed as a usual Sumerian commentary to temple names by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 153). Yet, for a number of reasons it probably represents a colophon; as for a description and discussion, cf. chapter 8, sect. 6., Col.D.

sect.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[é-kéš-da]	[e-ki-š]a-at-ta	: <i>bi-tù ra-ak-šu</i>
	5'	[é-kéš-da]	[e-ki-š]a-ad-da	: <i>bi-tù ru-uk-ku-{-šu}</i>
		[é-ĝál-tak ₄ -a]	[e-ka]l-da-ga	: <i>mu-u-pé-tù-DU</i>
		[é-]	[e-]úr-ku	<i>bi-it šu-ku-un-ni</i>
		[é-]	[e- ú]r-úr	: <i>bi-it šu-ku-ma-a-t[i]</i>
		[é-]	[e- a]k-ku	: <i>bi-tù ša 'x'</i>
	10'	[é-du ₆ -la]	[e-du-la]	[: <i>e-d]u-u-la</i>
		[é-du ₆ -la]	[e-du-la]	[: <i>šu-tu]-mu</i>
		[é-du ₆ -la]	[e-du-la]	[: <i>bi-it re]-du-ú-[ti]</i>
		[é-]	[e-]	[: <i>bi-i]t ma-ak-[ku-ri]</i>
		[é-]	[e-]	[] <i>na DU []</i>
	15'	[]	[]	[] <i>DU []</i>
		[]	[]	[] <i>'x' []</i>
			(break)	
B	1'	[]	'x' 'x'	[]
		[é-dub-ba]	[e-du-up]-pa	: <i>bi-it [tù-up-pí]</i>
		[é-šu-sum-ma]	[e-šu-š]um-ma	: <i>bi-it šu-šum-ma</i>
		[é-šu-sum-ma]	[e-šu]-šum-ma	: <i>bi-it ú-uṭ-ṭe₄-t[i]</i>
	5'	[é-šu-gi-na]	[e-š]u-gi-na	: <i>bi-it šu-gi-[na]</i>
		[é-en-nu-un]	[e]-en-nu-un	: <i>bi-it ší-mi-it-t[i]</i>
		[é-en-nu-un]	'e'-en-nu-un-zi-ga	: <i>bi-it ki-š[e-er-ti]</i>
		[é-ki-en-nu-un]	'e'-ki-en-nu-un	: <i>bi-it ma-aš-š[a-ar-ti]</i>
		[é-ti]	'e'-ti	: <i>bi-it bá-la-aṭ-ṭi</i>
	10'	[]	[e]-'x'-ga	<i>bi-it in-š[i-]</i>
		[é-téš]	[e-t]i'-eš	<i>bi-it bá-aš-[ti]</i>

A 6' The Sumerian term's literal meaning is "opened house" or "who is opening a house". The latter would fairly suit the Akkadian, which is hapax legomenon, but has to be linked to Akk. *mupettû* "person opening a sluice-gate, person regulating irrigation". Final <DU> has probably been added mistakenly (No. 013). Moreover note the plene shifting from the final vowel to the first vowel (No. 111).

A 7' The restorations in (1) and (2) are unclear. As noted by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 149), the equation OrthSum./SyllSum. [é-bur-gi₄] = [e-bu]-úr-ki would have a parallel in OB Kagal (l. 92), but does not fit the Akkadian. With regard to the Akkadian, one would expect Sum. é-gar-gar.

A 8' Akk. *šu-ku-ma-ti* probably is a sandhi writing for *šukun māti*. As for the Sumerian, see previous note.

A 10' Note that Akk. *edula* is without inflectional ending.

A 11'f. Since Sum é-du₆-la covers three entries in the OB forerunner, one expects this term equally to be restored at least in the present and the following entry. Akk. *šutummu*, the restoration proposed by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 149) for l. 11', is improbable in this respect. The restoration in 12' is supported by Sum./Akk. du₆-lá = *redûtu* in can. Erim 1 199.

translation of the Akkadian

“tied house”

“fortified house”

“opener”

“house of the harvest yield”

see note

“house which []”

an administrative building

“storehouse”

“house of the military servant”

“house of the treasure”

-

-

-

-

“house of the tablet”

“house of the delivery”

“house of the grain”

“house of the daily offerings”

“prison”

“prison”

“supervised house”

“house of life ^{house of the rib}”

“house of []”

“house of dignity”

- A 13' M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 149) restore é-níĝ-ga in (2).
- B 2' The restoration is as proposed by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock MSL (1971: 150). Sum é-dub-ba is the only term in OB Kagal that ends with /Pa/. Moreover, this entry is in immediate proximity to the é-en-nu-un entries in the OB forerunner, which are a part of the following section in the present manuscript.
- B 4' Although otherwise not attested, Akk. *bīt uṭṭeti* is the only term which is restorable in (4). Interpreting <Ú> as <UDU> and reading Akk. *bīt lu-uṭ-te₄-ti* “house of bowls” instead would make sense with regard to the basic meaning of the Sumerian equivalent “house of delivery”; however, *luṭṭētu* then is a very unusual plural form: The two literary attestations of Akk. *luṭṭu* (both in SB sources) show masculine gender.
- B 6' Note the change from /b/ to /m/ in Akk. *ṣimitti*.
- B 9' OB ^{lu}azlág = *ašlaqu* A 266 quotes a Sum. lú-é-ti, which is rendered into Akkadian by *ša bīt ṣīli* “one of the house of the rib” and probably denotes a temple servant. Judged from this parallel and from the vertical context, the translation Akk. *bīt balāti* is erroneous (No. 216).

sect.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[é-tag-ga] [?]	[e-ta]-ga [?]	<i>bi-tù r[u-uk-ku-šu/sú]</i>
		[é-tag-ga] [?]	[e-ta-g]a [?]	<i>bi-tù r[u-uk-ku-šu/sú]</i>
		[]	[] 𒄀	<i>bi-tù¹ x¹-[]</i>
			(break)	
C	1'	[]	[]	[: <i>bi-it</i>]-x ¹
		[é-mušen-na]	[]	[: <i>bi-it</i>] iṣ-ṣú ¹ -ri
		[é-uz-tur] [?]	[]	[: <i>bi-i</i>]t PA-MAŠ-PA-AŠ
		[é-nita]	[e-ni-ta]	[: <i>b</i>]i-it zi-ik-ri
	5'	[é-munus]	[e-mu-nu-us]	: <i>bi-it ši-ni-iš-ti</i>
		[é-nin]	[e-nin]	: <i>bi-it bé-el-ti</i>
		[]	[]-ma-an-ni	: <i>bi-it</i> x ¹ -[x]-x ¹ -šu
		[]	[]	[:] <i>bi-it nam-ma</i> -[]
		[]	[]	[:] <i>bi-it</i> []
C	10'	[]	[]-ga	: <i>bi-i</i> [t]
		[]	[]	[:] <i>bi-i</i> t ¹ []
			(break)	
D	1'	[]	[]	[b]i-i[t]
		[]	[]-x ¹	: <i>bi-it</i> x ¹ -[]
		[]	e ¹ -ki-za-an-ki	PU-x ¹ -[]
		[é-uzu]	e-u-uz-zu	: <i>bi-it</i> UZ[U-ri]
	5'	[é-zi-ša-ĝál]	e-zi-ša-a-an-ki	: <i>bi-it</i> x ¹ [x x x] x ¹ ti
		[é-gi-sig-ga]	e-ki-za-aq-qa	: <i>gu₅-up-ru</i>
		[é-gi-sig-ga]	e-ki-za-aq-qa	: <i>bi-it ki-ki-ši</i>
		[é-túl]	e-túl	: <i>bi-it bu-u-ur-ti</i>
		[é-kara ₆]	e-ga-a-ra	: <i>bi-it kà-re-e</i>
	10'	[é-diĝir-ra]	e-ti-in-ki-ra	¹ : <i>bi-it</i> i-li

B 12^f. The restorations in (1) and (2) are tentative, with Sum. é-tag-ga unattested in OB Kagal. However note the equation Sum./Akk. tag = *rakāsu* in can. Aa 5/1:226. Possibly, é-tag-ga results from shortened é-nam-tag(-ga) (OB Kagal 136f.).

C 2' The restorations, already proposed by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 150), are tentative.

C 3' The reading in (4) is not fully clear. Possibly it reflects Akk. *pa-aš¹-pa-aš*. The resulting counterpart, Sum. é-uz-tur would be paralleled by OB Kagal 149. The restorations also make sense with regard to the preceding entry.

C 7' M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 150) restore OrthSum./SyllSum./Akk. [é-nam-en-na] = [e-na]-ma-an-ni = *bi-it* [be]-l[u-t]i-šu, presupposing then that Sum. -en-na had been misinterpreted as -a-ni, as would be shown by the sequence preserved in (1).

translation of the Akkadian

“fortified house”

“fortified house”

“[] house”

-

“house of the bird(s)”

“house of the duck(s)”

“house of the man”

“house of the woman”

“house of the lady”

“house of his []”

see note

“house of []”

“house of []”

“house of []”

“house of []”

“house of []”

-

“house of the flesh”

“house of []”

“shepherd's (reed) hut”

a kind of reed hut

“(house of the) cistern”

“storehouse”

“divine house”

- C 8' M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 150) restore Akk. *bi-it nam-ma-[aš-te-e]*, which is possible, though without parallel.
- D 3' M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 150) restore OrthSum./Akk. [é-gi-sa-nigin] = *pu-u[t-tú-ru]* “released”. However, according to the parallel Kagal Bo. Bb = KBo. 26,40: 10', the restoration in (2) must be Sum. é-ki-šà-ĝál. Thereby note that SyllSum. za corresponds to OrthSum. šà (also see chapter 9, sect. 4.2.).
- D 5' M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 150) restore Akk. *bi-it šī(ZI)-i[k-na-at na-pi]š-ti*, remarking that the spelling with <ZI> would be very uncommon. Moreover, Akk. *šiknat napišti* does not appropriately translate the Sumerian. Rather, one would expect the term Akk. *zišagallu*. The last sign preserved, however, clearly is <TI>.
- D 10' The entry seems to form a kind of headline, introducing the following large section about ceremonial temple names.

sect.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[é-kur]	e-gur	: <i>bi-i[t mu-li-li]</i>
		[é-kur-igi-ĝál]	e-gur-ki-ga	: <i>bi-[it mu-li-li]</i>
		[é-kur-ĝeš-x]	ʿe ¹ -gur-na-aš-ki	: <i>b[i-it mu-li-li]</i>
		[é-kur-nam-ti-la]	ʿe ¹ -gur-nam-ti-[la]	[: <i>bi-it mu-li-li</i>]
	15'	[é-]	[e]-ʿx ¹ -[]	[: <i>bi-it mu-li-li</i>]
			(break)	
E	1'	[é-]	[e-]	[: <i>bi-i]t m[u-li-li]</i>
		[é-]	[e-]- ʿx ¹	: <i>bi-it m[u-li-li]</i>
		[é-]	[e-]-ʿx ¹	: <i>bi-it mu-l[i-li]</i>
		[é-]	[e-]-ʿx ¹	: <i>bi-it mu-l[i-li]</i>
	5'	[é-]	[e-]-ʿx ¹	: <i>bi-it ni-nu-ur-t[i]</i>
		é-šà-m[aḥ]	[e-]	: <i>bi-it ni-nu-ur-t[i]</i>
		é-igi-kala[m-ma]	[e-i-ki-ka-l]am-ma	: <i>bi-it ni-nu-[ur-ti]</i>
		é-me-ur ₄ -a[n-na]	[e-me-ur-a]n-na	: <i>bi-it ki-ra-a</i>
		é-zi-kal[am-ma]	[e-zi-ka-l]am-ma	: <i>bi-it ki-ra-[a]</i>
E	10'	é-AB-ma-[]	[e-]	: <i>bi-it ki-ra-a</i>
		é-èš-g[al]	[e-]	: <i>bi-it a-ni</i>
		é- ^d ʿx ¹ -[]	[e-]	: <i>bi-it a-ni</i>
		ʿe ¹ -[ĝeš-nu-ĝál]	[e-na-aš-n]u-un-kal	: <i>bi-it</i> ^D NANNA
		ʿe ¹ -[dumu-nun-na]	[e- n]u-na	: <i>bi-it ši-i-in</i>
	15'	[é-]	[e-]-ga	: <i>bi-it ši-i-in</i>
		[é-]	[e-]-ʿx ¹ -ga	: <i>bi-it ši-i-in</i>
		[é-]	[e-]-ʿx ¹ -ta	: <i>ni-IT-TA-ru bi-it ši-i-in</i>
		[é-]	[e- i]t ² -ta	: <i>ni-id-nu : bi-it ši-i-in</i>

D 13' A. George (1993: No. 681 + 693) restores é-kur-na⁴za-gin, which is also attested to in other texts as a part of the é-kur complex. Yet, apart from the fact that this restoration presupposes the determinative NA₄ to have been included into the pronunciation, the parallel entry Kagal Bo. Bb = KBo. 26,40: 20' clearly preserves Sum. ĝeš, which corresponds to SyllSum. -naš- (with the remaining pronunciation unfortunately broken).

D 14' A temple é-kur-nam-ti-la is otherwise not attested.

E 8'-10' Among the sanctuaries of the god Gira, only the é-me-lám-ḥuš is known; strikingly, this name is missing in the present section. The temple é-me-ur₄-an-na in l. 8' is invariably associated with the god Ninurta (George 1993: No. 789), to whom the temples of the preceding entries are ascribed as well. The temple é-zi-kalam-ma, – provided the restoration is correct – is only known in association with Ištar and the city Zabalam (George: 1993: No. 1245f.).

E 11'f. Note that temples devoted to Anu are strikingly missing in OB Kagal.

E 11' The é-èš-gal is actually dedicated to Inanna. In a late temple hymn (cf. Cohen 1988: 729, l.9), it is listed among temples of Anu, as well.

E 12' (1) is best to be restored to é-an-n[a]. In the copy, however, the broken sign clearly shows the beginnings of two

translation of the Akkadian

“house of Enlil”

“house of Enlil”

“house of Enlil”

“house of Enlil”

“house of Enlil”

“house of Enlil”

“house of Enlil”

“house of Enlil”

“house of Enlil”

“house of Ninurta”

“house of Ninurta”

“house of Ninurta”

“house of Gira”

“house of Gira”

“house of Gira”

“house of Anu”

“house of Anu”

“house of Sîn”

“house of Sîn”

“house of Sîn”

“house of Sîn”

unclear “: house of Sîn”

an offering “: house of Sîn”

parallel horizontals, which are very unlikely to yield <NA>. (The available photo is too blurred for a collation).

- E 13' Note the logographic spelling of the name of Sîn, as opposed to the syllabical spellings in the following entries.
- E 14' Restoration according to M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 152) and A. George (1993: No. 214). The temple é-nam-nun-na (George 1993: No. 845) is equally possible.
- E 15'f. Possible restorations in (2) are é-ĝissu-bi-du₁₀-ga (Damru; syncretistic Ištar hymn, syncretistic Borsippa hymn) and less probable for scarcely attested, é-šà-bi-du₁₀-ga, é-dàra-kù-ga or é-it₆-kù-ga, all three unlocated sanctuaries associated with Sîn (cf. George 1993: Nos. 407, 1016, 146, 538).
- E 17'f. A possible restoration in (2) is é-kar-zi-da, which is located in Gaeš.
- E 17' Akk. *nīTTaru* is unclear; morphologically it reflects a /pitras/ pattern, thus probably it is an adjective. There is no fitting root attested which consists of the consonants *nTr*.
- E 18' Possible restorations are mentioned in the previous note. Akk. *nidnu* possibly reflects a royal grant or votive gift to a deity in the form of a temple restoration, although such acts are usually denoted by the terms Akk. *nidintu* or *qīštu*.

sect.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumeian	(4) = Akkadian
E	20'	[é-dub-lal-maḥ]	[e]-du-ub-la-al-ma-aḥ	: <i>bi-it ši-i-in</i>
		[é-dim-an-na]	[e-]- ^r ti ¹ -na-na	: <i>bi-it ši-i-in</i>
		[é-]	[e-]- ^r x ¹ -al-mi-id-du	: <i>bi-it ši-i-in</i>
		[é-]	[e-]- ^r x ¹ -bi-id-du	: <i>bi-it ši-i-in</i>
		[é-ní-te-en-du ₁₀] [?]	[e-ni-te-e]d-du [?]	: <i>bi-it ši-i-in</i>
		[é-]	[e-]- ^r x ¹	[: <i>bi-it š</i>]i-i-in
	25'	[é-]	[e-]	[: <i>b</i>]i-it ^r ši-i-in ¹
			(break)	
F	1'	[]	[]	[]- ^r x ¹
		[]	[]	[:] <i>ur-pí-it</i> []
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹ -ni	: <i>ur-pí-it ḥa</i> -[]
F	5'	[é- ḡar-ra]	[e- g]a-ra	: <i>bi-it</i> ^D NIDABA
		[é-]	[e-]	: <i>bi-it ni-im-ni-t</i> [ab [?]]
		[é-mes-lam(-mi)]	[e-m]i-iš-lam-mi	<i>šu-ZI-ra-an-ni : bi-it</i>
		[<i>l</i>]u-ga-al-li-ir-ra ù mi-ša-l[<i>a-te-e</i>]		
		[é-x-ḥuš-kur-ra]	[e]- ^r x ¹ -ḥu-uš-kur-ra	<i>šu-ZI-ra-an-ni : bi-i</i> [t]
		[<i>l</i>]u-ga-al-li-ra ù mi-ša-la-te-e		
F	10'	[é-]	[e]- ^r x ¹ -pí-in-du	<i>šu-ZI-ra-an-ni : bi-it</i>
			[<i>l</i>]u-kal-li-ra ù mi-ša-la-te-e	
		[é-dim-gal-an-na]	^r e ¹ -tim-kal-la-a-na	: <i>bi-it u-zu-ur-pa-ra</i>
		[é-dim-kalam-ma]	^r e ¹ -tim-ga-lam-ma	: <i>bi-it</i> ^D INANNA

E 20' M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 152) restore é-danna in (2), which has further been corrected to é-dim-an-na by A. George (1993: No. 159). Further note that the nasal /m/ appears as SyllSum n.

F 2'f. Akk. *ur-BI-DU* very probably represents *urpatu* “bedroom”. The confusion very probably goes back to the sign <BAD>, which both can spell -*pát*- and -*pít*-, and therefore very probably points to a written *vorlage* (No. 103). Though as yet unknown in this function, the term may serve to denote the inner cella of a more extended temple complex. The segmentation of the Syllabic Sumerian and the Akkadian proposed for l. 3' by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 152), i.e., SyllSum. []-^rx¹-ni-u-ur as opposed to Akk. *bi-it* ^rx¹ is improbable due to the spatial distribution of the signs, and also due to the oblique stroke which precedes <UR> and which does very likely not represent <U>, but a gloss wedge marking off the Akkadian.

F 5' M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 152) restore *ni-im-ni-g[al]* in (4), interpreting the term as representing the deity Nanibgal. The last, partly-preserved sign in (4), however, seems to have two rather than three horizontal wedges, which would point to the signs <TAB> or <TA> rather than to <GAL> (collated on the photo). The signs in (2) do not fit any name of the sanctuaries known to have been erected for Nanibgal and Nimintab.

F 6'-11' As to the phrase *šu-ZI-ra-an-ni*, W.L. Moran (1974: 55ff.) probably is right in refusing the interpretation by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 152), i.e., that it is part of the syllabic spelling of the temple name. Moran claims that the resulting temple names would be “the only example of a temple-name in any period that contains the personal pronominal suffix {ani}” (56). It is moreover unlikely, as stated by Moran, that the three temple names are identical regarding their rear parts. Third, Moran claims that there is some space clearly visible in each of

translation of the Akkadian

“house of Sîn”

“house of Sîn”

“house of Sîn”

“house of Sîn”

“house of Sîn”

“house of Sîn”

“house of Sîn”

-

“cella of []”

“cella of []”

“house of Nisaba”

“house of Nimintab”

“guard me : house of
Lugalirra and Meslamtaea”“guard me : house of
Lugalirra and Meslamtaea”“guard me : house of
Lugalirra and Meslamtaea”

“house in Uzurbara”

“house of Ištar”

the three lines, which separates *šu-ZI-ra-an-ni* from the temple name. It then has to be regarded as a kind of extension or commentary. Yet, there is no Sumerian term which would make sense in this respect (possible interpretations like Sum. *šu.zi-ir.ani* “his destroying hand” or *šu.sir.ani* “his tied hand” all seem aberrant). The more plausible then becomes Moran's suggestion that *šu-ZI-ra-an-ni* reflects an Akkadian apotropaic formula, Akk *šuṣṣir=anni* “guard me”, which may have been included because of the mentioning of the underworld deities Lugalirra and Meslamtaea. The fact that the formula is not written in Hittite, which would seem more natural, as Moran himself admits (ibid. 58), is not necessarily a counterargument, for it may simply have been taken over from a bilingual *vorlage*.

- F 6f. Separating the phrase *šu-ZI-ra-an-ni* from the preceding, results in a temple name which is also attested from other sources, i.e. the *é-me-s-lam* in Durum (George 1993: No. 804; also see No. 802).
- F 8f. There is no temple name which can be reliably reconstructed from (1), since, according to George 1993, there is no temple name known which includes both the elements Sum. *ḫuš* and *kur*. Probably, the name refers to the *é-me-lám-ḫuš*, which is a sanctuary associated with Lugalirra and Meslamtaea (George 1993: No. 769); there is, however, hardly space for more than two signs before <ḪU> in (2) (collated on the photo).
- F 12' This is the only case in which the commentary does not associate a sanctuary with the deity to which it is dedicated, but with the place where it is located. (also cf. George 1993: No. 165).
- F 13' The temple name is otherwise unattested. As noted by A. George (1993: No. 168), the name might be restored to Sum. *é-dim-galam-ma*.

sect.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[é-ḥur-saĝ-ĝál]	ʿe¹-ḥu-ur-ša-an-ga	: <i>bi-it šu-ul-pé</i>
	15'	[é-x-zi-šu-tag-ga]	[e]-ʿx¹-zi-šu-ut-ta-ga	: <i>bi-it ʿšu-ul-pé¹</i>
		[]	[]-šu-lu-um ʿx x¹	[]
		[]	[]-ʿx¹-bi-ʿx¹	[]
			(break)	

Kagal Bo. Bb = KBo. 26,40 (771/z + 69/259)

1'	[é]-ʿx¹-[]	15'	é-[túl]
	[é-x]		é-[kara₆]
	ʿé¹-ku-AN-[x]		é-diĝir-[ra]
	ʿé¹-ʿku¹?		é-k[ur]
5'	ʿé¹-ku-nun-na		é-kur-igi-[ĝál]
	ʿé¹-ninnu	20'	é-kur-ĝeš-[x]
	ʿé¹-še		é-kur-nam-ti-l[a]
	ʿé¹-še		é-nam-ti-l[a]
	ʿé¹-[x]		ʿé¹-dur-an-k[i]
10'	ʿé¹-ki-šà-[ĝál]		[é-d]ur-an-k[i]
	[é-uzu]	25'	[é-x-x-n]a[m-x]
	[é]-zi-š[à-ĝál]		(break)
	ʿé¹-gi-[sig-ga]		
	é-g[i-sig-ga]		

F 14'f. As the temple name in 14' is not attested in combinations with the deity Šulpae, A. George (1993: No. 477) suggests that *Šu-ul-pí* might be an error for *Šu-ul-gi*, who was associated with a sanctuary with the name é-ḥur-saĝ (ibid. No. 474). The same confusion may be found in 15', the temple name of which, however, is otherwise not attested.

Bb 1'-25' The restorations are according to the parallels in Kagal Bo. B = KUB 30,7(+) (section D 1'ff.). As for comments to individual entries, cf. the notes there.

translation of the Akkadian

“house of Šulpae”

“house of Šulpae”

-

-

Kagal Bo. C = KBo. 16,87 + KBo. 36,1 + KUB 30,5

(2545/c + 1970/c + 1719/c)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
i	1'	[] [gú-re-a] [gú-e-a] [gú-bi]-a	[] [ku-u-re-y]a [ku-u]-e-ya ku-u- ^r bi ¹ -ya	[x]- ^r x-x ¹ [] [: a]n-ni-ke-e [:] an-ni-ke-e [: a]n-nu-me-ke-e
	5'	[gú-re]-eš [gú]- ^r e ¹ -eš [gú-še]-eš [gú-r]e-ta [gú-e-t]a	ku-u-re-eš ku-u-e-eš ku-u-ši-iš ku-u-ri-it-ta ku-u-e-et-ta	: [u]l-li-iš : an-ni-iš : an-nu-me-iš ^r iš ¹ -tu ul-li-i iš-tu a[n-n]i-e
i	10'	[gú-še-t]a [gú-si] [gú-si-kur-r]a [gú-gúru] [gú-gúru]	ku-u-še-et-ta ku-u-ši ku-u-ši-ku-u-ra ku-u-ku-ru ku-u-ku-ru	iš-tu a-[nu]-me-ke-e na-ap-ḥa-ru na-ap-ḥa-ar ma- ^r a ¹ -ti ka-na-a-šu ka-ma-a-šu
	15'	[gú-gúr-gúr] [ér] [ér] [ér] [ér]	ku-u-ga-ak-ri ar ar ar ar	ki-ta-mu-šu di ₁₂ -im-tù bi-ki-it-tù ta-az-zi-im-tù taq-ri-tù
i	20'	[ér] [ér] [ér]	ar ar ar	ta-às-li-tù ta-a-ni-ḥu ge ₅ -ra-a-nu

i 2'-10' This section gives a set of three paradigms. Each paradigm is built on the base Sum. gú-, which is complemented by the distal, proximal, and medial deictics -re-, -e-, and -še-. The first paradigm further adds the locative, the second one the terminative, and the third one the ablative postposition. The medial complement -še-, however, is replaced by -bi- in the first series (l. 4'; collated on the photo). The substitution of -bi- for -še- is already manifest in the OB period; it is possibly on account of the fact that the Akkadian deictic system, at least in the Mesopotamian heartland, lacks a medial category, with the missing category being replaced by an anaphoric element in order to keep up with the original three-fold distinction (cf. OBG 2 10-16; also reproduced in Woods 2001: 139f. The editors B. Landsberger / R.T. Hallock / Th. Jacobsen / A. Falkenstein (1956: 66) restore the base gú- for the -re- and -e- complemented forms, and ki- as base for the -bi- complement. However note that this latter restoration is not necessary; as the bases are actually not the elements which are varied in the paradigms, and as the whole text does not seem to be organized according to the Akkadian, one may also restore Sum. gú-bi).

The Akkadian translations are as it is expected, with Akk. *annû* corresponding to proximal -e-, *annumû* to medial -še-, and *ullû* to distal -re-. Only in l. 2'f, Akk. *annû* is erroneously repeated, substituting for Akk. *ullû*.

The diachronic aspects of this section, which is paralleled by Izi Bo. A = KBo. 1,42 iii 30, as well as by Late-OB Kagal I 377ff., are dealt with in chapter 12, sect. 5.2.2.

translation of the Akkadian

-

“hither”

“hither”

“thither”

“[to] yonder”

“[to] hither”

“[to] thither”

“from yonder”

“from hither”

“from thither”

“totality, all”

“totality of the land”

“to gather, collect”

“to gather, collect”

“to gather, collect constantly”

“tears, weeping”

“weeping, tears”

“lament”

“invocation ^{offering}”

“prayer, petition”

“moaning”

“wailing”

- i 2'-4'/7' As noted by G. Wilhelm (1989: 76), the ending Akk. *-kī'a* is not regularly contracted to *-kâ*, but to *-kê*, which is especially attested in Akkadian sources from Mari. However, this practice seems also to be known from other, southern sites, cf. von Soden 1969: § 16k (note).
- i 13'f. According to the Sumerian, Akk. *ka-na-a-šu* and *ka-ma-a-šu* are derived from WSem. *knš* “to gather, collect” and Akk. *kamāšu* “to pile up”. However, as can be seen from the parallel Izi Bo. A = KBo. 1,42 iii 42f., they may have been confused with the synonyms Akk. *kanāšu* “to bow down, submit” and Akk. *kamāsu* “to kneel down”.
- i 15' The Orthographic-Sumerian term corresponding to SyllSum. *gakri* is unclear. Due to the parallel in Izi Bo. A = KBo. 1,42 iii 43' and due to the Akkadian translation it must be OrthSum. *gúr-gúr*. OBLu Bo. B = KBo. 1,39 r. 8' gives SyllSum. *lu-ša-ga-ag-ri* for OrthSum. *lú-ša-gi₄*. However, as Sum. *gú--gi₄* is otherwise not attested, it is very unlikely to be restored in the present position.
- i 19' Due to parallel equations, the Akkadian term very probably has to be reconstructed as *taqribtu* “offering” (cf. can. Diri 3 151, can. Aa 1/1 138). However note that WSem. *qry* “to call, invoke” actually fits the vertical context much better than Akk. *taqribtu*.
- i 20' The Akkadian very likely has to be interpreted as Akk. *teslītu* “prayer, petition” due to the vertical context, and not as Akk. *taslītu*, which means something like “denigrating words”.

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[ér]	ar	<i>in-ni-it-t[ù]</i>
		[ér]	ar	<i>ʿun¹-[ni-in-nu]</i>
	25'	[ér]	ʿar¹	[]
			(break)	
ii	1'	ʿa-x¹ []	[]	[]
		a-pú-pú []	[]	[]
		a-pú-sa[ĝ]	[]	[]
		ugú-[]	[]	[]
	5'	[í]d-da	[]	[]
		(erasure)	[]	[]
		a-ab-b[a]	[]	[]
		a-làl	[]	[]
		a-zi-ʿx¹	[]	[]
ii	10'	a-zag-ba[r-ra]ʷ	[]	[]
		a-sur-ʿra¹	[]-ra	[]
		a-sur-ra	[]-ra	[]
		ʿa-x¹-na	[]-ʿx¹-na	[]-ʿx¹
		a-ʿx¹-na	[]-ʿx¹-na	[]-tù
	15'	ʿa¹-[]	[]	[]
			(break)	
iii	1'	ʿx¹-[]	[]	[]
		a-[]	[]	[]
		[e-ne-ĝin₇] ʿal-du¹	i-ne-ki-al-du	<i>ki-ma ma-an-ni al-k[à]</i>
		[a-b]a	a-pa-a	<i>ma-an-nu</i>
	5'	[a-ba]-kam	a-pa-a-ka	<i>ma-an-na-šū</i>

- i 23' Akk. *enittu* “punishment” as well as *irnittu* “triumph” do not fit the context very well and consequently do not appear in the parallels (can. Diri 3 149ff., can. Aa 1/1 133ff.). Thus, the term probably is a cognate of Akk. *unnīnu* in the following line, which is equally based on the root Akk. *ʿnn* or WSem. *ḥnn*. However, the pattern /pirist/ is not attested with this root, neither in Akkadian nor in West Semitic.
- ii 3' Sum. a-pú-saĝ corresponds to Sum. a-pú-sa in OB Kagal 331. Strikingly, the present manuscript preserves the morphologically correct form, while the OB forerunner only shows a phonetic spelling (according to Civil / Güterbock 1971: 76, in two independent manuscripts).
- ii 5' According to the parallel entry Sum. a-íd-da (OB Kagal 324), the scribe erroneously omitted <A>, thus shortening <A-A-ENGUR-DA> to <A-ENGUR-DA> (No. 005).
- ii 8' This entry, otherwise not attested, is probably to be linked to Sum. a-dùg-ga as found in OB Kagal 341.
- ii 10' Sum. a-zag-ba[r-ra] – if restored correctly – could reflect Sum. a-zag-ba-lá as found in OB Kagal 283.
- iii 3' The restorations in (2) as well as in (4) are tentative. Yet, restoring Sum. e-ne in (2) seems to be inevitable although entries with initial <E> or e-ne- are not attested in any other version of the series. Further note that Sumerian e-ne is according to the translation misinterpreted as Sum. a-ba.

translation of the Akkadian

see note

“petition, supplication”

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

“like whom does he walk?”

“who?”

“who belongs to him” / “who is he?”

Though Sum. *a1-du* is invariably translated by Akk. *tallak*, the traces of the last sign in (4) strongly point to <GA>.

iii 5'

The Akkadian expression *mannā=šu* is ambiguous. Generally, it renders Sum. *a.ba.ak.am*, literally “whose is it”, which is scarcely attested in literary texts (cf. *amar-e a-ba-kam amar-e a-ba-àm ba.an-de₆* “This calf, whose is it? This calf, who can take it”, Three Ox-Drivers from Adab; cf. Alster 1991: 32, l.15). One would actually expect Akk. (*ša*) *manni* as translation of this term, which, however, never occurs as an equivalent to Sum. *a.ba.ak.am*. Akk. *mannu* in genitive case is now and then attested in literary texts (cf. Akk. *alu al [mann]i bītu bīt manni* “Whose town is the town, whose house is the house?”, KAR 134:17), but never in lexical lists. Akk. *mannā=šu* is equally attested in literary texts. One can distinguish two different functions of this expression (which are not strictly kept apart in CAD): First, it denotes the affiliation of persons (“who is belonging to him, someone belonging to him”). Yet, Akk. *mannā=šu* also forms questions “who is he?”, sometimes rhetorical ones “who is he, that...”. This phrase has thus to be analyzed as *mannā šū*, spellings suggesting that it was contracted to *mannā=šu* and that it later fossilized, since it also serves to denote the second person: cf. *mannā=šu atta ša ištu* MU.10.KAM *rēqāta=ma* “Who are you that you have been without work for ten years,” OB letter TCL 1 29:24. Also cf. the Hittite translation in Erim Bo. A = KBo. 1,44+: 278.

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[a-ba-gin ₇]-nam	a-pa-a-ki-nam	<i>ki-ma ma-an-[ni]</i>
		[a-ba-gin ₇ -nam al]-du	a-pa-a-ki-nam-al-du	<i>ki-ma m[a-an-ni]</i> : <i>ta-al-la-ak</i>
			(break)	
iv	1'	[] 'x x' [] [] lú-še níĝ-gig 'x'-[] []-'x' lu-u-ši ni-in-ki-'x' [] []-'x' <i>ki-ma šu-ú ma-ru-u[š-tù]</i>		
	5'	[]-'e'-gin ₇ lú-ri za-e-gin ₇ -na[m] []-'i'-gin ₇ lu-u-ri zi-e-in-ki-[in-nam] []-'x' <i>ki-ma ul-lu-ú ki-ma ša-a-š[u]</i> []-'e'-gin ₇ lú-e ĝá-e-gin ₇ -nam ħa-'e' ¹² -[] []-'i'-gin ₇ lu-u-e ki-e-en-ki-na ħa-pa-du-u[š]		
iv	10'	[] <i>ki-ma : an-nu-ú ki-ma i-ya-ti ma-li-'x'</i> []-'x'-gin ₇ lú-še e-ne-gin ₇ -nam ħa-ba-BAD [gi]n ₇ lu-u-še ₂₀ -en-ki-na ħa-ba-du-uš [k]i-ma ul-lu-ú ki-ma ša-a-šu ma-li-ma 'a'-ħa-a-n : a-ħa-a-n <i>nas-šu</i>		
	15'	'a'-ħa-a-n-du ₁₁ -ga		

iv 2'-13' This highly notable section is as to yet completely unparalleled.

The entries do not list single-word items, but contain more complex, larger syntagmata. These start with a pronominal element, which is not identifiable due to the breaks at the beginning of the column (slot I in the scheme below). It is followed by the equative postposition Sum. -gin₇, in its turn followed by the pronoun lú- with a deictic complement added (slot II). Next is the personal pronoun complemented by a chain involving the ergative postposition -e-, again the equative postposition -gin₇, and the copula -àm (slot III). The entries end with an inflected verb, which is again not clearly identifiable (slot IV; The prefix chain consists of the elements Sum. ħa-ba-; the base is given as OrthSum. BAD, but transcribed by SyllSum. du-uš, which does not agree with any of the readings known of <BAD>. The Akkadian can not contribute much to an identification as well.). The paradigm can be schematized as follows:

	I	II	III	IV
rev. 5'	x-gin ₇	lú-re	za-e-gin ₇ -nam	ħa-ba-BAD
rev. 8'	x-gin ₇	lú-e	ĝá-e-gin ₇ -nam	ħa-ba-BAD
rev. 11'	x-gin ₇	lú-še	e-ne-gin ₇ -nam	ħa-ba-BAD

The Akkadian translation formally agrees with the Sumerian. It can be analyzed as follows:

	I	II	III	IV
rev. 7'	<i>x kīma</i>	<i>ullû</i>	<i>kīma šāšu</i>	?
rev. 10'	<i>x kīma</i>	<i>annû</i>	<i>kīma yāti</i>	?
rev. 13'	<i>x kīma</i>	<i>ullû</i>	<i>kīma šāšu</i>	?

Since the pronouns in slot II *annû* and *ullû* are in the nominative, *kīma* in slot I can impossibly refer to these elements. Rather the Akkadian seems to be a word-by-word translation of the Sumerian. In l. 10, Akk. *kīma*

translation of the Akkadian

“like whom?”

“like whom
do you walk?”

-

“[] like – he – sickness”

“[] like – the one over there like him []”

“[] like – this one like me []”

“[] like – the one over there like him []”
see note

is separated from *annû* by a gloss wedge, which is a further indication for the relative independence between slots I and II. It is even possible – and not improbable – that the whole line consists of two independent syntagmata, the first one made up by slot I, the second one comprising slots II-IV and meaning „this/that one like me/you/him performs X“

Although the exact meaning of the entries must remain unclear, the correspondence between the deictic elements of slot II and the personal pronouns in slot III is remarkable. The Sumerian deictics -re-, -e-, and -še- are correlated to the 2nd, 1st, and 3rd-person personal pronouns respectively. In the deictic systems of many languages, the distinct deictic grades are related to the grammatical persons, thus e.g. proximal deixis referring to the speaker (1st person), medial to the addressee (2nd person), and distal to an area out of the range of both speaker and addressee (3rd person; as for an overview of the evidence of such a system in Sumerian, cf. Woods 1991: 155ff). Interpreting the section in this perspective is even more promising taken into account the Akkadian translations. These deviate from the Sumerian by the disregarding of the distinction between Sum. -re- and -še- in slot II, and in that Sum. za-e is translated as 3rd person pronoun. However, the Akkadian section regarded as independent from the Sumerian section, the internal correlations within the Akkadian section are fitting: Akk. *ullû* refers to the 3rd person and Akk. *annû* to the 1st person. It appears, thus, that the Akkadian and Sumerian items are not intended simply to match each other, but to point out the differences between the threefold Sumerian and the twofold Akkadian deictic system as a whole.

The grade of abstraction and complexity achieved in the paradigm is remarkable, especially since it includes both the horizontal and the vertical axis. Among the various grammatical sources known in the cuneiform tradition, it can be regarded as unique.

iv 14'-16' CAD establishes the lemmata *nešû* “to vomit” and *nušû* “vomit” (/purs/), mainly referring to OBGT 11 iv 14, which lists Sum./Akk. a-ḥa-an-du₈-du₈ = *ne-šu-ú-um*. There are, however, no literary attestations of this word. The spellings may also reflect Akk. *nāšu/nuššu* “to shake”.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		a-ḥa-a-an-du-ug-ga		<i>nu-uš-šu</i>
		a-ḥa-an-du _{II} -ga		
		[a]-ḥa-a-an-d[u-u]g-ga		<i>nu-uš-šu-pu</i>
		[a]ddir ([A.P]A.BI.GIŠ.PAD.DIRI.GA)	at-ta	<i>li-I[K[?]]</i>
iv	20'	[a]ddir ([A.P]A.BI.GIŠ.PAD.DIRI.GA)	at-ta	<i>ni-id-[nu]</i>
		[a]ddir ([A.P]A.BI.GIŠ.PAD.DIRI.GA)	at-t[a]	[]
		[ad]dir ([A.P]A.BI.GIŠ.PAD.DIRI.GA)	ʾat ¹ -[ta]	[]
			(break)	

Kagal Bo. D = KUB 3,115 (Bo. 7718)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
i'	1'	[]	[Z]Í
		[]	[t]a
		[]	[]-ra
		[]	[]-ra
	5'	[]	[]-ra
		[]	[]-ra
		[]	[t]i
		[]	[I]NANNA
		(break)	
ii'	1'	ʾé ¹ -[]	[]
		é-[]	[]
		é-[]	[]
		é-[]	[]
	5'	é-[]	[]
		é-[]	[]
		ʾé ¹ -[]	[]
		(break)	

Kagal Bo. E = KBo. 26,41 (213/q)

1'	ḡeš-[]
	ḡeš-A[Š-]
	ḡeš-AŠ-si-[]

translation of the Akkadian

see note

“to blow away”

-

“gift”

-

-

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

- 5' ġeš-AŠ-si-[]
 ġeš-AŠ-si-[]
 ġeš-AŠ-si-[]
 ġeš-IG-AŠ-[si]
 ġeš-dím-[]
 ġeš-al-^rx¹-[]
 10' [ġ]eš-ġál-[]
 [ġe]š-zi-[]
 [ġeš]-bar-[]
 [ġeš]-^rx¹-[]
 (break)

Sag Bo. A = KBo. 26,46 (1989/u)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[saġ]	[KI.MIN]	^r a ¹ -w[i-i-lu ₄] [?]
		[saġ]	[KI.MIN]	[S]AG-š[u]
		[saġ]	[KI.MIN]	pa-a-nu
		[saġ]	[KI.MIN]	pu-u-t[u ₄] [?]
	5'	[saġ]	[KI.MIN]	bu-un- ^r nu [?]
		[saġ]	[KI.MIN]	ìR-du ₄
		[saġ]	[KI.MIN]	re-eš-t[u _{3/4}] [?]
		[saġ]	KI.MIN	hu-[]
		[saġ]	KI.MIN	ri- ^r i ¹ -[ša-tu ₄] [?]
	10'	[saġ]	KI.MIN	a-š[a-re-du ₄]
		[saġ]	KI.MIN	gi ₅ -[it-ma-lu]
		[saġ]	KI.MIN	^r x ¹ -[]
		[saġ]	KI.MIN	[]
		[saġ]	KI.MIN	[]
	15'	[saġ-saġ]	ša-an-ga-š[a-an-ga]	[]
		[saġ-saġ]	[š]a-a[n-ga-ša-an-ga]	[]
			(break)	

E 3'12-' Presumed that the Sumerian is arranged into three grapho-analytic subcolumns like in Kagal Bo. A = KBo. 1,59 and B = KBo. 26,40, there is one additional sign to be restored at the end of each entry.

A 1' The restoration in (4) is tentative. The first sign rather appears like <ZA> than like <A>.

A 2' The first sign in (4) can be read <KA> or <SAG> (<QA-QA> as read by M. Civil [1986: 37], is not supported by the traces). The Akkadian can also be restored to Akk. *kà-a[k-kà-du]*.

A 4' The sign read <TUM> actually seems to be <UG>. Since Akk. *pūtu* is likely to occur in this section, <TUM>

translation of the Akkadian

“man”

“head”

“face”

“forehead”

“face”

“slave”

“first, prime”

-

“beginning, prime”

“first, excellent”

“perfect”

-

-

-

-

-

may be appropriate. If the sign is to be read <UG>, however, the term best to be restored is Akk. *pu-u[g-gu-lu]* “very strong”.

A 5' The interpretation of the third sign is tentative.

A 15'f. The restorations are tentative. For systematical reasons of and due to the sequence in (presumably parallel) Sag Em. 575 i 10f., reduplicated Sum. *saĝ-saĝ* is the entry to be expected.

Sag Bo. B = KBo. 26,45 (Bo. 6645)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
1'		[]	[x]- ^r at ¹ -UD-KU	[]
		[saĝ-ĝá]	ša-an-ga-an-ga	a-[]
		[saĝ-ĝeš-ra]	ša-an-ga-na-aš-ra	^r x ¹ -[]
		[saĝ-ĝeš-r]a-ra	ša-an-ga-na-aš-ra-r[a]	[]
5'		[saĝ-í]l	ša-an-ki-el	[]
		[saĝ-ĝeš]-íl	ša-an-ga-na-[ši-el]	[]
		[na]m/taḥ	é-ša-an-g[a]	[]
		[]- ^r x ¹	[]	[]
			(break)	

Sag Bo. C = KBo. 26,43 (Bo. 69/476)

1'	sa[ĝ]- ^r x ¹ -[]
	saĝ- ^r x ¹ -[]
	saĝ- ^r x ¹ -[]
	^r saĝ ¹ -[]

(break)

Sag Bo. D = KBo. 1,38 (VAT 7464)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
obv. ¹	1	[saĝ-èn-tar]	sag-LI-tar	[]
		[saĝ-èn-tar]	sag-LI-tar	[]
		[saĝ-kešeř]	[]	<i>ri-ik-sú</i>
		[saĝ-kešeř]	[]	^r ki ¹ -iṣ-ru
	5	[saĝ-kešeř]	[]	<i>ru-uk-ku-šu</i>
		[saĝ-kešeř]	[]	[ku] ² -uṣ-šú-ru
		[saĝ-]	[]	[ru] ² -uk-ku-šu

B 7f. Initial <É> in (1) may also be the continuation of the Orthographic Sumerian, then more likely reading <Ú>. If <É> belongs to (1), the entry probably lists the name of a sanctuary. However, there is no such name attested with initial é-saĝ plus a further element -nam or -taḥ. As l. 8' seems to be uninscribed in the Syllabic-Sumerian column, it possibly is a continuation of l. 7'.

obv. 1f. These two lines appear written in a smaller script than the rest of the manuscript (collated). SyllSum. LI

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

(5) = Hittite

translation of the Akkadian

translation of the Hittite

[]

-

-

[]

-

-

iš-h[i-ú-ul]

“band, treaty”

“band, treaty”

ha-me-in-[]

“knot, rent”

-

iš-ḫi-ya-u-wa-[ar]

“to bind, conclude an agreement” “to bind”

ha-me-en-ku-wa-a[r]

“to tie together”

“to bind”

iš-ḫi-ya-u-wa-a[r]

“to bind, conclude an agreement” “to bind”

indicates that OrthSum. saĝ-èn-tar was read as saĝ-li-tar.

obv. 3'/5' Note the position-induced allophonic contrast between *ri-ik-ZU* and *ru-uk-ku-ŠU*; the same alternation is found in Izi Bo. A = KBo. 1,42 ii 37'f. and *ibid.* iii 10ff.

obv. 7' The restoration in (2) is very likely not [saĝ-kešeř], as proposed by M. Civil (1986), since the whole entry would be identical with obv. 6' then.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[saĝ-ri ₇ g]	[]	[še-r]i-ik-tù
		[saĝ-ri ₇ g]	[]	[ša-r]a-a-ku
obv.!	10	[]	[]	[x]- ^r x ¹
		[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[x]- ^r x ¹ -na-ak- ^r x ¹
		(break)		
rev.!	1'	[k]a-šu-búr-ra	[qa-a]	[pu-u ma-aš-du] [?]
		ka-sun ₅ -na	[qa-a]	[pu-u ša-al-tu]
		ka-sun ₅ -na	q[a-a]	[pu-u aš-ru]
		ka-kala-ga	qa- ^r a ¹ -[]	[pu-u dan-nu] [?]
	5'	ka-daĝal-la	qa-a-t[a]	[pu-u ra-ap-šu] [?]
		ka-sè-ge-ge	qa-a-zi-[]	[]
		ka-diri-ga	qa-a-at-ri-ka	[pu-u at-ru] [?]
		[k]a-maḥ	qa-a-ma-aḥ	pu-[u ši-i-ru] [?]
		[ka-l]àl-lá	qa-a-la-al	pu-u [da-aš-pu] [?]
rev.!	10'	[ka-d]ù-dù	qa-a-du-ud-du	pu-u al-t[ù]
		[ka-ḥ]ul	qa-a-ḥu-ul	pu-u ḤU[L]
		[ka-ḥ]ul	qa-a-ḥu-ul	pu-u ma-aš-k[u]
		[ka-ḥu]l-ḥul	qa-a-ḥu-ul-ḥu-ul	pu-u še-e-[nu]
		[ka-ḥu]l-ĝál	qa-a-ḥu-ul-gal	pu-u li-i[m-nu]
	15'	[ka-ḥab]	qa-a-ḥa-ab	pu-u bi-š[u]
		[ka]	qa-a-za-aḥ	pu-u mar-[ru]
		[ka-du ₁₀ -g]a	qa-a-du-ka	pu-u ta-[a-bu]
		[ka-nu-du ₁₀]-ga	qa-a-[nu-d]u-ka	pu-u NU ta-a-bu
		(break)		

Sag Bo. Db = KBo. 27,83 (Bo 79/17)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
obv.	1'	[sa]ĝ- ^r x ¹	[]	[]
		[sa]ĝ-èn-tar	[]	[]

rev. 1' According to a (not verified) equation quoted by ePSD, Sum šu-búr is set against Akk. *mašādu* “to strike with palsy”.

rev. 2' The restoration in (4) has also been proposed by CAD sub *šalṭu* B lex. sect. Cf. Sum./Akk. lú-al-sun₅-na = *šalṭu* in OB ^{lu}azlág = *ašlaqu* A 93 and B iii 20.

rev. 3' The restoration in (4) is tentatively based on the equation Sum./Akk. lú-al-sun₅-na = *waš[rum]* in OB ^{lu}azlág = *ašlaqu* A 95 B iii 21.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>i-wa-ru</i>	“inheritance grant, dowry”	“inheritance grant, dowry”
<i>i-wa-ar-[u-wa-ar]</i>	“to present, give, grant”	“to present, grant”
<i>pu-u[k]</i>	-	-
□	-	-
□	-	-
□	“paralyzed mouth/wording”	-
□	“authoritative mouth/wording”	-
□	“humble mouth/wording”	-
□	“strong/mighty mouth/wording”	-
□	“wide mouth/wording”	-
□	-	-
□	“excellent mouth/wording”	-
□	“excellent mouth/wording”	-
□	“sweet mouth/wording”	-
□	“fierce, stiff mouth/wording”	-
□	“bad, evil mouth/wording”	-
□	“bad, evil mouth/wording”	-
□	“bad, evil mouth/wording”	-
□	“bad, evil mouth/wording”	-
□	“bad, evil mouth/wording”	-
□	“bitter mouth/wording”	-
□	“good, sweet mouth/wording”	-
□	“non-good, non-sweet mouth/wording”	-

translation of the Akkadian

-
-

- rev. 10' As for Akk. *aštu* set against Sum. *dù-dù*, cf. bilingual *dù-dù-bi ú-gin₇ mu-ni-ib-dàr = aštu₇ū₇=šu [kīma šammi ...]* “he breaks his fierce (warriors) like grass” (with Sum. *dàr* taken as *dar*; quoted from CAD sub *aštu* lex.sect.). Possibly, Sum. *dù-dù* is a paralectic or unorthographic spelling for *du₇-du₇*.
- rev. 11'/4' Note the contrast between the logographic and the syllabographic spelling of Akk. *lemnu*. Strikingly, the logographic spelling only occurs in the entry in which the Sumerian syntagma corresponds exactly.
- rev. 16' M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 245) propose Sum. *ka-ŠEŠ* to be restored in (2). Although Akk. *marru*

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[sa]ĝ-èn-tar	s[ag-]	[]
		[s]aĝ-kešeř	saq-qa-šir	[]
	5'	𒀭saĝ-kešeř	saq-qa-šir	[]
		[saĝ-kešeř]	s[aq-q]a-šir	[]
		[]	[x x x] 'x'	[]
			(break)	
rev.	1'	[ka]-'x'-hul	'qa-a-x'-[]	[]
		[ka-n]íĝ-níĝin-na	qa-a-aš'-k[i']	[]
		[nundum]	nu-un-ti	[]
		[nundum-K]A-UD-RA	nu-un-ti-[]	[]
	5'	[nundum-a-š]a-šal-la'	nu-un-[ti-]	[]
			(break)	

Sag Bo. E = KBo. 1,49 (VAT 7416c)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[munus-uš ₁₁]	<i>kâ-aš-ša-a[p-tù]</i>
		[uš ₁₁]	<i>ru-u-tu₄</i>
		[uš ₁₁ -šu]b-ba	<i>ru-u-tu₄ na-d[u-u]</i>
		[uš ₁₁ -dú]b-ba	<i>ru-u-tu₄ na-p[á-šú]</i>
	5'	[uš ₁₁]-'x'	<i>ru-u-tu₄</i>
		[uš ₁₁]-bar	<i>li-'-a-tu₄</i>
		[uš ₁₁]	<i>im-tù</i>
		[uš ₁₁ -muš]	<i>im-tù MUŠ</i>
		[uš ₁₁ -gír-tab]	<i>im-tù GÍR.TA[B]</i>
	10'	[uš ₁₁ -šub-ba]	<i>im-tù na-du-[u]</i>
		[uš ₁₁ -dúb]-ba	<i>im-tù na-pá-[šú]</i>
		[uš ₁₁ -x(-x)]	<i>im-tù ša-ra-t[ù]</i>

invariably appears set against Sum. *ses*, the Syllabic Sumerian possibly reflects a different expression.

Db rev. 2' Note that this entry – if the resotations are correct – may have served as a kind of summary line, meaning “KA, everything completed” or the like.

E 1' M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 248) restore Sum. [munus-uš₁₁-zu], presumably according to Lanu 1 iv 17, which has this equation. The spatial situation, however, rather points to [munus-uš₁₁].

E 3'f. Note that Akk. *rūtu* is repeated with *u*-ending, although it serves as a nomen regens, which is common in 1st-millennium sources, but quite unique in the Hattuša corpus. Also cf. ll. 8'-12' (No. 164).

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

translation of the Akkadian

“sorceress”

“(poisonous) spittle”

“to spit/throw spittle”

“to spit at, fling spittle”

“(poisonous) spittle”

see note

“poison, poisonous foam”

“poison of the snake”

“poison of the scorpion”

“to spit/throw poison”

“to flung poison”

“to fart poison”

- E 4' Verbs coming into consideration for a restoration in (4), are Akk. *napāšu*, *napāhu*, *napāsu*, which are all not attested in combination with Akk. *ru'tu*. Akk. *napāhu* apparently is the best solution with regard to semantics, while *napāsu* has the advantage of being set against Sum. *dúb*, which would fit the traces preserved in (2).
- E 6' Akk. *li-'a-tu*₄ has been supposed to be linked with Akk. *alli'ayyu* “driveller” by CAD and by M. Civil (1986: 36).
- E 8'-12' Note that Akk. *imtu* is repeated with *u*-ending, although it functions as nomen regens or as accusative object. See ll. 3'f (No. 165).
- E 11' As to the restorations in (4), cf. note to l. 4'.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[nanam]	<i>ki-nu</i>
		[murgù]	<i>li-ib-bu</i>
	15'	[KAxX]	<i>ḥa-TU-u-tu</i>
		[KAxX]	[<i>m</i>]a-ru-ú
		[immen ₂]	[<i>lap-la</i>]p-tu ₄
		[immen]	[<i>x x</i>] ṛma-a-tu ₄
		(break)	

Diri Bo. Aa = KBo. 7,12 (14/k)

col.	l.	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
i	1'	(SI.A)	□
			□
			□
	5'		□
			□
			□
			□
i	10'		□
			□
			□
			□
	15'		□
			□
			□
			□

E 13'-18' The Restorations in (2) generally are according to M. Civil (1986: 36).

E 14' M. Civil (1986: 36) proposes to link the Akkadian to Akk. *labbu* B “raging” (derived from *labābu*). Linking it to Akk. *libbātu* “wrath” is an alternative and probably better interpretation.

E 15' When not addressing it as hapax legomenon, the Akkadian can either be connected with Akk. *ḥadû* “to enjoy” or Akk. *ḥatû* “to inflict”. Both terms are otherwise unattested in lexical equations.

E 18' As to (4), M. Civil (1986: 36) tentatively proposes a restoration Akk. ṛṣu-ma-a¹-tu₄ “thirst”. There is however no feminine variant of Akk. *ṣuumu* / *ṣummû* attested as to yet, neither in Akkadian nor in West Semitic.

i 1'-24' Because of the position of Sum. LAGAB-LAGAB in col. ii, which is among the first dozen of signs treated in

translation of the Akkadian

“true, consensual”

see note

see note

“fat, fattened”

“thirst”

see note

(5) = Hittite

translation of the Akkadian

translation of the Hittite

[]	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹ -ku-te-eš-ki-iz-[zi]	-	“who []es continually”
[]	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹	-	-
[]-wa-ar	-	“to []”
[]	-	-
[]-ra-an hu-e- ^r hu ¹ pé-eš-ki-iz-zi	-	see note
[a]r	-	“to []”
[]- ^r x ¹ -aš	-	-
[w]a-ar	-	“to []”
[]-ar	-	“to []”
[a]r	-	“to []”
[]- ^r x ¹ -nu-wa-u-wa-ar	-	“to cause to []”
[]-x-ya-u-wa-ar	-	“to []”
[]- ^r x ¹ -an GÌR-an GÌR-it ti-i-e-ez-zi	-	“he goes step by step []”
[]	-	-
[]- ^r wa-ar ¹	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹ -ya-u-wa-ar	-	“to []”
[]- ^r x ¹ -ki-u-wa-ar	-	“to []”

the other versions of *Diri*, the manuscript must represent the obverse of the tablet. The present section, thus, must be one of the initial ones. Its length suggests that the compound treated is <SI-A>. This is further confirmed by the fact that the interpretable Hittite terms of this section denote acts of procession or degradation, which are frequent among the Akkadian equivalents of Sum. *diriĝ*.

i 7' Hitt. *hu-e-hu* is as yet unparalleled. Possibly, it has to be connected with CLuw. *hu(i)huiya-* “to hurry”, then, in combination with *pešk-*, “to make pressure, drive forth”.

i 15' Hitt. *ti-i-e-ez-zi* is an example of particularly MH orthography.

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
i	20'		<div>□</div> <div>□</div> <div>□</div> <div>□</div> <div>□</div>
		(break)	
ii	1'	□	□
		ʽLAGABʽ-LAGAB	□
		la-al-ʽxʽ-[]	□
		la-gáb-ʽxʽ-[]	□
	5'	me-en-n[a-bi]	□
		(break)	

Diri Bo. Ab = KBo. 26,9 + KBo. 8,10 (1200/z + 48/m)

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
i	1'	(TUKU-TUKU)	<i>r[a-šū-ú]</i> <i>a-ḫa-zu</i> <i>ᵀé-a</i>
		TAK ₄ -ʽTAK ₄ ʽ	<i>ez-ze-bu</i>
	5'	ʽdagʽ-dag ʽxʽ-me-en-ʽna-biʽ	<i>uz-zu-bu</i> <i>ŠI-tù</i> <i>ši(UD)ʽ-ta-tù</i>

i 1' The restorations are as proposed by M. Civil (2004: 90).

i 2' The Hittite translation refers to the special meaning of Akk. *aḫāzu* “to take a woman, marry” (No. 234). The same equation occurs in SaV Bo L = KBo 1,53: 10'.

i 3' TUKU.TUKU as logogram for Ea/Enki is as yet unparalleled. The only reduplicated logogram commonly used in order to spell the name of this deity is ŠÁR.ŠÁR. In this respect, note the graphical similarity of <TUKU> and <ŠÁR>, especially in the OB and MB paleographic tradition (In the Hittite tradition, the signs are quite distinct). The present equation may thus be a graphical paralexia or an error having crept into the text during one of these periods.

i 4'-18' It is without doubt that the logogram addressed in this section must be reduplicated TAK₄, particularly since the sign name ends in *-min-na-bi*. Yet, from the copy, it appears that the two signs are written in two different forms. The first one is the expected form, the second rather looks like <KAD₅>, which seems to be a commonly used substitute for <TAK₄> in other Hittite manuscripts as well (cf. Rüster / Neu 1989: No. 227). The reasons for the variation are obscure.

The beginnings of the sign name are tentatively read *d[a -a]kʽ* by M. Civil (2004: 90). However, the lacuna is

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]- ^r x ¹ -kán pé-eš-ši-ya-u-wa-ar	-	“to push, throw []”
[]- ^r x ¹ -a-mi	-	-
[a]r	-	“to []”
[]	-	-
[t]i-u-wa-ar	-	“to []”
[]	-	-

[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[h]a-ap-pí-n[a]- ^r x-x ¹	“to acquire, get”	“to be/become rich”
[M]UNUS-aš da-a-u-wa-ar	“to seize, take, hold ^{a woman} ”	“to take a woman, marry”
^D EN.KI-aš	PN	PN

ar-ḫa da-lu(KU) ¹ -mar	“to leave”	“to leave (away)”
^r x ¹ -aš ḫa-ap-pu-uš-šu-wa-ar	see note	“to make up for []”
[w]a-aš-túl	“to be remaining ^{crime, evil deed} ”	“sin”
[h]a-ra-tar	“remnants ^{crimes, evil deeds} ”	“sin, crime”

too small for two signs.

The Akkadian column of the present section is paralleled by Diri Bo. Ac = KBo. 26,10 iii, with partially notable deviations regarding orthography.

i 5' There is only one additional attestation of a D-stem form of Akk. *ezēbu*, considered a mistake by CAD. One would actually expect the causative *šūzubu*; possibly, the D stem is employed in order to express the reduplication of the Sumerian. The quite specific, unfortunately partially broken, Hittite translation, however, qualifies Akk. *uzzubu* as a technical term.

i 6'f. According to the Hittite translations, Akk. *šētu/šittu* “to be remaining” / “rest, remainder” has been confused with Akk. *šētu/šētu* “to neglect, commit crime” / “crime, evil deed” (No. 174); this is also clear through the plural form in l. 7', which is frequently attested with Akk. *šittu* “rest”, but not with *šētu* “crime”. In 6'., the infinitive *šēt/ṭu* has moreover been confused with the nominal form *šetṭu/šittu* according to the translation (No. 143). The spelling in the parallel manuscript Diri Bo. Ac = KBo. 26,10 iii 3' [*ši/a*]-a-tu, is unambiguous, giving the infinitive as Akk. *šiāt/ṭu* or *šāt/ṭu*.

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
			i-ŠE/PU- ¹ x ¹ -ZU
i	10'		ša-ni(PA) ¹ -tù
			uḫ-ḫu-ru
			GA-a-ú(MA) ¹
			GA-a-tù
			pi-i-tù
			ul-lu-DU
	15'		mu- ¹ ku-ru ¹ ?
			BA-[]
			¹ x ¹ -[]
			[]
		(end of tablet)	
ii	1'	¹ x ¹ -[]	[]
			[]
		ŠUDUL-ŠUDUL	[]
		šu-du-ul	¹ e ¹ - ¹ x ¹ -[]
	5'	šu-du-ul ni-ru	ni-r[u [?]]
		me-en-na-bi	ku-ub-bu-[sú]
			šu-up-pu-[lu]
		BÚR-BÚR	e-le-[lu]
		[du-d]u	aš-ru- ¹ x ¹ []
	10'	[bu-ú]r-ru	a-ša-[ru]
ii		[me-en]- ¹ na-bi ¹	pa-š[a-ru]
		(break)	

- i 8' Meaning and origin of the Akkadian are unclear. The spelling in the parallel manuscript Diri Bo. Ac = KBo. 26,10 iii 5' is *i-še-eh*, with the ending dropped. Possibly, thus, the term has a Non-Akkadian origin.
- i 9' M. Civil (2004: 90f.) reads Akk. *ša-qa(!)-du* in (4). However, the sign in the parallel manuscript Diri Bo Ac = KBo. 26,10 iii 6' clearly is <NI>; Akk *šanītu* “second” seems quite appropriate with regard to the vertical context; the Hittite, however, seems to refer to an Akkadian infinitive due to the ending *-war*.
- i 10' In Izi Bo. A = KBo. 1,42 i 48', Hitt. *ištandaubar* is set against Akk. *uḫhuru*, hence offering a potential restoration in (5).
- i 11'f. Meaning and origin of Akk. *Kā'u* and *Kātu* are unclear. As for the vertical context, Akk. *qu"ū* “to wait” would be a plausible interpretation. However, this word is invariably attested in the D theme.
- i 12' A possible restoration in (5) is Hitt. *keššar* “hand”, presupposing then a translation error.
- i 13' The Akkadian is probably derived from the root *pt'* “to open” (Note that the parallel manuscript Diri Bo. Ac = KBo. 26,10 iii 10' reads PI-DU-ú). The equation then is a taxilexis of Sum. *tak₄--lá* “to open”.
- i 14' The parallel manuscript Diri Bo. Ac = KBo. 26,10 i 11' has *ul-ú-TUM*. There is no Akkadian term *ul'uTu* attested. It may then render Akk. *ulludu* “to give birth to”, which does however not suit the vertical context.

- ii 4'f. It is not entirely clear if šu-du-ul in ii 5' is part of the pronunciation or of the sign name. Since in <ŠÚDUL = ŠUDUL-ŠUDUL> the reduplication actually concerns only the graphic and not the phonetic level, it is more likely that the second component belongs to the sign name, which results in quite an uncusomary combination of Sumerian and Akkadian elements, then.
- ii 4' Simple Akk. *nīru* is improbable as restoration in (4), since it forms the basic translation of Sum. *šudul*, and is therefore expected to occur as initial entry of the section.
- ii 5'f. Both restorations are unparalleled, but they seem to be the most appropriate regarding the vertical context.
- ii 8'f. Both Akkadian terms are best to be linked to Akk. *wuššuru* due to their meaning and due to evidence from parallel sources (OB Diri Nippur 109 also lists Akk. *wa-ša-ru-um*). But note that G-stem variants of this roots are quite scarcely attested, and the meaning in these attestations actually is not “to be free” as expected from the D-stem variant, but something like “to sink down”.
- ii 8' On the copy, <RU> in (4) is clearly followed by an additional sign. A possible restoration would be the as to yet unattested abstract noun Akk. **ašrūtu*.

col.	l	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
iv	1'	ᵀX-Xᵀ ᵀxᵀ-AḪ-ki <i>ki-ib-</i> ᵀxᵀ- <i>ki-ta-ku</i>	ᵀDINGIRᵀ ᵀxᵀ <i>el-lu</i> ₄ <i>eb-b[u]</i> <i>kum-m[u]</i> <i>ku-up-[pu]</i> <i>na-[ka-a-sú]</i> ᵀxᵀ-[] ᵀxᵀ-[] []
	5'	[P]A-IB [š]a-ap [n]a-aš-ta- ᵀruᵀ-ša-ku	
		(break)	

Diri Bo. Ac = KBo. 26,10 (664/z)

col.	l	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
iii	1'	[TAK ₄ -TAK ₄]	[e]-ᵀze-buᵀ [uz]-zu-bu [ši/a]-a-tu ₄ [ši]-tá-tu ₄ ᵀiᵀ-še-eh ša-ni-tu ₄ uḫ-ḫu-rù GA-a-ú GA-a-tu ₄ pé-tù-ú ᵀulᵀ-ú-TUM [] [] [] []
iii	10'		
	15'		
		ᵀLAGAB-LAGABᵀ : la-ᵀxᵀ-[] ᵀ: laᵀ-ga-ab [<i>me-en-na-bi</i>]	[] []
		(break)	

iv 1'-5' The logogram that the present section addresses is unclear. On the copy, the second sign in l. 1 looks like <KI>. According to the sign name – provided the signs in 2'f. are segmented correctly –, the second sign should be <KID>. Unfortunately, there are no compounds attested with <KI> or <KID> as second sign which share the meaning of Akk. *ellu* and *ebbu*.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	“pure, sacred”	-
𐎶	“bright, pure”	-
𐎶	“cella, shrine”	-
𐎶	“cistern”	-
𐎶	“to cut”	-
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
𐎶	“to leave”	-
𐎶	see note	-
𐎶𐎶𐎶	“to be remaining”	-
𐎶	“remnants”	-
𐎶	see note	-
𐎶	“second”	-
𐎶𐎶𐎶	“to delay”	-
𐎶𐎶𐎶	see note	-
𐎶𐎶𐎶	see note	-
𐎶𐎶𐎶	“to open”	-
𐎶𐎶𐎶	see note	-
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	-	-

𐎶	-	-
𐎶	-	-

- iv 6'-9' The present section is paralleled by Diri Bo. I = KBo. 1,54 r. 1'ff. There, the sign name reads *na-aš-tar-u-ru-[ša-ak-ku]*, the present variant thus preserving a sort of contraction. (4) is restored according to OB Diri Nippur 350.
- iii 1'-15' The present section is paralleled by Diri Bo. Aa = KBo. 7,12 i, with some notable orthographic departures. As for notes to individual entries, see there.

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
iv	1'	[]	[]
			[]
			[]
	5'		[]
			[]
			[]
		[]	[]
			[]
iv	10'		[]
			[]
		[U U	U U]
			[] SLA NU.TIL
		(end of tablet)	

Diri Bo. Ad = KBo. 26,11 (Bo. 6593)

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
obv.	1'	[]	[]
			[]
			[]
		[]	[]
	5'		[]
			[]
			[]
			[]
		[]	[]
		(break)	

iv 1'-7' The compound logogram fitting best here is TUKU.TUKU, which is, however, already treated at an earlier position within the series.

iv 3'-10' The present section is paralleled by Diri Bo. Ac = KBo. 26,9+ rev.

iv 4' The present form is obviously erroneous, as is also shown by the parallel Diri Bo Ac = KBo. 26,9+ rev. 2 [kartimmiš]-ki-iz-zi-kán [ku-i]š.

iv 10' The reading of the first sign is uncertain; <TE> is as proposed by M. Civil (2004: 90). As for a short discussion

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[] 'x' []	-	-
[ka]r-tim-m[i]	-	[anger]
kar-tim-mi-ya-wa-an-za	-	“angry”
kar-tim-iš-ki-za-kán ku-it	-	“who is always angry”
[x]-'x'-ni-iḥ-ḥu-wa-ar	-	“to []”
[m]a-al-ki-ya-wa-'ar¹	-	“to plait, twist”
EGIR-'pa¹ 'pa-ra¹-a píd-da-a-u-wa-ar	-	lit. “to bring back forth”
mar-ki-ya-u-wa-ar	-	“to reject, repudiate”
ḥa-te-ša-an-za	-	“dried up”
'te¹-ik-ri-iš	-	see note
[a]n-da-kán im-pa-ḥu-wa-ar	-	“to be burdened, depressed”
[an-d]a-kán im-pa-ḥu-wa-ar-pát(AŠ)¹	-	“also to be burdened, depressed”
U		
U		

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
'iš¹-ša-al-'li¹-[iš]	-	“spittle”
al-wa-an-za-tar	-	“sorcery”
al-wa-an-zi-na-aš	-	“witch”
[x]-'x¹-wa-ar	-	“to []”
[kur-k]u-ri-iš-ki-u-wa-a[r]	-	“to scare”
[kur-ku-r]i-iš-'ga¹-an-zi ku-'i¹-[e-eš]	-	“who keep scaring”
[] 'x x x¹	-	-
[š]a-nu-'u¹-wa-a[r]	-	“to []”
[w]a-ar	-	“to []”

of Hitt. *tekri-*, cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 863f.

iv 11'f. The spelling of Hitt. *impauwar* with <Ḫ> is very remarkable. Even if there is a hiatus between *a* and *u*, such is usually not indicated through an extra sign.

obv. 1'-3' Possible restorations in (2) are: Sum. KAxLI-KAxLI and ÚḪ, in (4): Akk. *ru'tu*, *kišpu* and *kaššāpu*.

obv. 5' The restoration are as proposed by M. Civil (2004: 90).

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
rev.	1'	[]	[]
			[]
			[]
	5'		[]
		[]	[]
			[]
			[]
		(break)	

Diri Bo. B = KBo. 1,48 (VAT 7509)

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
r.	1'	DU-DU	[]
		la-aḥ ra-[an-ku-bu]-	[]
		me-en-na-bi	[]
	5'		r[e-du-ú]
			šu-UK- ^r x ¹ -[]
		^{DU-DU} ^{DU-DU}	i-tar-ru- ^r x ¹
		la-al-la-aḥ	i-tab-bu-lu
		ra-an-ku-ub-bu-	tù-bu-lu
		li-mu-ub-bi	nu-UZ-ZU-[]
r.	10'		nu-UZ-ZU-[]
		DU-šessig-DU-šessig	KI-tal-lu-[x]
		ki-ik-ri	hi-tal-lu-[pu/lu]
		gaz-ra-ku-nu-	ti-te-e[b-bu-ú]
		me-en-na-bi	na-[pa-gu]

rev. 1'-8' The present section is paralleled by Diri Bo Ab = KBo. 26,9+ iv 3'-10'. As for notes to individual entries, see there.

rev. 9' The reading of the first sign is uncertain; <TE> is as proposed by M. Civil (2004: 90). As for a short discussion of Hitt. *tekri-*, cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 863f.

r. 1'-5' The sign name is restored according to the following section. See note there.

r. 4' A restoration of Akk. *re'ú* is equally possible.

r. 6'-10' The name of the sign <DU> actually reads Akk. *ara-gub-bu*.

r. 6' The last sign preserved in (4) is almost completely broken. It either shows two small oblique strokes on top of each other or the beginnings of two horizontal wedges; possible restorations thus are Akk. *i-tar-ru-b[u]* “to enter repeatedly”, which is rather unlikely for contextual reasons, or *i-tar-ru-^rú¹* “to guide, steer”, which has a possible parallel in can. Diri 2 31 (with mistaken spelling *i-tar-ru-RU*).

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[] ¹ x-x ¹	-	-
[<i>kar-tim-mi-iš</i>]- <i>ki-iz-zi-kán</i> [<i>ku-i</i>] ^š	-	“who is always angry”
[<i>x-x-x-h</i>] <i>i-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	-	“to []”
[<i>ma-al</i>]- <i>ki-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	-	“to plait, twist”
[EGI]R- <i>pa pa-ra-a- píd-da-a-u-wa-[ar]</i>	-	lit. “to bring back forth”
<i>mar-ki-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	-	“to reject, repudiate”
<i>ḥa-te-eš-ša-an-za</i>	-	“dried up”
¹ <i>te²-ik-ri</i> ¹ -[<i>iš</i>]	-	see note

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	“to accompany, lead”	-
[]		
[]	see note	-
[]	“to bring continually”	-
[]	“to take away”?	-
[]	see note	-
[]	see note	-
[]		
[]	see note	-
[]	“to creep repeatedly into”	-
[]	“to sink, submerge continually”	-
[]	“to disappear”	-

- r. 8' Note that D-stem forms of Akk. *tabālu* are extremely rare. One rather expects Akk. *bubbulu*, which is also attested in OB Diri Sippar 2.2:3'.
- r. 9'f. Possible restorations in (4) are Akk. *nussuḥu* and *nussû*, both “to remove, deport” (also proposed by M. Civil MSL [2004: 91] and by CAD sub *nesû* lex.sect.).
- r. 11'-16' The name *kas-ra-gunû* for <DU-šessig> is unique (the name in 1st-millennium sources is *ara-gub-šessig*). It is very likely to be linked to the pronunciation [kas], with the element -ra-, however, remaining unexplained.
- r. 11' The restoration in (4) is unclear. Akk. *kitallušu* (basic-stem meaning “to wrinkle (the nose), roll up (the eyes)”) does actually not share the semantic field of submerging/sinking. Possibly restore the root *qll*, hence *qitallulu* “to get continually weaker” (Diri Em. 540'K': 1' has *qallulu*).
- r. 12' The restoration of both Akk. *ḥitallupu* and *ḥitallulu* is confirmed by various textual parallels.
- r. 14' The restoration in (4) is according to can. Diri 2 45.

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
	15'		<i>na-[]</i> <i>ti-^rx¹-[]</i>
		(break)	
1.	1'	[]	[] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] []
	5'		
1.	10'		
		(break)	

Diri Bo. Ca = KUB 3,98 (Bo. 591)

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	^r GIŠ-LAM ¹ lu-uk <i>na-aš-lam-ma-ak-ku</i>	^r <i>lu-uk-ú¹</i> <i>la-am-mu</i> <i>ši-iq-du</i>
	5'	GIŠ-SÍGxNUN : i-ri-na <i>na-aš-ši-ki-</i> <i>mu-na-ak-ku</i>	<i>i-ri-nu</i>
		GIŠ-SÍGxLAM : šu-ú-šú <i>na-aš-ši-ki-lam-ak-ku</i>	<i>šu-ú-šu</i>
	10'	GIŠ-SÍGxLAM (traces)	[<i>qí</i>]- ^r <i>ri¹-tù</i> (traces)
		(break)	

1. 1'-10' According to the translation in l. 5', the present section possibly deals with compounds based on initial <GIŠ>.
1. 5' Note the defective spelling of Hitt. *lu-it-ya-a[n-]*, which may however be due to the limited space. One either expects a verbal ending *-anzi* “they drag” (in combination with a relative clause), or a participle ending *-anza* or *-antes* “dragging, dragged”.
- Ca 1'-3' The pronunciation SyllSum. luk in combination with Sum. GIŠ-LAM (there are no Syllabic-Sumerian equations available for this compounds except the present one) as well as the Akkadian translation are otherwise not attested. Also note the peculiar spelling of Akk. *lu-uk-ú*, which seems to indicate //.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹	-	-
[]- <i>wa-ar</i>	-	“to []”
[]	-	-
[<i>t</i>] <i>ar</i>	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹ <i>mu-uš-ša-an</i> ^{GIŠ} UR ^{HLA} - <i>uš lu-it-ya-a[n]</i>	-	“[] and drag[] beams”
[<i>w</i>] <i>a-ar</i>	-	“to []”
[]	-	-
[<i>a</i>] <i>r</i>	-	“to []”
[]	-	-
[<i>a</i>] <i>r</i>	-	“to []”

translation of the Akkadian

hapax leg.

“almond tree”

“almond tree”

“cedar”

“licorice tree”

“storeroom, granary”

- Ca 2'f. In can. Diri II 223f., Akk. *lammu* and *šiqdu* are set against Sum. GIŠ-LAMxKUR. The two entries may thus have been erroneously assigned to the present section.
- Ca 3'f. The horizontal ruling between these lines is only visible in the Akkadian column; in the Sumerian column, it is possibly covered by (1-3) l. 4', or it is completely absent.
- Ca 7'f. The pronunciation SyllSum. šušu is otherwise not attested in combination with Sum. GIŠ-SÍGxŠÉŠ. Rather, it occurs in combination with Sum. GIŠ-MÜŠ-SÍGxLAM (e.g., can. Diri 2 254).
- Ca 9' Akk. KI-*ri*-DU is restored according to the duplicate Diri Bo. Cb = KBo. 26,14: 3' (also see notes there). The interpretation as Akk. *qirītu* “storehouse” is tentative, but with regard to following *sittātu* “remnants” not improbable.

Diri Bo. Cb = KBo. 26,14 (542/u)

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[GIŠ-SÍGxLAM] []	[š]u-ú-šu
		[GIŠ-SÍGxLAM] [i]m?	qí-ri-tù ši-it-ta-tù
	5'	[na-aš-ši-ki]-lam-ma-ku ₁₃ [n]a-aš []- ^r x ¹ []- ^r x ¹	ki-ri-súm šu-ú-šu šur-šu
		[GIŠ.MÁ.MUK]? 10' [] []	^r tar ¹ ?-kúl-lu [šu] [?] -ub-tù [a-ša] [?] -a-bu
		(break)	

Diri Bo. D = KUB 3,109 (Bo. 1252)

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[Ú-ŠÀ-SAR]	ša-ad-dar ₆ -ru
	2'	[Ú-ZI+ZI-LAGAB]	šu-up-pa-tù
	3'	[]	qáp-pa-tù
	4'	[]	NI-el-pé-tù
	5'	[]	NI- ^r PI ¹ -rù
	6'	[]	NAM-ku-rù-rù
	7'	[Ú-KUL-ŠÀ-SAR]	NAM-ku-ru-rù
	8'	[]	[x]-lu
		(break)	

Cb 1'f. See note to the parallel manuscript Diri Bo. Ca = KUB 3,98: 7'f.

Cb 3'-5' The restoration of the Sumerian is according to the duplicate Diri Bo. Ca = KUB 3,98: 9' and confirmed by the (remains of the) sign name. However, both Akkadian terms never occur as equivalents to Sum. GIŠ-SÍGxLAM.

Cb 6'-8' Akk. *kurissu*, *šūšu* and *šuršu* actually have no common logogram. The usual corresponding Sumerian terms are GIŠ-kirid(ŠĪR) (*kurissu*), GIŠ-arina^(MUSxNA) (*šuršu*), and a variety of items in case of Akk. *šūšu*. Therefore, it is possible that the present section does not deal with a single, but with three different logograms. However, as the logograms are quite complex, it is hardly conceivable that each of them, together with its pronunciation and sign name, takes a single line only. Moreover, the remains of l. 6', NA-AŠ, seem to form the beginnings of the sign

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	“licorice tree”	-
[]	“storeroom, granary”	-
[]	“remnants”	-
[]	“hairpin”	-
[]	“licorice tree”	-
ʾx¹-[]	“root”	-
[]	“wooden post, pole”	-
[]	“seat, throne”?	-
[]	“to sit”?	-

translation of the Akkadian

a sort of grass

“rush, sedge”

a basket made of palm leaves

“alfalfa grass”

see note

a sort of grass

a sort of grass

-

name – or more likely: of the pronunciation, which is then also a part of the following line.

Cb 9'-11' Among the possible restorations in 9', Akk. *akkullu* (Sum. GIŠ-NÍG.GUL) denoting a hammer-like tool, Akk. *tarkullu* (Sum. (GIŠ-MÁ-MUK) “wooden post, pole”, or less probable, Akk. *kakkullu* (Sum. GIŠ-U-MUN), Akk. *tarkullu* fits best due to the sign traces at the beginning of (4), and due to the parallel in can. Diri 2 302.

The restorations in 10'f. are as proposed by M. Civil MSL (1004: 92); they are however not compatible with any of the Sumerian counterparts quoted above.

D 4'-7' The entries in 4' and in 6' are very likely to be interpreted as representing Akk. *elpetu* and *immikkarūru* (Nos. 077/078). The reason for the addition of initial n is unclear; a graphical confusion can at any rate be excluded.

Diri Bo. E = KUB 3,103 (Bo. 2148)

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
obv.	1'	(X-X)	[]- ^r x ¹ []
		[A.IGI]	[]- ^r x ¹ [ni]-is-sà-tu ta-zi-im-tù ZU-mu
	5'		
		[A.DU]	te ₄ -e-mu me-el-a-ku mil-ku
obv.	10'		ša-ḥa-a-tù a-ra-a-du me-ta-aš-šu-ru a-di
		[A.KAL]	mì-lu ḥi-i-lu ši-iḥ-lu
	15'		
		(end of tablet)	
rev.	1	[A.KAL]	^r ni ¹ -šu ZI-BU ZA-a-BU ti ₇ -ik-ku
	5		ta-ti ₇ -ik-ku

Presuming that *n* is also to be erased in 5', one could interpret that entry as Akk. *ippāru* “marsh, reed-bed”, which is, however, not attested with a Sumerian counterpart with initial <Ú>. AHW's interpretation of 6'f. as Akk. *nam-pá-ru-ru*, i.e., as an irregular N-stem infinitive of *parāru*, is very probably aberrant.

obv. 4' The transliteration of (4) is confirmed by E. Laroche's (1966: 161) collations.

obv. 6' According to the Hittite translation, the Akkadian has to be interpreted as *šūmu* “thirst”. This meaning is not attested to as to yet as corresponding to Sum. A-IGI or to any other compound based on <A>. Possibly it is also based on a literal interpretation of Sum. a--igi “to see water”. Akk. ZU-mu may also originate in the root *nzm*, with loss of the augment *n* (cf. Akk. *zimmatu* “lamentation”, which is actually considered a variant of *dimmatu*).

obv. 7'-13' The present section derives its entries from two different sources. The sememes <<plan, message>> as well as the equation with Akk. *adi* trace back to the *Izi*-compound Sum. a-rá. Akk. *arādu* and *šaḥāṭu* seem to refer to the compound Sum. DU₆-DU = e₁₁ originally. <A-DU> either forms a graphical variant of this sign or is a misinterpretation of it. The OB Nippur version still keeps apart both sections (DU₆-DU: 303-307 and A-DU: 317-317), and also in the version from Ugarit, they appear in different places (in tablet 1 and 3 respectively); there, however, the logogram already appears as A-DU in both sections. The present version, thus, seems to represent the next step

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
ʿx¹-[]	-	-
ku-it []	-	“which []”
<i>an-da ha-ʿx¹-[]</i>	-	“to [] in”
<i>pít-tu-l[i-ya-aš]</i>	“worry”	“anguish, worry”
<i>mu-ga-u-[wa-ar]</i>	“complaint”	“to pray, invoke”
<i>ka-ni-i-[in-za]</i>	see note	“thirst”
<i>wa-tar-n[a-aḥ-ha-za]</i>	“thought, instruction, plan”	“instruction”
<i>ḥa-at-[ra-]</i>	“messenger”	[message]
<i>pár-r[īʷ]</i>	“advice, council”	-
<i>wa-at-k[u-wa-ar]</i>	“to jump, attack”	“to jump, flee, escape”
<i>kat-ta š[alʷ]</i>	“to descend”	-
<i>kat-ta []</i>	“to drag around”	“to [] down”
<i>ku-i[t-ma-an]</i>	“until”	“as long as, while”
<i>ka-r[i-za]</i>	“high water, flood”	“high water, flood”
<i>wa-[]</i>	exudation of plants / “resin”	-
<i>wa-a-[]</i>	“high water, flood”	-
[]	here: “rising of water”	-
[]	see note	-
[]	see note	-
[]	“drop, shower”	-
[]	“dropping”	-

in this development, combining both sections into one. Can. Diri strikingly lists the real *Diri*-compound DU₆-DU only and has completely dropped the a-rá section.

obv. 8' Akk. *me-el-a-ku*, hapax legomenon, corresponds to WSem. *ml'k*, which is confirmed by the 'broken' spelling. In West Semitic, the vowel in the initial syllable of *ml'k* is expected to be /a/.

obv. 14'ff. The present section contains a number of sememes which are not attested in literary texts, but are well paralleled by other lexical sources; they involve <<resin>> (Akk. *ḫīlu*), <<soaking/dissolving>> (Akk. *šbw/zwb*), and <<dripping>> (Akk. *tikku*).

obv. 16' Possibly restore Hitt. *wa-a-[tar x]* in (5)

rev. 2f. The Akkadian terms can be either derived from the root *zwb* “to dissolve, flow away” or from *špw* “to soak, drench”. With regard to the vowel pattern in Akk. ZA-a-BU the Akk. *zwb* is more suiting; Akk. *špw*, in turn, is more frequently attested (esp. the /pīrs/-form) and it better fits the vertical context. ZA-a-BU would then be a mistake for *ša-bu-u*_{1/2}.

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
		[A.KA]	<i>mì-ik-ru-u</i> [<i>m</i>]aš-qí-tu
		[A.KA/A.SAG/U.KA]	[<i>e</i>]-lu [<i>mu-u</i>]h-hu [<i>bu-up-pa</i>]-ni?
rev.	10		
		[A.LÛ]	[] [<i>a-ba-a-ru</i>] [] []
			(break)

Diri Bo. F = KBo. 26,12 (206/w + 333/z)

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
obv.	1'	[]	[]
		[A-AN]	<i>ša-mu-tù</i> <i>zu-un-nu</i> <i>za-na-n[u]</i> <i>na-al-š[u]</i> <i>na-la-š[u]</i> Š[UR?]
	5'		(break)
rev.	1'	(ŠU-NAGA)	<i>ha-[]</i> <i>te-líl-[tu_{3/4}]</i> <i>me-šu-^rú¹</i> <i>el-l[u₄]</i> <i>eb-bu</i>
	5'		

E rev. 6 Akk. *makru* (< *mkr*) does not show a long vowel in final position. <U> may also be part of an incompletely erased sign originally having followed <RU>.

E rev. 9 As for Hitt. *tarna*- “skull”, as opposed to *tarna(i)*- “release”, cf. HEG sub *tarna*- I.

E rev. 10 As for (4), cf. the equations SyllSum./OrthSum./Akk. ugu = U-KA = *buppāni*, *sihip pāni* (can. Diri 3 147f.). The restoration remains questionable, since the Hittite translation seems to be based on a different term.

E rev. 11-14 The restorations in (2) and (4) are as proposed by E. Laroche (1966: 162). Sum. A-LÛ actually is an *Izi*-compound to be read a-gar₅ (cf. can. Ea 1 184). The existence of this compound is not confirmed by literary sources, but it is well paralleled by other versions of *Diri*. The equivalent of Hitt. *šulaiš* cannot be Akk. *abāru* “lead”, since, as has been rightly pointed out by CAD sub *abāru* B lex.sect., the translation Hitt. *hasztilyanza* is based on this

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
ʾx¹-[]	“irrigation, flooding of fields”	-
ʾx¹-[]	“irrigation outlet”	-
še-e[r]	“on, above”	“on above”
tar-na-ʾa¹-[aš]	“topside, skull”	“head, skull”
ḫu-u-wa¹-ši	“face”?	a cultic stone object?
šu-la-a-iš	-	“lead”
ḫa-aš-ti-li-ya-a[n-za]	“lead ^{strength} ”	“powerful”
a-ra-an-za-aš-ša-an	-	“standing”
ʾa¹ ri []	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
ʾx¹-[]		
[]	“the heavens”	-
[]	“rain”	-
[]	“to rain”	-
[]	“dew”	-
[]	“to dew”	-
[]	-	-
[]	see note	-
[]	“purification”	-
[]	“to wash”	-
[]	“pure, sacred”	-
[]	“bright, pure”	-

term (notably yet, it is confused with the homonym Akk *abāru* “strength”), and since two subsequent entries with identical Sumerian and Akkadian terms are virtually not attested to in the Ḫattuša lists.

F rev. 1'-10' The restorations in (2) are as proposed by M. Civil (2004: 95). Although none of the Akkadian equivalents are definitely attested in one of the parallel versions, the restoration is probable, since <ŠU-NAGA> is the only known *Diri*-compound with the meaning “to clear”, and since it is followed by the compounds <ŠU-BÙLUG> and <ŠU-KAL> in the parallels, which are also attested on the present manuscript.

F rev. 1' The present entry is possibly to be linked to Akk. *ḫīTu* (with meaning unclear), which is an equivalent of Sum. ŠU-NAGA in parallel can. Diri 5 93 and OB Diri Nippur 1:03.

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
			<i>nam-r[u]</i> [?] ¹ x ¹ ¹ x ¹ [] AB-[] RA KU/MA ¹ x ¹ ¹ x ¹ [] UR.MEŠ BI-[]
rev.	10'	ŠU-KUL-KA(UŠ-BAR) [?] x-x-ki	<i>na</i> ¹ x x x ¹ ¹ x x x x ¹
		ŠU-BÙLUG ke-eš-pí <i>šu-nu-?</i>	¹ IGI/KI X AZ ¹ [x] ¹ x ¹ ¹ x ¹ []
	15'	ŠU-KAK ¹ x ¹ -pa-aḥ <i>šu-n[u]</i> - [?]	¹ x ¹ -TE
		ŠU-KAL ¹ RU TA/GA ¹ [x] [x] ¹ x x ¹ []	¹ x x ¹ []- ¹ x ¹ <i>ki-it-ru-ṣú</i>
rev.	20'	[x x] ¹ x ¹ [x x] ¹ x ¹	¹ LI ¹ -DA-DU ¹ x ¹ -iš-kán <i>ki-it-¹x¹-ZU</i> : <i>ma-¹x-x¹-ku-u-wa-[ar]</i> KA : [?] ¹ AZ ¹ [] ¹ x ¹ []
(break)			

- rev. 6' Although the traces of the second sign do not support the restoration, it is likely due to preceding Akk. *ellu* and *ebbu*, which usually occur in group with Akk. *namru*.
- rev. 7' M. Civil (2004: 95) reads Akk. ¹ri[?]-¹iš[?] -[nu] in (4), which is an equivalent of Sum. ŠU-NAGA in can. Diri 5 94 and OB Diri Nippur 1:02. However, the signs rather look like <MAR> and <BAR> (the photo is too indistinct for a collation).
- rev. 9' As proposed by M. Civil (2004: 96), the third sign can be interpreted as mistaken <KU>, thus completing the line to Akk. *ramāku*. However, there clearly is a fourth sign, which then remains unexplained. Note that the third sign could also read <AK>, but the traces of the fourth sign do apparently not fit <KU>. (the photo is too indistinct for a collation)
- rev. 11'f. M. Civil (2004: 96) reads the sign as <ŠU-KUL-DU-BAR>. The second line in (2/1) very likely represents the pronunciation. The second line in (4) is slightly indented. It could either contain the sign name or a part of a longer Hittite translation, the two lines then making up a single entry.
- rev. 13'f. The segmentation of the second line is according to the reading Sum. ḡéšpu as attested in can. Lu Excerpt 2 217f. As 16' equally contains the element *šu-nu*, this element may represent the beginning of the sign name, which must start with *šu-* (M. Civil [2004: 96] interprets the two signs as belonging to the Akkadian). The sequence moreover seems to be continued in the Akkadian column; thus the section, like the preceding one,

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	“bright, shining”	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	“dogs []”?	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
<i>a</i> -[]	-	-
<i>šu</i> -[]	-	-
ZA-[]	-	-
¹ <i>x</i> -[]	“to break off”	-
[]	-	-
[]	see note	-
	-	-
	-	-

probably consists of one entry only. The Akkadian equivalent of the parallel versions (can. Diri 5 97, OB Diri Nippur 1:4, OB Diri Oxford 305) is Akk. (*h*)*umāšu* “strength”.

rev. 15'f. As to the segmentation of 16', see previous note. The section again seems to contain one entry only, as 16' (2) is blank, and despite that the Hittite column seems to be inscribed in 16'. The sequence in 15' (4) is very short, possibly representing a logographic spelling.

rev. 17'ff. The complicated spatial situation of the present section could not be reproduced exactly in the transliteration: 19' (4) could be a continuation of 19' (2/1), as well as 20' (4) of 20' (2/1). The sequence *x-iš-kán* in 20' (4) may be Hittite and 20' (5) or 21' (1/2) may be its continuation. 22' (4) ranges into 22' (5). The signs in (5) are not exactly on the same line as the terms in (4), but rather in a position intermediate with the respective following lines.

The usual reading of ŠU-KAL, i.e., Sum. *liru(m)*, cannot be restored in any line of the section. Equally, none of the Akkadian equivalents known from other versions can be found in it; Akk. *ki-it-¹x-ZU* in 21' may possibly correspond to Akk. *šitpušu* in can. Diri 5 113.

M. Civil MSL (2004: 96) gives a couple of further tentative restorations in (4), which are not followed here.

Diri Bo. G = KBo. 26,16 (1005/z)

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
1'	[SAL.LAGAR]		<i>e-nu šá^DA-a</i> <i>pí-in-KU</i> <i>BI-in-DUG</i> <i>bi-ra-ta-ḫi</i>
5'			<i>u-ru-uḫ-ḫu ša [s]í-ni-iš-t[i]</i>
	[]		^r x x x ¹ []
		(break)	

Diri Bo. Ha = KBo. 26,15 (125/v)

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
1'	[]		[]
	[]		[]
	[PA.GÁ] [?]		[]- ^r x ¹
	[]]- ^r x ¹ -ku	
5'	[PA-DU-g.-KAK] [?]		[<i>r</i>]a-bi-iṣ-šú
	[]	<i>k</i> u ² -nu-ka ₄ -ka ₄ -ku	
	[PA-NUN-LAGAR] [?]		^r ú-tù ¹ -lu ša GU ₄
	[]]- ^r ka ₄ ¹ -ra-ku-u-da-i-ku-ub	
	[PA-E-KISIM ₅ XUDU]		[<i>ú</i>]-tù-ul-lu ša UDU
10'	[]	-ki-ši-m]a-ak-ki u-da-i-ku-ub	
	[PA-GI]		[ma-ḫa]-šú
	[]		[ra-bá]-šú
		(break)	

G 1' Akk ^DA-a, according to OB Diri Sippar sect. 1 13', is a mistake for ^DÉ-a

G 3' Possible interpretations of Akk. *PinTu* are *bintu* “daughter”, *pendû* “a skin mole”, *pēntu* “a tree”, and even *pēmu* “upper thigh”, which is however as yet not attested with an *-at-* extension. Possibly, the term may further be connected with unclear Akk. *a-PI-tum* in the parallel OB Diri Sippar 1:15'.

G 4' Akk. *bi-ra-ta-ḫi* is a sandhi for *birât aḫi*, which is usually attested in the singular *birīt aḫi* or *birti aḫi*. A sandhi form [*b*]ir-ta-ḫi is also preserved in can. Hg. B 4 i 4.

G 5' Can. Diri 4 186 preserves Akk. *ūru ša sinniṣti* “woman's pudenda” instead. With regard to the preceding entry, which refers to the area between the arms, this seems to be the primary entry. Present *uruḫḫu ša sinniṣti* very likely is a secondary interpretation. Also note also the peculiar spelling of /s/ by <ZI>.

Ha 3'f. The only known Hittite word beginning with *tarpi-* is Hitt. *tarpiš*, denoting an unfavorable state. It would well correspond to Sum. PA-GÁ, which is set against Akk. *ḫatû* “(to be) defective” and *silitu* “sickness”. However, the final sign preserved in 3' (5) does not seem to be <IŠ>. Rather it combines with preceding <I> to <YA>; an adjectival derivation of Hitt. *tarpi-* is as yet not attested.

translation of the Akkadian

“*en*-priestess of Aya”

-

see note

“space between the arms, chest”

“hair of head” woman's pudenda ”

(5) = Hittite

ʿx¹-[]

[]

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

-

translation of the Hittite

-

-

see note

tar-pl-i-i[š]?

na-an-[]

“bailiff”

-

GU₄^{HLA}[-aš SIPA]

“(chief) herdsman of cattle” “[shepherd of] cattle”

UDU^{HL}[-aš SIPA]

“(chief) herdsman of sheep” “[shepherd of] sheep”

ʿx¹-[]

“to beat”

-

[]

“to sit, be recumbent”

-

Ha 5ʿf. The common equivalent to Akk. *rābišu* is Sum. *maškim* (PA-DU-*šessig*) or *máškim* (PA-DU-*gunû*). The restoration of <PA-DU-*gunû*-KAK> is based on the sign name, which clearly refers to an element <KAK> (similarly Gong 2000: 87).

Ha 7ʿf. The Sumerian has been restored as PA-E-KISIMxGU₄ by M. Civil (2004), followed by Y. Gong (2000: 87), as the entries 7ʿf. and 9ʿf. seem to be exactly paralleled except for <UDU>, which replaces <GU₄> in 9ʿf. However, the suggested sign is otherwise not attested, and also the respective sign name apparently points into another direction. It seems improbable that the sequence *ku-u-da* represents <GU₄>; rather, *-ku* belongs to the ending *-akku*.

The present restoration, i.e. Sum. PA-TÙR(NUN-LAGAR), is based on OB Diri Nippur 364, which there precedes Sum. PA-DAG-KISIMxUDU-MÂŠ and is equally set against Akk. *utullu ša* GU₄. The sign <LAGAR> could be expressed by *-qa-ra-ku* in the sign name. <TÙR> is however never attested with an additional sign inscribed; the sequence *uda-igub* could simply be an interference with the following line (A similar instance is attested in the parallel Diri Bo. Hb = KBo. 26,18 r. 3ʿf.).

Ha 11ʿf. The restorations are according to the parallel Diri Bo. Hb = KBo. 28,18 r. 5ʿf.

Diri Bo. Hb = KBo. 26,18 (353/z)

col.	l	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
l.	1'	[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
	5'	[]	[]
<hr/>			
		[]	[]
		(break)	
r.	1'	P[A [?]] ú-[túl] [?]	[] []
<hr/>			
		PA-E-KISIM _x X ú-túl <i>na-aš-^rta¹-ki-ši-ma-ku-u-^rx¹-[]</i>	[ú-t]ù-lu
<hr/>			
	5'	PA-GI zi-ig <i>na-aš-ta-an-ki-ši-ma-ku</i>	<i>ma-ḥa-šú</i> <i>ra-bá-šú</i>
<hr/>			
		PA-GAN [x]- ^r x ¹ -ig	<i>ša-dá-du</i> <i>šu-zu-bu</i>
r.	10'	[]	<i>šu-ta-^rzu¹-b[u]</i>
		(break)	

Diri Bo. I = KBo. 1,54 (VAT 7763)

col.	l	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
l.	1'	[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	
<hr/>			
		[ŠU.NÍG.DUMU.LAL.BI] [?]	[]
	5'	[]	[]

Ha r. 3'f. According to the parallel Diri Bo. Ha = KBo. 26,15: 9'f., the inscribed sign in 3' (2) should be <UDU>. The traces, however, do not support this restoration, nor does the sign name support it, since the last, partly-broken sign in 4' rather looks like <IGI> than like <DA>, <DU> or <UD>. The element <E/DAG> is omitted in the sign name.

Ha r. 5'-7' The sign name in 7' should actually read *naštan-kikku*, as has already been noted by Y. Gong (1995: 52f.). The sequence *-kišimakku* is obviously inferred from the preceding entry.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[x] ʿx¹ []	-	-
ʿKL.MIN¹?	-	“ditto”
aš-ša-nu-mar	-	“to provide (with)”
ḫar-pí-iš	-	a meat cut
[ku-i]-ʿe¹-eš-kán ku-wa-pí		“who lead off to some place”?
[ar-ḫ]a pé-e-ḫu-da-an-zi		
[]-al-ta-al-liš	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	“chief herdsman”	-
[]	“to beat”	-
[]	“to sit, be recumbant”	-
[]	“to pull, drag”	-
[]	“to cause to leave”	-
[]	“to cause continually to leave”	-
(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]-ʿx¹	-	-
[x]-ʿx-na¹-wa-an-za	-	“[]ed/ing”
[m]a-a-an	-	“if, when”
ma-a-an-[pátʰ]	-	“also if, when”

Ha r. 8'-10' Attested readings for PA-GAN are Sum. ság and sig₁₁. The sequence before SyllSum -ig in 9' could accordingly be restored to <ZI>; however, the preserved oblique stroke seems too large for such a restoration (collated). Possibly restore <GÁL = ig>.

Il. 4'-8' Actually, the Hittite terms in the present section do unambiguously point to Sum. tukum-bi. This restoration would also account for the unusually large space the Sumerian subcolumn takes (5 lines); spelling out the full sign

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
		□	[m]a
		□	
		□	
		□	□
l.	10'	□	
		□	□
		□	□
		□	□
		(break)	
r.	1'	PA-IB : š[a-ab]	□
		na-aš-tar(KUR) ¹ -u-ru-[ša-ak-ku] ²	□
			□
		(blank space covering at least ten lines)	□
		(break)	

Diri Bo. J = KUB 3,97 (Bo. 1244)

col.	1	(2/1/3) = Orthographic & Syllabic Sumerian (+ sign name)	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	ŠU.BAD : ú-d[u]	[ú-tù]
		ŠU.U : šu-u-um	šu-[u-um]
		šu-u-ki-ku-ra-ak-ku	
		ŠU.MÌN : šu-u-mi-in	šu-m[i-in-nu]
	5'	šu-u-ki-ku-ru-ša-ak-ku	ma-[]
			a-[]
		[Š]U.BAD : za-pa-aḥ	□
		(break)	

name of <TUKUM> would require at least two lines. A section dealing with <TUKUM> is also attested in OB Diri Oxford 318 and can. Diri 5 119f., but the sections following the section in the present manuscript cannot be brought in accordance with those following the TUKUM-section in the parallels.

- 1 l. 9' The Hitite must probably linked to the root Hitt. *alwanz-* “sorcery”
- 1 l. 12' The first sign in (5), read <ŠA>, apparently has four instead of the usual two small oblique strokes. However, there is no compelling alternative reading (<GURUN> or <KAS₄> do not completely agree with the sign form either). The term Hitt. *šangari-* is as to yet unattested.
- 1 r. 2' In texts of the canonical period, <ŠAB> (<PA-IB>) is named *gištar-uraš-akku*; in the parallel Diri Bo. Aa = KBo.7,12 iv 6, the name reads [n]ašta-ruš-akku.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
---------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

<i>ma-a-an-ma-an</i>	-	“as if”
----------------------	---	---------

^{LÚ} <i>al-[x-x-ta]l-li-iš</i>	-	see note
---	---	----------

<i>du-ud-du-wa-an-za</i>	-	“deaf”
--------------------------	---	--------

<i>ša²-an-ga-ri-iš</i>	-	hapax leg.
-----------------------------------	---	------------

ʽx-kánʽ KÙ.ʽBABBARʽ-uš ʽxʽ	-	-
----------------------------	---	---

□	-	-
---	---	---

□	-	-
---	---	---

□	-	-
---	---	---

□	-	-
---	---	---

□	-	-
---	---	---

	translation of the Akkadian
--	-----------------------------

	“span, half-cubit”
--	--------------------

	a stone
--	---------

	a stone
--	---------

	-
--	---

	-
--	---

	-
--	---

J 1' Note that the compound ŠU-BAD is treated in two separate, not directly-adjacent entries (ll. 1' and 8'), with distinct Sumerian readings.

J 2'f. The reading for ŠU-U listed in can. Diri 5 115 is SyllSum. šu-u. Present SyllSum. šum is probably incorrect, as ŠU-U actually seems to be an *Izi*-compound; it is apparently inferred from the mimated form of the respective Akkadian loanword *šûm*, which possibly is the term to be restored in (4) as well.

J 4'-6' The sign name *šu-gigur-uš-akku* is difficult to analyze; possibly it is erroneous. Usually, <MAN> is named *gigur(u)-min-na-bi*. The meaning of the element *-(u)š-* is unclear. Also note that Sum. šu-mìn is actually an *Izi*-compound.

J 8' See the note to 1'.

OBLu Bo. A = KBo. 1,30 (VAT 7455)

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
i'	1'	[] [] []	[] [] []	[] [] []
			(break)	
ii'	1'	[] [lú-KIMIN-gi ₄ -nu-tuku] [lú-KIMIN-gi ₄ -nu-zu] [lú-KIMIN-šu]-ĝar-nu-tuku	[]- ^r x-x ¹ lu-KIMIN-ki-nu-ud-ma lu-KIMIN-ki-nu-zu lu-KIMIN-šu-kar-nu-ud-ku	^r ša x x ¹ [] {ša} ¹ ša-ni-na ₇ la-a i-šu-u : {ša} ¹ ša-ni-na ₇ la-a i-du-u ša te-er- _{ta4} ir-ta ₄ la-a i-šu-u
	5'	[: u] t-ta-ni-za [lú]-KIMIN-šu-ĝar-nu-zu ^r : ¹ ut-ta-ni-za lú-aš-ḥab lú-gada-tar	ku-iš ar-ku-u-wa-ar lu-KIMIN-šu-kar-nu-zu ku-iš ar-ku-u-wa-ar lu-aš-ḥa-ab lu-ga-at-tar	na-at-ta ša te-er-ta ₄ ir-ta ₄ la-a i-du-u na-at-ta nu-'-ú nu-'-ú
ii'	10'	lú-níĝ-gal-gal lú-níĝ-gal-gal lú-níĝ-al-di lú-níĝ-al-di-điri-ga [lú-ní]ĝ-ḥul-dím-ma	lu-ni-in-gal-gal lu-ni-in-gal-gal lu-ni-al-ti lu-ni-al-ti-at-ri-qa lu-ni-ḥul-tim-ma	ša ra-bá-a-ti ša at-ra-a-ti ni-ir- ^r tu/ti ¹⁷ ša i-na ni-ir-ti ma-a-Ú mu-lam-mi- {in} ¹ ŠÀ-bi

ii 2'-7' The term to be substituted for KIMIN in (2) very likely is Sum. gaba.

ii 2'f. As noted by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1969: 218), the Hittite is to be analyzed as A.A-an=za according to the following entries and because of the accusative which is required by the grammatical construction. For a discussion of Hitt. *muwa-* (denoting an awe-inspiring quality) and the corresponding logogram A.A, cf. CHD; in any case, the meaning is not in agreement with Akk. *šāninu*. CHD suggest that the translation was based on defective Akk. *ni-na₇*, which results from the (erroneous) omission of the initial determinative pronoun Akk. *ša*. However, this omission rather appears as a simple scribal mistake (No. 006), which is rather unlikely to have affected the translation.

ii 4'f./6'f. The expression Akk. *te-er-ta₄ ir-ta₄* probably derives from the idiom Akk. *irta turru* lit. “to turn away the chest; to push away, deflect”, which often occurs in bilingual texts, then set against Sum. *gaba--gi_{1/4}*. Sum. *šu--ĝar*, the corresponding term in the present entries, actually means “to carry out”; possibly yet, it must be conceived of here as in its literal meaning, i.e. as “to put the hand to/on the chest”, then “to push away.” Akk. *te-er-ta₄* hence is to be analyzed as verbal adjective *tērtu* “turned (away)”. The vertical context; however, rather demands for an active meaning, i.e., for the formation *mutīr irti*, in the meaning of “who does not have/know a rival (one who pushes him away)”. Akk. *tērtu irta* may therefore correspond to a certain group of *damqim-īnim* syntagmata which do not have a passive-possessive meaning, but an active one (cf. Akk. *aklam asakki* “who has broken a taboo”). The very few instances of these active *damqam-īnim*-s are all attested in OB ¹⁰azlāg = *ašlaqqu* A 235f.; they very likely are ad-hoc formations

The Hittite translations offers an alternative interpretation of the Akkadian. The phrase Hitt. *uttani arkuwar iya-* “to make an excuse in a (specific matter)” is also attested in literary sources (cf. KUB 14,1 rev. 36; Götze 1928: 28) and must therefore be regarded as idiomatic. The translation, however, seems to be based solely on

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]- ^r x ¹	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹	-	-
[]	-	-
: A.A-an-za ku-i[š]	“who does not have a rival”	“who [does not] <i>muwa</i> -”
A.A-an-za ku-iš U[L]	“who does not know a rival”	“who [does] not [] <i>muwa</i> -”
<i>i-ya-z[i]</i>	“who does not have anyone who pushes away (i.e. a rival)”	“who does not make a reply in a (specific) matter”
<i>ša-^rak¹-ki</i>	“who does not know anyone who pushes away (i.e. a rival)”	“who does not know a reply in a (specific) matter”
<i>dam-mu-pí-iš</i>	“rude, barbarian”	“rude, barbarian”
<i>dam-mu-pí-iš</i>	“rude, barbarian”	“rude, barbarian”
<i>šal-la-e-eš</i>	“(man) of great things”	“great ones”
<i>kal-la-ra-at-te-eš</i>	“(man) of hughe/excellent things”	“enormities, monstrosities”
<i>i-ši-ya-aḥ-ḥi-eš-kat¹-tal¹-^rla¹-aš</i>	see note	“denouncer, informer”
<i>me-ek-ki</i> MIN	see note	“very ditto”
<i>ŠÀ-kán ku-iš an-da ḪUL(KI)¹-eš-ki-iz-zi</i>	“making the heart evil”	“who is always evil in the heart”

the element Akk. *turru* “to reply, give an answer,” ignoring Akk. *irtu*, which is never attested in the semantic context of replying/excusing.

- ii 8f. Hitt. *dammupi*- is the less common variant of *dampupi*-. As for a short discussion of this term, also including the present attestations, cf. J. Klinger (1992: 191f.).
- ii 8' Sum. *aš-ḥab* is otherwise unattested, but it very likely is a variant of *is-ḥab* “rude person”, as judged from the Akkadian loan word with the alternating forms *išhappu* and *ašhappu*.
- ii 9' Sum. *gada-tar* lit. “cut(ting) flax” is hapax legomenon.
- ii 10f. The Hittite translator obviously disregarded the genitive (i.e., possessive⁹) relation as expressed by the Akkadian (No. 169).
- ii 12f. The lexical relations between all three columns are indeterminable. Sum. *níḡ-al-di* has the meaning “request, need”; it is usually translated by Akk. *erīštu*. The supposed parallel entry in OB ^{lu}azlág = *ašlaqu* A 309 accordingly reads [lú-níḡ-a]l-di = *ša erīšti*. Akk. *nērtu*, which is the only possible interpretation of the sequence *ni-ir-tu/ti*, can hardly be brought into agreement with that meaning. Its usual Sumerian counterpart is *saḡ-ḡeš-ra*, as e.g., exposed by the entry in OB ^{lu}azlág = *ašlaqu* A 114, which reads Sum./Akk. lú-sa[ḡ-ḡeš]-ra = *ša nērtim*. That the sequence *ni-ir-tu* results from badly-transmitted *ir-ri-iš-tu* is possible, but not very probable. Hitt. *išiyahḫeškattalla*- “to denounce, inform” does neither correspond to Akk. *erēšu* nor to *nēru*. It may fairly fit the semantic field of the latter, but it is by no means an exact translation. In 13', furthermore, the sequence Akk. *ma-a-ú* poses interpretative problems. It may be linked to Akk. *mā'u*, which is, however, never attested in the suffix conjugation, or to Akk. *malû* “to be full (of)”, with confusion between <Ú> and <LU>, which is improbable because of the orthography (plene-written *a*), but which would suit Sum. DIRI = *sa₅* (= Akk. *malû*).

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[lú-níĝ-ĥul]	lu-ni-ĥu-ul	<i>li-im-nu</i>
		[lú-níĝ-ĥul]	lu-ni-ĥu-ul	<i>ma-aš-ku</i>
		[lú-níĝ-ĥul]	lu-ni-ĥu-ul	<i>ša-ab-ru</i>
		[lú-níĝ-ĥul]	lu-ni-ĥu-ul	<i>ZÉ-e-ru</i>
		[lú-níĝ-ĥul]	lu-ni-ĥu-ul	<i>a-ya-bu</i>
ii'	20'	[lú-níĝ-ĥul]	lu-ni-ĥu-ul	<i>gul-lu-bu</i>
		[lú-níĝ-ĥul]	lu-ni-ĥu-ul	<i>ZU-ul-pu-tù</i>
		[lú-níĝh-ĥul-ĥ]ul	lu-ni-ĥu-ul-ĥu-ul	<i>li-im-nu</i>
		[lú-níĝh-ĥul-ĥ]ul	lu-ni-ĥu-ul-ĥu-ul	'x¹-[]
		[lú-níĝh-ĥul-ĥ]ul	lu-ni-ĥu-ul-ĥ[u-ul]	[]
			(break)	
iii'	1'	[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
	5'	[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
iii'	10'	[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
			(break)	

OB Lu Bo. B = KBo. 1,39 (VAT 7460)

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
1.	1'	[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]

- ii 14' The omission of <IN> in (4) may also be due to a sandhi spelling. As to (5), M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1969: 219) propose to read Hitt. *ĤUL-eš-ki-iz-zi*, thus Hitt. *ḫuwappeškiizzi* (as opposed to HED sub *idalu*-, reading *idalauweškiizzi*, which is otherwise unattested). This suggestion is compelling, as the possible interpretations of Hitt *kešk*-, i.e., as a derivation of *kīš*- “to comb” or of the homonym *kīš*- “to smash”, which is attested but very scarcely, hardly fit the Akkadian.
- ii 18' The Akkadian can either be interpreted as *šerru* “enemy” or *zēru* “hated”. The Hittite translation is based on the latter.
- ii 20' Akk. *gullubu* “to shave” generally refers to two different (social) acts: transferring people into slavery by

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>hu-wa-ap-pa-aš</i>	“evil”	“evil”
<i>i-da-lu-uš</i>	“bad”	“evil”
<i>har-ra-an-za</i>	“false”	“damaged, bad”
<i>pu-uk-kán-za</i>	“enemy” / “hated”	“hated, disgusting”
<i>har-pa-na-al-li-[iš]</i>	“enemy”	“enemy”
<i>an-na-nu-wa-[an-za]</i>	“shaved; put into slavery ^{consecrated} ”	“trained”
<i>gur-ša-m[u]</i>	“to ruin, destroy; ruined”	see note
[]	“evil”	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹ - <i>an-za</i>	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹	-	-
[]	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹ - <i>na-an</i>	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹ - <i>tar-na-an</i>	-	-
[]	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]- ^r x ¹ - <i>ra-aš</i>	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹ - <i>iš-ša-ra-aš</i>	-	-

shaving the characteristic *abbuttu* hair style or consecrating priests or craftsmen who are connected with the temple. Both meanings are not fully compelling in the present context; the Hittite translation apparently refers to the second meaning, whereas the first meaning seems to be the more appropriate according to the Sumerian. M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1969: 219) therefore propose to take Akk. *gullulu* “to sin, comit sacrilege” as the original entry, which seems improbable due to the nominal pattern of that term (one would rather expect Akk. *mugallilu* or the like instead).

- ii 21' Note that <Z> here represents Akk. /š/. The Hittite has been connected with Hitt. *kurš(a)*- “to cut, separate” by HEG sub *kurš(a)*- via intermediate **kuršamman*- “something that has been cut”.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		□	□	□
		□	□	□
	5'	□	□	□
		□	□	□
		□	□	□
		□	□	□
		□	□	□
l.	10'	□	□	□
		□	□	□
		□	□	□
		□	□	□
		(break)		
r.	1'	□	[lu]-'ki ¹ -ti-ma-an- ¹ x ¹	□
		[lú-šà-ta-dili]	lu-ša-ta-at-li	<i>em-ru</i>
		[lú-šà-ta]-ḫa-la	lu-ša-da-ḫa-la	<i>em-ru</i>
		[lú-š]à-bi-šè-UZU-UD-BAD	: lu-ša-bi-iš-ši-mu-li-ku-du	
	5'		: ŠÀ-ir-kán ku-{e} ¹ -da-ni	<i>e-eš-ḫar ma-a-ni-it</i>
		lú-šà-til-la	lu-ša-ti-[il-la]	¹ gam ¹ -ra-at ŠÀ-bá
		lú-šà-ti-la	lu-ša-ti-[la]	<i>bá-la-aṭ ŠÀ</i>
		lú-šà-gagri(GI ₄)	lu-ša-ga-ak-ri	<i>ṭù-ub ŠÀ-bi</i>
		lú-šà-dib	lu-ša-ti-ib	<i>ze-nu-ú</i>
r.	10'	lú-šà-dib-dib	lu-ša-ti-ib-ti-ib	<i>ze-NI-nu-ú</i>
		lú-gú-bar	lu-ku-pa-ar	<i>ZA-a-i-DU</i>
		lú-šà-šu-bar-ra	lu-ša-šu-pa-ra	<i>ša a-na ŠÀ-šú ¹x¹-[]</i>
		lú-šà-ku ₄ -ku ₄	lu-ša-ku-ku	<i>ša a-na ŠÀ-šú ¹x¹-[]</i>

- l. 4'f. CHD sub *šamenu-* lex. sect. regards both lines as belonging to one entry, thus reading [*kui*]t(?) *kudani awan* | [*arḫ*]a *šamenuwan* “for whom [somethin]g(?) has been dispensed with”. This suggestion is appropriate as it accounts for the missing glide between <NI> and <A> in 4' (however, note that there is a glide missing between <NU> and <AN> in 5', as well), and for the neuter gender of the participle in 5', which would, according to the character of the list, be expected to have animate gender. The interpretation further presugestes <E> to have been omitted between <KU> and <DA> in 4'; a similar spelling of Hitt. *kuedani* can be found in r. 5'. If the two lines are taken as single entries, one could alternatively explain the term in 4' as a derivation of the verb Hitt. *kuddaniya-*, which is apparently also attested in KBo. 16,25 i 8 (cf. Rizzi Mellini 1979: 518f. + 543) in incomprehensible context.
- r. 2'f. The present entries form the only instance within the corpus in which a set of identical Akkadian items is rendered by varying Hittite translations (also see chapter 11, sect. 2.6.2.).
- r. 3' Sum. ta-ḫa-la very likely corresponds to Sum. ta-ḫa-ar as attested in the OB ¹⁰azlág = *ašlaqu* B v 51 (Sum./Akk. lú-šà-ta-ḫa-ar = *ša libba=šu emru*)
- r. 4'f. According to (2) and (5), the Orthographic Sumerian should read lú-šà-bi-šè-múd(BAD)-lugud(BAD-UD)-(dé); cf. also OB ¹⁰azlág = *ašlaqu* B v 52 (Sum./Akk. lú-šà-múd-lugud-dé-dé = *ša libba=ša dama*

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[l]i-iš	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹ ku-da-ni-a-wa-an	-	see note
[]- ^r x ¹ ša-me-nu-an	-	“passed by, burnt”
[]-za	-	-
[]-a	-	-
[] ^r x x ¹ a pí šu	-	-
[]-la-aš	-	-
[]- ^r x ¹ -an-za	-	-
[ku-i]š pé-da-iz-zi	-	“who brings []”
[]- ^r x ¹	-	-
[]		
: pa-pár-ri-y[a-an-za]	“suffering from colic”	hapax leg.
: šu-u-wa-an-[za]	“suffering from colic”	“filled up”
: ša []	“who []”	“whom the heart
an-da		[] blood with pus”
[]	“whose heart is complete <small>completeness of the heart</small> ”	-
[]	“whose heart is alive <small>living of the heart</small> ”	-
: ZI-ni ^r x ¹ []	“whose heart is well <small>well-being of the heart</small> ”	“[who] in the soul []”
[]	“angry”	-
[]	“very angry”	-
[]	see note	-
[]	“who [] to his heart”	-
[]	“who [] to his heart”	-

u šarka malû). As to the paleographic form of <KU>, see note to r. 13.

- r. 8' As to Sum. *gagri* as reading of GI₄, there is no compelling interpretation. Kagal Bo. C = KBo. 16,87+ i 14' equally lists SyllSum. *ga-ag-ri*, however, with the (broken) Orthographic Sumerian very likely to be restored as *gûr-gûr*.
- r. 9'f. Otherwise unattested Sum. *ša-dib* very likely is to be connected with Sum. *ša-dab₅*. The interpretation probably results from a paralexia of Sum. DAB for *dab₅*.
- r. 10' Akk. *ze-ni-nu-ú*, to be interpreted as *zenênu* (*ānu*-extension) or as *zēninû* (reduplication), is only attested here and probably an ad-hoc formation.
- r. 11' Sum. *gû-bar* is not matched by any Akkadian root with the structure Z'T. M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1969: 219) therefore propose to read Akk. *za-a-i-ru*¹ “enemy, hostile”; however, the expression does not fully suit the horizontal and the vertical context. This is also true for Akk. *šā'itu* “neglecting, committing sin”.
- r. 13' <KU> in (1) appears in its pre-late form, as is the case in 4', while it appears in the late, MA form in all other attestations. The distribution seems to be meaningful and probably indicates that the manuscript is a copy of a written *vorlage* (as for details, cf. chapter 5, sect. 3.3. and the introductory remarks in part D).

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	15'	lú-igi-bar-ra	lu-i-ki-pa-ra	<i>na-at-tá-lu a-hu-u</i> : 'x' 'x'
		lú-igi-bar-zalag-ga	lu-i-ki-bar-za-la-aq-qa	<i>za-la-aq-ti e-ni</i>
		lú-igi-bar-zalag-ga	lu-i-ki-bar-za-la-qa	<i>nam-ra-at e-n[i]</i>
		lú-igi-duḥ-duḥ	lu-i-ki-tu-uḥ-tu-uḥ	<i>ZU-uḥ-h[u]</i>
		lú ¹ -la _x (IGI)-la _x (IGI)	lu-la-al-la	<i>h[u]</i>
r.	20'	[lú]-lì-lì	lu-li-il ₅ -l[i]	[]
		[lú]-lì-IGI	lu-l[i]	[]
		[lú]-IGI-IGI	[]	[]
		[lú-IG]I-IGI	[]	[]
			(break)	

OBLu Bo. C = KBo. 26,39 (1432/u)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[lú-al-mud-da]	[l]u-a[l-m]u-ud-da	[]
		[lú-al-mud-da]	[l]u-al-mu-ud-da	[]
		[lú-al-mud-da]	[l]u-al-mu-ud-da	[]
		[]	[l]u-al-tar-ri	[]
	5'	[]	lu-al-ku-'x'-'x'	[]
		[]	lu-'al'-'x'-'[]	[]
			(break)	

Erim Bo. Aa - Abc

Aa = KBo. 1,44 + KBo. 13,1 + KBo. 26,20 (VAT 7450 + 451/s + München)

Aab = KBo. 26,21 (1661/u)

Aac = KUB 37,147 + KBo. 26,32 (2049/g + 1147/u)

Aad = KUB 3,108 (Bo. 8385)

Aae = KBo. 26,22 (1782/u)

Aaf = KBo. 26,23 (1431/u)

Ab = KBo. 1,35 (+) KBo. 26,25 (VAT 7446 (+) 1651/u)

Abb = KBo. 26,26 (1146/u)

Abc = KBo. 1,37 (VAT 7435)

r. 16' Akk. *zalaqtu* is only attested here. Obviously loaned from Sum. *zalag*, it may represent an ad-hoc formation.

r. 18' Possible interpretations of (4) are Akk. *suhḫu* “disturbed, confused” or *suhḫuru*, with *īnu* as object, “to turn

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	lit “watching the extraneous”	“[who] looks at []”
: IGI- <i>an-da uš-ki-z[i]</i>		
[]	“whose eyes are bright”	-
[]	“whose eyes are bright”	brightness of the eye(s) ”
[]	see note	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-

ll. 1-69, 90-169, 196-244
 ll. 61-66
 ll. 94-108, 132-153, 182-198
 ll. 120-129, 175-181
 ll. 133-141
 ll. 207-227
 ll. 228-244, 260-281
 ll. 264-269
 ll. 265-278, 300-307

one's eyes”. Yet, both expressions are otherwise not attested to in equation with Sum. *igi-gu*₈.

	mns	col	1	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
1	Aa	i	1	[erim-ḥuš]		<i>a-na-[an-tu_{3/4}]</i>
2	Aa	i	2	[]		<i>ip-pí-[ru]</i>
3	Aa	i	3	[]		<i>a-dam-mu-[ú]</i>
4	Aa	i	4	nun-nun		<i>ḥi-it-ru-ZU</i>
5	Aa	i	5	šu-ZAG-ZAG		<i>ḥi-it-nu-qú</i>
6	Aa	i	6	šu-si-sá		<i>ši-it-ru-šú</i>
7	Aa	i	7	nam-nir-ri-a		<i>ši-it-PU-ZU</i>
8	Aa	i	8	ul ₄ -gal		KA-ŠU
9	Aa	i	9	ʾul ₄ ¹ -gal-gal		UZ-ZU-ZU
10	Aa	i	10	ul ₄ -gal-ri-a		<i>a-na mi-ma la-a mi-ma</i>
11	Aa	i	11	èn-tar		<i>ša-'a-lu</i>
12	Aa	i	12	èn-tar-tar		<i>ši-ta-'a-lu</i>
13	Aa	i	13	èn-tar-ri-a		<i>uṣ-šú-šú</i>
14	Aa	i	14	ì-ne-éš		<i>i-na-an-na</i>
15	Aa	i	15	a-da-lam		<i>i-na-an-na-ma</i>
16	Aa	i	16	ù-ŠIR-sá		<i>iḥ-tám-ṭá-ak-ku</i>
17	Aa	i	17	ʾAN/AB ¹ -za		<i>a-di</i>
18	Aa	i	18	úš-gu ₇		<i>pé-du-ú</i>

- 1-3 The restoration in (2) is according to the incipit of the canonical version. The canonical parallel entries for 2f. are Sum. 𒂗 and zag-nu-sá-a
- 4-7 The semantic fields respectively described by the Sumerian and by the Akkadian items of this section apparently do not match. The Akkadian expressions all denote hyponymous actions performed during fighting, whereas Sum. nam-nir-ri-a “supremacy” (as for Sum. -ri-a, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.2.), šu--si-sá “to put in order”, as well as Sum. šu--ZAG, hapax legomenon (possibly “to confine, set boundaries”) and Sum. nun “to behave lordly” (possibly paralectic/unorthographic for for nùn “to fight”) apparently belong to the semantic field <<(displaying) lordly supremacy>>. According to the spelling, the Akkadian forms all derive from the reciprocal Gt stem. According to the Hittite translations, which, though not fully interpretable, seem invariably to contain the iterative -ške- suffix, and according to the reduplication of the Sumerian in 4f., one rather expects Gtn-stem forms. Gtn-stem forms appearing as forms of the Gt stem can also be found in other positions of the corpus (cf. chapter 10, type III.2.c.).
- 5 According to Izi Bo. A = KBo. 1,42 ii 41'f., possibly restore Hitt ʾú-e-šu¹-ri-iš-kán-za as proposed by H. Otten / W. v. Soden (1968: 9) and H.G. Güterbock (1985: 101).
- 6f. H. Otten / W. v. Soden (1968: 9) propose finite medial forms with ending -antari plus particles =za=kan as restorations in (5), however without an appropriate verbal root available. As to l. 6, K.K. Riemschneider (1971: 476), following H. Otten / W. von Soden, tentatively suggests Hitt. ʾša-aš¹-kán-ta-ri-y[a-za-kán] “they push one another”.
- 8-10 Regarding Sum. -ri-a, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.2. The Akkadian terms in 8f. are unclear, and the Hittite is unclear as well. The parallel section in can. Erim 1 7f. preserves Akk. *magal* “very, much” and *azzuuzá* “from time to time”. While Akk. UZ-ZU-ZU may be linked to the latter, a connection between Akk. *magal* and KA-ŠU can not be easily established. As to (5), CAD sub *zūzā* takes 9f. as a single expression corresponding to Akk.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	“battle”	-
[]	“conflict, war”	-
[]	“conflict, battle”	-
ᵀx¹ ᵀx¹ kán t[a]	“to cut off, fix, determine” / “to itch scratch” Gt/Gtn	
ᵀx¹ ᵀx¹ ri iš kán []	“to press, throttle“ Gt/Gtn	
ᵀx¹ ᵀx¹ kán ta ri y[a]	“to clutch, claw“ Gt/Gtn	
ᵀx¹ ni kán ta ri ya za ᵀkán/ú¹ []	“to grapple, wrestle” / “to be angry” Gt/Gtn	
ᵀx¹ ik ki ši na-ak-ku-ri-ya-u-ᵀwa-ar¹	see note	see note
NU.GÁL-kán ku-ed-da-ni	“now and then”	“who has nothing” see note
ku-it	“somehow”	“what”
pu-nu-uš-šu-u-wa-ar	“to ask, question”	“to ask, question”
pu-nu-uš-ki-u-wa-ar	“to ask, question repeatedly”	“to ask, question repeatedly”
ᵀkat¹-ta-aš-ša-an ar-nu-mar	“to ask, inquiry to remove? ”	“to bring down, bring a case to concl.”
ki-nu-un	“now”	“now”
ki-nu-un-pát	“right now”	“also now”
li-li-wa-aḥ-ḥi-eš-ki-it-ta	“he hurried to you repeatedly”	“he hurried to you repeatedly”
ku-it-ma-an	“until, as long as”	“as long as”
GU₄-i EGIR-pa tar-nu-mar	“to spare, release”	“to concede (mercy) to an oxen”

ana mimma lā mimma. The restoration and segmentation of l. 8 (5) is difficult. None of the possible verbs ᵀši¹nakkuriya-, *nakkuriya-, or *akkuriya- is otherwise attested. The first sign is very likely to be read <ME>; resulting Hitt. *mekki* would at least correspond to Akk. *magal*. Subsequent -ši, interpreted as 3rd person pronominal suffix (which would however be expected to appear in scriptio continua *me-ek-ki-iš-ši*), may be identified to correlate to Akk. ŠU.

- 13 As for Sum. -ri-a, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.2. The Hittite translation has apparently not been based on Akk. *uššušu* “to ask, inquiry”. HW² sub *arnu-* lex.sect tentatively suggests Akk. *uzuzzu* “to stand” as basis for the translation; however, the semantic discrepancy between Akk. *uzuzzu* and Hitt. *arnu-* is considerable. Another possible basis for the translation is Akk. (w)*uššû* “to pull aside, remove”, erroneously interpreted as root mediae geminatae then (which is not an uncommon phenomenon in the present-corpus manuscripts; cf. chapter 10, type III.5.c). However, there still remains a semantic gap. Moreover note the use of the Hittite particle =šān, which is outdated for the period when the manuscript was written down (cf. chapter 9, sect. 1.3.2.).
- 15 As to the function of the particles Akk. =ma and Hitt. =pat and the possible link between them, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.3. & 6.4.
- 16 The Sumerian is not quite clear; the canonical version has Sum. bí-sá-sá, a regular finite verb form, which does not fully match the Akkadian with regard to semantics, however. Also note that Akk. *iḥtamṭ*=*akku* is spelled as a *t*-infix form and not as a *tan*-infix form, as it would be expected due to the Hittite translation (No. 136, also see ll. 4-7).
- 18 The Hittite is as to yet unparalleled. There are a number of possible interpretations. The present translation mainly follows the vertical context (for alternative suggestions, cf. Güterbock 1985: 102).
- 18f. With regard to the Sumerian, one would expect an alteration of G and Gt-stem root variants as Akkadian translations (and accordingly, alternating simple and ške-infix forms in (5)). Hitt. *tattalušk-* is hapax legomenon

	mns	col	1	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
19	Aa	i	19	úš-gu ₇ -gu ₇		<i>pé-du-ú(LU)</i> ¹
20	Aa	i	20	ʽx-ki-DU ¹		<i>ka₄-šu-ú</i>
21	Aa	i	21	šu-bar-zí		<i>az-za-ru</i>
22	Aa	i	22	a-na-àm		<i>mi-nu</i>
23	Aa	i	23	a-na-aš-àm		<i>a-na mi-ni</i>
24	Aa	i	24	nam-ĝu ₁₀ -u		<i>mi-EN-šu</i>
25	Aa	i	25	BUL		<i>ub-bu-lu</i>
26	Aa	i	26	[BU]L-BUL		<i>šu-ub-bu-lu</i>
27	Aa	i	27	[gu]r ₄ -ra		<i>gi₅-it-ma-lu</i>
28	Aa	i	28	gìr-ri-a		<i>kap-kap-pu</i>
29	Aa	i	29	tuku		<i>ša-ru-ú</i>
30	Aa	i	30	ʽnu ¹ -tuku		<i>la-ap-nu</i>
31	Aa	i	31	[diĝir]-tuku		<i>ra-a-aš DINGIR^{LIM}</i>
32	Aa	i	32	[diĝir-tu]ku		<i>na-ZAR-ti [DING]IR^{LIM}</i>
33	Aa	i	33	[]		<i>[ti]-e-ʽbu¹ ?</i>
34	Aa	i	34	[]		<i>ti-ib ša-ni-iš</i>
35	Aa	i	35	[]		<i>na-PA/QA-šú</i>
36	Aa	i	36	[]		<i>qá-na-a-u</i>

(the connection with Lyk. *ttlei*- “to pay” [cf. HEG, hence translating “to solve”], is very uncertain). The contrast between both Hittite translations, that respectively refer to root variants in the Sumerian and Akkadian column, is remarkably strong.

20 The vertical context provides two possible explanations for the Akkadian, Akk. *qāšu* “to grant as gift”, which is also attested with the direct object “life”, or Akk. *kāšu* “to help”, which is listed as an independent lemma in CAD only (in AHW it is incorporated into *qāšu*). The latter interpretation is supported by the equation Sum./Akk. *azāru* = *Kāšu* in Malku 5 87. The Hittite translation has erroneously been based on the quasi-homophone *kāšu* “to linger, delay” (No. 205).

22-24 Presumed that Akk. *mīnu* is used with the secondary meaning “why”, the Akkadian terms are quasi-synonyms. This is equally true for the Sumerian if Sum. a-na-àm is taken as rhetorical question “what is it?” (as for Sum. nam-ĝu₁₀, cf. the following note). Sumerian and Akkadian, then, do not match exactly (Sum. “what is it?”-Akk. “why”). Notably, yet, the position of the individual Sumerian and Akkadian terms within the section seems to be interchangeable, as is shown by parallel equations like Sum./Akk. [e]-ne-àm = *mīššu* (OBGT 1b i 3') or nam-mu = *mīnu* (NBGT 3 i 16). This interchangeability cannot be found regarding the corresponding Hittite terms, which provide quite literal translations of the Akkadian. Hitt. *nu*=*šši kuit* even provides an exact grammatical analysis of Akk. *mīn*=*šu*, disregarding the actual, idiomatic meaning. In 23, possibly restore Hitt. *nu ku-it* [*ha-an-da*]); as for the possible meta-linguistic use of Hitt. *nu*=, see chapter 9, sect. 6.4.

25f. The sign in (2) is best to be interpreted as <BUL = LAGABxĖŠ>, a sign which is otherwise not attested in Hittite writing; the meaning of Sum. BUL (possibly to be read *tuku₄* in homophony to Sum. *tuku* in the following section) is “to rock, shake”. According to the Sumerian, which contrasts a simple and a reduplicated form, the Akkadian terms are probably to be conceived as D-stem and Š-stem variants of the same root. Available roots which attest both a D stem and a Š stem are *ʽpl* “to answer” and *ʽbl* “to dry”, which both do not match

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>ta-at-ta-lu-uš-ki-u-wa-ar</i>	“to spare, release”	hapax leg.
<i>ḫu-uš-ki-u-wa-ar</i>	“to help ^{to linger, delay} ”	“to wait, expect”
<i>PAB-nu-mar</i>	“to help, treat merciful”	“to protect”
<i>ku-it</i>	“what” / “why”?	“what”
<i>nu ku-it</i> []	“why”	“and what []”
<i>nu-uš-ši k[u-it]</i>	“why ^{whose} ”	“and his what”
<i>e-et-ri-^ʿx-x¹</i>	see note	-
<i>ḫa-aš-te-^ʿli¹-[a]n-za</i>	see note	“powerful”
[]	“noble, perfect”	-
[]	“strong, powerful”	-
[]	“rich”	-
[]	“poor”	-
[]	“who possesses (the protection of) a god”	-
[]	see note	-
[w]a-ar	“arousal, attack”	“to []”
[]	“also arousal, attack”	-
^ʿ x ¹ -[]	“to push away, smash” / „to cut, fell”	-
<i>ar-[ša-na]-^ʿtal¹-la-aš</i>	“jealous, envier”	“envier”

the Sumerian. There are also no respective roots attested to in West Semitic (cf. WSem. *ʿbl* “to mourn”). The corresponding Hittite terms do not contribute much, for they cannot be appropriately linked to the Akkadian (Hitt. *etri*[] possibly deriving from *etri-* “fodder”, *ḫaštelianza* from *ḫaštili-* “strong”, as to which formations with *-ant-* are as to yet not attested). However, note that Hitt. *ḫaštelianza* would provide quite a suitable translation for Akk. *gitmālu* and *kapkappu*, i.e., for the following entries. If this is not due to a misordering, the Akkadian items in 25f. must be roughly synonymous with the terms in 27f.

- 28 Sum. *ĝir* very likely is to be interpreted as “proud, splendid” here (as in equation with Akk. *šarāḫu*); as for Sum. *-ri-a*, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.2.
- 32 Depending on whether one restores Sum. [diĝir]-tuku or [diĝir-nu]-tuku in (2) (with the first term being more likely regarding space), one may interpret the Akk. *naZarti* as deriving from *nšr* “to protect” (then, “protected by his god”) or from Akk. *nzr* “to curse” (then “cursed by his/a god”). The semantical symmetry of the section favors the latter interpretation, i.e., the negative-connoted term. Peculiar is also the morphological of Akk. *naZarti*, i.e., with feminine *-t-* and final *-i*, as well as the pattern /parast/ which is not attested for either *nšr* or *nzr*. Possibly, the whole phrase has to be regarded as personal name, then to be derived from *nšr* “who is protected by (his) god”. The name is not otherwise attested, but this interpretation could account for the morphological peculiarities (feminine gender, sandhi, peculiar vowel pattern). Note that the term of the preceding entry, Akk. *rāš ili* frequently occurs as a personal name (e.g. *Ra-šil*, *Ra-ši-AN* or *Ra-šil-tum*).
- 33-35 Note that the Akkadian part of this section reoccurs in 112-114. As this parallel section also preserves the Sumerian and Hittite counterparts, possible interpretations of the Akkadian are discussed there.
- 36 AHw sub *qannā'u* quite convincingly links the Akkadian term to Hebr. *qn'* “to be jealous”, and especially to the adjective *qannā'* “jealous”, to which the present term corresponds quite exactly.

	mns	col	l	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
37	Aa	i	37	[]		<i>re-e-ú</i>
38	Aa	i	38	[]		<i>ra-'-i-bu</i>
39	Aa	i	39	[x-su]r ² - ^r sur ¹		<i>za-a-bu</i>
40	Aa	i	40	[x]-x-x-ḫul		<i>ḫa-a-lu</i>
41	Aa	i	41	[ig]i-lib		<i>dá-la-pu</i>
42	Aa	i	42	[i]gi-lib-kúr		<i>la-a ṣa-la-lu</i>
43	Aa	i	43	[á]š-sa ḡ		<i>al-pu</i>
44	Aa	i	44	[á]š- ^r daḫ ¹		<i>ar-ta-ti-il₅-lu</i>
45	Aa	i	45	[á]š-daḫ-DI		^r KAR-ri-ru ¹
46	Aa	i	46	ù-ma		<i>en-ni-it-^rtù¹</i>
47	Aa	i	47	ù-na		<i>kat-ti-lu</i>
48	Aa	i	48	[ig]i-ḫuš		<i>né-ké[l-mu-u]</i>
49	Aa	i	49	^r gu ¹⁷ -šakán(GU) ¹		<i>qú-u</i> ^D ŠAKÁN
50	Aa	i	50	^r gu ¹⁷ -ZI		<i>qú-u et-t[ù-ti]</i>
51	Aa	i	51	[x] x DIŠ		<i>qú-u nu-na-[tù]</i>
52	Aa	i	52	sìla-zabar		<i>qa-a ZABAR</i>

- 37 Akk. *rē'u* has quite convincingly been linked to Hebr. *ḥri* “to burn (with anger)” by H. Otten / W. v. Soden (1968: 12).
- 39-42 The present section is of particular interest with regard to its internal organization. The link between 39f. and 41f. is provided by the homonymous variants of Akk. *ḫālu*.
- 39 (2) is restored according to Sum./Akk. *sur-sur* = *zābu* in Antagal C 267. However, there is space at least for one additional sign at the beginning of the line. Hitt. *ḫalḫazuwališ* is hapax legomenon, also in case the partly-broken sign is read <YA> or <AL> (which is also possible).
- 40 As for the homonymous relation between *ḫālu* “to melt, dissolve” and *ḫālu* “to be in labor”, cf. note to 39-42. In any case, the Akkadian has apparently been interpreted as a participle (Akk. *ḫayyālu*) according to the participle used in the Hittite translation.
- 42 An expression Sum. *igi-lib-kúr* is otherwise not attested. As for a possible meta-linguistic meaning of the *kúr*-formative, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.3. H. Otten / W. von Soden (1968: 10) tentatively interpret it as a *ḫarran* mark.
- 43 As to the available attestations of Akk. *alāpu/alpu*, see CAD sub *alpu* and sub *elēpu* 1a/b. It is probably more suiting to establish two different lemmata, as it has been realized by AHw: i.e., Akk. *elēpu* “to sprout, flourish” vs. *alāpu* “to stretch forth (the arm) threateningly”. The latter has to be considered in close connection with WSem. *ḫlp*, which besides the general meaning “to exchange” can also mean “to pierce”; in this respect, note the occurrence of this term in the series *Malku* (cf. following note). Regarding the maintenance of the *a*-vowel, Akk. *alpu* probably is a loan from West Semitic. Hitt. *šarḫuntalliš*, otherwise unattested, presumably derives from Hitt. *šarḫiya-* “to assault” (as for a short summary, cf. CHD sub *šarḫuntalli-*).
- 44 Since Akk. *alpu*, *ardadu* and *karriru* occur in ultimate succession in Malku 1 89-91 (set against Akk. *sāru* “criminal”), the suggestion by H. Otten / W. von Soden (1968: 13), i.e., to regard Akk. *artatillu* as erroneous, seems appealing. Unfortunately, the Sumerian terms are altogether but scarcely attested, but they rather represent synonyms than contrasting different homonymous uses of Sum. *áš*; in this respect, note the equation Sum./

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>kar-tim-mi-ya-za</i>	“anger”	“anger”
TUKU.TUKU- <i>u-wa-an-za</i>	“angry”	“angry”
<i>ḫal-ḫa-¹zu¹-wa-liš</i>	“to melt, dissolve”	hapax leg.
<i>ú-i-wi₅-iš-kat-tal-la-aš</i>	“to melt, dissolve” / “to be in labor ^{who is in labor} ”	“(woman) who is in labor”
<i>ar-ri-ya-a-u-wa-ar</i>	“to be/stay awake”	hapax leg.
<i>Ú-UL še-eš-ki-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	“not to sleep”	“not to sleep”
<i>šar-ḫu-un-ta-al-liš</i>	“threatening”	hapax leg.
<i>ka-aš-ta-an-za</i>	a plant	hapax leg.
<i>za-ap-pí-at¹-tal-la-aš</i>	a criminal “dripping, trickling”	“dripping” see note
<i>¹x¹-¹x¹-[x-y]a-u-wa-ar</i>	“triumph, battle ^{sin, punishment} ”	-
<i>ar-m[a-li-y]a-u-wa-ar</i>	“a disease, demon”	“to become ill, illness”
<i>tar-¹kúl¹-li-ya-u-¹wa¹-ar</i>	“to look at angrily”	“to look at angrily”
<i>^DŠAKÁN-aš ḫa-an-za-na-aš</i>	“thread of sheep whool”	“thread of sheep whool”
<i>a-u-wa-wa-aš ḫa-an-za-na-aš</i>	“thread of the spider”	“thread of the <i>auwawa</i> -”
<i>ḫa-aš-mu-ša-al-li-ya-aš ga-pa-an-za</i>	“vessel made of <i>nunnu</i> ”	“black <i>ḫašmušalliya</i> -vessel”
<i>pár-ku-ya-aš ḫa-zi-la-aš</i>	“bronze vessel”	“bronze vessel”

Akk. aš-daḫ = *ardadu*, which can be extracted from a bilingual text (Lambert 1960: 119; ll. 17f.). As Akk. *artatillu* is normally set against a Sumerian term with initial aš, i.e., Sum. ^aaš-tál-tál, as well, the entry is not necessarily erroneous. As to Hitt. *kaštanza*, a connection with Hitt. *kašt*- “hunger” is improbable, for all nominal derivations formed to *kašt*-, i.e., with the suffix *-want*- or *-ant*-, are without exception based on the (weak) stem variant *kišt*-.

- 45 As to the possible meta-linguistic meaning of Sum. di/sá, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.4. The broken sign in (5) very likely is <AT>. Resulting Hitt. *zappi(y)attallaš* can be derived from *zappiya*- “to drip, leak”, thus denoting something which is dripping, leaking. The Hittite translation thus seems to be based on Akk. *garāru* “to writhe; D to drip”; note that WSem. *gr(r)* has “to leak, trickle” as basic meaning. According to the vertical context, however, the original form of the Akkadian must be *karriru* (possibly derived from Akk. *karāru* “to put down, discard”, No. 176).
- 46 According to the Sumerian, it is clear that the Akkadian originally read *ernittu*, as noted by H. Otten / W. von Soden (1968: 14). Unfortunately, the Hittite is broken.
- 47 Akk. *kattillu*, probably to be connected with WSem. *qtl*, which denotes a kind of demon, sometimes taking possession of animals, and/or the disease provoked by it (possibly a sort of hydrophobia). It is quite in agreement thus with Akk. *kadru* “wild”, the usual equivalent of Sum. ù-na. The Hittite translation is obviously based on the disease aspect of Akk. *kattillu* only.
- 48 The entry has been extensively discussed by H. Otten / W. von Soden (1968: 14). Except for the present attestation, Hitt. *tarkulliya*-, can be found in the Bilingue of Ḫattušili I (KBo. 10,2 iii 1f.; with root extension *-ške*-). The corresponding Akkadian word is partly broken there, reading [X]-ak-la-mu-šu; a link with Akk. *nekelmû* is not improbable.
- 49 Mistaken <GU> instead of <GÌR> in (2) has apparently been provoked by preceding <GU> (No. 026). The translation of the Akkadian follows Otten / von Soden 1968: 15.

	mns	col	l	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
53	Aa	i	53	ʿx ¹ -ga		1-en
54	Aa	i	54	ʿx ¹ -ga		e-de ₄ -nu
55	Aa	i	55	ʿx ¹ -bi		a-ḫu-ru-u
56	Aa	i	56	[x]-bi-ri-a		a-ḫu-ru-u
57	Aa	i	57	[x-s]i-ge		ʿAŠ BAL x x ¹
58	Aa	i	58	[x-s]i-ga-ʿsì ¹ -ge		AŠ ʿBAL x ¹
59	Aa	i	59	[x x]-zi-ʿx ¹		a-ḫu-ru-u
60	Aa	i	60	[x x x x]-ʿe/a ¹		a-ḫu-ur-tù
	Aab		1'	[]		ʿx ¹ -[]
61	Aa	i	61	[x x x] ʿx ¹		ú-i
	Aab		2'	[]		ú-ʿi ¹
62	Aa	i	62	[]		a-ʿi ¹
	Aab		3'	[]		a-i
63	Aa	i	63	[x x x] ʿx ¹		S[A-r]a-ʿa ¹ -[]
	Aab		4'	[x x x] ʿx ¹		ša-ra-[a-ḫu]
64	Aa	i	64	[]		[]
	Aab		5'	[] ʿx ¹ DI		šu-úš-r[u-ḫu]
65	Aa	i	65	[]		[]
	Aab		6'	[]		na-am-ʿx ¹ -[]
66	Aa	i	66	[]		[]
	Aab		7'	[]		na-ʿx ¹ -[]

50 Sum. ZI is unexpected, here; Akk. *ettūtu* is usually set against Sum. aš, aš₅, or kád. Hitt. *auwawa-* has frequently been considered to denote a spider because of the present equation, which is questionable due to those attestations which closely link the term to rhyta vessels (cf. HW² sub *auwawa-*).

53-56 Concerning possible restorations in (2), two suggestions have been offered. H. Otten/W. von Soden (1968: 17) propose to restore <SIG> as the first sign in each line and thereby refer to the equation Sum./Akk. sig = *we-du-u* in Izbu Comm. 1 69, which can also be extracted from some late omen texts, where Akk. SIG, complemented by -ú, -a or -i, probably reflects *wēdû*. H. G. Güterbock (1985: 104) refuses this suggestion, mainly as a consequence of his collations, which have yielded two horizontal wedges or oblique strokes that precede the two vertical wedges visible in the copy. H. Hoffner's proposal (1982: 42f.), i.e. Sum. : ʿa¹-ga (with a pair of marker wedges preceding the entry) is based on that new reading. The restoration is supported by parallel equations like Sum./Akk. a-ga-ba = *aḫamma* “separately” (RA 16 167 iv 31, group vocabulary) or a-ga-ba = *edēš[u]* (Diri Ug. 2A = RS 17.154 r. 2). However, a pair of marker wedges does not make much sense in that position. An alternative solution is restoring <GA> as first sign; yet, although this sign would be fitting with regard to the sign form, there are no lexical or literary sources supporting such an equation.

The Hittite translations contrast masculine and feminine forms, which neither seems to be explicable from the Sumerian nor from the Akkadian counterparts.

54 H. Otten / W. von Soden (1968: 17) read Hitt. 1-e-la-aš in (5), which they analyze as 1-el=aš lit. “of one he/ unius is”, while H.G Güterbock (1985: 104) simply treats it as an otherwise not attested adjective 1-ela-, which H.A. Hoffner (2006: 192) in turn interprets as a representation of the adjective *šielas “single”. Taking into account that the sign interpreted as <LA> rather looks like <AT>, and that the Hittite entries in the present and

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
1- <i>aš</i>	“one”	“one, unus”
1 ^{E-AT} - <i>aš</i>	“alone”	“one, una”
<i>nu-u-ma-a[n] DÙ-an-za</i>	“social inferior; younger child”	“who (m.) is not able to do (s.th.)”
MUNUS- <i>za nu-u-m[a]-an DÙ-an-za</i>	“social inferior; younger child”	“who (f.) is not able to do (s.th.)”
<i>Ú-UL tar-aḥ-ḥa-an-za</i>	-	“not capable (m.)”
MUNUS- <i>za ʾÚ-ULʾ tar-aḥ-ḥa-an-za</i>	-	“not capable (f.)”
<i>nu-u-ma-an DÙ-an-za</i>	“social inferior; younger child”	“who (m.) is not able to do (s.th.)”
MUNUS- <i>za nu-u-ma-an DÙ-an-za</i>	“social inferior; younger child (f.)”	“who (f.) is not able to do (s.th.)”
[]		
<i>ú-i</i>	an exclamation	an exclamation
[]		
<i>a-i</i>	an exclamation	an exclamation
[]		
[<i>píd</i>]- <i>du-li-ya-aš</i>	“to cry out , wail”	“anguish, worry”
[]		
[<i>píd-d</i>] <i>u-li-iš-ki-u-wa-ar</i>	“to make lament, weep”	“to worry repeatedly”
[]		
[]-ʾ ^x - <i>ki-za ku-iš</i>	-	-
[]		
[<i>x x l</i>] <i>a-u-za</i>	-	-
[]		

the following section regularly alternate masculine and feminine forms, reading 1^{E-AT}-*aš* seems more plausible, although it is based on an as to yet not attested Akkadogram and although the result is not in grammatical congruence with the Akkadian then (yet, note the same incompatibility in 55f.).

- 55f. H. Otten / W. von Soden (1968: 17) translate (5) as “einer, der keineswegs gemacht ist”. H.A Hoffner (1982: 42f.), adducing all available evidence of Hitt. *numan*, demonstrates the voluntative and abilitative modal implication of this particle, and consequently translates “he, who doesn't want to do something”, stressing that participles of transitive verbs can of course have an active meaning. The translation proposed here, is based on the abilitative aspect of Hitt. *numan*.
- 57-60 As for (2) and (4) in 57-59, there seems to be no ready interpretation. Following H.A. Hoffner (1982: 42f.), possibly restore Sum. *ri-a* at the end of l. 60 (2).
- 59f. As for (5), cf. note to 55f. Note that contrary to the preceding section, the contrast in gender which the Hittite translations form, is also reflected in (4). Akk. *aḫurtu* however seems to be artificial; the usual form expected is *aḫurrātu*.
- 63f. Akk *šarāḫū*, as proposed by H. Otten / W. von Soden (1968: 68) seems more likely than Akk. *šarāpu*, the restoration proposed by H.G. Güterbock (1985: 105), due to the vertical context and due to the equation with Hitt. *pittuliya-*. Notably, Akkadian /*parās*/ is translated by a simple noun, and not by averbal abstract with suffix *-war*. Also note that according to the attestations quoted in CHD, the root *pittuliya-* does not occur in literary texts of the post-MH period, thus possibly is anachronistic with regard to the date of the production of the manuscript.

	mns	col	l	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
67	Aa	i	67	[]		[]
68	Aa	i	68	[]		[]
69	Aa	i	69	[]		[]
(break)						
90	Aa	ii	1'	[]		[]
91	Aa	ii	2'	[]		[]
92	Aa	ii	3'	[]		[]
93	Aa	ii	4'	[]		[]
94	Aa	ii	5'	[]		[]
	Aac	i'	1'	[x] x x a		
95	Aa	ii	6'	[]		[<i>hu-bu-ul-lu</i> _{1/4}]
	Aac	i'	2'	ur ₅ -ra		
96	Aa	ii	7'	[]		[<i>qí-ip-tù</i>]
	Aac	i'	3'	šu-lá		
97	Aa	ii	8'	[]		[<i>šu-pé-el-tù</i>]
	Aac	i'	4'	šu-bal		
98	Aa	ii	9'	[]		[<i>hu-ub-bu-ta-tù</i>]
	Aac	i'	5'	šu-bal-bal		
99	Aa	ii	10'	šu-du[l ₉]		<i>e-le-p[u]</i> [?]
	Aac	i'	6'	[š]u-du[l ₉]		
100	Aa	ii	11'	šu-du[l ₉]-[du[l ₉]		<i>ha-la-p[u]</i>
	Aac	i'	7'	[š]u-du[l ₉]-du[l ₉]		
101	Aa	ii	12'	šu-du[l ₉](UR-x)'-ĝá		<i>na-aš-lu-l[u]</i>
	Aac	i'	8'	[š]u-du[l ₉]-ĝá-ĝá		
102	Aa	ii	13'	šu-ḫi		<i>šu-tám-ḫu-ru</i>
	Aac	i'	9'	[š]u-ḫi		
103	Aa	ii	14'	šu-ḫi-ḫi		<i>šu-ta-bu-lu</i> ₄
	Aac	i'	10'	[š]u-ḫi-ḫi		

65 Possibly read Hitt. [*ša-a*]*k-ki*=*za kui-iš*, following H.G. Güterbock (1985: 105).

95-98 The restorations in (2) are according to can. Erim 1 a32-35).

96 The partly broken sign in (5) possibly is <A>. Both Hitt. *ša-ra-a tiyauwar* as well as *pa-ra-a tiyauwar* do not match Akk. *qīptu*.

99-101 Sum. šu-du[l₉] is as to yet unattested with the meaning as suggested by Akk. *ḫalāpu* and *našallulu*. The traces in manuscript Aa do not fully agree with the sign form of <ŠÜDUL> as it is known in Hattuša; however, manuscript Aac unambiguously preserves this sign. Can. Erim 2 93-94 has a section with the same Akkadian terms, the Sumerian counterparts being *sur-gir₅* and *sur-ḫum*. As for a possible meta-linguistic meaning of Sum.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[x-x]- ^ʿ x ¹ - ^ʿ x ¹ GIŠ DÌM	-	-
[]	-	-
[x x x t]i-ya-aš ZI-aš	-	-
<hr/>		
[x] ^ʿ x ¹ []	-	-
<hr/>		
[x x]- ^ʿ x ¹ -za	-	-
[pár-ku]-iš	-	“pure”
[me-e]k-ki pár-ku-iš	-	“very pure”
[x]- ^ʿ x ¹ -ya-tar	-	-
<hr/>		
[x] ^ʿ x ¹	“interest-bearing loan”	-
[]- ^ʿ x ¹ ti-i-ya-u-wa-ar	“loan, credit”	“to put/stand []”
[x-x-m]ar	“exchange”	“to []”
[x-x-x]-uš-ki-u-wa-ar	“interest-free loan”	-
<hr/>		
[]- ^ʿ ya/a ¹ -u-wa-ar	see note	“to []”
[x x]- ^ʿ x ¹ -liš-šu-u-wa-ar	“to slip (in/through)”	“to []”
[x x]-kán KI.MIN	“to slither”	“[] ditto”
<hr/>		
[an-da] im-mi-ya-u-wa-ar	“to equate, make equal”	“to mix, mingle”
[x a]n-da im-mi-ya-u-wa-ar	“to mix”	“[] to mix, mingle”

ġá/ġar, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.4.

99 Can. Erim 2 92 presumably preserves Akk. *erēbu*. Present *elēpu* may be a conflation of *erēbu* and following *ḫalāpu*.

101 Akk. *našallulu* invariably appears as a root with four consonants in all its other attestations (No. 140). In this respect, cf. the many contracted Gtn forms which appear like Gt forms (cf. chapter 10, type III.3.b.).

102-105 The original paradigmatic variation within the Hittite column is unclear. H.G. Güterbock (1985: 106) proposes the terms Hitt. IGI-*anda* and *takšan anda* to be restored in front of *immiyauwar* in 103f. respectively. However, the available space seems to be too limited.

	mns	col	l	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
104	Aa	ii	15'	šu-ḫi-tab-b[a]		šu-ta-at-te-nu
	Aac	i'	11'	[š]u-ḫi-tab-ba		
105	Aa	ii	16'	šu-gíd-d[a]		ús-ŠA-tù
	Aac	i'	12'	[š]u-gíd-da		
106	Aa	ii	17'	šu-E-UD ^{1?} -DA ^{1?}		az-zi-bá-tù
	Aac	i'	13'	[š]u-sù-ud-da		
107	Aa	ii	18'	šu-sù-ud-da-ri-a		az-za-bá-tù
	Aac	i'	14'	[š]u-sù-da-ri		
108	Aa	ii	19'	šu-bar-zí-ri-a		AZ-UD ¹ /ZÍ ¹ -tù
	Aa	ii	20'			UD ¹ ḫa-an-ti-i ḫa-a-ši
	Aac	i'	15'	[š]u-UD ¹ -bar ¹ -zí-ri-a		
109	Aa	ii	21'	KA-UD ¹		e-peš pi-i
110	Aa	ii	22'	KA-UD ¹ -bal		da-bá-bu
111	Aa	ii	23'	KA-UD ¹ -bal-bal		at-mu-ú
112	Aa	ii	24'	UD ¹ kir ₁₄ -[ḫur] [?]		te-bu
113	Aa	ii	25'	kir ₁₄ -ḫur-UD ¹ ḫur [?]		ti-ib ša-ni-iš
114	Aa	ii	26'	kir ₁₄ -te-[ri]-a		na-UD ¹ pá ^{1?} -šú
115	Aa	ii	27'	KA-zal		mu-té-el-lu
116	Aa	ii	28'	KA-zal []		[x]-lu-u
117	Aa	ii	29'	KA-zal []		a-wa-UD ¹ nu ₄ ^{1?}

104 As to the possible meta-linguistic context of Sum. tab, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.3..

105-108 Among the three Sumerian terms given, only šu-bar-zí can be linked to the semantic field <<help>>. Sum šu--gíd and šu--sud taken literally, all three terms are quasi-synonyms (as for Sum. -ri-a, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.2.). The Hittite column does not give a line-by-line translation, but a paraphrase comprising at least four lines (also see chapter 11, sect. 2.6.3.). The segmentation of the whole phrase is not quite clear. H.G. Güterbock (1985: 107) isolates three phrases, though the terms in Aa ii 20' are not visibly separated; he further translates Hitt. *ḫanti ḫaši* as “separately you trust” (similar: HW² sub *ep-* 0.3.).

108 The Akkadian expression is unclear. Note that it principally contains the same consonants as Akk. *usātu* in l. 105, and may thus trace back to the same root.

109-111 The second sign in (2) very likely is identical in all three lines. As proposed by H.G. Güterbock (1985: 107), it could be <BA>; <DU> also seems possible. According to the well-known phrase Sum. *inim--bal*, one would read initial KA as *inim*. However, the phrase is virtually never attested with a complementing attribute to *inim*. As to (5) Güterbock (ibid.) points out that Hitt. *aiššit* can only be interpreted as nom.-acc. n. *aiš=šit* “his mouth“, because the instrumental takes the weak stem: *iššit*. Hitt. *aiš-* is very often attested with enclitic pronouns, which makes the first interpretation even more probable. Notably, the pronominal element is missing in the Akkadian counterpart (one would accordingly expect Akk. *epēš pī=šu*). Possibly the 3rd person is still reflected in Sum. -ba, i.e. -bi-a.

112-114 The Akkadian part of this section is paralleled by ll. 33-35, where the Sumerian and the Hittite is broken. The sign in 112, i.e., <KAxKAK = KIR₁₄>, similarly to <KAxUD = ZU₉>, is a differentiation of simple <KA>.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[x]- ^r x ¹ an-da im-mi-ya-u-wa-ar	“to mix”	“[] to mix, mingle”
[x-x] ku-iš ku-e-da-ni pa- ^r a ¹ -[i]	“(commercial) help, assistance”	“One gives [X] to another
[nu-uš-ši t]e-ez-zi le-e-wa [e-e]p-ši	“help”	[and s]ays [to him]: 'Don't [ke]p (it),
[nu-wa-r]a-at-mu EGIR-pa	“help”	[but] give it back to me
[ša-ku-w]a-aš-ša-ra pa-a-i 2-an-k[i] PAB-nu-mar	see note	intact!' ” “you trust the one who trusts/ is trusted“; „to protect twice []”
^r a ¹ -i[š-š]i-it me-mi-ya-u-wa-ar	“to make the mouth', speak”	“to speak his (= one's) mouth”
me-m[i-a]š	“to talk, speak”	“speech”
me-ek-ki me-mi-[y]a-u-wa-ar	“to talk, discuss”	“to talk much”
tar-ŠU/MA/KU-[u]-wa-ar	“arousal, attack”	see note
2-an-ki [tar]-MA/KU-u-wa-ar	“also arousal, attack”	see note
pí-ip-pu-[u]-wa-ar	“to push away, down, to smash”	“to knock down, tear down”
wa-al-li-u-ra-aš	“proud, lit. who praises himself”	“glorious”
2-an ḥa-ad- ^r da ¹ -an-za	-	see note
ud-da-na-la-aš	“talker”	“talker”

which is only attested in the Hittite sign inventory, corresponding to Sum. KA = kir₄. The (literal) meaning of Sum. kir₄-ḥur is “to pierce with a spindle”; there is no Akkadian root attested with the consonants T and P which would suit this meaning. As to (5), H.G. Güterbock (1985: 107) already notes that it can either be interpreted as derived from *tarku-* “to dance”, from *tarmai-* “to knock, fix with a nail”, or from *taršu-* “to dry”; however, as with the Sumerian, there is no compatibility between either of these terms and Akkadian TP. Strikingly, Hitt. *tarmai-* corresponds well to the Sumerian.

As for the peculiar construction of Akk. *šanīš*, its meaning and the corresponding term Hitt. 2-*anki*, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.3. and 6.4.

- 114 The second sign in (4) is unclear. According to the parallel entry in l. 35, one would expect <PA> or <SILA>, which does not fit the three initial horizontals of the present sign, yet. Also, <BA> is virtually impossible due to the traces of two additional horizontals visible on the copy. In any case, Akk. *napāšu* is more fitting than *nakāsu*, with regard to the vertical context as well as with regard to the Hittite translation.
- 115 Hitt. *walliuraš* apparently is a derivation of Hitt. *walli-* “glory, fame”.
- 116 Hitt. *ḥaddant-* either derives from *ḥat-* “to dry out” or from *ḥatta-* “to cut, kill” (with the secondary meaning “clever”). With regard to the vertical context, the second meaning is the one to be preferred.
- 117 Though the damaged sign in (4) rather resembles <TUM>, H.G. Güterbock's restoration <LUM = nu₄> (1985: 108) seems plausible: Akk. *amānū* is close in meaning to the translation Hitt. *uddanala-*, which, hapax legomenon, is very likely a -*talla-* derivation of *uddan-* (hence “a talker”), as pointed out by Güterbock (ibid.).

	mns	col	l	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
118	Aa	ii	30'	KA-b[a]l [?]		<i>a-mu-u</i>
119	Aa	ii	31'	KA-š[u-b]al		<i>a-mi-it-tù</i>
120	Aa	ii	32'	KA-š[u-ba]l-ta-a		<i>ši-it-lu-u</i>
	Aad	i'	1'	[x x x] 'x ¹		
121	Aa	ii	33'	zu ₉		<i>'šu¹-uḫ-ḫu</i>
	Aad	i'	2'	[]		
122	Aa	ii	34'	zu ₉ -è-a		<i>mi-lu-lu</i>
	Aad	i'	3'	[x]-'è ¹ -a		
123	Aa	ii	35'	zu ₉ -è-a-DI		<i>tar-ra-ZU</i>
	Aad	i'	4'	'x ¹ -è-a-DI		
124	Aa	ii	36'	[x]-'LAGABxX ¹ -u		<i>ši-IB-BU</i>
	Aad	i'	5'	[x]-'x ¹		
125	Aa	ii	37'	[x]-LAGABx'X ¹ -gu ₄		<i>ki-lu</i>
	Aad	i'	6'	[x] [?] níĝ-ga		
126	Aa	ii	38'	[]		<i>ki-lu-tù</i>
	Aad	i'	7'	níĝ-šú		
127	Aa	ii	39'	[x]-DU-gam		<i>mu ma mi</i>
	Aad	i'	8'	[x]-du		
128	Aa	ii	40'	[x]-lú		<i>ḫu ḫa ḫi</i>
	Aad	i'	9'	[x]-d		
129	Aa	ii	41'	[x]-dù-a-bi		<i>'lu¹ la li</i>
	Aad	i'	10'	[x]-e-še		

118-120 According to the Akkadian translation in ll. 118f., Sum. KA is best to be read inim (i.e. “to exchange words”). The Akkadian terms in ll. 118f. very likely reflect /parās/ and /pirist/ forms of the root 'wy. According to the Hittite translation, they have apparently been confused with /pāris/ and /pārist/ forms of a root which is attested as *hmy* “to bark, bellow, roar” in Hebrew (Nos. 145f./207). Akk. *ši-it-lu-u* possibly derives from the semantic field << talking >>, as well, and then represents *šita'lu*, a Gt-stem form of *šālu*, “to consult, talk to one another”. The reciprocity of the Gt stem is possibly reflected in the peculiar ending -ta-a (i.e. da) of the Sumerian (cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.5.). As for the corresponding Hittite, there seems to be no appropriate interpretation available.

121-123 <ZU₉ = KAxUD> is the specific Hittite form of <KA> in the reading zú.

121 According to his translation, the Hittite scribe analyzed the Akkadian as adjective /purrus/, whereas it originally meant the nomen conretum *ṣūḫu* (/purs/, No. 147).

123 As for the possible meta-linguistic meaning of Sum. di/sá, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.4. The interpretation of the Akkadian is unclear. According to the Hittite translation, it expresses a reciprocal relation, which is to some degree inherent in Akk. *tarāṣu*, in the sense of “to turn (the face, heart towards s.th./s.o.)”. Thus, with regard to the vertical context, possibly translate “to smile to one another”.

124-126 Manuscripts Aa and Aad apparently provide different versions: (Unilingual) Aad lists varying terms denoting propriety. The Sumerian terms in Aa are unclear, but the Akkadian translations do not match the Sumerian of Aad. Akk. *Ki-lu(-tù)* either derives from *qlw* “to burn” or, as proposed by the Hittite translation, from *kly* “to hold back, detain” with the derivation Akk. *kīlu* “enclosure” or even from *qyl* “to be silent”, though there is

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
UR.GI ₇ -aš ku- ^ʾ iš ¹ wa-ap-pé-eš-k[i-iz-zi]	“to talk ^{barking, bellowing (m.)} ”	“(male) dog which keeps barking”
MUNUS-za ku-iš UR.GI ₇ -aš i-wa-a[r]	“to talk ^{barking, bellowing (f.)} ”	“(female) dog likewise”
^ʾ šar ¹ -ki-iz-zi ku-iš	see note	hapax leg.
<i>ḥa-aḥ-ḥar-ša-na-an-za</i>	“laughter ^{amused} ”	“laughing, laughed at”
<i>ḥi-in-ga-ni-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	“to play”	“to play”
<i>a-ri IGI-an-da KI.MIN</i>	see note	“to play with one another”
<i>ka-ru-uš-ši-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	“to lead away as a captive ^{to be silent?} ”	“to be silent”
^ʾ a ¹ -ra-a-u-wa-ar	“imprisonment, captivity”	“to stop, hinder, prohibit”
^ʾ x ¹ -aš KI.MIN	“imprisonment, captivity”	“to stop, hinder, prohibit”
<i>ma-a-an</i>	see note	“when, if”
<i>ku-it</i>	see note	“when, because”
<i>GIM-an</i>	see note	“when, as”

no derivation **qīlu* attested of this root as to yet. Akk. *ši-iB-Bu* cannot be brought into agreement with this semantic field unambiguously. The Hittite translation apparently refers to Akk. *špy* “to be silent”, which, like *qyl*, equally does not have a derivation *šīpu* attested. Akk. *šebû* “to replete” and *šibbu* “belt” are even less fitting. Taking into consideration West Semitic evidence, one could adduce the common root *šby* “to lead away as a captive” (No. 177), which matches Akk. *kalû*, and especially its derivation *kīlu* “enclosurement, prison”. Akk. *Ki-lu-tù* is hapax legomenon.

126 The first sign in (5) is unclear. Possibly read <BAL> or <DINGIR>. Also note the phonetic paralexsis / unorthographic spelling Sum. *níĝ-šú* for *níĝ-šu* in Aad (2).

127-129 Manuscripts Aa and Aad apparently represent distinct textual versions. According to the Hittite translations, the section deals with (mainly temporal) conjunctions. The Sumerian terms can only very partially be interpreted as such. Sum. *lú* may be compatible in its use as relative pronoun, and in Aad l. 129 one may restore Sum. *u₄-dù-a-bi*. The other terms remain obscure, which is even more true for the Akkadian. Note that the canonical version equally contains sections in which the Akkadian column simply lists syllables in the TU-TA-TI sequence (can. Erim 2 c 3-8). These are arranged slightly different, with each line containing one syllable only: The first section lists *mu ma mi*, the second *lu la li*, which remarkably involves two of the three consonants treated in the present section. The respective Sumerian terms are unfortunately broken in the canonical version, but traces at the end of c3f. give <LÚ> and <DU>, which are also the final signs of Aad l. 127 and Aa l. 128, strongly suggesting, thus, that there is a textual parallel between these passages. Note that, with the exception

	mns	col	1	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
129a	Aad	i'	11'	[x]-DI-DI- ¹ DI ¹ -DI		
129b	Aad	i'	12'	[x-D]I-DI-DI		
129c	Aad	i'	13'	[x-x]-x-x		
130	Aa	iii	1	¹ x ¹ -DU		[]
131	Aa	iii	2	ĝéštug- ¹ x ¹ -lá		[]
132	Aa	iii	3	ĝéštug		<i>še₂₀-mu</i>
	Aac	ii'	1'	¹ ĝéštug ¹		
133	Aa	iii	4	ĝéštug-gu-la		<i>ši-te₉-mu</i>
	Aac	ii'	2'	ĝéštug-gu-la		
	Aae		1'	[]	[gi-i]š-d[u]	[]
134	Aa	iii	5	ĝéštug-ĝar-ra		<i>a-du-u</i>
	Aac	ii'	3'	ĝéštug- ¹ ĝar ¹ -ra		
	Aae		2'	[]	[gi-i]š-du-k[u-la]	[]
135	Aa	iii	6	[l]ib-ĝar		<i>pu-qú-u</i>
	Aac	ii'	4'	lib-ĝar		
	Aae		3'	[]	[l]i-ib-kar	[]
136	Aa	iii	7	[li]b-ĝar-ĝar		<i>ku-ud-du-u</i>
	Aac	ii'	5'	lib-ĝar-ĝar		
	Aae		4'	[]	[l]i-ib-kar-kar	[]
137	Aa	iii	8	[li]b-ĝar-ri-a		<i>ka₄-du-ú</i>
	Aac	ii'	6'	lib-ĝar-ri-a		
	Aae		5'	[]	[l]i-ib-kar-ri-a	¹ x ¹ -[]
138	Aa	iii	9	[li]b-kúr		<i>qa-a-lu</i>
	Aac	ii'	7'	lib-kúr		
	Aae		6'		li-ib-gur	<i>qá-[a-lu]</i>
139	Aa	iii	10	[li]b-kúr-kúr		<i>šu-ḫar-ru-ru</i>
	Aac	ii'	8'	lib-kúr-kúr		
	Aae		7'	[]	li-ib-gur-gur	<i>šu-ḫa[r-ru-ru]</i>

of *li*, all syllables quoted in the canonical version fulfill the function of particles in Akkadian (with =*mu* being a rare allomorph of =*ma*), which especially makes sense with regard to the Hittite translations assigning obviously grammatical functions to the syllables. However, this interpretation does not apply to the syllables *ḫu ḫa ḫi*, that are found in the present version exclusively.

132-134 Manuscripts Aae possibly switches entries 133f., as compared to the other manuscripts. Sum. *ĝéštug-gu-la* is unclear; actually, with regard to the pattern common to many sections of the series, one would expect a reduplicated term in this position, as is also implied by the Akkadian translation. Akk *adû* “oath” may be linked to the semantic field of Akk. *šemû* as “force to listen/obey to s.o.”; possibly it is better to be linked to Akk. *idu*

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	-	-
𐎶	“to listen, hear”	-
𐎶	“to listen constantly”	-
𐎶	“oath” / “to recognize”?	-
𐎶	“to pay attention”	-
𐎶	“to be attentive”	-
𐎶	“to watch, guard”	-
ʾx¹-[]	“to be silent”	-
iš-ʾkal-la¹-[]?	“to be deathly silent”	-

“to recognize, know”, as for which one would however at least expect initial *e*, if not *i*.

135-137 According to the Sumerian, it is clear that the Akkadian terms reflect the roots *pwq* and *kwd*, and not roots *teri-tiae infirmae* as indicated by the spelling (Nos. 105-107). Unfortunately, the Hittite column is broken, so it is impossible to know if the deviant plene shifts also involve errors at the semantic level. As for Sum. -ri-a, possibly referring to the uncusomary G stem *kādu* here, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.2.

138f. Sum. lib-kūr is hapax legomenon. As for the Hittite translation in l. 139, the most probable restoration is the one proposed by H.G. Güterbock (1985: 110), i.e., Hitt. *iškallauwar* “to split, slit”, which however cannot be explained in terms of the Akkadian.

	mns	col	l	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
140	Aa	iii	11	[š]u-bal		<i>sú-up-pu-u</i>
	Aac	ii'	9'	šu-bal		
	Aae		8'	[]	[š]u-pa-al	<i>sú-u[p]</i>
141	Aa	iii	12	[š]u-lum		<i>sú-ul-lu-u</i>
	Aac	ii'	10	šu-lum		
	Aae		9'	[]	[]	<i>s[ú]</i>
142	Aa	iii	13	[š]u-sa-lá-e		<i>qú-UD-DU-u</i>
	Aac	ii'	11'	šu-sa-lá-e		
143	Aa	iii	14	su	: zu-u	<i>ši-ru</i>
	Aac	ii'	12'	šu		
144	Aa	iii	15	úš	: u-uš	<i>dá-mu</i>
	Aac	ii'	13'	sa		
145	Aa	iii	16	šár	: ša-ar	<i>ri-ša-tù</i>
	Aac	ii'	14'	šár		
146	Aa	iii	17	[erín]- ^r á ¹ -daḥ		<i>na-ra-ru</i>
	Aac	ii'	15'	[er]ín-daḥ		
147	Aa	iii	18	[er]ín-zú-kéš		<i>bi-ir-tù</i>
	Aac	ii'	16'	[er]ín-zú-kéš		
148	Aa	iii	19	[er]ín-nir-ra		EN <i>na-ra-ri</i>
	Aac	ii'	17'	[er]ín-nir-ra		
149	Aa	iii	20	[er]ín-nir-ri-a		<i>ni-ru</i>
	Aac	ii'	18'	[er]ín-nir-ra-a		
150	Aa	iii	21	erín-kaskal-kur-lá		<i>ti-il₅-la-tù</i>
	Aac	ii'	19'	[er]ín-kaskal-kur- ^r x ¹		
151	Aa	iii	22	erín-kéš-da		<i>na-mu-u</i>
	Aac	ii'	20'	[er]ín-kéš-da		

140-142 The Akkadian terms clearly define the semantic field of the section as <<praying/adoring>>. Among the Sumerian terms, however, not a single one is attested in this specific meaning. Sum. šu--bal simply means “to change”; šu-lum and šu-sa-lá-e (lit. “to stretch out the hand”) are hapax legomena. With regard to the given semantic field, one would rather expect expressions like Sum. šu-zi or šu-íl. Sum. šu-lum could be a loan or and ad-hoc formation based on Akkadian *sullū(m)*.

142 According to the vertical context, Akk. *qu-UD-DU-u* must originally reflect the root *qdd* “to bow down”, as noted by J. Klinger (1996: 336) (No. 219). Note that confusions of this sort are particularly explainable in a West Semitic linguistic environment (cf. chapter 10, type III.5.c.), where verba mediae geminatae often inflect like verba mediae infirmae.

143-145 Manuscripts Aa and Aac represent distinct textual versions. According to the Akkadian translations, source Aa appears to be more reliable. Secondary Sum. šu in Aac l. 143 probably is a (mistaken) phonetic spelling; the variants Sum. sa “vein, artery” (Aac l. 144) and Sum. úš “blood” (Aa) are apparently semantically related. The organizational position of Sum. šár within the section, however, is less clear. The whole section notably lists

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>mu-qa-a-u-wa-ar</i>	“to pray”	“to pray, implore”
<i>tal-li-ya-u-wa-a[r]</i>	“to pray”	“to pray, implore”
<i>hi-in-ku-u-wa-^rar¹</i>	“to bow down” to bring to an end, destroy ”	“to destroy”
<i>UZU-ni</i>	“flesh, body”	“flesh”?
<i>e-eš-ḫar</i>	“blood”	“blood”
<i>ši-im-na-ta</i>	“rejoycing”	see note
<i>wa-a[r]-ri-iš ERIM^{MEŠ}-za</i>	“auxiliary troops”	“auxiliary troops”
<i>^ra¹-š[a-a]n-du-liš ERIM^{MEŠ}-za</i>	“fort, citadell”	“occupation troops”
<i>w[a-a]r-ri-aš EN-aš</i>	“commander of the auxiliary troops”	“lord of the auxiliary”
<i>[al-š]a-an-za ERIM^{MEŠ}-za</i>	a kind of troops	“troopos of 'followers'”
<i>[ša]r-ti-ya-aš</i>	“auxiliary/allied troops”	“allies”
<i>[x]-ḫa-li-ya-aš</i>	“steppe-dweller”	-

Sumerian single-sign expressions only.

- 145 Sum. ul₄--šár is a regular equivalent to Akk. *rāšu* “to rejoice”. Sum. šár therefore has to be taken as taxilexis, and Akk. *rišātu* as plural form of *rīštu* “rejoice”. As for Hitt. *šimnata-*, see the note to l. 227.
- 146-149 The section deals with various kinds of troops, but only the term Sum. erín(-á)-daḫ is confirmed by literary sources. As to Sum. -ri-a and its possible meta-linguistic function, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.2.
- 148 One would actually expect an expression like Akk. *šābū šarri* or *šābū bēli* (thus displaying an inverted word order) as equivalent to Sum. erín-nir-ra.
- 149 As to the restoration of Hitt. *alšanza* in (5), as proposed by H.G. Güterbock (1985: 110) and by CAD sub *nīru* C, also cf. the extensive lexical discussion of the term by R. Beal (1992: 112ff.).
- 150f. Opposed to the preceding section, which probably treats the various royal troops, the present section seems to deal with kinds of troops of other origin, such as recruited nomadic tribes, etc.
- 151 As to (5) H.G. Güterbock (1985: 111) as well as CAD sub *namû* B propose to restore [ERIM.MEŠ] *ḫaliyaš*

	mns	col	l	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
152	Aa	iii	23	ĝeš-šub-ba		<i>is-si-qú</i>
	Aac	ii'	21'	[ĝe]š- ¹ šub ¹ -b[a]		
153	Aa	iii	24	ĝeš(ERÍN) ¹ -SIG ₅		<i>is-si-iq</i> NI-ŠI
	Aac	ii'	22'	[ĝ]eš-[]		
154	Aa	iii	25	¹ d ¹ nin-piriĝ		<i>al-mu</i>
155	Aa	iii	26	[^d]nin-piriĝ-gal		<i>al-la-mu</i>
156	Aa	iii	27	[x]-kúr-ra		<i>bi-bu</i>
157	Aa	iii	28	[x]- ¹ x ¹ - ¹ si ¹ la ¹ -kúr		<i>ḫa-lu-la-ya</i>
158	Aa	iii	29	[x-x]-kúr		DINGIR-lu ₄ šu-na-ti
159	Aa	iii	30	¹ á ¹ -kal		<i>e-mu-qú</i>
160	Aa	iii	31	[x]- ¹ x ¹		<i>gíp-šú</i>
161	Aa	iii	32	[x]- ¹ x ¹		<i>ša-QA-nu</i>
162	Aa	iii	33	[]		<i>ši-il₅-lu₄</i>
163	Aa	iii	34	[]		<i>ku-ša-ru</i>
164	Aa	iii	35	[]		¹ uš ¹ - ¹ šu ¹ -ru
165	Aa	iii	36	[]		[]
166	Aa	iii	37	[]		[]
167	Aa	iii	38	[]		[]
168	Aa	iii	39	[]		[]
169	Aa	iii	40	[]		[]
						(break)
175	Aad	ii'	1'	ur ₅ -ra		

“troops of the watch“, which seems improbable, as it cannot be explained on basis of the Akkadian, and as Hitt. ERIM.MEŠ is usually *preceded* by the term specifying it (similar: R. Beal [1992: 249ff.]).

- 152 Akk. *is/šqu* invariably follows the pattern /pirs/. That the spelling represents Akk. *ešēk/qu* can be virtually excluded due to the Sumerian translation, the vertical context, and the parallel section in the canonical version (1 208f.). The form with geminated /s/ and inserted /i/ are probably based on the bound state form, the pattern of which was then transferred to the absolute-state form (No. 142).
- 153 Sum. *erim-sig₅*, apparently written over an erasure, cannot be brought in agreement with the Akkadian translation; it is probably induced by the entries of the preceding sections, which also have initial Sum. *erim*. The canonical recension has Sum. *ĝeš-šub-AŠ* and the Akkadian equivalent given there is *išqu lemnu*. Present *issiq ni-ši* must therefore be considered a mistake for *issiq lem-ni*, with <NI> and <IGI> having been switched (No. 014). Unfortunately, the Hittite cannot be reliably reconstructed and it cannot be known, thus, if the graphic misordering also affected the semantic level. A restoration Hitt. [HÜ]L-aš *pūl* would not fit the preserved traces; for equivalents to Akk. *nīšū*, the gap is too small.
- 154-158 The present section lists a number of deities and celestial beings which are roughly associated with the nether-world. Parallel sections are preserved in can. *Erim* 2 210-216 and in can. *Izi* A 12'-15', which yield some more

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[<i>pu</i>]- ^r <i>ú</i> - <i>ul</i>	“lot, share”	“lot, share”
[<i>x</i>]- ^r <i>x</i> ¹ - <i>aš pu-ú-ul</i>	“lot of the evil ^{lot of the people} ”	“lot of []”
[<i>tu-t</i>] <i>i-iš</i>	PN	unkn. m.
[<i>x-x</i>] <i>tu-ti-iš</i>	PN	unkn. m.
[<i>x</i>]- <i>x</i> UDU- <i>aš MUL-aš</i>	“wild sheep (saturnus)”	“star of the [] sheep”
[<i>ú-e-r</i>] <i>i-te-ma-aš</i> [?]	a female demon [?]	“fear”
[<i>Ú^{HI}</i>]- ^r <i>A¹</i> - <i>aš DINGIR^{LIM}-aš</i>	“the god of dreams”	“the god of dreams”
[<i>na-ak-k</i>] <i>i-ya-tar</i>	“strength, power”	“heaviness”
[<i>x-x</i>]- ^r <i>x</i> ¹ - <i>aš na-ak-ki-ya-tar</i>	“uprising, mass”	“heaviness of []”
[<i>x-x-m</i>] <i>ar</i>	see note	-
[]	“shadow, shelter”	-
[<i>x-x</i>]- <i>aš</i>	“reed stalk, reed shelter”	-
[<i>x-x ta</i>] <i>r-nu-mar</i>	“to set free, release”	“to release []”
[<i>x-x-a</i>] <i>t-ti-iš</i>	-	-
[<i>x-(x)</i>] KI.MIN	-	“[] ditto”
[<i>x-x</i>]- ^r <i>x</i> ¹ - <i>u-wa-ar</i>	-	“to []”
[<i>x-x-m</i>] <i>ar</i>	-	“to []”
[<i>x-x</i>]- ^r <i>x</i> ¹ - ^r <i>x</i> ¹ -[<i>x</i>]	-	-

compelling spelling variants: Sum -gal in present ^dnin-piriĝ-gal there appears as phonetic complement -ga or -ĝá. Akk *bibbu* is equated with ^dnin-piriĝ-tur-ra, which may explain present -kúr-ra, Akk. *ilu šunāti* with Sum. diĝir-zà-gar(-ra), which may be reflected in present -kúr.

156 HW² sub *ḥašter(a)*- lex.sect. reads [*Š*]*A* UDU.IDIM¹ MUL-*aš*, which is not very compelling: There must be at least one additional sign preceding the first, half-preserved sign. The logogram UDU.IDIM is as to yet not attested to in Hittite writing, and it is also not a part of the Sumerian or the Akkadian column; moreover, the sign identified as <IDIM> clearly is <AŠ> (written over an erasure). The present interpretations thus are according to Güterbock 1985: 111. The Hittite word expressed by the logogram MUL has been considered to be *ḥašter*-. The complement given in the present entry suggests a secondary thematic stem variant *ḥaštera*-. Variants of this kind are frequent in combination with inherited *r*-stems (cf. Hitt. *keššara*- or *weštara*-; cf. E. Rieken 1999: 413).

157 The restoration in (5) is tentative and follows the restoration proposed by H.G. Güterbock (1985: 111).

161 The interpretation of the Akkadian is not quite clear. Akk. *šakānu* is improbable because of the vertical context. A possible alternative is Akk. *šagāmu* “to roar, shout”, which also occurs as *šagānu*.

162-164 Akk. *kušāru* and *šillu* also appear in direct succession in can. Diri 4 29f. Both terms reappear in 274f.

	mns	col	1	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
176	Aad	ii'	2'	ki-[]		
177	Aad	ii'	3'	kúr- ^r x¹-[]		
178	Aad	ii'	4'	DI-[]		
179	Aad	ii'	5'	sa[ĝ]		
180	Aad	ii'	6'	sa[ĝ-]		
181	Aad	ii'	7'	s[aĝ-]		
182	Aac	ii'	1'	[]		
183	Aac	iii'	2'	KI-K[I]		
184	Aac	iii'	3'	šà-UD		
185	Aac	iii'	4'	šà-UD-UD		
186	Aac	iii'	5'	^r šà¹-U[D X]		
187	Aac	iii'	6'	šà-U[D X]		
188	Aac	iii'	7'	ni-ir-[]		
189	Aac	iii'	8'	gu-l[i]		
190	Aac	iii'	9'	gu-li-ri-a		
191	Aac	iii'	10'	AN-kúr		
192	Aac	iii'	11'	lú-kúr		
193	Aac	iii'	12'	íb-ba nu-me-en		
194	Aac	iii'	13'	AN-kúr		
195	Aac	iii'	14'	AN-kúr-kúr		
196	Aa	iv	1'	[]		[]
		Aac	iii'	15'	igi-AN-kúr-kúr	
197	Aa	iv	2'	[]		[]
		Aac	iii'	16'	ḫu-b[a]	
198	Aa	iv	3'	[]		[]
		Aac	iii'	17'	[]	
199	Aa	iv	4'	[]		[]
200	Aa	iv	5'	[]		[]

188 Possibly restore Sum. ni-ir-[ra] “trustee”.

191-193 Sum. íb-ba nu-me-en possibly forms a kind of specification or explanation to the preceding terms.

197-200 According to the supposed parallel section in can. Erim 2 306-209, H.G. Güterbock (1985: 112f.) suggests the following restorations: Akk. *lillu* “idiot” (197), Akk. *makkannû* “cripple” (198), Sum./Akk ḫu-ur = *akû* “weak, powerless; cripple” (199); Sum./Akk. ḫu-ru = *aḫurrû* “socially inferior” (200).

198 Hitt. *iššalant-* has commonly been linked to *iššalli-* “spittle”. Both a passivic interpretation (“spat upon;” as proposed by H.G. Güterbock [1985: 113]) as well as an activic one (“salivate, drivelling, drooling;” sub *issalli-*;

199 As to the term to be restored in (5), several suggestions have been offered: K.K. Riemschneider (1971: 476) proposes Hitt. *ar-[pa-š]an-za* “unsuccessful, defeated” and *ar-[ša-n]a-an-za* “envious (person)”. Apart from mere semantic discrepancies, the proposed restorations take too much space, as has been objected by H.G. Güterbock (1985: 113), who restores Hitt. *ar-[za-n]a-an-za* “sheltered, supported”, following H.A. Hoffner (1983: 417). However, this suggestion faces semantic problems.

	mns	col	l	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
201	Aa	iv	6'	[]		[]
202	Aa	iv	7'	[]		[x x x] 'x ¹
203	Aa	iv	8'	[]		[x-x]-'x ¹ -š <u>u</u>
204	Aa	iv	9'	[]		[h]u-ur-ru
205	Aa	iv	10'	[]		ni-in ₄ -gi ₅ -ša-at i-ga ₅ -a-ri
206	Aa	iv	11'	[]		ni-in ₄ -gi ₅ -ša-at qa-aq-qa-ri
207	Aa	iv	12'	[x-x]-'a ¹		bu-sú-mu
	Aaf		1'	[]	[]	[b]u-uš-šu-u
208	Aa	iv	13'	[x]-'x ¹ -a		ar-kà U ₄ -mi
	Aaf		2'	[]	[]	ar-kà-a UD
209	Aa	iv	14'	[x] PAB		i-ši-it-tù
	Aaf		3'	[]	[]	i-še-et-tù
210	Aa	iv	15'	KA-zu-kal-la	: qa-zu-gal-la	šu-up-pu-u
	Aaf		4'	[]	[]	šu-UK-KU-u
211	Aa	iv	16'	pà-è-a	: pa-e	uṣ-šú-tù
	Aaf		5'	[]	[]	uṣ-šú-tù
212	Aa	iv	17'	gú-'gilim ¹ -an-na	: da-'na ¹	šu-UK-KU-u
	Aaf		6'	[]	[]	šu-up-pu-u

- 201 O. Carruba (1966: 36, with n62) reconstructs Hitt. *karšanu-* in (5), taking the first *i*-vowel as epenthetic, yet without explaining why the supposed suffix *-nu-* appears as *-ni-*.
- 204f. The corresponding Sumerian terms in the parallel section can. Erim 1 271-273) are Sum. ḫabrud, iz-zi-dir, and ki-in-dar.
- 205f. Note the hyper-dissimilation in the spelling of Akk. *nigiššu*, which with regard to all other attestations and to the noun pattern (/pirist/) should show simple /g/ (cf. l. 127).
- 207-209 The corresponding Sumerian terms in can. Erim 1 274-276 are níĝ-ĝál-la, ul-dù-a, and da-rí. The Akkadian equivalents read *bu-šu-u*, *ki-sít-tú* and *ar-ka-tu_{2A}*. The link between Akk. *būšu* “propriety” on the one hand and *kisītu* “branch, descendance” and *arkātu* “future, descendants” on the other, is apparently provided by the quasi-homonym Akk. *kišittu* “achievement, acquisition, property” (*kišittu* is primary because of the Sumerian counterpart); as for Akk. *arkātu*, a similar, but less compelling homonym can be found in *arkatu*, which can also mean “legacy, estate”. In the Ḫattuša version these relations are completely blurred (see the following notes).
- 207 As the parallel canonical version preserves Akk. *bu-šu-u*, the variant given by source Aaf seems to be the primary one. As for further (OB) attestations of Akk. *bsm*, cf. H. Otten / W. von Soden (1968: 21). The root is very probably loaned from West Semitic, where it is frequently attested (cf. Syr. *bsm* “to be sweat, to please”, also attested as noun *bšm* “perfume” in Canaanite). As further noted by H. Otten / W. von Soden (ibid.), the two different interpretations preserved by manuscripts Aa and Aaf can be explained through the ambiguity of Hitt. *aššu-*, which on the one hand means “goods, propriety”, on the other “good, pleasant”. Akk. *bussumu* may thus be a re-interpretation shaped according to the Hittite translation and influenced by West Semitic.
- 208 Akk. *ūmu* “day” in combination with the root *wrk* only occurs in the compound *arkât ūmi* “future, following days”. It is never attested in combination with the preposition *arki/u* “after” or the adverb *arkâ* “afterwards”.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>ka-ri-iš-ša-ni-wa-an-za</i>	-	see note
<i>2-an-ki</i>	-	“twice”
<i>mar-la-an-za</i>	-	“fool, idiot”
<i>ḥa-at-te-eš-šar</i>	“hole”	“hole, perforation”
<i>ku-ut-ta-aš pār-sez-eš-šar</i>	“crack of a wall”	“crack of a wall”
<i>KI-aš pār-še-eš-šar</i>	“crack of the ground”	“crack of the ground”
<i>a-aš-šu</i>	“pleasant”	“goods, propriety; good, pleasant”
ʾa¹-[]	“property”	
EGIR.U ₄ .KAM-aš	“future” ^{future days}	“future (days)”
EGIR.U ₄ -az		
<i>mar-ri-iš</i>	see note	see note
<i>mar-ri-iš</i>		
<i>šu-up-pí-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	“(to make) glorious, resplendent”	“to be pure, holy”
<i>šu-up-p[í]</i>		
<i>pa-ra-a-kán pa-a-u-wa-ar</i>	“coming out, forth”	“to go out”
<i>pa-ra-a-[]</i>		
<i>gul-ku-le-eš-ki-iz-zi</i>	“to elevate, raise, extol”	see note
<i>gul-k[u]</i>		

The expression preserved by the Hattuša version is unique. A possible solution is provided by the parallel entry in can. Erim 1 276, which reads Akk. *ar-ka-tú*. The expression *ar-ka* UD is explainable if <UD> was erroneously interpreted as logogram and not as syllabogram for /tu/. Note in this respect that source Aaf still preserves the original spelling with plene-written *a*. In Aa, the new interpretation is more manifest, as the logogram UD is now complemented by Akk. *-mi*. The value /tu/ for <UD> is otherwise not attested to in the present-corpus manuscripts. The error is obviously based on a written *vorlage* (No. 170).

As to the Hittite, note the concurring stem endings presented by the two sources. As these are the only attestations of Hitt. *appašiwatt(a)-* in the nominative, it is not possible to determine the primary form.

- 209 The canonical version preserves Akk *kisittu* “branch, descendant” (with quasi-homonym *kišittu* “acquisition, property”) instead. The interpretation of *iši/ettu* depends on the meaning of Hitt. *marri-* which is tentatively given as “daylight, sunrise” and also “eastside” (HED) on the basis of a single bilingual attestation, where the counterpart is Akk. *šītu*. However, none of the possible meanings of the Akkadian, “storehouse” (*išittu*), “base, foundation” (*išittu*), “confusion” (*ešittu*) fit this interpretation. A confusion with Akk. *šītu*, proposed by HED and K.K. Riemschneider (1971: 477), is very improbable, as errors of this sort always show the Akkadian in the form as required by the Hittite translation (i.e., if Akk. *kisittu* was confused with *šītu* one would expect *šītu* in (4) and not a hybrid form).

- 210-212 The Akkadian terms in ll. 210 and 212 appear inverted in manuscripts Aa and Aaf. The reconstruction of the original sequence largely depends on the interpretation of the Hittite. Hitt. *šuppiyawwar* “to be pure, holy” could refer to Akk. *zukkû* “to purify; purified” (as proposed by H. Otten / W. von Soden [1968: 23]), to *šuqqû* “to elevate, exalt”, to *suppû* “to pray” (as proposed by K.K. Riemschneider [1971: 477]) or to *šūpû* “(to make) visible, clear, glorious”. The latter is the term most appropriate, conforming with the spelling and being close to the Hittite translation. Hitt. *gulkuleškizzi* is unclear. HED sub *ku(wa)liya-* and R.H. Beal (1988: 173f.) link

	mns	col	1	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
213	Aa	iv	18'	eme-sig		<i>kar-ṣú</i>
	Aaf		7'	[]	[]	: <i>kar-ṣu</i>
214	Aa	iv	19'	ša-ġar-ra		<i>a-kíl kar-ṣí</i>
	Aaf		8'	[]	[]	TA AŠ KAR ZI
215	Aa	iv	20'	KA-é-gal		<i>tá-AŠ-li-im-tù</i>
	Aaf		9'	[]	[]	<i>ta-AŠ-li(TE)¹-im-tù</i>
216	Aa	iv	21'	kúr-du ₁₁ -ga		<i>qú-ut-tù-u</i>
	Aaf		10'	[]	[]	<i>qú-ut-tù-u</i>
217	Aa	iv	22'	kúr-du ₁₁ -ga-ta		<i>er-r[e]</i>
	Aaf		11'	[]	[]	<i>er-re-tù</i>
218	Aa	iv	23'	kúr-inim-bal		<i>bá-ar-t[u₄]</i>
	Aaf		12'	[]	[ba]l	<i>ba-ar-tù</i>
219	Aa	iv	24'	igi-kal		<i>ʿek¹-ṣú</i>
	Aaf		13'	[]	[ga]l	<i>ek-ṣú</i>
220	Aa	iv	25'	igi-kal-kal		<i>ši-ik(UZ)²¹-ṣú</i>
	Aaf		14'	[]	[ga]l-gal	<i>ša(NA)²¹-ʿak-ZU¹</i>
221	Aa	iv	26'	igi-kal-di-di		<i>e-re-šu</i>
	Aaf		15'	[]	[]-te-ti	<i>er-re-šu</i>
222	Aa	iv	27'	UD-x		<i>ša-a-u</i>
	Aaf		16'	[]	[]	<i>ša-a-ú</i>

it to Hitt *ku(wa)liya-* “to flow, calm down”, to which it would form a reduplicated root variant (the use of a finite form that is not accompanied by a relative pronoun and that is moreover set against an infinite form in the Akkadian column, is unique in lexical texts; one must therefore take the relative pronoun as mistakenly omitted or regard *-izzi-* as a [Luvian?] nominal formative). The Akkadian term fitting best again is Akk *suppû*, i.e. in the meaning “to silence, calm down”. Thus, a decision about the original sequence of entries cannot be deduced from the Hittite translations, particularly unless the term Hitt. *gulkuleškizzi* is not fully clarified. The Sumerian equally does not help much, as both equivalents are hapax legomena. K.K. Riemschneider *ibid.* proposes to read Sum. *ka-zu-kal-la* as *ka-šu-ġál-la* “to pray”, and consequently to interpret the Akkadian as *suppû* “to pray”. However, the Sumerian more likely is to be taken literally “a valuable/powerful and wise wording”, which would be very similar in meaning to Sum. *pà-è-a* in the following entry. For the third expression, there is no ready interpretation.

- 214 The mistaken spelling in Aaf (4) results from interference with the preceding entry (No. 015/128). Sum. *ša-ġar-ra* ([šangarra]) is a mistaken or unorthographic reading for *a-ša(-an)-ġar*. As to the Hittite translation, there is a second attestation of the listed term in KUB 13,4 i 60 *kuiš=wa=kan tuēl DINGIR^{LIM}-aš NINDA¹haršiyaz [ù] ʿišpan¹duzziaz dāš nu=war=an DINGIR^{LIM} EN-YA appan [šanḫdu] nu=wa=za=kan apēl pir kattan šarā ēpdu* “Whoever takes from your divine bread or libation vessel, may the god, my lord pursue him and seize his house from bottom to the top”. Comparing the two attestations, one could extract a meaning like “to bring in complete disorder”, which would also include the meaning “slanderer”, as proposed by H.G. Güterbock (1985: 114).
- 215-217 The intersection rulings are placed differently in manuscripts Aa (between 216 and 217) and Aaf (between 215

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>ku-uš-du-wa-an-za</i> EGI[R]	“calumny”	“defamated/defamating (person)”
GAM- <i>an ša-ra-a ku-iš ap-pé-eš-ki-zi</i> ‘x ¹ -[]	“defamating; breaking a taboo”	see note
<i>2-an-ki-kán ku-i-e-eš me-mi-iš-kán-z[i]</i> []	“malicious talk ^{reconciliation} ”	“who talk to each other”
‘x x x x x x ¹ [] []	see note	-
[] [] [] []	“curse” “rebellion”	- -
[] [] ‘x-ku ¹ -wa-an-za [] ‘ú ¹ -e-ku-u-wa-ar []	“dangerous” “wild, raging” “to ask, request”	- - “to ask, request”
<i>ut-tar-za ku-iš pu-‘nu-uš-ki-iz¹-zi</i> []	“to fly, flutter”	lit. “who always poses questions”

and 216). Both manuscripts also vary as to the Sumerian.

- 216 Akk. *quttû* “to bring to an end” does not really fit the Sumerian. Can. Erim 1 283 lists Akk. *tuššu* “hostile, malicious talk” instead. Within Akkadian, there are no alternative roots containing K and T, which would be closer to the Sumerian. A possible, but equally not fully compelling basis would be WSem. *khḏ* (Hebr. “to deny”).
- 217 Sum. *kúr-du₁₁-ga-ta* obviously is in opposition to *kúr-du₁₁-ga* in the preceding entry; as for the possible meta-linguistic function of Sum. -ta, i.e., to express reciprocity, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.2.5.
- 218 Sum. *inim--bal* is a quasi-synonym of *du₁₁*, especially if the latter is used in a reciprocal mode (cf. the previous note). The parallel entry in can. Erim 1 284 lists Sum. *kúr-bal-bal* instead, which is more appropriate with regard to the Akkadian translation.
- 220 The interpretations of (4) follow H. Otten / W. von Soden (1968: 25). The transition from <UZ> to <IK> and from <NA> to <ŠA> is well possible, and the resulting variants are exactly the same as in l. 223. However, if the reconstructions are correct one would expect the Hittite translation to be identical with that of entry 223, as well – which it is not (yet, also note the distinct translations of Akk *erēšu* in ll. 221 and 224).
- 221 The usual Sumerian counterpart of Akk. *erēšu* is (níĝ-)al-di-di; accordingly, can. Erim 2 8 preserves Sum. *níĝ-al-dug₄-dug₄*. Present *igi-kal-di-di* is probably results from an assimilation to one of the dominant section patterns within the series ([R-x] - [R-x-x] - [R(-x)-y]) and via the homoiophony of [al] and [kal].
- 222 The second sign in (2) appears as a ligature of <AH> with <HU>. H.G. Güterbock (1985: 115) reads Sum. *kúšu* on the basis of Sum. *kušu* in can. Erim 2 9. Rüster / Neu 1989 does not include the sign, possibly regarding it as combination of <AH> and <HU>, as well. The most evident interpretation of (4) is Akk. *šā'u* “to

	mns	col	l	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
223	Aa	iv	28'	[x x] x		<i>ši-ik-šú</i>
	Aaf		17'	[]	[] 'x' 'x'	<i>ša-ak-šú</i>
224	Aa	iv	29'	[x x x] 'RI'		<i>e-re-šu</i>
	Aaf		18'	[]	[]	[x] 'x' []
225	Aa	iv	30'	[]		<i>zi-im-¹mu¹</i>
	Aaf		19'	[]	[x]-ki-im	[]
226	Aa	iv	31'	[]		<i>ša-al-mu</i>
	Aaf		20'	[]	[]	[]
227	Aa	iv	32'	[]		<i>bu-na-nu-ú</i>
	Aaf		21'	[]	[x-x]-ma	[]
228	Aa	iv	33'	[]		<i>dú-tu</i>
	Ab	iii	1'	[me]	me-i	<i>'du¹-u-tu</i>
229	Aa	iv	34'	[]		<i>bá-aš-tù</i>
	Ab	iii	2'	[téš]	ti-iš	<i>bá-aš-tù</i>
230	Aa	iv	35'	[^d lamm]a		[še-d]u
	Ab	iii	3'	[]	la-am-ma	<i>la-ma-sú</i>
231	Aa	iv	36'	[^d ala]d		<i>la-ma-sú</i>
	Ab	iii	4'	[]	a-la	<i>'še₂₀¹-e-du</i>
232	Aa	iv	37'	a-da-mìn		<i>šu-te(UD)¹-IZ-BU</i>
	Ab	iii	5'	a-d[a]	a-da-mi-en	<i>šu-ti-e(IB)¹²-ZU</i>

fly, flutter”, mostly due to the vertical context. The lexical attestation *šá'u ša amāti* (Nabniitu O 183f.), quoted by CAD sub *šá'u* 3., which would establish a connection with the semantic field of speaking, and thus to the present Hittite translation, is useless, since it is based on a very tentative restoration. A possible translation of the Hittite, taking it as idiomatic phrase, is “who is flighty, fickle, unsteady”; it would fit one of the uses of Akk. *šá'u* (cf. *išá' ittanapraš libbii kīma iššūr šamāmi* “my heart flutters and flits about like a bird in the sky” CT 2 pl. 80 63).

224 H. Otten / W. von Soden (1968: 26) read Hitt. *hu-un-tar-ri-ya-u-wa-ar* in (5). The third sign, however, rather looks like <NU>. Moreover, the resulting meaning “to fart” cannot be brought into agreement with the Akkadian.

227 Hitt. *šimmanata*, to which one may add *šimnata* in l. 145, has been commonly traced back to Hitt. *šamanātar* “fundament, retaining wall” and *šamnai-* “to build, erect”, the latter also occurring with stem vowel *i* (H. Otten / W. v. Soden [1968: 26], and E. Neu / H Otten [1972: 181]). If this interpretation is correct, the equation may be caused by a confusion between *bny* “to be good, beautiful” and the homonymous *bny* “to build, erect” (No. 208); in this respect, note that some West Semitic derivations of this root take an *n*-suffix (cf. Hebr. *binyān* “building, mausoleum” and Syr. *benyānā* “building”; also cf. DNWSI sub *bny*). To find a link between Hitt. *šimnata-* in l. 145 and its equivalent Akk. *ri-ša-tù* (presumably to be connected with *rīštu* “rejoicing”; see note to l. 145) which agrees with the established meaning “fundament, retaining wall”, is more difficult (possibly through Akk. *rēšu* “top (of a building)”). Yet, note that neither the identity between Hitt. *šimmanata-* and *šimnata* nor the suggested etymology can be taken for granted..

228-231 Akk. *dūtu* and *bāštu* often occur side by side in lexical texts (cf. CAD sub *dūtu* lex.sect.) and also in literary

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>ša-al-ḫu-ri-ya-u-wa-ar</i> []	“wild, raging”	hapax leg.
<i>ḫu-un-NU-ri-ya-u-wa-ar</i> []	see note	see note
NÍ.TE- <i>aš</i> []	“face, appearance”	“body, person”
<i>e-eš-ša-ri</i> []	“image, statue”	“image, statue”
<i>ši-im-ma-na-ta</i> []	“face, appearance” ^{building? ”}	see note
A.A.TÉŠ- <i>aš</i> ‘A.A’ ¹ .TÉŠ- <i>aš</i>	“virility, manliness”	“virility”
UR.[X]- <i>aš</i> [iš]-ḫa-aš-[ša-r]a-w[a-tar] <i>tar-pi-iš</i>	“dignity, good look”	“dignity, politeness”
^D LAMA- <i>aš</i> <i>a-an-na-ri-iš</i> <i>tar-pi-iš</i>	“spirit/demon representing an individual's vital power” (<i>šēdu</i>) a protective spirit (<i>lamassu</i>)	a (negative) spirit (<i>tarpi-</i>) a beneficent spirit, “strength” (<i>annari-</i>)
<i>an-da ták-ša-an-za</i> <i>an-da ták-šu-u-wa-‘ar’¹</i>	“to quarrel”	“to put together, assign/commit to so.”

texts (ibid. 1.), as is the case with the couple *lamassu* and *šēdu*. As for a discussion of the Hittite counterparts *annari-* and *tarpi-*, cf. H. Otten / W. von Soden (1968: 27-32); as for *tarpi-*, also see F. Josephson (1979: 177ff). The entry is very notable since the quite unconventional spellings with <TU> in (4) occur in both manuscripts, strongly suggesting thus that both sources are related via a written *vorlage* (cf. chapter 12, sect. 3.3.).

- 228 Note the plene extension of SyllSum. *me*, which suggested a certain interchangeability of <E> and <I> in Syllabic-Sumerian orthography.
- 229 The reading in source Ab (5) is as proposed by H.G. Güterbock (1985: 115; H. Otten / W. von Soden [1968: 27) suggest [MUNUS-*aš*] *ḫa-aš-š[a-tar]*). A logographic spelling of this term with initial UR, which source Aa preserves instead, is otherwise not attested, however.
- 230f. Note the divergence between the phonetic complement of Hitt. ^DLAMA-*a-* and the stem ending of *annari-*, which is the term the logogram supposedly represents. Either it does not at all reflect Hitt. *annari-*, but was simply inferred by the resulting congruence with Sum. *lamma* and Akk. *lamassu*, or the scribe took the *-a-* from an alternative source, possibly from Hitt. *kurunta*, as a common reading of Hitt. ^DLAMA.
- 232 According to the parallel entries in can. Erim 2 1 and other lexical series (Sum./Akk. *a-da-min-sá*, *a-da-min-du₁₁-ga* = *šutēšû* in Nabnitu M 269f.), it is clear that present *šu-te*-IB-ZU and *šu-te*-EZ-BU are not entirely correct. There are two possible explanations of these forms: In a phonetic/phonological perspective, one may presume a hyper-dissimilation (cf. chapter 10, type. III.2.b.) Akk. *šutēšû* > **šuteššû* > *šutebšû*, which, in a very similar phonetic environment, is also attested in Unid Bo. 5-2 = KUB 3,116: 4' (Akk. *kitrušu* spelled *ki-it-ru-ub-šu*). The combination of the emphatic sibilant/affricate /š/ with the labial /b/ in both instances could point to a certain regularity. In comparison with this form, manuscript Ab seems to preserve the primary

	mns	col	l	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
233	Aa	iv	38'	lú-kúr-TUKU-TUKU		<i>qáb ša-ni-tù</i>
	Ab	iii	6'	lú-kúr-[]	lu(Ú)'-rdu ¹ -ku-du	[<i>qa-a</i>]b ša-ni-tù
234	Aa	iv	39'	saĝ(KA)'-íl-lá		<i>ša-qú-ú</i>
	Ab	iii	7'	saĝ-í[l]	ša-an-ki-il ₅	š[<i>a-q</i>]ú-ú
235	Aa	iv	40'	á-rdugud ¹		<i>ku-ub-bu-tù</i>
	Ab	iii	8'	rá(ŠA) ¹ '-[]	a-du-ku-ud	<i>hu-ub-bu-tù</i>
236	Aa	iv	41'	me-ta		<i>a-ya-nu</i>
	Ab	iii	9'	me-ta	me-ta	<i>a-ya-nu</i>
237	Aa	iv	42'	me-ta-a		<i>a-ya-ni-iš</i>
	Ab	iii	10'	me-ta-[]	mi-ta-a	<i>a-ya-ni-iš</i>
238	Aa	iv	43'	me-ta-a-kam		<i>iš-tu a-ya-ni-iš</i>
	Ab	iii	11'	me-ta-[a-šè]	mi-ta-a-aš-ši	<i>iš-tu a-ya-ni-iš</i>
239	Aa	iv	44'	[me-e]n-na		<i>ma-ti</i>
	Ab	iii	12'	me-na	[me-n]a	<i>ma-ti</i>

version, while Aa additionally shows both phonemes in inverted order (No. 015). In a graphical perspective, the peculiar spelling could also result from a confusion between original <E> and <IB> (No. 033), which are similar to a certain degree. Again, manuscript Ab would preserve the more original version then.

It is unfortunately not determinable if the Hittite translation is still based on original *šutēšû* or on a root 'ZB or 'BZ. Hitt. *takš-* basically means “to put together, arrange”, but also “to assign” and “to commit s.th. to s.o.”. In the latter meaning, it may fairly – but not necessarily – suit Akk. *šutēšû*; hence H. Otten / W. von Soden (1968: 27) propose Hitt. *idalû takš-* “to commit s.th. evil”, as the original entry; possible Akkadian roots on which the translation could be alternatively based, involve Akk. *epēšu* Št “be active, work against” or *wašābu* “to add”; but these are even less fitting.

233 The parallel entry in can. Erim 2 29 lists Sum. lú-kúr-dug₄-dug₄ instead, which is surely the more appropriate term, especially in regard of the Akkadian translation. Present TUKU-TUKU, which, as indicated by the Syllabic Sumerian, also has to be restored in source Ab (2), either forms a phonetic paralexia or, more likely, a mistake.

234 Both sources preserve Hitt. *parkuiš* instead of expected *parkuš*. The confusion is either based on the phonetic closeness of the Hittite terms, or it is inferred by a confusion between Akk. *šaĝû* “high” and *zakû* “pure”, which – presuming <Š> to represent [s] – is not impossible (No. 084/2110).

235 Note the PAB-mark in manuscript Aa, which clearly points to a written *vorlage* (cf. chapter 8, sect. 3.5.). Also note the spirantization of [k] in Akk. *kubbutu* as indicated in source Ab.

236-244 The Sumerian, the Akkadian, and the Hittite terms are notably not related in terms of the usual one-by-one translations in this grammatical section. It rather seems that the grammatical paradigms of the individual columns corresponds to each other as a whole:

The Sumerian column gives the adverbs me-ta “whence” and me-na “when”, whereby me-ta is addressed within two sections (A and C). The paradigmatic pattern within the individual sections is not quite clear due to the differences between the individual manuscripts. One can either analyze it as to follow the case sequence [absolutive] - [locative] - [terminative] (note in this respect that [fossilized?] Sum. me-ta itself already contains the ablative postposition) or as to contrast [basic form] - [basic form + -àm (copula, appearing as -a)] - [basic form + -kam (genitive + copula)].

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
UL <i>ḥa-an-da-a-an ku-iš me-mi-iš-[ta]</i> : UL <i>ḥa-an-da-a-an ku-i[š]</i>	“saying hostile (words)”	“who says incorrect/untrue (words)”
<i>pár-ku-uš(IŠ)¹</i> <i>pár-ku-¹uš(IŠ)¹</i>	“high”	“pure ^{high} ”
[<i>t</i>] <i>a-aš-ša-nu-wa-an-za</i> PAB <i>ta-aš-ša-nu-an-za</i>	“heavy, powerfull”	“(made) heavy, powerfull”
<i>ku-[e]-za</i> <i>ku-e-ez-za</i> <i>ku-¹e¹-[d]a-za</i> <i>ku-e-da-za</i> <i>nu k[u]-¹e¹-za</i> <i>nu ku-e-za</i>	“where” “whither” “whence”	“from which; whence” ² see note see note “from which; whence” ² see note
<i>ku-i[t-ma-an]</i> <i>ku-it-[]</i>	“when”	“when, while”

The Akkadian column deals with Akk. *ayyānu* “where” and Akk. *mati* and *immati*, both “when”. It follows a different paradigmatic pattern in the 'local section' (A) and the 'temporal sections' (B and C); in section A the sequence is [nominative] - [terminative] - [ablative], in sections B and C it is [basic form] - [basic form + =*ma*] - [*ana/adi* + basic form (=terminative)]; thus, whereas in A, there is a simple series of different cases, in B and C, the paradigm is two-dimensional, on the one hand contrasting relative (basic form) and indefinite (*ma*-extended) pronouns, on the other hand nominative (zero) and terminative case (*ana/adi*).

The paradigms in the Hittite column are organized differently in section A and in sections B and C, as well. In the latter, they contrast [basic form] - [*nu*= + basic form] - [*nu*= + basic form + =*pat*]. The particular function of *nu*= is not entirely clear. If it corresponds to Akk. =*ma*, it would not be expected to be repeated in the third item; possibly it has the same function as =*pat*, denoting repetition of identical items (cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.4.). The Hittite subcolumn in section A is hard to analyze: Hitt. *kuedaza* is hapax legomenon, and the ablative relative pronoun *kuez(z)a* is never attested representing locative functions. The term actually to be expected in this section is Hitt. *kuwatta*.

The different paradigmatic patterns can be summarized as follows:

	Sumerian (interpr. A)	Sumerian (interpr. B)	Akkadian	Hittite
A	zero	- Ø	nom.(gramm.)/loc.(sem.)	ablative
	locative	-à m	terminative	?
	terminative	-k a m	ablative	<i>nu</i> = plus ablative
B/C	zero	- Ø	- Ø / nominative	- Ø
	locative	-à m	= <i>ma</i> / nominative	<i>nu</i> =
	terminative	-k a m	- Ø / terminative	<i>nu</i> = plus = <i>pat</i>

Thus, there are paradigms in three languages set against one another, each column using and contrasting its own grammatical categories.

- 239-241 The restoration of Hitt. *kuitman* in (5), as suggested by H.G. Güterbock (1985: 116), is by no means secure. Although less fitting in meaning, simple Hitt. *kuit* is also possible.

	mns	col	l	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
240	Aa	iv	45'	me-en-na-a		<i>ma-ti-ma</i>
	Ab	iii	13'	me-na-[a]	[me-na]-a	<i>ma-ti-ma</i>
241	Aa	iv	46'	me-en-na-a-šè (KU) ¹		<i>a-na im-ma-ti</i>
	Ab	iii	14'	me-na-[a-šè]	[me-na-a-aš]-ši	<i>a-di ma-ti</i>
242	Aa	iv	47'	me-ta		<i>im-ma-ti</i>
	Ab	iii	15'	me-ta	[]	<i>im-ma-[]</i>
243	Aa	iv	48'	me-ta-a		<i>im-ma-ti-ma</i>
	Ab	iii	16'	me-ta-[]	[]	[]
244	Aa	iv	49'	me-ta-a-kam		<i>a-na im-ma-ti</i>
	Ab	iii	17'	me-ta-[a-šè]	[]	[]
(break)						
260	Ab	iv	1'	[]	[]	[]
261	Ab	iv	2'	[]	[]	[]
262	Ab	iv	3'	[]	[]	<i>ḫu-ud-du-ú</i>
263	Ab	iv	4'	[]	[x]-[ta ¹]-[x ¹]	<i>ḫu-ta-ad-du-ú</i>
264	Ab	iv	5'	[]	ku-ta-ta-ta	<i>ḫa-di-du</i>
	Abb		1'	[]		[]
265	Ab	iv	6'	[]	pa-ar	<i>ṣí-DU</i>
	Abb		2'	[]		[]
	Abc	r.	1'	bar		[]
266	Ab	iv	7'	[]	pa-ri	<i>bi-ir-tù</i>
	Abb		3'	[]		[]
	Abc	r.	2'	bar-r[i]		[]
267	Ab	iv	8'	[lú-kúr]	lu-gur	<i>na-ak-rù</i>
	Abb		4'	[]		[]
	Abc	r.	3'	ùr-ra		[]
268	Ab	iv	9'	[]	šu-uš-ša-a	<i>ma-an-na-šu</i>
	Abb		5'	[]		[]

262-264 The corresponding Sumerian terms in can. Erim 2 126-128 are: Sum. gu₄-ud-tuk₄-tuk₄, uḫ-tag and uḫ-tag-tag. The Akkadian equivalents are: Akk. *ku-ut-tu-tú* “to (make) quiver, vibrate”, *ḫu-ut-tu-tú* “louse ridden” *ḫa-ti-ta-an*, which seem to correspond quite well to the Sumerian. As the Sumerian expressions of the present section are not fully restorable, one cannot be sure whether the parallel terms or the interpretations offered here are prevalent. At any rate, the Hittite translations in 262f. cannot reflect the original state.

265 According to the Hittite translation, the scribe apparently confused Akk. *ṣiddu* and *ṣītu* (No. 180).

266 The meaning of the Hittite is unclear due to the scarce attestations of Hitt. *newalant-*. The term has been interpreted as privative compound *ne-wal-ant* (to Hitt. *walli-* “glory”; thus “not powerful, weak”) by E. Laroche (1966: 164), who translates the whole as “repaire de brigands”. However, as remarked by HEG sub *newalant-*,

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>nu ku-[it-ma-an]</i>	“whenever, always”	“(and) when, while”
<i>nu []</i>		
<i>nu ku-it-[ma-an-pát]</i>	“when“ / “until when”	“(and) equally when, while”
[]	“until when”	
<i>ku-uš-ša-an</i>	“when”	“when”
[]		
<i>nu ku-uš-ša-an</i>	“whenever, always”	“(and) when”
[]		
<i>nu ku-uš-ša-an-pát</i>	“when“ / “until when” ?	“(and) equally when”
[]		
<i>[x-x-l]i-^reš-ki-ar¹</i>	-	-
<i>[i]š-ḫi-ú-ul</i>	-	“treaty”
<i>du-uš-ga-ra-az</i>	“to roar ^{joy} ”	“joy”
<i>du-uš-ku-um-mar</i>	“to roar ^{to make enjoy continuously} ”	“to enjoy, rejoice”
<i>ÍD-aš a-la-li-ma-aš</i>	“roaring”	“roaring of the river”
<i>[Í]D-aš a-^rla-li-ma-aš¹</i>		
<i>pa-ra-a-kán pa-a-u-ar</i>	“mob ^{exit} ”	“to go out”
<i>[pa-r]a-a-kán pa-a-wa-ar</i>		
<i>ne-wa-la-an-ta-aš a-š[a]</i>	“riffraff ^{fortified town?} ”	see note
<i>[n]e-wa-al-la-an-da-aš a-ša-tar</i>		
^{LÚ} KÚR-aš	“foreign, hostile”	“hostile, enemy”
[]-aš		
<i>ku-en-zu-um-na-aš</i>	“who is he?”	“coming from where”
<i>[ku]-en-zu-um-na-aš</i>		

the translation rather results from a misinterpretation of Akk. *birtu* (209). Possible terms corresponding to Hitt. *ašātar* are the homonym *birtu* “fortified town” or Akk. *birītu* “space between, distance”.

267 Manuscripts Ab and Abc list different expressions in (2). Sum. *ùr-ra* in source Abc is very likely to be connected with Sum. *ur-(re)* in the parallel entry in can. Erim 2 134. The term given by Ab may be a later reinterpretation, possibly based on the Sumerogram in (5).

268 According to (1), (2) could be restored as Sum. *šu-ús-sà* “sent/led away” (similar: CAD sub *mannu* lex.sect.). As to Hitt. *kuenzumna-*, for which an additional attestation is available, cf. the discussion in HEG sub *kuenzumna-*.

	mns	col	1	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
269	Ab	iv	10'	[ŠÚ]	šu	<i>bur</i> (ŠUR) ¹ - <i>ru-u</i>
	Abb		6'	[]		[]
	Abc	r.	4'	bar		<i>b[ur]</i>
270	Ab	iv	11'	[]	ʿx ¹ -ma	<i>ub-bu-bu</i>
	Abb		7'	[]		[]
	Abc	r.	5'	tam-ma/tam(DU) ²		<i>ub-b[u]</i>
271	Ab	iv	12'	[]	[k]i-na	<i>ku-un-nu-ú</i>
	Abc	r.	6'	gi-na		<i>ku-un-[]</i>
272	Ab	iv	13'	[]	[x]-ʿx ¹	<i>a-la-ak-tù</i>
	Abc	r.	7'	en-ti		<i>a-la-a[k-tù]</i>
273	Ab	iv	14'	[]	[x-x]-ʿx ¹	<i>al-ka-ka-tù</i>
	Abc	r.	8'	en-ti-ti		<i>al-ka₄-a[k-tù]</i>
274	Ab	iv	15'	[]	[]	<i>ší-il₅-lu</i>
	Abc	r.	9'	en-ti		<i>ší-il₅-l[u]</i>
275	Ab	iv	16'	[]	[]	<i>ku-ša-a-ru</i>
	Abc	r.	10'	en-ti-ti		<i>ku-ša-a-ru</i>
276	Ab	iv	17'	[]	[]	<i>bi-ib-lu</i>
	Abc	r.	11'	níĝ-E-NA-a		<i>bi-ib-lu</i>
277	Ab	iv	18'	[]	[]	<i>šu-bu-ul-tù</i>
	Abc	r.	12'	níĝ-šu-tak ₄		ʿšu-bul-tù ^{1?}
278	Ab	iv	19'	[]	[]	<i>tar-ḫa-a-tù</i>
	Abc	r.	13'	[níĝ-š]u-tak ₄ -a		[]
279	Ab	iv	20'	[]	[]	ʿx ¹ -MA/KU-DU
280	Ab	iv	21'	[]	[]	[x]-ʿx ¹ -DU
281	Ab	iv	22'	[]	[]	[]

(break)

- 269 <ŠUR> in Ab (4) is obviously a mistake for <BUR> (No. 037), since the parallel entry in can. Erim 2 129 preserves Akk. *burru*, and the Hittite translation also refers to this term. Quite interesting is SyllSum. šu. As indicated by the parallel Abc and by the parallel canonical entry, the Sumerian must read bar (although this term is not known in literary sources with a meaning as indicated by the Akkadian). SyllSum. šu very likely refers to <ŠÚ>, which must have been confused with <BAR>, an error which must go back to a written *vorlage* (036/085). The translation of the Hittite is formed according to the meaning of Akk. *burru*, which, like the two following terms, denotes a legal action (H.G. Güterbock [1985: 117] translates “to ‘let in’ with a word”).
- 270 The usual equivalent of Akk. *ebēbu* is Sum. tam. <DU> in source Abc (2), thus, rather is a mistake, either for <UD> (resulting in tam-tam) or for <MA> (tam-ma). It possibly results from interference with the frequent logogram Ē. Accordingly, Ab (1) could be restored to SyllSum. [da]m-ma.
- 274f. Akk. *šillu* and *kušāru* already appear in Il. 162f. Sum. in-ti is never attested in the corresponding meaning. The Sumerian may thus be an erroneous repetition of the preceding section.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
: <i>ud-da-ni-it an-da tar-nu-mar</i> [i]t an-da ʾtar-nu-mar ¹	“to affirm, declare, also: to prove”	“to release with a word”
<i>pár-ku-nu-mar</i> [ma]r	“to cleanse”	“to cleanse”
<i>ḥa-an-da-a-u-wa-ar</i>	“to fix, establish”	“to fix, establish”
KASKAL-aš	“way, course”	“way”
<i>pa-an-ku-uš KASKAL-aš</i>	“ways”	“high' way”
GIŠGISSU-aš	“shadow, shelter”	“shadow, shelter”
: <i>ku-wa-pí-it-ta pa-ra-a e-eš-šu-mar</i>	“reed stalk, reed shelter”	see note
<i>ku-ši-iz-za</i>	“(marriage) gift”	see note
<i>up-pí-iš-ʾšar¹</i>	“consignment, gift”	“consignment, gift”
<i>ku-ʾša-da¹</i>	“bride payment”	“bride payment”
<i>ḥa-an-da-an-te-eš</i>	-	“true ones”
<i>wa-al-kiš-ša-ra-aš</i>	-	“able, skilled”
<i>za-ki-an-ʾx¹-[]</i>	-	-

275 Hitt. *eššumar* has commonly been connected with the root *ešš-/išš-* “to make, perform”. Translations proposed for the whole phrase involve “everywhere to perform 'out'” (H.G. Güterbock [1985: 118]), “making [someone] move forth somewhere” (HED sub *essa-*), and “avancer, progresser (partout)” (Laroche [1966: 164]). Regardless of the translation, the phrase does apparently not correspond to Akk. *kušāru*. Akk. *kušīru* “profit, success”, supposed as basis for the Hittite translation by H.G. Güterbock (ibid.) and E. Laroche (ibid.), is equally not fully compelling.

276 The usual counterpart of Akk. *biblu* is Sum. *nîĝ-dé-a* (can. Urta 1 36; Emesal 3 50; also cf. Sum./Akk. *babālu* = *dé* in can. Aa 4/3 160). According to the OB form of <DÉ>, a reanalysis into <E> and <NA> seems possible. H.G. Güterbock (1985: 34) reads Sum. *nîĝ-e-tak₄* according to collation. The most plausible interpretation of Hitt. *kušizza* has been offered by E. Rieken (1999: 257f.), who takes it as a derivation of Hitt. *kuša-* “bride, daughter in law” with suffix *-izzi-*, “belonging to the bride”. Final *-a* then has to be explained as collective nominative-accusative plural neuter, “belongings of the bride” (probably aberrant is H.G. Güterbock's suggestion

mns	col	l	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
300	Abc l.	1'	[]	[z]u-mu
301	Abc l.	2'	[]	ta-zi-im-tù
302	Abc l.	3'	[]	ra-mi-mu
303	Abc l.	4'	[]	ra-ma-mu(ZU)!
304	Abc l.	5'	[]	ŠI-it-tab-ru
305	Abc l.	6'	[]	[x-x]-ib ú-ba-a-ni
306	Abc l.	7'	[]	[x-x]-[x]
307	Abc l.	8'	[]	[x-x-x-n]u
(break)				

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
1.	1'	[] []	[] []	[] []
		[] []	[] []	[] []
	5'	[] [] []	[] [] []	[] [] []
1.	10'	[] [] []	[] [] []	[] [] []
			(break)	
r.	1'	[] [] []	[] [x]-[x¹-za-al]² [x-x-š]a	[x¹-[] šu-mu-rù šu-te-mi-qú

300-303 The Sumerian terms in the parallel section in can. Erim 1 b21-24 are almost completely broken. The first term

in the Akkadian column reads *i-ta-az-zu-ma*, the last one *ra-ma-ma*, referring to Akk. *itazzumu* and *ramāmu*. Final <ZU> in (2) l. 203 is very likely a mistake for <MU> (with the oblique strokes of <MU> misinterpreted as horizontals' heads, No. 039) .

304 Akk. *ŠI-it-tab-ru*, in view of following Akk. *ubānu*, possibly reflects *kittabru* “hand”.

l. 14. Possibly restore Hitt. [*ha-n*]-*i-is-su-wa-ar* and [*is-tap*]-*pu-ul-li*. The Akkadian equivalents are unclear.

translation of the Akkadian

-

“complaint”

“roaring, rumbling”

“to roar, growl”

see note

“[] of the finger(s)”

-

-

(5) = Hittite

translation of the Akkadian

translation of the Hittite

[x-n]i-iš-šu-wa-ar

-

-

[x-x]-pu-ul-li

-

-

[^{NA4}]ARA₄-aš ḫa-ni-šu-mar

-

“plaster(ing) of the millstone”

[an-d]a ta-ru-up-pu-u-ar

-

“to gather, assemble”

[X^M]EŠ-aš iš-ḫi-ú-ul

-

“treaty of []”

[ŠA]Ḫ-aš ḫu-um-ma-aš

-

“pigsty”

[ÍD-a]š dan-na-at-te-eš-šar

-

“emptiness of the river”

[x-y]a ḫur-ta-uš

-

“[] curses”

[x-x]-tar-ma-aš

-

-

[x-x]-ḫa-ra-la-an

-

-

[x-x-x-x]-la-an

-

-

[]

-

-

[]

“to strive for, pursue”

-

[]

“to pray, supplicate”

-

1 3'-5' The Akkadian terms of the supposed parallel section in can. Erim 2 58-60 read: Akk. *ummat erê* “main body (=lower part) of the millstone”, *ummat šābi* “main body of troops”, *ummat pukki* “main body of the *pukku* drum”. The Hittite expressions in 3'f. quite well correspond to the first and the second term, whereas the relation between the third one and Hitt. *išḫiul* is unclear.

1. 6'-8' The Akkadian equivalents of the parallel section in can. Erim 2 61-63 are Akk. *erretu ša šaḫê* “pigsty”, *erretu ša nāri* “river bed”, *erretu ša nazāri* “curse”. The section thus treats the homonyms Akk. *erretu* “curse” and *erretu* “weir, barrage”.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[]	[x-x]-ša-ša	<i>ši-it-mu-rù</i>
	5'	saĝ-dul saĝ-dul-saĝ saĝ-dul-saĝ-na	[ša-an]-ga-túl sag-túl-ša-an-ga sag-túl-ša-an-ga-na	<i>pu-us-sú-mu</i> <i>ḥa-da-šu</i> <i>muš-^rx¹-lu</i>
		an-UM an-SIG ₇	an-šu-mu-uk an-ša-ma-ak	<i>pé-en-du</i> <i>ḥa-lu-ú</i>
r.	10'	an-UM an-simìg an-simìg-ma	an-šu-mu-uk an-ši-mi-ik an-ši-mi-ik-ma	<i>e-r[i-mu]</i> <i>šu-tal-^rli-iš¹-[]</i> <i>um-ša-am-tù</i>
		sá-sá sá-sá-sá	za-ša za-ša-ša	<i>ša-na-nu(DU)¹</i> <i>ka-ša-du</i>
	15'	sá-sá-silim	za-ša-zi-li-ma	<i>šu-tar-ḤU-RU</i>
		[x x x] x	x-[]	[š]a-az-[]
			(break)	

Erim Bo. C = KBo. 1,50 + KUB 3,99 (VAT 7437 + Bo. 2109)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
l.	1'	[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
	5'	[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]

- r. 4' The Akkadian may also be considered to reflect the Gtn stem according to the apparently reduplicated verbal root in (1). Further see chapter 10, type III.2.c. (No. 137)
- r. 5'-7' None of the terms in the Sumerian column can be linked with the semantic field of marriage, as it is imposed by the Akkadian translations.
- r. 6' As has already been noted by CAD sub *ḥadaššūtu*, the root underlying Akk. *ḥadaššu* may be of West Semitic origin.
- r. 12' Note the hyper-dissimilation [t^s] > [mt^s] in Akk. *umṣatu* (with simple /t^s/), possibly inferred by the dissimilation in Akk. *pendū* (8', No. 129).

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	“to extol, praise”	-
[]	“bride”	-
[]	“bridegroom”	-
[]	-	-
[]	a mole, birthmark	-
[]	a mole, birthmark	-
[]	a mole, birthmark	-
[]	hapax leg.	-
[]	a mole, birthmark	-
[]	“to become equal, to rival”	-
[]	“to reach, arrive”	-
[]	“to make glorious, splendid”	-
[]	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]- ^r x ¹	-	-
[]- ^r u ¹ -wa-ar	-	“to []”
[]-iš	-	-
[m]ar	-	“to []”
[]- ^r x ¹ -tar-za	-	-
[]-ar	-	“to []”
[]-ar	-	“to []”
[w]a-[ar]	-	“to []”
[]- ^r x ¹ -wa-ar	-	“to []”

- r. 13' According to the vertical and horizontal context, the Akkadian must read *šanānu*. <DU>, graphically quite distinct from <NU>, may have been inferred from following *ka-ša-du* (No. 096). <ŠA> in (4) is written in Babylonian paleography (with two additional horizontals; also cf. chapter 5, sect. 3.2.); all other attestations of the sign on the manuscript are written in the regular Hittite ductus (collated).
- r. 15' According to the parallel entry in the can. Erim 2 21, which reads Akk. *šutarruḫu*, the third and fourth sign in (4) are inverted (No. 016).

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
l.	10'	[] []	[] []
		(break)	
r.	1'	[]- ^r x ¹ []- ^r x ¹ -mìn ^r x ¹ -[x]- ^r x ¹ -lá	^r x-x ¹ -[x] li-AḪ-D[U] ^r li ¹ -UD-[x]
		an-ba	ḫa- ^r x-x-x ¹
	5'	ki(KU) ¹ -ba	ḫ[u-ṣ]a-bu
		an-sig an-ta-sig	[x-(x)]-il-[] ^r x x x ¹
		^r x ¹ -ḫul ^r x ¹ - ^r x ¹ -a	ṣú-[uḫ-ḫu] ZA-x-[x]- ^r iš/e ¹
r.	10'	[]	[x-x]-x-SU
		gú-[x]- ^r x ¹ -a gú-e-la-a-e gú-ṣu-e-[x] gú-ṣu-e-[x-x]	[] KU ^r x ¹ -[x-(x)] šá ANŠE ^r x x x ¹ ^r x KI x ¹ TA ni
	15'	gú-ki-[x-x]	^r x ¹ -ŠA-DU-u
		URU- ^r x ¹ ud(NI) ^{1?} -sur	i-tù-u a-TA [?] - ^r a ¹ -nu
		ne-ri ne-ri-ri	ul-lu-[u] an-nu-[u]
r.	20'	^r x ¹ -ta-a	šum-[ma(-an)]

- r 2'f. H.G. Güterbock (1985: 17) restores Sum. [ḡeš-si-si-i]g¹ in l. 2' (2) on the basis of can. Erim 2 184; in l. 3' (4), he reads ^rtu¹-ut-[]. However, the last sign in l. 2' (2) is definitely not <IG>. The Akkadian terms probably are derivations of the root l'y (/pirist/ and /parsūt/).
- r. 4' According to the vertical and horizontal context and according to the parallel entry in can. Erim 2 189, one would expect Akk. ḫāmu "rubbish" in (4). While the traces of the last sign would fit <MU>, there are, however, two additional signs in-between.
- r. 5' The emendation in (2) is according to parallel can. Erim 2 190. The resulting term is hapax legomenon, but constitutes a formal antonym to Sum. an-ba.
- r. 8'-10' H.G. Güterbock (1985: 121) supposes the section to be parallel to can. Erim 2 202-204. The entries preserved there read: Akk. *ṣuḫummu* (set against Sum. []-ḫul), *sakāpu*, and *tarāṣu* (with the Sumerian broken). Yet, none of these entries fit the semantic field formed by the the Hittite terms. In contrast, Hitt. *ḫaḫḫaršananza* is set against Akk. *ṣuḫḫu* "laughter, mirth" in Erim Bo. A 121, which is the basis for the restoration presented here.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[a]r	-	“to []”
[]- ^r x ¹	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	“twig, stick, splinter”	-
[]	-	-
[x]- ^r x ¹ - ^r ha ¹ - ^r x ¹ -[]	-	-
ha-ah-har-ša-na-an-za	-	“laughing”
hi-in-ga-ni-ya	-	“game, dance”
du-uš-ki-ya-u-wa-ar	-	“to rejoice”
pu-un-tar-ya-u-wa-ar	-	“stubbornness”
ANŠE-aš pu-un-ta-ri-ya-[u-wa-ar]	-	“stubbornness of the donkey”
gal-gal-ni-ya-u-wa-ar	-	“to clash, clang”
ši-i-ša-aš KI.MIN	-	“ditto of the stag”
^{UZU} GABA-it hu-it-ti-[ya-u-wa-ar]	-	“to draw by the breast”
A.ŠÀ-aš	“sign border, territory ”	“field, territory”
A.ŠÀ A.GÀR-aš ZAG-aš	“fixed date boundaries ”	“boundary of field and ground”
a-ši-iš	“this one”	“this one
ka-a-aš	“that one”	“that one”
ma-a-an	“as if”	“if”

- r. 11'-15' The terms in the Sumerian column are all hapax legomena; but the semantic field indicated by the Hittite translations correspond quite well with Sum. gú ”neck”.
- r. 16'f. The parallel entries in can. Erim 2 264f. are: Sum. uludin (KI-KAL) and ud-sur. That the present Sumeran items trace back to these expressions via some graphical confusions, is at least possible. According to the spelling and the Hittite translation, Akk. *ittu* was apparently confused with Akk. *itû* (No. 211). The explanation of l. 17. (5) is more difficult. Possibly, the translation is based on a commutation of Akk. *adannu* and Akk. *itânu*, which is the plural form of *itû*.
- r. 18'-20' The Sumerian counterparts in can. Erim 2 276-278 are: Sum. ne-ri, ne-še, ud-da. They fairly match the Akkadian terms preserved in the present manuscript (with medial Akk. *anummû* expected for proximal Akk. *annû*), so the terms in (2) are probably deviant. The Hittite translations in ll. 18'-20' correspond quite exactly to their Akkadian counterparts; also see P. Goedegebuure (2002-03: 24).

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
r.	21	ʿe¹-bi-še	lu-m[a-an]²
		[x]-šu	š[i]
		(break)	

Erim Bo. D = KBo. 1,41 (VAT 7434 c (+) VAT 7447)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
a	1'	[] [] ʿx¹-[]	[] [x x x] ʿx¹ ʿšu¹-la-ga-ar	in-ni-it-t[u₄] in-ni-né-[tu₄]² tú-pu-ul-[lu₁/₄]
	5'	gi gi-šú gi-gi	ki-i ki-i-šu ki-i-ki	ši-ip-ṭ[u₄] pu-ru-u[s-sú-u₁/₂] ma-ḥa-a-[ru₁/₃]
		ġá-e-da-nu-me-en za-e-da-nu-me-en [e]-ne-KI.MIN	ga-e-da-nu-mi-in za-e-da-nu-mi-en e-ni-da-nu-mi-en	i-na b[a-lu-a] i-[na ba-lu-ka] [i-na ba-lu-šu]
a	10'	a-ba a-ba-ra a-ba-kam	a-ba a-ba-ra a-ba-[ka-am]	[] [] []
		u₄-da u₄-ʿda¹-bi	ud-[da] [ud-da-bi]	[] []
	15'	[u₄-da-k]am	[ud-da-ka-am]	[]
		(break)		
b	1'	ʿeme-ki¹[gi₇-] eme-ki¹gi₇-nu-me-e-ʿx¹	[] []	[] []

- r. 21' The meaning given for Akk. *lūman* is confirmed by other lexical entries. The translation by Hitt. *mamman* is unclear; it is not explicable on the basis of a graphic or phonetic confusions. Possibly restore *lu š[um-ma]* in (4), thus. The Sumerian counterpart preserved in can. Erim 2 279 is Sum. á-še.
- a 2' Akk. *innenētu* is otherwise unattested; it could be analyzed as a hyper-correct plural formation to Akk. *innettu* (with usual plural *innētu*).
- a 3' According to collations of the original tablet, the first sign could be <KI>, <IGI-X>, or even <ŠUL>, each of them preceded by a blurred oblique stroke. The usual Sumerian equivalent of Akk. *ṭupullû* is Sum. *sulummar* (KI.SAG.DU, also spelled *su-lum-mar*). Thus, possibly restore Sum. *su[l-lu-mar]* in (2). AHw sub *ṭupullû* provides an alternative interpretation in (1), reading SyllSum. [šu]-lu¹-um¹-ga-ar.
- a 6' An alternative restoration in (4) is Akk. *maḥāšu*, as proposed by H.G. Güterbock (1985: 123), which also

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>ma-an-ma-an</i>	“now!”	“as if”
[A].ŠÀ-aš []	-	“field”

translation of the Akkadian

“sin, (divine) punishment”

“sins, (divine) punishment”

“slander, suspicion”

“judgment, punishment”

“decision”

“to accept, receive”

“without me/my permission”

“without you/your permission”

“without him/his permission”

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

has the meaning “to punish”. Akk. *maḥāru* is preferred here because of the parallel equation Sum./Akk. *gi* = *maḥāru* in Lanu B iii 6; the term can be linked to the respective semantic field through the submeaning “to receive an evil, punishment, decision”.

- a 7'-9' The suffix denoting the state of exclusivity usually reads -da nu-me-a in Sumerian. The forms listed here deviate adding the copula -en and adding it to the ergative forms of the personal pronouns and not to the absolute forms.
- a 13'-15' The section deals with Sum. *u₄* in the use as a subjunction. The variants *u₄-da-bi* (rendering *u₄.d-ba[?]*) and *u₄-da-kam* presumably are artificial, as they are not attested to in literary texts. They are apparently built on a reanalyzed pseudo-root *u₄-da*.
- b 2' The final sign of (2) ranges into (1). The frequent phrase Sum. *dub-sar-eme-gi₇-nu-mu-un-zu-a* “a scribe

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		šà-mud	ša-mu-ud	[]
		šà-bi	ša-bi	[]
	5'	šà-bi-ta	ša-bi-ta	[]
		šà-sur	ša-a-šu-úr	^r x ¹ -[]
		zi-sur	[z]i-šu-úr	sà-ah-lu
		šur-ma-s[ur]	[šu-m]a-šu-úr	i-DA-[]
		BUL []	[]	na-r[a]
b	10'	BUL []	[]	DA-a-[]
		[]	[]	DA-[]
			(break)	

Erim Bo. E = KBo. 26,27 (1652/u)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
l.	1'	[]	[T]U ₄
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹
		[]	[]
		[]	[l]i-ik
	5'	[]	[l]i-kam
			(break)
r.	1'	[]	ri-[šu-tu _{3/4}]
		[]	ha-z[i-qa _{1/2/3} -tu _{3/4}]
		še-gin ₇	^r ši-ma ¹ -[at]
		zag-šú	[]
	5'	nam-tar	[]
		saĝ- ^r x ¹ -[]	[]
			(break)

who does not know Sumerian” possibly forms the pattern which the entry follows.

- l. 4'f. As suggested by H.G. Güterbock (1985: 120), the traces very probably reflect inflected forms of Akk. *alāku*.
- r. 1'f. The restorations are according to can. Erim 2 175f.. The corresponding Sumerian terms are Sum. [lú-s]u-kú-e and [lú-ḡa]-an-di-di.
- r. 3'-5' The corresponding Akkadian terms in the parallel section of the canonical version are *šīmat* NAGAR, *šīmat būli* and *šīmat amēlūti*. The section obviously treats the quasi-homonyms Akk. *šimtu* ”mark, brand” and *šimtu* ”destiny”. The first of the three equations is unclear, with Sum. *še-gín* denoting glue, actually.

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

-

-

“pierced”

-

-

-

-

translation of the Akkadian

a skin disease

a skin disease

-

-

-

-

An Bo. A = KBo. 26,1 + KUB 3,118 (774/z + Bo. 2399)

col. 1. (2) = Orthographic Sumerian (1) Akkadian/Sumerian commentary

obv. i	1'	[^d ama-(ù)-tu-a]n-ki	^d [nammu]
	2'	[^d nin-šar ₆]	<i>an-tu₄ ^DIš-tar</i>
	3'	[^d šim-bi]-zi	MIN ki-id-ru-maḥ-š[u-du-a]
	4a'	[^d ga-ga]	^D I-lí-ab-rat ^{ges} NÍG [?] -gidru-maḥ-šu-du ₇ -[a]
	4b'		<i>na-aš ḥa-aṭ-ṭi ši-ir-ti</i>
obv. i	5'	[^d MIN-me-ninnu-an-na]	MIN
	6'	[^d i g-gal-la]	[l]ú- ^{ges} i g-maš-tab-ba-ke ₄
	7'	[]	ʿx ¹ mu še e ri e ti -
	8'	[^d ka-ba-a-ni-an-na-ke ₄]	[sukkal-g]i-sum-mu (break)
obv. ii	1a'	^d M[AŠ]	[]
	1b'	MAŠ-ZA-[]	[]
	2a'	^d MAŠ-ʿX ¹ -[]	[]
	2b'	MAŠ-ʿX ¹	[]
	3a'	^d i gi-[]	[]
	3b'	i-ki-[]	[]
	4'	^d ZA-[]	[]
	5'	^d []	[] (break)
obv. ii	10'	[]	[Š]U
	11'	[]	ŠU
	12'	[]	[] A DU ŠU
	13'	[]	ŠU

i 4' Sources A and B of can. An 1 32 correctly preserve du₈; whereas source C apparently equally has du₇. The sources of the canonical version consistently preserve the Sumerian 'form' ^dnin-šubur. instead of ^DIliabrat.

i 5' The restoration in (2) is according to can An 1 33. There, however, the deity is equated with ^dpap-sukkal, which does not agree with the dittos of the present source.

i 6' The meaning of Sum. ^{ges}i g-maš-tab is not fully clear. The term also occurs in OB Urra 1 381 and in can. Urra 5 218f. There, it is equated with Akk. *tū'amatu* and *muttirtu*. While the latter is not attested beyond highly

translation of the commentary

-

-

“ditto”

“who holds the great scepter”

“ditto”

see note

“lit. vezir who gives judgment”

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

“the same”

“the same”

“the same”

“the same”

specialized lexical entries, Akk. *tū'am(a)tu* “twin” is also known as referring to doors in literary texts (cf. AHw sub *tū'amtū*), so the Sumerian may quite literally denote a “twin door”

i 7' (1) appears to be Akkadian rather than Sumerian. Akk. *mušērtu*, the most compelling interpretation, denotes a kind of demon.

i 8' The parallel entry in can. An 1 38, gives the commentary in Akkadian as well, i.e., reading Akk. *sukkal[lu X] šip̄ti*.

col. 1. (2) = Orthographic Sumerian (1) Akkadian/Sumerian commentary

14' [] [Š]U
(break)

obv. iii 1a' ^dmaškim-silim-m[a]

[]

1b' ^rx¹-[]

2a' ^den-ki

mu-[še-du-u ša da-ni]

2b' MIN

3' ^dnin-ki

[]

4' ^den-mul

[]

5' ^dnin-mu[l]

[]

(break)

rev. iv 1' ^den-ḫal

[ŠU]

2' ^dnin-ḫal

[ŠU]

3a' ^den-pirìḡ

[ŠU]

3b' en pi-ri-ig

4' ^dnin-pirìḡ

[ŠU]

rev. iv 5a' ^den-gàraš

[ŠU]

5b' ga-ra-aš

6' ^dnin gàraš

[ŠU]

7a' ^den-kum_x(NUN-ME-EZEN-KUM) [ŠU]

7b' en-kum

8' ^{d}nin-nun-m[e-sìr-gum] [ŠU]

(break)

rev. v 1' ^den-me-šár-ra

[] ^rx x¹

2a' ^dnin-me-šár-ra

42 en-ama-a-bi¹

2b' : ^den(MAH)¹-líl-lá-ke₄-ne

2c' ni-min-mi-en-^rx-x¹ : en-nam-ma-a-a-^den-líl

iii 1' The present entry provides the reconstruction for can. An 1 94 (Litke 1998: 30; given as Sum. ^dḡeš-[x-x]-silim-ma there).

iii 2' The restoration in (1) is tentative. The commentary would well apply to the two preceding entries, as can be seen from can. An 1 95f. It would then form an instance of cross-column misordering.

translation of the commentary

“the same”

-

“informer of Anu”

-

-

-

“the same”

“the same”

“the same”

“the same”

“the same”

“the same”

“the same”

“the same”

-

“the 42 lords, mother(s) and father(s) 30
of Enlil”

iv 7' Cf. can. Diri 4 67f., where SyllSum. en-ku-um is given in equation with OrthSum. EN-PAP-SIG₇-NUN-ME-EZENxKASKAL. Thus, <NUN-ME> of the present entry apparently corresponds to <PAP-SIG₇>, and <EZEN-KUM> to <EZENxKASKAL>.

v 2' The present manuscript has Sum. -a-bi- instead of -a-a- “fathers”, which is expected from the parallel entry

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Akkadian/Sumerian commentary
	3a'	^d zi-s[um-m]u	nibru ^{ki} -šà-ga-ke ₄
	3b'		[n]i-ib-bur-ša-qa-ki
	3c'		ša qí-ri-ib ni-bu-ru
	4a'	^d ad _x (ZA[-tenû)-gì]r-ḥaš	ŠÚ+NIR-bar-ra-ke ₄
	4b'	[]	za-am-bar-ak-ki(RU)'
	4c'	[^d šu-zi-an-n]a	ša ab-si-i
rev. v	5a'	^r d ¹ [še]g ₉ -bar-ra-gim ₄ -gim ₄ -a	a-ša-ma-ra-ke ₄
	5b'	[g]i-ri-mi-ri-me	ša-ki-in A.ŠÀ
	5c'	[]- ^r x ¹	
	6a'	[^d ur-bàd-dumu]	[lú-su]kud-da-ke ₄
	6b'		[lu-šu]-ku-ud-da-ki
	6c'	[^d kù-sù]	[EN š]a-qu-ú (break)
rev. vi	1'	[]	MIN (= ^d en-líl)
	2'	[]	MIN
	3'	[^d darà-dím-dí]m	MIN
	4'	[^d DUG-SÌLA-B]UR	MIN
rev. vi	5'	[]	MIN
	6'	[]	MIN
	7'	[]	MIN
	8'	[]-BA	MIN-e lam-m[a] (break)

in can. An 1 137f. as well as from the Syllabic Sumerian of the present entry itself. With regard to the genitive construction, however, -bi- is sensible as well; a confusion between the graphically-similar signs <A> and <BI> seems probable. The Syllabic Sumerian is incomplete probably due to a lack of inscriptional space.

v 3' Can. An 1 139 has Sum. nibru^{ki}-a-šà-ga-ke₄ in (1). The Sumerian, apparently, is cryptic, and it is striking that both versions attest almost identical forms. The Akkadian translation taken as correct – which seems to be likely – one had to reconstruct Sum. lú-nibru^{ki}-šà-ga-bi(-ke₄).

v 4' The restoration in a (2) is according to can. An 1 140, the restoration in c (1) follows the commentary AO 6479 iii 6 (also note that the actual position of c (2) must be c (1)). The first sign in a (2) corresponds to <ŠEG₉= ŠÚ-ŠE-KU-GAG> in the canonical version. Possibly, it reflects <ŠEG₈= ŠÚ-NAGA> (thereby note that <ŠEG₉> appears in its correct shape in the following entry).

translation of the commentary

“the one of the midst of Nippur”

see note

“Šuzianna of the Apsû”

“who establishes fields”

“the lofty lord”

“ditto (Enlil)”

“ditto (Enlil)”

“ditto (Enlil)”

“ditto (Enlil)”

“ditto (Enlil)”

“ditto (Enlil)”

“ditto (Enlil)”

“ditto (Enlil) of Elam”

- v 5' SyllSum. gi-ri-mi-ri-me in b (2) renders OrthSum. gim₄-gim₄. Sum. a-ša-ma-ra-ke₄ makes the impression of being Syllabic Sumerian. According to the Akkadian translation, it must reflect Sum. a-szà-ĝar-ra-ke₄ (Can. An 1 141 preserves Sum. a-šà-bar-ra-ke₄, the commentary AO 6479 iii 7 Sum. a-šà-mar-ra-ke₄).
- v 6' The restorations in (1) and (2) are according to can. An 1 142, and as for c, according to the commentary AO 6479 iii 9, where the deity is equated with ^dkù-sù.
- vi 3' The restoration follows can. An I 165.
- vi 4' The restoration follows can. An I 167.
- vi 8' There are no possible restorations available from the canonical version, since the respective column is broken there as well.

SSgL Bo. A = KBo. 26,35 (69/470)

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[]	[]	ʾx x¹ []
		[I ta-ar]	[TAR]	he-pu-[u _{1/2}] le-tù-[u _{1/2}] lu-ut-TE-[]
	5'	[si-la]?		šu-lu-[u _{1/2}] sú-u[l-lu-u _{1/2}] ʾpu¹-r[u²-sú] [ha]-ša-[a-bu], [x] ʾA/ZA¹ []
		[ku-ud]?		
			(break)	

SSgL Bo. B = KBo. 26,17 (124/v)

col.	l.	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[]	[]	[x]-en-tù
		[I tu-ba-ši-in]	[KU ₇]	dá-bá-ši-in-nu
		[I da-ba-an]		šar-dáp-pu
		[]	[]	ú-bá-nu
	5'			šú-up-ru ʾki¹-tab-ru qa-tù še ₂₀ -e-pu ʾIK¹-DU
	10'			KU-IŠ-ru [p]u²-ri-du
			(break)	

SSgL Bo. C = KBo. 13,6 (14/t)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[]	ʾnu¹²-ʾZU¹-UR

A 4' The third sign in (4) definitely is <TE>. Akk. *lutû* “twig”, derivation of *letû* and thus a possible restoration, invariably forms the plural in masculine gender (Akk./Gen. *lutê*).

A 5' Note that, though Akk. *šulû* is quite fitting as restoration, Sum. *silá* is the last among the readings of <TAR>

translation of the Akkadian

“to break”
 “to split”
 see note
 “street”
 “street”
 “to cut”
 “to break off”
 -

translation of the Akkadian

-
 a leather object
 a leather part of a harness
 “finger”
 “nail, claw”
 “arm”
 “hand”
 “foot”
 -
 -
 “leg”

(5) = Hittite

translation of the Akkadian

translation of the Hittite

PAP-*nu*-[*mar*]

see note

“to protect”

in the usual order as it is found S^a and *Ea*.

A 6' Akk. *sullutu* is also a possible restoration in (4).

C 1' According to the Hittite translation, the Akkadian most probably reflects the root *nṣr*, either in the form of the

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	2'	[]	<i>nu-ru-u</i>
		[]	<i>ar-ka₄-tu₄</i>
		[]	<i>ḥa-la</i>
	5'	[]	<i>ḥa-la-AZ-ZU-u</i>

(end of tablet)

SSgL Bo. D = KUB 3,113 (Bo. 5855)

col.	l.	(2) Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	I KI	<i>ʿx¹-li-[]</i>
		I KI	<i>iš-tu</i>
		I KI	<i>a-dì</i>
		I KI	<i>šu-ub-tù</i>
	5'	I KI	<i>i-ši-ir-tù</i>
		I AL-KAR	<i>kùl-ta-r[u]</i>
		I U(Ú)'	<i>e-eš-re-ʿe¹²-[tù]</i>
		[I] 'X'	<i>ḥa-am-ša-[a-tù]</i>
		[I]]-A	<i>ra-ʿx-x¹ []</i>
	10'	[I]	<i>ʿa¹²-[]</i>

(break)

SSgL Bo. E = KUB 3,94 (Bo. 2713)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
i	1'	[]	[]
		[I]	[]
		[]	[]

imperative Akk. *nušsur*, or as mistaken infinitive *nušsuru*.C 3' Possibly restore Hitt. EGIR.U₄-az “future”.

C 4'f. Akk. *ḥa-la* makes the impression of being a particle. A respective word is however attested neither in Akkadian nor in West Semitic. Probably, it has to be interpreted in connection with the following, acrophonically related entry, which is unclear, as well; it possibly reflects the verb Akk. *ḥalāšu*. In this respect note that the (broken) Hittite translations equally begin with the syllable *ḥa-*, so both terms could also represent a (idiomatically conceived) exclamation or the like.

D 1'-5' Note that among the Akkadian terms, only *šubtu* is a common equivalent to Sum. KI. The other terms rather form equivalents to Sum. ZAG (e.g. see SaV Bo. K = KBo. 1,43 rev. 9'-23'). Graphically, <ZAG> and <KI>

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
ZALAG.G[A-aš]	“light”	“light”
EGIR-[]	“posterity, future, descendants”	see note
ha-[]	-	-
ha-[]	-	-

translation of the Akkadian

-
“from, since”
“until”
“seat, throne”
“sanctuary”
“tent”
“one-tenth”
“one-fifth”
-
-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	-	-
[x x x] ¹ x ¹ e-ku-pí	-	-
[x x] ¹ š ^u ¹ x ¹ i]š?	-	-

are quite distinct, and there is hardly a possibility of phonetic association between them, so it is unlikely in this perspective, that a scribe confused both signs, and there still remains the equation with Akk. *šubtu*, which is never used as equivalent to Sum. ZAG. However, note the mistake in 7' and the reconstruction of the Sumerian in 6', za-lam-ĝar, which would be acrophonically related to Sum. zag.

C 6' The Sumerian equivalent of Akk. *kultāru* is za-lam-ĝar. Note that Sum. za-lam-ĝar is also acrophonic to Sum. zag, which probably has to be reconstructed in the preceding entries (see previous note). If the equation is not taken as unorthographic spelling, Sum. AL-KAR possibly forms an oral/memory-based mistake (No. 100; further see chapter 10, sect. 3.1.).

C 7' A possible link to the preceding entries is through Sum. zag-10 and zag-5.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
i		[I]	[]
	5'	[]	[]
		[]	
		[I]	[]
		[]	[]
		[I]	[]
i	10'	[I]	[]
		[I]	[]
		[I]	[]
		[I]	[]
		[I]	[]
		[I]	[]
	15'	[I]	[]
		[I]	[]
		[I]	[]
		[I]	[]
		[I]	[]
		[I]	[]
		[I]	[D]U
		[I]	[D]U
		[I]	[b]u
	25'	[I]	[]- ^r x ¹
		[I]	[]
		[I]	[]- ^r x ¹
		[I]	[]
		[I]	[]
		(break)	
ii	1	I X	^r x-x ¹ -[]
		I X : mu-še ₂₀ -en-nu	KI-IT-[]

i 2'-8' The Hittite translations are apparently identical in section 4'-6' and in section 7'f. (note in this respect that Hitt. *-pat* in 8' refers to the whole section; a similar case appears in Izi Bo. A KBo. 1,42 iii 30-35; cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.4.). The initial term of both sections seems already to appear in section 2'f., equally in the first entry. Unfortunately, there are no sensible restorations available. The first expression, ending in *-(e)kupi*, does not appear like a genuinely Hittite formation, the second one seems to be a genitivus-pendens construction derived from an verbal abstract with suffix *-eššar*.

i 16' With regard to morphology, Hitt. *da-li-ya-u-ar* either derives from *dala-* “to leave”, the verbal noun of which shows an alternation between *dalummar* and *daliyawar* (cf. HEG sub *dala-*), or to *tallai-* “to implore” (only *daliyawar*). The preverb *arḫa*, however, makes sense in combination with *dala-* “to leave” only. In this respect,

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[x x] ʿx¹-ku-pí	-	-
[x-mi-e]š-na-aš	-	-
<hr/>		
[x]-ku-pí	-	-
[x]-mi-eš-na-aš-pát	-	“also []”
<hr/>		
ʿx¹-GÌR?	-	-
ʿx¹-ma-a-u-ar	-	“to []”
wa-ar-kán-za	-	“fat”
ša-ak-la-a-iš	-	“custom, rite”
pár-ku-uš	-	“high”
ʿša¹-ra-zi	-	“upper”
URU.ʿBÀD¹-ta KUR-e	-	“fortified land”
ar-ḫa da-li-ya-u-ar	-	“to leave away”
<hr/>		
ur-ru-[x]?	-	-
ZAG-aš	-	“right”
LU e-an-za?	-	hapax leg.
mi-im-ma-a-u-ar	-	“to refuse”
LU tar-wi₅-eš(MÍN)¹-ga-la-aš	-	“dancer”
wa-ar-ḫu-eš(MÍN)¹-šar	-	“roughness”
GIŠ BUR ZA	-	see note
ar-ḫa da-lu-mar	-	“to leave away”
ḫé-e-šu-u-ar	-	“to open”
LU NÍG.TUKU	-	“rich”
za-ḫar-ti-iš	-	a kind of seat
na(BA)¹-ak-ki-i-uš	-	“heavy/important ones”
ʿx x x¹ []	-	-
<hr/>		
[]	-	-
[]	-	-

note that i 24' lists the allomorph form *dalumar*, which may be taken as indication for that the present text was compiled from different sources (generally, and as for further evidence, cf. the introductory remarks in part D and chapter 11, sect. 3.2.).

i 22' Hitt. BUR in ^{DUG}BUR.ZI denotes a bowl used in sacrifices. The determinative GIŠ is not known in combination with it, nor is the complement ZA. However, note that a sequence BUR ZA GAN is attested in Unid Bo. 4-3 = KUB 3,111: 14'.

i 24' Also see note to i 16'.

ii 2 Although identified as <MUŠEN> by the accompanying sign name, the sign in (2) rather appears as <BULUG>.

col.	1.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		I BULUG : bu-lu	<i>pu-lu-uk-[ku]</i>
		I EDIN(GA-MAŠ-BUR) ¹ -NA	<i>še-e-[ru]</i>
5		I BĀḪAR	<i>pa-a-ḫa-[ru]</i>
		I ŠÁM	<i>ši-im-[mu]</i>
		I DÚB (GEŠTIN-IŠ)	<i>[na-pa-a]ṣ-ṣú</i>
		I GEŠTIN	<i>k[a-r]a-nu</i>
		I UD-LUGAL-DU a-[lal] : a-la-al-lu-gal-ku-pa-ak-ku	<i>ʿa¹-la-al-lu</i>
ii	10	I ALAN	<i>ša-[a]l-mu</i>
		I NÁ	<i>ʿe-er¹-šu</i>
		I NÁ : ki-iš-na	<i>ša(A)¹-la-lu-u</i>
		I E-KISIM ₅ xGA : ki-ši-im	<i>ki-ši-mu</i>
		I E-KISIM ₅ xA-MAŠ	<i>ša ki-ši-ma-ak-ku a-maš i-gub</i>
15		: ma-AZ-ZA	<i>ma-AZ-ZU-u</i>
		I E-KISIM ₅ xLA	<i>ša ki-ši-ma-ak-ku la i-gub</i>
		: la-aḫ-ta	<i>la-aḫ-ta-nu</i>
		I E-KISIM ₅ x[X]ii 18-26ii 18-20	<i>ši-i-ḫu(RU)¹</i>
		I E-[KISIM ₅ xX]	<i>nap-pí-lu(DU)¹</i>

- ii 4f. The usual appearance of <EDIN> in Hittite cuneiform is <AM.SĪLA.BUR>, as opposed to following <BAḪĀR>, which is <DUG.SĪLA.BUR>.
- ii 9 The parallel entry SSgL Bo. Db = KBo. 26,50: 5' has Sum. KI.LUGAL.DU in (2). With regard to the pronunciation and the Akkadian translation, it is clear that the sign treated must be <ALAL>, which in Mesopotamian as well as in Hittite cuneiform appears as <ŠIDxA>. The sign form in the present entry is plausible presuming the determinative <DUG> has originally preceded the logogram, as it is frequently attested. Strikingly, the original sign composition is by no means reflected in the accompanying sign name, which clearly isolates the elements <LUGAL> and <GUB/DU>. The first element appears as *alal*, which neither fits <UD> nor <KI>.
- ii 10f. The strong graphical connection of <ALAN> and <NÁ> – whereby <NÁ> forms the second element of <ALIM> – is only evident in Mesopotamian paleography (in Hittite paleography <ALAN> appears as <GĀR-GĀR>).
- ii 12 Note that the given pronunciation includes the determinative <GIŠ>, which moreover is not a part of the logogram as given here.
- ii 13-26 Mesopotamian <DAGxKISIM₅> generally occurs as <E-KISIM₅> in Hittite cuneiform.
- ii 13 As pointed out by H.G. Güterbock (1973: 81f.), the compound sign <DAG-KISIM₅xGA>, usually referred to as <UBUR> and denoting the (female) breast, is not known in the meaning which is implied by the Akkadian equivalent. The specific composition of the entry may thus derive from a merger of two entries, like it is possibly the case with regard to the following entry as well.
- ii 14f. The Akkadian has been commonly linked with Akk. *massû* “expert”; but there is no compelling connection with the given logogram in (2). Regarding the Hittite translation, B. Landberger (1951: 103 n5) suggests that Hitt. *ašauwar* “beruht auf Verwechslung mit AMAŠ”, which is <DAG-KISIM₅xLU-MÁŠ>. Note, however, that this would be a very unique instance of the Hittite being modelled according to the (ill-conceived) Sumerian. It seems more compelling that the entry results from a merger of originally two entries, the Sumerian and

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
□	“stake, frontier”	-
□	“steppe, open country”	-
□	“potter”	-
□	“purchase price”	-
ʾx¹-[]	“to push away, smash”	-
GIŠGEŠTIN-aš	“wine”	“wine”
GIŠ KAL MA ʾx¹	“drain, pipe”	-
<i>e-eš-ri</i>	“image, figure”	“image, shape”
GIŠNÁ	“bed”	“bed”
<i>še-eš-ki-ya-u-[wa-ar]</i>	“to sleep”	“to sleep”
<i>wa-at-ta-nu-[]</i>	“sour milk”	hapax leg.
<i>a-ša-u-wa-ar</i>	see note	“fold, pen”
: <i>a-ʾar¹-ru-ma-aš la-aḥ-ḥu-uš</i>	“beer vat”	“washing vessel”
: <i>ḥu-u-i-tar-za ku-it</i> KI.MIN	an insect	“grubs which []”
<i>mu-uš-gal-la-aš</i>	“caterpillar”	hapax leg.

the Akkadian taken from the first one, the Hittite from the second one; also see previous note.

- ii 18-26 The section has extensively been treated by B. Landsberger (1951: 111/115) and especially by H.A. Hoffner (1974: 87ff.), who very likely is right in claiming “that, while the Hittite scribe may not have sufficiently understood the two lefthand columns to give precise equivalents, he seems to have provided us in these nine lines with a number of otherwise unknown Hittite designations for insect pests” (91). Although the other parts of the text are full of misconceptions as well, the number of errors is even higher in the present section. The following comments only involve the most important points; as for an extensive discussion, cf. H.A. Hoffner (ibid.).
- ii 18-20 The interpretation of (4) in all three lines is according to can. *Urri 14 245-247* (Sum./Akk. ^{ki-si-im}DAG- KISIM₅xÚ. GÍR = *ši-i-ḥu*; ^{zi-bi-in}DAG-KISIM₅xÚ-GÍR = *nap-pil-lum*; ^{šu-ri-in}DAG-KISIM₅xÚ-GÍR = *ša-ši-ru*) and according to can. *Ea 4 62f.* (only ii 19f.; SyllSum./Orth.Sum./Akk. ^{zi-bi-in} = DAG-KISIM₅+TAK₄ = *nap-pil-[lum]*; ^{šu-ru-un} = DAG-KISIM₅xNE = *ša-ši-ru*). These interpretation have already been suggested by B. Landsberger (1951: 111) and H.A. Hoffner (1974: 87f.); as for ii 20, Hoffner adds that the Akkadian “may be correct as it stands, for *zerru* (*zīru* B in CAD Z 136) is a ‘dwarf locust’”; yet, regarding the parallel entries in *Urri* and *Ea*, this is rather improbable.
- ii 18 As to Hitt. *ḥuitar=za kuit* KI.MIN, H.A. Hoffner (1974: 87) points out that it “is incomprehensible as it stands, since its verb, hidden behind KI.MIN (‘ditto’), is not contained in the preceding line [...]. Whatever it was, it required *-za*. The noun *ḥuitar* denotes ‘living creatures’ in general. [...] when it is qualified by the genitives *taknaš* and *daganzipaš*, it denotes grubs, which attack and consume the grain”; for further attestations see there. The present unmotivated usage of KI.MIN, seems to indicate that the present text was compiled out of components of different origin, whereby the internal references were not appropriately adjusted (also see chapter 11, sect. 3.2.).
- ii 19 <UŠ> in (5) is collated.

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
ii	20	I E-K[ISI]M ₅ x[X] I E-[KISI]M ₅ x[X] I 'E ¹ -[KIS]IM ₅ x[X] I [E-KIS]IM ₅ x[X] I E-[KI]SIM ₅ x'X ¹	{ša}-ši-ir-ru e- ¹ ki ¹ -im ap-pa-nu ZA-ZI-in ZI-ZI-in-nu i-ši-KU-ú
	25	I 'E ¹ -[K]ISIM ₅ x'X ¹ : ga-al/ra I 'E ¹ -[K]ISIM ₅ x'X ¹ ki-ši-ib	hu-ur-sé-en-nu kúl-bá-ab(RA) ¹ -tù
(rest of the column and reverse uninscribed)			

SSgL Bo. Eb = KBo. 26,50 (49/p)

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[I EDI]N	pa- ¹ a ¹ -[ha-ru]
		I ŠÁM	ši-im-[mu]
		I DÚB	na-pa-šú
		I GEŠTIN	kà-[r]a-a-nu
	5'	I KI-LUGAL-DU	a-la-al-l[u]
		[I A]LAN	ša-al-[mu]
		[I NÚ]	er-š[ú]
		[I]	'x ¹ -[]
(break)			

- ii 21 Presuming that the present entry is parallel to can. Urta 14 248 and can. Ea 4 64., one would expect Akk. *išid bukanni* “lit base of a pestle” or “root of the bukanu plant”, so present *e-ki-im appanu* may be a “Verballhornung” (B. Landsberger [1951: 115]) of that term. Interpreting the – otherwise unattested – term *ēkim appānī* as “taking/carrying away chick-peas” would fit the context quite well. The interpretation of the Akkadian also depends on the Hittite translation and on whether one regards it as a literal rendering of the Akkadian or as an independent idiomatic expression. A. Goetze (1945: 237), referring to Lat. *larva*, suggests that ‘wrapping of the dead’ may in fact denote an insect. B. Landsberger *ibid.*, who refuses this suggestion as “zu kühn”, proposes to emend the Akkadian to *eṭim appānī* “ghost of the chick-pea”, with Akk. *eṭemmu* corresponding to Hitt. *akkant-* then – which yet, does not seem very convincing either.
- ii 22 As has been noted by H.A. Hoffner (1974: 88), the Akkadian “looks suspiciously incomplete.” Possible interpretations offered by him involve Akk. *zunzunnu*, *sīsānu*, *zirzirru* and *šaššaru*, all denoting different sorts of locusts; Hoffner also considers a derivation from Akk. *sāsu* “mouth”. As to the Hittite, he cautiously suggests a logographic reading 𐎶𐎵.𐎶𐎵, possibly to be derived from 𐎶𐎵.𐎶𐎵 (cf., among other attestations, can. Aa 5/2

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>zi-ir-liš</i>	“cricket”	hapax leg.
: <i>ak-kán-ta-aš hu-u-la-li</i>	see note	“wrapping of the dead”
HI-HI- <i>ra-aš</i>	see note	see note
[x]- <i>za-ar-ti</i>	see note	-
<i>pa-aš-pa-na-aš</i>	hapax leg.	hapax leg.
<i>mi-ša-ri-iš</i>	see note	“weevil”
<i>la-la-wi₅-iš-š[a-aš]</i>	“ant”	“ant”

translation of the Akkadian

“potter”
 “purchase price”
 “to push away, smash”
 “wine”
 “drain, pipe”
 “image, figure”
 “bed”
 -

138f.: OrthSum./SyllSum./Akk. U₅-U₅ = ú-uh₅ = *nābu*, *kalmatu* “louse”, “insect eggs”), which “would be drawn much like HI.HI in the Hittite script”.

- ii 23 As for possible origins of the Akkadian, see previous note.
- ii 25 The Akkadian has cautiously been linked to Akk. *ḥars(a)p(a)nu* by B. Landsberger (1951: 116), a term which is attested in lexical lists only and which denotes a kind of insect or insect larva.
- ii 26 Note that a feminine form of Akk. *kulbābu* is otherwise not attested. Although suggested by most parallel entries, the sign inscribed in <KISIM₅> in (2) does not seem to be <GÍR> (kišī₈). Also, <GI> is virtually excluded. As to (5) H.A. Hoffner (1974: 91) reads Hitt. *la-la-wi₅-iš-n[a-aš]*. Yet, there is no *n*-extended stem variant of Hitt. *lalawiš*- preserved otherwise (also see HED sub *lala(k)ues(s)a-*).
- Eb 1'-8' As for notes, cf. the notes to the parallel manuscript SSgL Bo. E = KUB 3,94.
- Eb 7' The reading in (4) tentative; according to the traces visible on the photo, <ŠÚ> is more probable than <ŠU>.

GodL Bo. A = KBo. 26,2 (1435/u)

A ii	1'	^d KID-šeš ^d KID- ^r nin ¹ (break)	B i	1'	[^d x]-ni-na [^d K]AL-ni-na ^r d ¹ kù ^r d ¹ lamma
A iii	1'	^r d ^x -x ¹ ^d r ¹ ugal ¹ - ^r x ¹ ^d ugal-bàn-da ^r d ⁿ in-sún ¹ (break)		5'	^r d ^x -ma ^r 7 ¹ -gurun ^r dgašan ¹ ^r d ¹ gašan []ib-gal [^d]gal- ^r x-x ¹
A iii	18'	^d rBI ¹ -ur-kala[m] ^d ME-LÁL ^d nin- ^r kar ¹ -ga[r] (break)	B i	10'	[^d]x-x-kalam-ma ¹ [^d]x-(x)-kalam-ma ¹ ^r d ¹ ugal-zi-kalam-m[a] ^d tišpak diġir-meš-ba-ba ₆
				15'	^r x (x) x ¹ -ba-ba ₆

Them Bo. A = KBo. 26,4 (614/u)

D i	1'	[]- ^r x ¹ []- ^r x ¹ []- ^r x ¹ -ak []- ^r x ¹ -zu	D ii	1'	[x]- ^r x-x ¹ lú-èn-tar lú-ġu ₁₀ -me-en lú-zu-me-en
	5'	[]-ama-zu []-SILIM []-SILIM []-GÁL (break)		5'	lú-bi-me-en lú-zu-ne-ne lú-bi-ne-ne lú-KÍD-KÍD ^r x ¹ -lú
			D ii	10'	^r x ¹ -lú [x]-lú [x]-lú [x-x]- ^r x ¹ (break)

A iii 20' Possibly read ^dnin-kar-r[a-ak]. The sign traces, however, clearly point to <GAR> and not to <RA>.

B i'f. It is possible, though not very likely, that the element -ni-na represents the site Nina, a part of the city state Lagaš; cf. the summary line B i 14'.

B i 7'f. Sum. ib-gal actually is the name of a sanctuary, apparently denoting the main temple of the E-anna district in Lagaš, which would aptly fit the summary line B i 14'. It is therefore possible that B i 7' and 8' join to one entry, with ^dgašan-ib-gal very likely referring to a manifestation of Inanna, then.

- B i 16' ^rd₁nin-ki-^ral¹?-^rx¹
^rd₁MUŠEN-BAR-ZI/GI
[^dMUŠ]EN-^rx x¹
[^d]^rx¹-mu-un-gi
- B i 20' [^d]šubur-zi-^rx¹
[^d]^rx¹-zi-SAR
[^d]^rx¹-kalam-m[a]'
[^d]^rx¹-KU/MA-^rx¹
[^dx (x)]-^ra¹-^rx¹
- 25' [^dx (x)]-^rx¹-^rx¹
[^dx (x)]-^rx¹-^rx¹
[^dx (x) x]-^rx¹
[^dx (x) x]-^rx¹
(break)

- B i 13' Since the sign is missing in Rüster / Neu 1989, the present entry seems to contain the sole attestation of the sign <MÚŠ = TIŠPAK> in Ḫattuša.
- D ii 2' Sum. lú-èn-tar is otherwise not attested, neither in literary texts nor in one of the lexical series series dealing with professions and human conditions.
- D ii 8' As for the form of <KÍD> and its possible origin, cf. E. Neu / Ch. Rüster (1989: No. 227).

Them Bo. B = KBo. 1,51 (VAT 7465)

col.	I.	(4) = Akkadian	(5) = Hittite
i	1'	□	[]-šar
		□	[]-šar
		□	[]-ru
		□	[]-uš
	5'	□	[]- ^r x ¹ -an
i		□	[]-šar
		□	[]-aš
		□	[š]u-u-wa-ar
		□	[]-za
	10'	□	[]- ^r x ¹ - ^r šar ¹
		□	[]- ^r x ¹ -u-wa-ar
		□	[]- ^r x ¹ -aš
		□	[]- ^r x ¹ -uz-ze- ^r eš ¹ -šar
	15'	□	[]-ma-al-li
		□	[]- ^r š/ta ¹ -ma-al-li
		□	[iš-t]a-mi-na-aš
		□	[x-š/t]a-ma-aš iš-ta-mi-na-aš
		□	[x]-a-wa
		□	^r ša-ku ¹ -ú-i-iš
i	20'	□	[]-ir-ru-uš
		□	[]- ^r x-x ¹ -pu-uš
		□	[]-li- ^r wa ¹ -lu-uš
		□	[]- ^r x ¹ -ki
		□	[]- ^r i ¹
	(break)		
ii	1'	ri-ik-[sú]	□
		ur-'ú-[du]	□
		SAG.DU ur-'u-d[u]	□
		mu-ša-a-lu	pa-[]

ii 4' Akk. *mu-ša-a-lu* can be linked to *mušālu* “mirrow” or *mušallû* “(clay) pipe”. Both terms, especially the latter, are scarcely attested and never mentioned in connection with parts of the human or of the animal body. Possibly it denotes the gullet or the aorta.

The term is notably repeated in the following entry. There are only smaller bits of the respective Hittite translations preserved, but these traces do at least not exclude that the translations were repeated as well. In this case

col.	I.	(4) = Akkadian	(5) = Hittite
ii	5'	<i>ṛmu¹-ša-a-lu</i> <i>ḫa-šu(KU)¹-ú</i> <i>li-ib-bu</i> <i>ku-ut-mu ŠÀ-ib-bi</i> <i>ga-bi-du</i>	<i>pa-[]</i> <i>ḫ[a-aḫ-ri]</i> <i>Š[À-ir]</i> <i>ṛŠÀ¹-[aš]</i> <i>li-[iš-ši]</i>
ii	10'	<i>te-er-tù</i> <i>te-ra-a-nu</i> <i>me-er-tù</i>	<i>li-[iš-ši]</i> <i>ḫu-u-ṛx¹-[]</i> <i>kar-[]</i>
		<i>tù-li-im-mu</i> <i>ṛka^{1?}-li-tù</i>	<i>ṛx¹-[]</i> <i>ta[l-]</i>
	15'	<i>ṛx-x¹-šu</i>	[]
		<i>ba-ṛan¹-ṛtù¹</i> <i>ri-iq-qí-[tù]</i> <i>ḫa-AB-ZU-[x]</i>	[] [] []
ii	20'	<i>mi-is-sí-is-[sú]</i> MAŠ-[x] <i>er-[ru]</i> <i>qé-er-[bu]</i> <i>šu-b[u-ur-ru][?]</i> []-ṛx ¹	[] [] [] [] [] []
	25'	[]-ṛx ¹ []-ṛx ¹	[] []
		[]-ṛx ¹ [] []-ṛx ¹	[] [] []
		(break)	
iii	1'	[] [] []-ṛdu-x ¹ []	[x] ṛx ¹ [] [a]r-ša-a-[an/aš] : ḫar-ga-[na-uš] [k]a-ṛlu-lu-pa ^{1?}
	5'	[]	[x]-ṛliš ¹

ii 15' The traces of the first sign in (4) could represent <YA> or <IL>; however, there is no notion of a part of the body preserved in Akkadian with initial *ya-*, *il-*, or *el-*.

ii 18' A possible interpretation of (4) would be Akk. *ḫabṣūtu* “plentiness”, which however makes little sense in the present context.

	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
	“pipe, tube”	-
	“lung”	“lung”
	“heart”	“heart”
	“stomach tissue”	“[] of heart”
	“liver”	“liver”
	“(animals') liver”	“liver”
	“coils, intestines”	-
	“gall bladder”	-
	“spleen”	-
	“kidney”	-
	-	-
	“ribcage, chest”	-
	one of a ruminant's stomachs	-
	one of a ruminant's stomach	-
	-	-
	“intestine(s)”	-
	“intestine(s)”	-
	“rump”	-
	-	-
	-	-
	-	-
	-	-
	-	-
	-	-
	-	-
	-	“sole”
	-	“toe”
	-	-

- ii 19' Akk. *misissam* (this is the form in which it appears in the other sources) is but scarcely attested and exclusively in lexical texts; it seems to denote (a part of) one of the ruminants' stomachs.
- ii 20' (4) possibly contains a root cognate of preceding Akk *misissu*, which also occurs as *messam* in other sources.

col.	I.	(4) = Akkadian	(5) = Hittite
		[]	[<i>wa-a</i>]l-li-iš
		[]	[<i>wa-a</i>]l-li-iš na-ta-[]
		[]	GÌR-aš
		[GÌ]R	pa-tal-ḫa-[aš]
iii	10'	[ú-ba-an] GÌR	GÌR-aš ka-lu-lu-pa-[aš]
		[]-nu	ʽtu ¹ -e-kán
		[pa-ag]-ru	NÍ.TE-an-pát
		[ša-la]m-tù	a-an-ša-aš-ši-wi ₅ -iš
		[x]-ʽx ¹ -ši-DU	ḫu-ri-ši-ya-a[š]?
	15'	ʽtá ¹² -bi-iḫ-tù	: ḫu-[u]-ni-ki-iš-ša-[an]
		bu-bu-uḫ-tù	pal-wa-aš
		[d]á-am-mu	iš-ḫar
		šar-ku	ma-ni-iš
		i-ša-a-ru	la-a-[lu]
iii	20'	mu-ša-a-ru	la-a-lu-[pát]
		ʽx ¹ -lu-li-ZU	zu-up-pa-[]
		ʽx-x ¹ -ZU	ʽzu ¹ -[]
		(break)	
iv	1'	[]	[]-ʽx ¹
		[]	[]
		[]	[]-aš
		[]	[]-ʽx ¹ -iš
	5'	[]	[]-ʽi ¹
		[]	[]-ʽx ¹
		(break)	

Acro Bo. A = KBo. 1,46 (VAT 7534b)

col.	I.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[i gi-tur]	i-ki-dur	[]
		[i gi-tur]	i-ki-dur	[]

- iii 11'f. The neuter stem variant Hitt. *tuekan-* of regular communis *tueka-* is quite unique apart from some occasional logographic spellings with complementing neuter adjectives (as for which see HEG sub *tuekka-*).
- iii 11' Possibly restore Akk. *dīkīnu* in (4). The restoration of Akk. *ramānu* “self” proposed by CAD and HEG seems improbable, since the list deals with 'physical' parts of the body.
- iii 15' HEG sub *ḫunikiššar* reads Akk./Hitt. [*t*]i-bi-iḫ-tù = ḫu-[u]-ni-ki-iš-ša-[ar]. With regard to the vertical context, however, one expects a nomen concretum and not a verbal abstract. The traces of the first sign in (4) are too scarce

translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
-	“thigh”
-	“[] thigh”
-	“foot”
-	“ankle”
“toe”	“toe”
- “body, corpse”	
“body, corpse”	“also body, corpse”
“corpse”	hapax leg.
-	hapax leg.
”slaughtered (corpse)”	“slaughtered (corpse)”
“boil, pustule”	hapax leg.
“blood”	“blood”
“pus”	“pus”
“penis”	“penis”
“penis”	“also penis”
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-

translation of the Akkadian

-
-

for serving as a criterion. In any case, the suffix Hitt. -šar would be expected to be rendered with simple <ŠAR>.

iii 19'f. Akk. *išaru* and *mušaru* appear to be diachronic/dialectal variants, the latter as to yet restricted to SB sources with the exception of the present attestation.

A 1'-3' M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 259) restore Sum. *igi-tur* in (2) and suggest the term to be mistaken for *igi-du₈*. The equation Sum./Akk. *igi-tur(-tur) = šātu*. is also attested in Sag Em. 575 v 13 and Antagal 8 64f.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[igi-tur]	ṛi ¹ -ki-dur	[]
		[igi-bal]	ṛi ¹ -ki-pa-al	[]
	5'	[igi-bal]	ṛi ¹ -ki-pa-al	[]
		[igi-x]	ṛi ¹ -ki-na	[]
		[igi-lá]	ṛi ¹ -ki-il-lá	[]
		[igi-ĝál]	[i]-ki-gal	[]
		[igi-ĝál]	[i]-ki-gal	[]
			(break)	

Acro Bo. B = KUB 3,104 (Bo. 7345)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
l.	1'	[]	[]
		[]	[]
		<hr/>	
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
	5'	[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
		(break)	
r.	1'	[b]al	[]
		bal	ŠE-[]
		bal	ni-[]
		<hr/>	
		bal-bal	at-[mu-ú]
	5'	bal-bal	šu-[]
		bal-bal	š[u-ba-al-ku-tù]
		<hr/>	
		gír	[]
		gír	[]
		[g]í[r]	[]
		(break)	

r. 4' The restoration in (4), proposed by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 146), is mainly based on an identical equation in can. Nabnitu 4 321.

r. 5' M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 146) restore Akk. *šu-[te-nu-u]* in (4).

r. 6' The restoration, proposed by M. Civil / H.G. Güterbock (1971: 146), is based on the equation of single BAL

translation of the Akkadian

-
-
-
-
-
-
-

(5) = Hittite

translation of the Akkadian

translation of the Hittite

[i]š

-

-

[]-eš-šar

-

-

[]-iš

-

-

[]-zi

-

-

[]-^rx¹-za

-

-

[]-^rx¹-wa-ar

-

-

[]-^rx¹-u-ar

-

-

[a]r

-

-

[]-^rx¹

-

-

[]

-

-

[]

-

-

[]

-

-

[]

“to speak, talk”

-

[]

-

-

[]

“to bring across, transfer”

-

[]

-

-

[]

-

-

[]

-

-

with Akk. *nabalkutu*.

r. 7'-9' H.G. Güterbock (1973: 80) proposes to read Sum. BÚR instead of GÍR in (2), according to Sag Bo. D = KBo. 1,38 rev.¹ r.2f. (with BÚR read sun₅ there).

Acro Bo. C = KUB 3,107 (Bo. 8384)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(x) = unclear language
1'		[]	ʽx¹-[]
		[]	ʽx¹-[]
		[]	ʽx¹-[]
		[]	ʽx¹-[]
5'		gi	[]
		gi-gi	[]
		gi-bi	[]
		gi-bi	[]
(break)			

Syn Bo. A = KBo. 26,28 (1430/u)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
1'		[]	ʽx-x¹-nu-bi	ʽx-x¹ []
		[x-gin ₇]	[x-k]i-im	<i>da-an-ni-iš</i>
		[x-gin ₇]	[x-k]i-im	<i>ma-a-ti-iš</i>
		[ur ₅ -gin ₇]	[ur-k]i-im	<i>ki-a-am</i>
5'		[ur ₅ -ra-àm-ĝál] [?]	[ur]-ra-àm-gal	<i>aš-šúm ki-a-am</i>
		[dùb-gúr]	[x]-ʽx¹-gur	<i>kà-ma-a-šu</i>
		[dùb-gúr-gúr]	[x]-ʽx¹-gur-gur	<i>ki-tám-mu-šu</i>
		[dùb-bad]	[x]-ʽx¹-bad	<i>pí-it pu-ri-dì</i>
		[bal]	[x-b]a-al	<i>na-bal-ku-ut-tù</i>
10'		[ù-na-du ₁₁]	[]-ʽx¹	<i>qí-bi-ma</i>
		[ù-na-dè-daḥ]	[d]a-aḥ	<i>šu-un-ni-šu-ma</i>
		[ù-na-dè-péš]	[p]í-iš	<i>šu-ul-li-ša-šum-ma</i>
		[]	[]-ʽx¹	<i>um-ma</i>
		[]	[]	<i>um-ma-ma</i>
15'		[]	[]	ʽx x x nu ma¹
(break)				

A 2'-12' The restorations are as suggested by H.G. Güterbock (1985: 125).

A 13'f. Akk. =ma in 14', possibly also in 15', seems to be used meta-linguistically. As for further instances and a discussion, cf. chapter 9, sect. 6.3.

translation of the Akkadian

-

“very, greatly”

“very”

“thus; how”

“hence, for that reason”

“to kneel down”

“to kneel down continuously”

“opening of the knees”

“to transgress”

“speak”

“repeat (it) for him”

“repeat (it) for him for a second time”

“thus, as follows”

“*equally* thus, as follows”

-

Syn Bo. B = KBo. 26,33 (1491/u)

1' 'x¹-[]
nu-GEŠT[IN]-'x¹
zú-kešeř

šu-diriĝ

5' níĝ-UŠ
níĝ-TA

ma[h-x-t]ur

[x-x-t]ur

(break)

Syn Bo. C = VBoT 80 (Ash. 1933-108i)

obv. 1 maḥ
tur
sig
daĝal
(break)

rev. 1' [UD-uḥ-ḥu ḥ]u
[UD u]ḥ-ḥu-tag-g[a]
UD-uḥ-ḥu-tag-ga

UD alim

5' alim
ᵈlamma
(end of tablet)

Unid Bo. 1-1 = KBo. 26,29 (2008/g)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
i	1'	[]	[]
		[]	[]
		<hr/>	
	5'	[]	[]-'x¹
		[]	[]-'ú¹
		[]	[]-ú
		<hr/>	
		[]	[]-'x¹
		[]	[D]U

- obv. 3 Other possible readings are: Sum. i[b] and tuk[u]; with regard to the vertical context present Sum. sig fits best.
rev. 4' According to H.G. Güterbock's collations, "UD [is] written over erasure that looks like a separation gloss between UD and alān, plus some traces in front of UD" (1985: 128).

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>wa-at-ku-u[m-mar]</i>	-	“to jump, flee, escape”
<i>da-a-an a-ni-ya-u-wa-[ar]</i>	-	“to perform twice”
<i>ge-en-zu da-a-u-w[a-ar]</i>	-	“to take a pity”
<i>GABA-it wa-al-ḫu-[wa-ar]</i>	-	“to hit with the chest”
<i>a-ru-um-ma ʿxʿ-[]</i>	-	“exceedingly []”
<i>ú-iš-kat-ta[l-la-aš]</i>	-	“who complains continually”
<i>iš-ḫa-a[h-ru]ʹ</i>	-	“tears”

i 7' The restoration in (5) is as proposed by H.G. Güterbock (1985: 126), yet remains tentative. In (4), possibly restore Akk. *di-im-tù*.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹ -ZU
i	10'	[]	[]- ^r x ¹ -u
		[]	[]-u
(end of tablet)			
iii	1'	MUNUS-[]	[]
		MUN[US-]	[]
(break)			
iv	1'	[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
	5'	[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
		[]	[]
(break)			

Unid Bo. 1-2 = KUB 3,110 (Bo. 2895)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
	5'	[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
		[]	[]	[]
	10'	[]	[]	[]

iv 1'-6' As noted by H.G. Güterbock (1985: 126), the section – or at least some entries in it – may join to a longer paraphrase (cf. the accusative object(s) in 3' and the inflected verb form in 6'). It may even be part of a literary text. H.G. Güterbock (ibid.) additionally restores Hitt. GÌR.MEŠ-uš “feet (acc.)” at the beginning of 3' and *ariyawen* “we inquired by oracle” in 6'.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>pí-[]</i>	-	-
<i>d[a]</i>	-	-
<hr/>		
<i>ʿx¹-[]</i>	-	-
<i>[]</i>	-	-
<hr/>		
<i>[]</i>	-	-
<i>[]</i>	-	-
<hr/>		
<i>[]-ʿx¹-um-ma-re-eš</i>	-	-
<i>[]-ʿx¹-um-ma-an-kán ku-e-da-ni</i>	-	“to whom []”
<i>[]-MEŠ-uš-kán ŠU.MEŠ-uš-ša</i>	-	“the []s and hands (acc.)”
<i>[]-ʿx¹-e-eš ar-ḫa</i>	-	“[] away”
<i>[]-ša-an-za</i>	-	-
<i>[]-ʿx¹-ri-ya-u-e-en</i>	-	“we []ed”
<hr/>		
<i>[]-ʿx-x¹-an-za</i>	-	-
<i>[]</i>	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>[x-r]a-a-aš</i>	-	-
<i>[E]N-aš</i>	-	“lord”
<hr/>		
<i>PAB-ar</i>	-	“to protect”
<i>ḫu-šu-wa-an-da</i>	-	“alive (pl.n.)”
<i>[tá]k-šu-u-wa-ar</i>	-	“to equal”
<i>LUŠU.GI-an-za</i>	-	“elder”
<i>GIŠ LI BUR DU</i>	-	-
<i>ša-ni-iz-zi</i>	-	“pleasant, fine”
<i>e-ku-ni-ma-aš</i>	-	“cold”
<hr/>		
<i>ad-da-aš</i>	-	“father”

1-2 7' The sequence probably has to be interpreted as logogram. Among the logograms known in Hittite writing, possible interpretation are: the Sumerogram ^{GIŠ}LI.DUR.ZU, possibly denoting a plant, and the Akkadograms ^{GIŠ}LE-U₅ “wooden tablet”.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		□	□	□
		□	□	□
		□	□	□
		□	□	□
15'		□	□	[<i>lu-mu-u</i>] <i>r</i> ²
		□	□	[<i>ši-i</i>] <i>m-tù</i>
		□	□	[<i>ši-i</i>] <i>m-tù</i>
		□	(vacat)	[<i>x-N</i>] <i>I-TI-KU</i>
		□	(vacat)	¹ <i>x</i> ¹ <i>NI</i> ur ru
20'		[] ¹ <i>inanna</i>	(vacat)	^D <i>Ištar</i>
		[^d <i>e</i>]n- ¹ <i>lil</i> [?]	(vacat)	[^D <i>En-l</i>] <i>il</i> [?]

(end of tablet)

Unid Bo. 1-3 = KBo. 36,6 (1624/u)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	□	¹ <i>ša-ra-a</i> ¹ [<i>ku</i>]
		□	<i>šu-ut-lu-m</i> [<i>u</i>] [?]
		□	<i>ša-ra-a-ku</i>
		□	<i>ma-aš-ša-lu</i>
5'		□	<i>mu-uš-šu-lu</i>
		[]- ¹ <i>x</i>	<i>i-mi-it-tù</i>
		[]- ¹ <i>x</i>	<i>šu-me-lu</i>
		[]- ¹ <i>x</i> - <i>du</i> ₁₁ - <i>ga</i>	: <i>sú-up-pu-u</i>
		□	<i>nu-'-u-du</i>
10'		□	<i>ku-uz-zu-bu</i>
		□	□
		□	□

(break)

- 11'f. Note the explicitly possessive use of the enclitic sentence particle Hitt. =*mu*, which originally denotes the dative.
- 13'-15' The usual order of imperative forms when dealt with systematically in grammatical texts is 2nd-1st-3rd person. The sequence within the present section deviates from this pattern.
- 17' Note that Hitt. *gulšuwat* can as well be related to Akk. *šimtu* “destiny” (i.e. in the sense of “to inscribe, fix, confirm”) as to Akk. *šimtu* “mark” (in the sense of “to inscribe, mark”).

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>ad-da-aš-mu</i>	-	“my father”
<i>ŠEŠ-aš-mu</i>	-	“my brother”
<i>a-ú</i>	-	“see!”
<i>a-ú</i>	-	“see!”
<i>ú-wi₅-il₅-lu-ut</i>	-	“I will see”
^D NAMRÙ	“fate”	“(the deified) fate”
<i>gul-šu-u-wa-ar</i>	see note	“to inscribe, incise”
ʽx ¹ -aš ʽx ¹ -aš	-	“[] of []”
ʽx ¹ -aš ʽx ¹ -aš	-	“[] of []”
^D ʽIŠTAR ¹ ? ʽx ¹	-	PN
ʽ ^D 1[EN.L]ÍL-aš ?	-	PN

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	“to present, give”	-
[]	“to grant generously”	-
[]	“to present, give”	-
[]	“to become equal”	-
[]	“to make equal”	-
[]	“right”	-
[]	“left”	-
ʽx ¹ -[]	“to pray”	-
ú-[]	“to praise”	-
ú-[]	“very attractive”	-
<i>ni</i> -[]	-	-
ʽx ¹ -[]	-	-

Unid Bo. 1-4 = KBo. 26,30 (808/z)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
l.	1'	[] []	[] []
		[] []	[]- ^r x ¹ []
	5'	[] []	[] []- ^r x ¹
		(break)	
r.	1'	g[ú] gú- ^r x ¹ -[]	[] []
		KU- ^r x ¹ -[] ^r tar-ri ¹ -[]	[] []
		(break)	

Unid Bo. 2-1 = KBo. 26,51 (265/t)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
obv.	1'	^r x ¹ -[] ^r x ¹ -[] ^r NINNU-BU ¹ -[] ^r EŠ ₅ ¹ ^r x ¹ -[] (break)	[] [] [] [] []
rev.	1'	^r ri ¹ -[] áb- ^r x ¹ -[] áb-[] áb-[] ^r áb ¹ -[] ^r x ¹ -[] (break)	[] [] [] [] []

obv. 1'-5' The present section possibly lists numbers; it may be compared with the respective passage in can. Ea/Aa 2, which however shows a entirely different entry sequence.

rev. 2' Possibly restore Sum. áb-naga.

(5) = Hittite

translation of the Akkadian

translation of the Hittite

[x-x]-¹x¹-ra-u-ar

-

“to []”

[wa-a]l-li-u-ra-aš

-

“glorious, proud”

ut-tar kha-an-da-u-ar

-

“to fix a word/an affair”

IGI^{HLA}-it PAB-nu-mar

-

“to protect with the eye, watch”

pu-kán-za

-

“hatred”

¹x x x x¹-e-eš

-

-

[]

-

-

[]

-

-

[]

-

-

[]

-

-

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
le.ed. i	1'	[]	[]
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹ -DU
		[]	[]- ^r TUM ¹
		[]	[e/a]l-lu ₄
	5'	[]	[]- ^r x ¹ -lu ₄ er-bi-tu ₄
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹ -EL-lu
		[]	[]- ^r ra ¹ - ^r ri ¹
(end of column)			

le.ed. ii	1'	AN-BUR- ^r x ¹	[]
		DUL [?]	[]
		DUL [?]	[]
		DUL [?] -DU[L] [?]	[]
	5'	DUL [?] -D[UL] [?]	[]
		DU[L [?] -DUL] [?]	[]
		^r x ¹ -[]	[]
(end of column)			

Unid Bo. 2-2 = KBo. 36,4 (164/p)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	^r x-x ¹	[]
			^r x ¹ -[]
			^r x x x ¹ []
			nu-'u-TUM
	5'	giri ₁₇ -zal(SÌLA) [?]	ta-ši-la-a[t-tu _{3/4}]
			e-en-na-r[a]
		tàl-zal(SÌLA) [?]	ri-ig-mu(RI) [!]
			I-ŠI-tu
			ta-nu-qa-t[u ₄]
	10'	tàl-x	ta-nu-qa-t[u ₄]

le.ed. ii 2' The signs treated within the present section cannot be identified with certainty. The exact form is <U-BA>; possible, but not fully-fitting interpretations thus are <DUL>, <IŠTAR>, <Û>.

1' The traces of the first sign could represent .

4' The Akkadian can either be interpreted as nu''udu, D-stem form to the root n'd “to be attentive”, or more appropriately in regard of the vertical context, as nu'ūtu, a variant of Akk. *namūtu* “joke, mockery”.

5'/7' <NI> in (2) rather appears like <SÌLA>, with the (single) vertical not inscribed but set behind the diagonals. Regular Hittite <SÌLA>, however, always lacks the oblique stroke (as can be seen in 9'f. (2)). Also, <NI>

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

-

-

“the four []”

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

-

see note

“celebrations”

hapax leg.

“clamour”

see note

“battle cry”

“battle cry”

usually lacks the inscribed vertical(s) in Hittite paleography. Yet, the position of the vertical besides the diagonals is also atypical for Babylonian script.

7'/10' Sum. *tâl* as a nominal part of a compound verb is otherwise unattested.

8' The sequence I-ŠI-*tu*₄ must reflect Akk. *šisītu* “clamour, cry” according to the vertical context. While <ŠI> simply may spell /si/, <I> most likely was on account of a confusion with <ŠE>; however, the spelling Akk. *še-si-tu*_{3/4} is as yet unattested.

10' The sign given as x in (2) is difficult to identify. The first part looks like <KU>, while the second appears as

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
			LÚKÚR

im-^rra¹-^rx¹^rx-x¹-[]

(break)

le.e. 1'

[] KUR ÍD ^rx¹ []

[]

[] ^rx¹ D(MA) UTU È []

[]

[] ^rD(MA) UTU È []

[]

(end of column)

Unid Bo. 2-3 = KBo. 26,38 (291/q)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
------	----	-----------------------------	----------------

l.

1'

[]

[] ^rx¹-DU-^rx¹

[]

[] ^rx¹-IB-BU

[]

[]-^rx¹ ^rx¹-a-^rx¹

[]

[] mu-TI-IK-^rKI¹

5'

[]

[]-^rx¹ mu-TI-TI-IK-^rKI¹

(break)

r.

1'

[]

[]

-

^rġéštug-x¹

[]

-

ġéštug-GE₆-AŠ

[]

-

[ġ]éštug-RA-A

[]

-

5'

[ġéš]tug-KU-LAL

[]

-

[ġéš]tug-BAR-DU

[]

-

^rġéštug-x¹

[]

-

(break)

Unid Bo. 3-1 = KBo. 26,52 (685/u)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
------	----	-----------------------------	----------------

1'

[]

[]

[]

[]

[]

[]

(break)

<PA> with only one horizontal; possibly it reflects mistaken <KA>, thus resulting in otherwise unattested Sum. tál-du₁₁.

translation of the Akkadian

“enemy”

-

-

-

-

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

-

see note

see note

(5) = Hittite

[]-^rx¹

[]-^rx¹

[z]i ku-iš ^rx¹-[]

translation of the Akkadian

-

-

-

translation of the Hittite l.

-

-

“who []s []”

l. 4' The terms in (4) possibly derive from Akk. *dekû* “to raise”; cf. Akk. *mudekkû* “instigator” in Izi Bo. A = KBo.1,42 ii 30'.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
r.	1'	IGI-[] bur- ^r x ¹ [] bur- ^r x ¹ []	[] [] []
		a []	[]
	5'	a-bi-[] a-[] ^r x ¹ -[]	[] [] []
		(break)	

Unid Bo. 4-1 = KBo. 13,2 (239/s)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
obv.	1'	[]	[]- ^r x ¹
		[]	[]
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹
		[]	[x-l]u-ú
	5'	[]	[pu-l]u-uḫ-ti
		[]	[ta]-ru-ru-ya
		[]	[ša-l]u-um-ma-tù
		[]	[me-l]e-em-mu
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹ -a-ru
obv.	10'	[]	[]- ^r x ¹
		[]	[]
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹
		[]	[t]i
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹
	15'	[]	[]- ^r x ¹
		[]	[]
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹

obv. 2'-9' The co-occurrence of the sememes <<self>> and <<fear/awesomeness>> clearly points to Sum. n í or to compounds based on this term to be restored in (2) (and not to Sum. me, as suggested by CHD sub *naḫšaratt-* lex.sect.).

obv. 4' Hitt. *tuti-*, noun of unknown meaning, also occurs in Erim Bo. A 154f., where it equated the deities ^D*Almu* and ^D*Allamu*.

obv. 6' Note the quite peculiar stem ending of Akk. *tarūru*.

obv. 9' There are varying interpretations that have been offered regarding the Hittite phrase. CHD sub *mai-* lex.sect. translates "When a child is born, she (the mother or an attendant) holds (its) mouth open (?)". G.M. Beckman

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
[]	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
¹ x-x-eš-šar x-x ¹ -[]	-	-
<i>e-eš-ri-me-et</i>	-	“my image, shape”
<i>še-e-na-aš-me-iš</i>	-	“my substitute”
<i>tu-u-ti-iš</i>	-	see note
<i>na-aḥ-ša-ra-az</i>	“my fear”	“my fear, awe”
<i>kat-kat-ti-ma-aš-me-iš</i>	“my trembling”	“my trembling”
<i>ú-e-ri-te-em-ma-aš</i>	“radiance”	“fear”
<i>na-aḥ-ša-ra-az</i>	“fearsome radiance”	“fear, awe
DUMU-aš <i>ku-wa-pí mi-ya-ri</i> <i>nu a-iš a[r-ḫ]a e-ep-zi</i>	-	“when a child is born, / and (he/she) ‘takes the mouth away’”
<i>ka-ru-uš-ši-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	-	“to be silent”
KI.MIN	-	“ditto”
<i>ḫa-aš-ša-tar-me-et</i>	-	“my progeny”
¹ te ¹ -eš-ḫa-aš-me-et	-	“my sleep”
<i>ku-up-pu-¹wa¹-ar</i>	-	“to plan, conspire”
<i>pár-ga-tar-me-et</i>	-	“my height”
<i>ma-ni-in-ku-wa-an-¹ta¹-tar-me-et</i>	-	“my shortness”
<i>mar-¹la¹-tar-me-et</i>	-	“my foolishness”

(1983b: 38) takes it as a paraphrase for an infant's refusal to suck at the breast, translating “when a child is born and holds the mouth away”. Regarding the context, however, the phrase – if not based on a misinterpretation of the Akkadian – must denote the state of fear, fearsomeness or something similar. Hitt. *aiš arḫa epp-* may therefore mean “to open the mouth wide” or “to press one's lips together”. The uncomplemented particle *nu*, without an enclitic personal pronoun added, could in fact indicate that it is not the child which performs the action, but another person involved.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		□	□
		□	□
obv.	20'	□	□
(end of tablet)			
rev.	1	□	□
		□	□
		□	□
		□	□
	5	□	□
		□	[t]i
		□	[]-ti
		□	[]-ti
		□	[]-ti
rev.	10	□	[ṣe-eh]-ru-ti
		□	[]-ti
		□	[]-ZU
		□	[]-x ¹
		□	[]-x ¹
	15	□	□
		□	□
		□	□
		□	□

(rest of tablet uninscribed)

Unid Bo. 4-2 = KBo. 13,10 (217/t)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
obv.	1'	□	□
		□	□
		□	□

rev. 1 The Hittite is possibly linked with Hitt. *zappiya-* “to drippl”.

rev. 11 The traces at the beginning of (5) look like <GA-PA>.

rev. 14 As suggested by HEG sub *tunassallatar*, the nominal root of the Hittite term, *tunašsal(a)-*, could be the word for “son”, as would be confirmed by complemented Hitt. DUMU-*li* (Dat.); the term then, analogue to following Hitt. *attātar*, denotes the status of being a son.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
¹ x x x ¹	-	-
¹ x-x-wa ¹ -ya-tar-me-et	-	“my []”
¹ x ¹ -nu-ma-an i-ya-tar-me-et	-	“my [] prosperity”
<i>za-ap-pí-ya-¹x¹-[]-¹x¹</i>	-	see note
<i>gul-ša-aš gul-šu-w[a-ar]</i>	-	“here: to inscribe the fate”?
¹ la ¹ -ap-pí-ya-aš	-	“fever”
¹ a ¹ -ra-a- ¹ tar ¹ -me-et	-	hapax leg.
¹ ga ^{1?} -aš- ¹ ta ^{1?} -me-et	-	“my hunger”
¹ šar ¹ -ra-aš-ki-u-wa-ar	-	“to divide repeatedly”
¹ ma ¹ -ak- ¹ la ¹ -an- ¹ te ¹ -eš	-	“thin ones”
¹ x-x ¹ -me-et	-	-
<i>mu-wa-tal-¹la¹-tar-¹me-et¹</i>	-	“my virility”
¹ TUR ¹ -tar-me-et	“my smallness”	“my smallness”
¹ x-x ¹ -a- ¹ tar-me ¹ -et	-	“my []”
[x-x]-te- ¹ e ¹ -tar-me-et	-	“my []”
¹ x-x ¹ -ta-ya-ri-me-et	-	“my []”
<i>tu-u-na-aš-ša-al-la-tar-me-et</i>	-	see note
¹ at ¹ -ta-tar-me-et	-	“my being-father”
<i>mi-ya-u-wa-an-¹ta¹-tar-me-et</i>	-	“my becoming-old”
<i>an-tu-uh-ša-tar-me-et</i>	-	“my being-human, humanity”
<i>an-tu-uh-ša-¹tar¹-kán ku-it</i>	-	“population that
<i>aš-ša-nu-wa-an-za</i>		has been supplied”

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>pa-u-[]</i>	-	-
<i>ma-an-¹da^{1?}-[]</i>	-	-
<i>na an ti ik ra an da</i>	-	-

obv. 2' Possibly restore Hitt. *mantalli*- “venomous”? / “ritual against rancorous words”?

obv. 3' The segmentation of the sequence remains unclear.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		□	□
	5'	□	□
		□	□
		□	[]- ^r x ¹ -u
		□	□
		□	□
	10'	□	□
		□	□
		□	□
		□	□
		□	□
	15'	□	□

(break)

rev.	1'	□	□
		□	□
		□	□

		□	□
	5'	□	□
		□	□
		□	□
		□	□
		□	□

(break)

Unid Bo. 4-3 = KUB 3,111 (Bo. 3940)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	□	[m]u
		□	[]- ^r x ¹
		□	[]-ú
		□	[]- ^r x ¹

rev. 3' The second, partly-preserved sign could be <KU>/<MA> or <ŠU>, but may as well represent the final element of the preceding sign.

rev. 4' The second sign very likely is <GUR>, which together with the preceding sign may combine to the logogram Hitt. ŠU.GUR “ring” ; however this logogram is never attested with an additional attribute, nor does the following sign – if the identification as <IGI> is correct – make sense as phonetic complement.

rev. 5' A possible restoration in (5) is Hitt. DUḪ.LĀL “wax”, which is at least not contradicted by the sign traces. With

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
ʾx ¹ iš KA-aš	-	“[] mouth/speech”
ne-ku-uz me-ḫur	-	“nocturnal time”
A.A-an-za KA-aš	-	“awe-inspiring mouth/speech”
A.A-an-za KA-aš ku-e-da-ni e-eš-ta	-	“who has an awe-inspiring m./s.”
[A.A-an-za K]A-aš ku-e-da-ni NU.GÁL	-	“who does not have ...”
EGIR-pa e-ša-an-za	-	lit. “sitting/set back”
[i]š-tar-ni-ya-aš	-	“middle, central”
ʾx ¹ -aš-na-tar	-	-
[]-aš KA-aš	-	“[] mouth/speech”
[K]A-aš	-	“[] mouth/speech”
[]-ʾx ¹ -an-za	-	-
[]-ʾx ¹ -[]	-	-
[x] ʾx x x ¹ []	-	-
LUGAL-uš	-	-
[(x)] ʾx x ¹ -nu-wa-u-ar	-	-
ŠU GUR [?] ʾIGI [?]	-	-
ʾx x ¹ ma-ra-an-za	-	“melted / lost”
K[I.M]IN taḫ-ša-an-za	-	“ready-made ditto”
KI.MIN gul-ša-an-za	-	“incised ditto”
K[I.M]IN ku-e-da-ni a[n [?]]	-	“whom ditto []”
[KI.MI]N [?] []	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	-	-
ʾx ¹ -[]	-	-
du-[]	-	-
ḫu-[]	-	-

regard to the attributes appended in the present and following entries, the restoration makes sense. However, since it apparently inflects as neuter plural, there is no gender/number agreement with the attributes.

Hitt. *maranza* either derives from Hitt. *marr-* “to melt (down)”, which however mostly appears in the spelling *mar-ra-°*, or from *merr-* “to disappear, get lost”, which but rarely shows the root vowel spelled *-a*. If the restoration of the logogram is correct, the first interpretation is the one to be preferred.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	5'	[]	[]-KU
		[]	[]-KU
		[]	[Š/T]A-lu
		[]	[Z]U-ZU
		[]	[Z]U-ZU
	10'	[]	[Z]U-KU
		[]	[]-ru
		[]	[]-ZU-ú
		[]	[]-ZU
		[]	[]-ZU
	15'	[]	[]-ZU-uh ₄ -hu
		[]	[]-u
		[]	[ra-a]-mu
		[]	[]-x ¹
		[]	[]
	20'	[]	[]-x ¹
		[]	[]-šu
		[]	[]-DU
		(break)	

Unid Bo. 4-4 = KUB 3,93 (Bo. 2108)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[]	[]-ú
		[]	[]-TA/ŠA-bu
		[]	[]-x ¹ -tu ₄
		[]	[] INANNA
	5'	[]	[x]-im-ma-tù
		[]	[b]u-ra-šu
		[]	[t]á-ya-ru

- 4-3 9'f. The signs transliterated <BAL> in (5) rather look like <TIM> (in its MA form), which is however not attested as logogram in Hittite writing.
- 4-3 14' The sequence in (5) is best interpreted as BUR.ZA-kán. <BUR> as a logogram in Hittite occurs in BUR.ZI only. A logogram BUR.ZA is not attested, nor is simple BUR with a phonetic complement -za. In this respect, also note the sequence Hitt. GISZ BUR ZA in SSgL Bo. E = KUB 3,94 i 23'.
- 4-3 15' A possible Akkadian restoration corresponding to Hitt. SAḪAR, would be *napalsuḫu* “to fall to the ground, squat”. There is, however, no Hittite verb with initial *an-* having a similar meaning. Thus, probably read *an-[da]*.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>ku/ma-^rx¹-[]</i>	-	-
<i>ḥa-[]</i>	-	-
<i>še-^rx¹-[]</i>	-	-
<i>ki-^rx¹-[]</i>	-	-
BAL- <i>a</i> [<i>n</i>]	-	see note
BAL- <i>a</i> [<i>n</i>]	-	see note
<i>li-^rx¹-[]</i>	-	-
<i>ka-l</i> [<i>i</i>]	-	-
<i>i-pu-r</i> [<i>i-ya-wa-ar</i>]	-	“to besiege, dam up”
BUR ZA GAN []	-	-
SAḪAR ^{HIA} - <i>kán an</i> -[<i>da</i> [?]]	see note	“[] in [?] the dust”
<i>ú-iš-kat-tal</i> -[<i>la-aš</i>]	-	"who sends/cries repeatedly"
<i>a-aš-ši-ya-u-wa-a</i> [<i>r</i>]	“to love”	“to love”
<i>ar-ma-aḥ-ḥa-an</i> -[<i>za</i>]	-	“pregnant”
<i>ḥa-at-ri-ya-š</i> [<i>ar</i>] [?]	-	see note
<i>ḥa-at-ri-ya</i> -[<i>šar</i>] [?]	-	see note
GE ₆ - <i>aš i</i> [<i>š</i>]	-	“[] of the night”
<i>i-ya-al-l</i> [<i>a-aš</i>]	-	
<hr/>		
(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
^r x ¹ -[]	-	-
^D U.D[AR]	GN	GN
<i>ḥi-in-ḥi-^rx¹-[]</i>	see note	-
<i>ḥu-wa-al-ya-^rx¹-[]</i>	“juniper (tree)”	see note
<hr/>		
EGIR- <i>pa wa-aḥ-nu-mar</i>	“turning back”	“to turn back”

4-3 19f. As for Hitt. *ḥatriyašar*, cf. Rieken 1999: 384; the term is very probably not a derivation of Hitt. *ḥatrai*-.

4-4 5' H.G. Güterbock (1985: 124) restores Akk. *ḥimmatu* in (4).

4-4 6' The number of signs following <YA> in (5) is not quite clear. According to the photo, however, it seems most likely that it is a single sign only. <AŠ> is quite possible; *ḥu-wa-al-ya-ta*[*l-la-aš*], as proposed by A. Goetze / E.H. Sturtevant (1938: 81) and HEG sub *ḥuwalliš*- seems improbable. The term is very likely to be connected with Hitt. *ḥuwalliš* “cone”.

4-4 7' Akk. *ta_{1/2}-ya-ru*, either reflecting the strong infinitive *tayāru* or the nomen auctoris *tayyāru*, altogether occurs

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		[]	<i>kà-la-ak-ku</i>
		[]	^r x ¹ -du-ú
10'		[]	[t]a-ḥa-zu
		[]	[i]r-ZA-a-nu
		[]	[m]u ² -ru-ú
		[]	[x]- ^r ru ¹ -ú
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹
15'		[]	[]
(break)			

Unid Bo. 4-5 = KBo. 26,19 (202/s)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[]	[x]- ^r x ¹ -ú
		[]	[x-n]i-mu-u
		[]	[x]- ^r x ¹ -lu
		[]	[x]- ^r x ¹ -DU
5'		[]	[x]-e-ru
		[]	[šu-k]é-e-nu
		[]	[šu-k]é-e-nu
		[]	[ki]- ^r nu ¹ -nu
		[]	[]
10'		[]	[]- ^r x ¹
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹ -KU
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹ -DU
(break)			

Unid Bo. 4-6 = KUB 3,100 (Bo. 2147)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[]	[x]- ^r x ¹ -[]
		[]	^r x ¹ -im- ^r x ¹

three times in the Hattuša lexical lists (the other attestations are: SaV Bo. B = KBo. 1,45 rev. 21 and SaV Bo. G = KBo. 13,5: 9'; as for a short discussion, cf. note to the entry in SaV Bo. B),

4-4 9' H.G. Güterbock (1985: 124) regards the Hittite as unique logographic writing PA-an (for *walḥan*), restoring Akk. *naṭû* “to hit strike” in (4).

4-4 12' H.G. Güterbock (1985: 124) restores <ZI> as the first sign of (4). Neither Akk. *Sirû* nor *murû* fit the semantic

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
IM-aš pé-e-da-an	“excavation, trench”	lit. “place of mud”
pa-an-[]	-	-
za-aḥ-ḥa-iš	“battle”	“battle”
IGI ^{HIA} -aš iš-tar-n[a]	hapax leg.	“between the eyes”
A.ŠÀ-aš	see note	“field”
iš-tar-ni-ya-[]	-	“middle, center”
du-ug-ga-an-[za]	-	“seen, visible”
a-ni-ya-at-[ta]	-	“vestments”

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
ʿx x xʿ []	-	-
gi-en-zu-[]	-	see note
a-ni-ya-[]	-	-
wa-ar-[]	-	-
lu-ú-[]	-	-
ḥi-in-ku-[wa-ar]	“to submit, bow down”	“to bow down”
MIN-pát	“to submit, bow down”	“also ditto”
ḥa-aš-ša-[aš]	“fireplace, stove”	“fireplace, stove”
MIN-pát	-	“also ditto”
ar-du-mar	-	“to saw”
lam-ni-ya-u-wa-a[r]	-	“to name, call”
ʿxʿ-ʿul-laʿ-a-ʿxʿ	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	-	-
[]	-	-

field given by the Hittite translation.

4-4 15' As one expects a nominative form, Hitt. pl. nom-acc. n. *aniyatta* is the only plausible restoration. The neuter variant of the actual communis stem *aniyatt-* is apparently attested in the plural only.

4-5 2' The most probable restoration in (5) is: Hitt. *genzu-* “lap”, the derivation *genzuwai-* “to be friendly, gentle”, or one of the several verbal compounds based on it.

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		□	<i>ša-la-lu</i>
		□	<i>šu-up-šu-uḫ-ḫu</i>
	5'	□	<i>qú-bu-u-ru</i>
		□	ŠA-ma-AḪ-ḪU
		□	ŠA-ma-AḪ-ḪU
		□	ŠA- ^r x ¹ -AZ-ZU
		[]- ^r x ¹	NI LU UZ ZU
	10'	□	[x]- ^r x ¹ -ZU <i>ma-lu-ú</i>
		□	[x-x]-ZU Ú/É- ^r x ¹ -[x]
		(break)	

Unid Bo. 4-7 = KUB 3,101 (Bo. 3572)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	□	□
		□	□
		□	[]- ^r x ¹
		□	[]-ú
	5'	□	^r x ¹ - ^r x ¹ -KA-ru
		□	<i>ka-ad-ru-ut-tù</i>
		□	UZ-ZU-ú
		□	<i>ḫa-ta-nu</i>
		□	<i>ḫa-ša-bu</i>
	10'	□	<i>šu-u-šu-ul-mu</i>
		□	<i>ša-r[a-k]u</i>

- 4-6 6'f. Akk. ŠA-ma-AḪ-ḪU can either be interpreted as *šamāḫu* “to grow, flourish”, which does yet not match the vertical context, as *samāku* “to cover up, bury”, which is never attested in combination with graves, or in combination with Hebr. *smḥ* “joy”, which would at least correspond to Hitt. *duškara-* in 9'.
- 4-6 8' There are only two Hittite roots with initial *ḫun-*: Hitt. *ḫunḫu-* “flood” and Hitt. *ḫuntariya-* “to fart, grunt”. An Akkadian equivalent to these terms which is in accordance with initial consonant /š/ and final /Z/ is not attested.
- 4-6 9'-11' According to Hitt. *du-uš-ka-*[], which probably derives from the root *dušk-* “to enjoy”, the Akkadian terms must denote something similar. However, there is no root with final /Z/ attested fitting this semantic field, and the Akkadian terms in 10'f. do not seem to be based on the same root as the one in 9'.
- 4-6 9' Initial NI-LU possibly is part of the Sumerian column. Otherwise, the line could be read as *šal-lu*-UZ-ZU with the meaning unclear.
- 4-6 10' The second, partly-broken sign could be <GA> or <BAL>. The sign expected with regard to context is <UZ>.
- 4-7 5' The second sign in (4) very likely is <UŠ>, the first one could be <BU>. A Term Akk. *Puškaru* is however not attested.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	“to lie down, sleep”	-
[]	“to rest, pacify”	-
[]	“grave”	-
[]	see note	-
<i>a[r-]</i>	see note	-
<i>ḫu-un-ʿx¹-[]</i>	-	see note
<i>du-uš-ka-r[a-az]</i>	-	“joy”
KI.MIN <i>šu-u[n-na-aš]</i>	-	“full joy (ditto)”
K[I.MIN]	-	“[] joy (ditto)”

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
<i>ʿḫi eš¹-[]</i>	-	-
<i>pa-at-[]</i>	-	-
<i>an-da-an []</i>	-	“in []”
<i>ḫa-ap-[]</i>	-	-
<i>ḫa-at-[]</i>	-	-
<i>ták-[šu-ul]ʷ</i>	see note	“agreement, peace”
<i>lu-ʿx¹-[]</i>	-	-
<i>ʿx¹-[]</i>	“to protect, shelter”	-
[]	“to break off”	-
[]	“to make befitting / gift”	-
[]	“to present”	-

4-7 6' Akk. *kadrûtu* either is a derivation of Akk. *kadru* “aggressive” or of *kadrû* “present, greeting gift”. According to the vertical context, particularly in regard of the subsequent section, the second interpretation seems to be the more appropriate one, although a derivation with the suffix *-ûtu* is otherwise not attested of this root. This interpretation would also well agree with the Hittite, which could be restored as a derivation of the root *takš-* “to agree with, be friendly” then.

4-7 9' Note that Akk. *ḫaṣābu* does not fit the vertical context, which consists of terms with positive connotation. Possibly, it is a mistake for Akk. *ḫaṣānu* “to take under protection”.

4-7 10'/12' The Akkadian either represents the – otherwise unattested – phrase Akk. *šū šulmu* lit. “he is peace”; or more likely, it renders Akk. *šūsumu*, Š-stem of *wasāmu*, or the derivation *šūsummû*. The dissimilation of /mm/ to /lm/, which in terms of usual Akkadian grammar is unique, rather points to the second interpretation; otherwise the spelling would form a case of hyper-dissimilation, which is not infrequently attested in other texts (No. 130).

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
		𒀭	ʾšū ¹ -u-šū-ʾul ¹ -mu
		𒀭	[š]a-ra-ku
		𒀭	ʾx x x ¹
		(break)	

Unid Bo. 4-8 = KBo. 13,7 (213/s)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	𒀭	[]-ʾx ¹
		𒀭	[]-ʾx ¹ -DU
		𒀭	[x]-ʾx ¹ -mu
		𒀭	[x]-KU
	5'	𒀭	[x-U]Z-ZU
		𒀭	[ar-k]a ₄ -a-tù
		𒀭	[it-ṭù]-u
		𒀭	[]
		(break)	

Unid Bo. 4-9 = KBo. 36,2 (868/v)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	𒀭	[] ʾx x x ¹
		𒀭	[A]Ḫ na ḫu
		𒀭	[] ʾx ¹
		𒀭	[]
	5'	𒀭	[]
		𒀭	[]
		𒀭	[] ʾx ¹
		(break)	

4-8 7' The corresponding term in (2) could be Sum esír.

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	“to make befitting / gift”	-
[]	“to present”	-
[]	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	-	-
[]	-	-
ʾx¹-[]	-	-
ú-ʾx¹-[]	-	-
IŠ-TEN ʾx¹-[]	-	“one []”
ḫar-du-[wa]	“posterity, descendancy”	“descendancy”
ku-up-[ri]	“bitumen”	“bitumen”
ʾx¹-ʾpi¹-[]	-	-

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
ʾx x¹ []	-	-
te-et-[ḫe-eš-šar]	-	“thunder”
BÚN-ʾx¹-[]	-	“thunderstorm, thunder”
kat-t[a]	-	“to [] down”
da-n[i]	-	-
ʾx¹-[]	-	-
[]	-	-

Unid Bo. 4-10 = KUB 3,117 (Bo. 8386)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	□	[]- 'x¹
		□	[A]Z-ZU
		□	[]- 'x¹-DA-BU
		□	[ša-ba]- 'a¹-tù
	5'	□	[]- 'x-nu¹
		□	[]- 'x¹
		(break)	

Unid Bo. 5-1 = KBo. 26,54 (1433/u)

col.	l.	(2) = Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian	translation of the Akkadian
	1'	□	na[m]	-
		□	LUG[AL]	“king” / “kingship”
		□	ri- 'x¹-[]	-
		□	qí-bi-[tu _{1/4}]	“command, speech”
	5'	□	ta-ra-a-[du _{1/4}]	“to send (off)”
		□	UZU-[ru _{1/3}] [?]	“flesh”
		□	me-en-né-eš-tù 'x¹-[]	“weakness”
		□	'x¹-hu-[x]	-
		□	□	-
	10'	□	[]- 'x¹-[x]	-
		□	□	-
		□	[]- 'x¹-[x]	-
		(break)		

5-2 2'-4' Note the hyper-gemination of the final consonants, which is particularly interesting in 4', where there is an additional hyper-dissimilation (Nos. 126/131). This dissimilation thus suggests that the gemination is indeed phonetic (also cf. chapter 10, type.III.2.b.)

(5) = Hittite	translation of the Akkadian	translation of the Hittite
[]	-	-
<i>a-ku</i> []	-	-
ZALÁG.GA ² <i>li y[a]</i>	-	“bright/light []”?
DAB- <i>tar</i>	“to seize”	“to seize”
<i>pa-ra-a n[a²]</i>	-	“to [] forth”
¹ x x ¹ []	-	-

Unid Bo. 5-2 = KUB 3,116 (Bo. 9359)

col.	l.	(2) = Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian	translation of the Akkadian
	1'	[]	[x]- ¹ x ¹ -UK	-
		[]	<i>mì-it-ḫu-uš-šú</i>	“to beat each other”
		[]	<i>ši-it-ku-uš-šú</i>	“to watch each other wildly”?
		[]	<i>ki-it-ru-ub-šú</i>	“to scratch each other”?
	5'	[]	<i>ga₅-me-ru</i>	“strong, perfect”
		[]	<i>ga-ma-a-rù</i>	“to finish, complete”
		[]	NI EŠ ḪA NI EŠ []	-
			(break)	

Unid Bo. 5-3 = KBo. 36,3 (1213/z)

col.	l.	(2) = Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian	translation of the Akkadian
	1'	[]	[]- ¹ x-x ¹	-
		[]	[]-ḫu-ur	-
		[]	[]-ḫu-ru	-
		[]	[]-lil	-
	5'	[]	[]-ḫu-ru	-
		[]	[n]a uḫ ḫu ¹ ra ¹ ¹ x ¹	-
		[]	[] ¹ x ¹ ¹ x ¹	-
			(break)	

Unid Bo. 5-4 = KBo. 26,31 (Bo. 8891)

col.	l.	(2) = Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian	translation of the Akkadian
	1'	[]	[x-m]a-a	-
		[]	še-e-bu	“to be full, replete ^{elder, witness} ”
		[]	šu-ul-mu	“completeness”
		[]	šu-uk-lu-lu	“to fulf
	5'	[]	kam-mu-ú	“plaque, board” / “to bind”
		[]	[x]- ^r x ¹ -lu	-
			(break)	

Unid Bo. 6-1 = KBo. 13,11 (252/t)

col.	l.	(2)/(4) = Sumerian / Akkadian	(5) = Hittite	translation of the Hittite
	1'	[]	[d]a-ni []	-
		[]	[x]- ^r x ¹ -aš	-
		[]	[x-x]-pu-u-wa-u-[]	-
		[]	[g]a-zi	-
	5'	[]	[g]a-zi	-
		[]	[g]a-zi ši-[]	-
		[]	[g]a-zi ú-[]	-
		[]	^r x ¹ -an- <i>ḫu</i> -u-w[a-ar]	-
		[]	[i]š- <i>ḫa</i> -aš-š[ar-wa-tar]	“lordliness”
	10'	[]	[i]š- <i>ḫa</i> -ša[r-wa-tar]	“lordliness”
		[]	[i]š- <i>ḫa</i> -šar-[wa-tar]	“lordliness”
		[]	[i]š- <i>ḫa</i> -šar-w[a-tar]	“lordliness”
		[]	[x x] an []	-
		[]	[x x] ^r x ¹ []	-
			(break)	

5-4 2' According to the following entries, Akk. *še-e-BU* must read *šebû* “to be full/replete”. Either the deviant spelling represents a shift of the plene writing, or it is a substantial confusion between Akk. *šebû* and Akk. *šēpu* “foot” or *šēbu* “old person” (Nos. 114/229).

6-1 3' Possibly read Hitt *ka-ap-pu-wa-u-wa-ar* “to count”.

6-1 8' Possibly read Hitt. *ša-an-ḫu-u-wa-ar* “to look for, strive”.

6-1 9'-12' The most probable equivalents are Akk. *bēlūtu* and *šarrūtu* and respectively, Sum. *nam-en* and *nam-lugal*. Yet, as the other entries can not be identified, it must remain unclear whether the section is really based on Sum. *nam*. If so it may represent the lexical series *Nigga*.

Unid Bo. 5-5 = KBo. 26,13 (Bo. 696)

col.	l.	(2) = Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian	translation of the Akkadian
	1'	[]	<i>ka-ra-[a-bu]</i>	“to pray”
		[]- ^r x ¹	<i>ik-ri-[bu]</i>	“prayer”
		[]- ^r x ¹	[]	-
			(break)	

Unid Bo. 6-2 = KBo. 13,12 (256/t)

col.	l.	(2)/(4) = Sumerian / Akkadian	(5) = Hittite	translation of the Hittite
	1'	[]	[x-x]- ^r x ¹ -ru- ^r x ¹ -[]	-
		[]	[x-x]-wa-la-a[š]	-
		[]	[x]- ^r x ¹ -[x]	-
		[]	[x]- ^r x ¹ -a[š]	-
	5'	[]	[x]- ^r x ¹ -a-a[š]	-
		[]	[x-r]a-an-z[a]	-
		[]	[ka]-ru-uš-ši-ya-w[a-ar]	“to be tacit, quiet”
		[]	[k]a-ru-uš-ši-y[a-wa-ar]	“to be tacit, quiet”
		[]	^r na-ah ¹ -šar-ra-az	“fear”
	10'	[]	[x-x]-ri-ya-[]	-
			(break)	

Unid Bo. 7-1 = KBo. 26,55 (89/p)

col.	l.	(2) = Orthographic Sumerian	(1) = Syllabic Sumerian	(4) = Akkadian
	1'	[]	[]- ^r x ¹	[]
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹	[]
		[]	[i]m	[]
		[]	[i]m-igi-la-al	[]
	5'	[]	[] nu-igi-la-al	[]
		[]	[]-uk	[]
		[]	[]-ki-im	[]
		[]	[]- ^r x ¹	[]
		[]	[]	[]
	10'	[]	[]- ^r x ¹ -al	[]
			(break)	

5-5 1'f. Common Sumerian equivalents to the Akkadian involve: Sum. siskur, siskur, but also Sum. me.

Unid Bo. 8-1 = KUB 3,96 (Bo. 7690)

col.	l.	(y) = unclear language	(y) = unclear language
	1'	[]	ʽx xʽ []
		[]	A-L[A]
		[]	A-L[A]
		[]-MA	A-LA-K[I]
	5'	[]	ZI-[]
		[]	HU-U-[]
			(break)

Unid Bo. 8-2 = KBo. 13,4 (115/u)

col.	1.	(y) = unclear language	(y) = unclear language
	1'		[x]-ʽxʽ
		I LU-TUM	[L]U-ZU ú-[]
			aš ši n[e]
			ʽli kiʽ xʽ []
	5'		ʽxʽ
			[]
		I ʽxʽ []	[]
			(break)

