

AULA ORIENTALIS

Revista de estudios del Próximo Oriente Antiguo

VOLUMEN VII



EDITORIAL AUSA

Apdo. 101 - 08280 SABADELL - BARCELONA

The Texts from Meskene-Emar

M. Civil – Chicago

[This is a review article of a remarkable publication: D. Arnaud. *Recherches au pays d'Aštata. Emar VI/1-4* (Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations "Synthèse" nos. 18, 28), Paris 1985-87, 21 × 29,5, pp. 756 + 494 + 400. The article consists of two parts: the first is a conventional book review, the second a sort of guide to the many lexical texts published in these volumes.]

In 1971 a team of l'Institut Français d'Études Arabes unexpectedly found a cuneiform tablet while excavating the medieval town of Balis built on the tell of Meskene, the ancient Emar, some 90 km East of Aleppo, on the Euphrates. See, provisionally, D. Beyer, ed., *Meskene-Emar: Dix ans de travaux 1972-82*, Paris 1982. The find attracted cuneiformists and archeologists alike and resulted in five successive seasons of excavations. In all of them tablets were found, the 1974 season being extremely productive. About 1,900 tablets and fragments were recovered by the excavators, not counting Hittite and Hurrian texts (for which see E. Laroche in Beyer, *op. cit.*, 53ff.) and a large number of pieces stolen from the site which have since found their way into the antiques trade. The four volumes published by D. Arnaud provide copies, transliterations, and translations of all the texts found in the official excavations.

This text discovery is no doubt one of the more significant of the century. The legal and administrative documents open new views into the political and social history of Northwest Syria, expanding and complementing the world revealed by the Ugarit and Alalakh finds. The literary and lexical tablets represent a poorly known stage in the history of cuneiform texts. The literary link between the late Old Babylonian period (end of the XVIIth century B.C.) and the Assurbanipal library (VIIth century B.C.) and the Neo-Babylonian renaissance is almost completely missing. Only the library of Tiglath-pileser I (end of the XIIth century) inadequately fills this gap. This is the more regrettable since it is during these times that the "canonization" of the literary and lexical series, namely their textual standardization and beginning of their exclusively written transmission, took place. The Emar texts, like those from Ugarit, represent the late Old Babylonian tradition, witness the names of rivers and canals in the geographic lists — with the names of water courses of the Babylon-Sippar area — or the ichthyological nomenclature — with fish names of South Mesopotamian species — clearly out of place in the Northwest. This Babylonian tradition expanded to the peripheral areas not only to the Northwest but also in the opposite direction (Nuzi). Despite a low level of scribal ability and a strong substratum influence, these tablets are thus extremely important for the history of cuneiform literature.

Remarkable as these texts are, more remarkable is the way in which they have been published. Little more than a decade after their discovery, they reach the scholarly world in a very complete publication due to the single-handed efforts of D. Arnaud. His copies fill the first two volumes. To evaluate the extent of his effort, consider that his 756 pages of copies, if published in the format of the traditional Cuneiform Texts from the British Museum, would fill between eight and ten volumes. In addition to the copies, Arnaud has given us a transliteration and translation of the legal and administrative texts (volume 3), and of all the lexical, omen, calendar, divination, and literary texts (volume 4). The amount of work and the competence with which he deals with texts as diverse as *iqqur ipuš*, sale documents, and vocabularies, is nothing short of astounding. The reviewer will attempt to give a more detailed view — within the limits of this article — of the richness of this work. Volume 3 gives the transliterations and translations of legal and administrative texts (536 numbers), arranged by find spots. The texts include real estate transfers (of vineyards, orchards, houses, and a type of building called *kiršitu*), slave sales, marriage contracts, wills, inventories, letters, and royal acts. Absolutely unique is a document in which a couple gives its four children in servitude (*ana ardūti*) and have one foot of each child stamped on separate clay tablets. Of these four tablets, three have been recovered (vol. 2 pp. 670, 748, and 749; vol. 3 nos. 217-20). It would be interesting to see a photo of them since it is not clear whether it is a simple tracing, an impression, or both. The texts dealing with cultic matters form another important category: priest lists, offerings, local monthly rituals and festivals, etc. The contribution of these new texts to local history, geography, institutions, etc. is considerable. Note, for instance, the information about the tablet baskets (no. 100:16f.), and the wooden tablets (*li'um*, nos. 285, 290, 305) and their scribes (DUB.SAR.GIŠ, e.g., no. 261). Volume 4 has the lexical texts (which constitute more than one fourth of the total publication numbers), divination (including almanacs, menologies, astrology, hepatoscopy with a couple of liver models, *šumma izbu*, medicine, etc.), incantations, a few fragments of rituals in Sumerian considered by the author to have a Mesopotamian origin (in contrast to the local or "Anatolian" ones published in vol. 3), and strictly literary texts in Sumerian (see below) and in Akkadian (fragments of tablets IV and VI of Gilgameš, important portions of the "Contest between the Date Palm and the Tamarisk", and a wisdom text).

The remarks of the reviewer will be confined to general matters and to those portions of the corpus containing texts with which he is better acquainted: Sumerian or bilingual texts, and lexical tablets. The latter are treated separately in the second part of this article.

Volumes 1-2. The copies are arranged according to excavation numbers, with some exceptions. A minimal index of excavation numbers, at the beginning of vol. 1, allows the reader to find the ones out of order, sometimes encased by dividing lines on the plates. One text (p. 564) is published only in photo. The copies are in general excellent. The author provides no information about his copying methods, but the inspection of the copies suggests that they have been made, at least initially, from photos. In such a huge amount of material one naturally will find here and there an imprecise, ambiguously copied, or malformed sign; the ambiguity is no doubt, in most cases, imputable to the native scribe but it is possible to find here and there a lapsus of the modern copyist. For instance, 731055 (p. 131) i 8, undecipherable in the copy, is to be read *na-bal-ka-tum* with the *-tum* overflowing into the right column (collated on photo). In some cases, shading seems to have been left out, e.g., in lines 8ff. of the last column of 74121 (p. 296). The copies are not all at the same scale (see vol. 1 p. 7, footnote). This creates some problems when a reader tries to verify joins; more about this later.

Volume 3. It is not clear why the author makes no distinction in his translations between GIŠ.KIRI₆.GEŠTIN and GIŠ.KIRI₆.NUMUN, both translated 'verger'. The reader would like to know whether the local practice excludes a translation 'vigne' for the first. Why is *kunīnu* translated 'chalumeau' (p. 59)? No. 157:3 a width of 1 1/2 cubits for a house is most unlikely; the copy has 10 1/2.

Volume 4. For nos. 537-603, see the second part of this review.

No. 604 lists the colophons, mostly from lexical tablets. In colophon no. 7.1, šèr-šèr is not simply 'un matériel de bronze', but specifically 'chains'; thus one must translate 'I wrote this tablet when I was in chains at the time of [...]' (suggestion of my colleague E. Reiner). Ribī-Dagan must have been jailed during one of the civil strifes (e.g., no. 263, end) or as a result of personal circumstances. If the proposed restoration of Izi (see second part, Izi and Lu II) is correct, the sequence of fragments from left to right, looking at the colophon, is 74233j + 74122i + 74105b. As a consequence, colophons 15 and 16 are the same and the restoration is different from the one proposed by the author. The reviewer is not sure of the result without checking the originals. As a consequence of the join 74126a + 7498f in "Tablet 2" of Hh V-VII (see discussion in second part) a colophon of Sin-qarrad can be restored; it reads: ŠU ^md30-[U]R.SAG LÚ DUB.SAR LÚ HAL.HAL.

No. 767. This is a text, known from Ugarit (Nougayrol *Ugaritica* 5 nos. 164-66) — as already recognized by Arnaud — which goes back to an OB original (see Civil, *RA* 63 [1967] 179) in CT 44 18. The nature of this latter tablet is now more clear thanks to the discovery of two identical tablets CBS 1208 (Civil [1977], unpubl.) and BM 80091 (Alster, *ASJ* 8 [1986] 1ff.). CBS 1377 is a Nippur ancestor with the end of this text in a different literary context. Except for the latter, all three OB tablets have identical contents: a collection of short compositions or paragraphs of which no. 767 parallels the last one. Interestingly enough, the beginning of the tablet contains a series of blessings for the king. No. 775 (Bénédiction sur le roi) if it is not one of these prayers — it is not duplicated in the OB tablets but there are large gaps on them — is at least inspired by them; CBS 1208 i 14ff. has a paragraph starting ti-la lugal-mu, exactly like no. 775. Join to no. 767 the tiny fragment 74159n with the beginning of lines 6-7 and 20-22. Source B is very similar but in the reviewer's opinion does not belong here: ki-iš-tu (= geštu!, not ki-būru) ... nu-mu-un-zu-wa-^ra'. In line 1, central column, read i]k-ki-ik-ki ki-iš (one ki missing in edition); in line 6' read šu ^rx' da-ri-ke-e-ne, and in 13' a translation "Angeštug" is misleading, ^dgiš-... and ^mdKi-iš-mas-su (i.e. Gilgameš) seems preferable.

Nos. 768-69. These are meager remains of a Mesopotamian composition not better preserved on the back of a LB exercise tablet (W. G. Lambert, *BWL* 221, quoted by Arnaud). "Trilingue" is not the proper term for the tablet since subcolumns one and two (syllabic) are both Sumerian. Perhaps fragment 74238t belongs to this composition.

No. 770. In line 5', n]am-da-e-ni stands for nam-tag-ni = ar-^rni-šū. In line 13' in-ta ba-an-ki = an-ta ba-an-gi₄ (an-ta--gi₄ = mahāru), showing how the "standard" Sumerian in Emar is riddled with syllabic spellings. Another example, among many others, would be būru = buru₄ or buru₅? in no. 768: 7.

Nos. 771-74, 592. The first, bilingual, part is an adaptation of an OB tale studied by the reviewer in *AJO* 25 (1974-77) 65ff. All fragments are part of the same tablet. The beginning of the text is found in no. 773 = lines 1, 4-6 of the OB version (the first line of 773 seems to be an overrun from the reverse); note mu-tal for OB mu-zal. No. 592 seems to be the Akkadian of these first lines, see end of the second part of this review. There is a gap until the lower part of the obverse represented by 74174a which has lines 23-25, and 19. No. 774 has the Akkadian of lines 23-24 (= 9' of the Emar text): [a-b]a-ām [mu-zu] [...] šu!-um-ka ... The reverse has lines 21 and 20 of OB, six interpolated lines, and ends with lines 7-9 of OB, the latter in the "Akkadian" subcolumn. In line 26' read e!-na (= en-na) instead of x-na. Line 28' nu-na-an-gub na-an-gub gir!-mu ub-bé corresponds to nam-mu-un-gub-bé-en gir-mu u₄ táb-táb in OB. This gives a measure of the inexperience of the Emar scribes in matters Sumerian. Add to this the alteration of the sequence of lines which renders the text ununderstandable. A similar disruption of lines sequence can be seen in no. 767.

No. 778. The title "Sagesse syrienne" is a misnomer. The Old Babylonian tablet catalogue published by M. Cohen in *RA* 70 (1976) 131 lists in line 15 a tablet incipit [še-me]-e mi-il-kam which must be this composition. Even if no fragments have so far been found in the South, this composition too comes from Babylonia.

The low level of comprehension evidenced in these literary texts is present in the lexical material too. Words, especially technical ones, are distorted beyond recognition, for instance, *kinšibbu* for *agadibbu* (Hh V-VII 127') or *iskillu* for *isqarrurtu* (Hh V-VII 354'). This happens also with Sumerian readings, like *du-uṭ-ṭu* for an expected *li-id-da* or *li-id-ga* (Hh V-VII 274'). There are cases of determinative inversion like *ku-ri-né-eš* for **geškur* or *lu-uk-ki-iš* for *giš.illag*. As in late OB Sippar and elsewhere, Sum. *ḡ* is often written *n* or *k* in Emar. Morphological, presumably dialectal, variations are frequent, e.g., the use of the prefix *mi-*, instead of *ma-* and *mu-*, seen in *miskiliti* for *mašqalitti* (Hh V-VII 266'), *mišlitu* for *mašlatu* (Hh V-VII 445'), *mitallikati* for *muttallikat* (Hh V-VII 431'), etc. There is a tendency toward metathesis: *nusqu* for *nukuššū* (Hh V-VII 222') *tiḡqīnu* for *tiḡmēnu* (Sⁿ Voc. 306). While some of these facts should be attributed to scribal inexperience, others must be attributed to substratum influence. The inadequacy of the traditional Mesopotamian lexical lists to reflect the current language of the area is shown by the presence of glosses that accompany some of the entries (around forty in total). Some of them are merely explanatory, e.g., *SAL šī-ib-tu*, clarifying *puršumtu* (Lu 380'), others are expected, e.g., *ar-wu=ajalu* (Hh XIV 55'), but others are completely new like *šī-ir-ha-du* explaining *epinnu* (Hh V-VII 120', revised) or *e-la-ra-mu* explaining *mēdelu* (Hh V-VII 225'). The study of these glosses, coupled with an analysis of exotic words in legal and administrative texts, will throw much needed light on the linguistic conditions of the area. It will be very interesting to see how far back, i.e. to Mari and even to Ebla, these dialectal peculiarities go. Tantalizing links seem to exist with Ebla. The local word for plow, *šerhatu*, just cited, explains the until now enigmatic ⁶⁵apin = *su-ha-tum* (MEE 4 248 no. 435) which has to be phonemicized /*šurhatum*/ (perhaps related to *šer'hu* 'furrow'; cf. still *šerhānu*?). In Hh V-VII 345', *aga = gur-di-mu!* 'ax' is virtually identical to ⁶⁵aga (GÍN) = *gur!-du-mu-um* in MEE 4 253 no. 477 (collation Krebernik, *ZA* 72 [1982] 231). At this point a rather depressing thought comes to mind. Was the level of understanding of the Ebla scribes as low as the one exhibited one millennium later by those from Emar, Ugarit, or Boghazköy? Did they try to solve in similar ways similar problems in dealing with a language and a script in a large measure foreign to them? What are the chances of accurately recovering a pre-Old Akkadian dialect thus disguised?

The volumes are well organized, except for the dispersion of fragments in vols. 1 and 2, and the sorely needed indices. Misprints are few and so are mistransliterations, although some of them, such as *gūr* for *gúr* (GAM), tend to occur repeatedly.

In conclusion, we have here a most valuable collection of texts in an admirable publication. To D. Arnaud goes not only the gratitude of his colleagues but also their admiration for his titanic efforts. He has announced several volumes of commentaries — including the much needed indices — and a supplementary volume of dispersed texts. We are all eagerly waiting.

* * *

Although only 66 out of 793 numbers in vols. 3 and 4 are lexical, at least one-fourth of the pieces copied in vols. 1 and 2 have lexical contents. This disparity illustrates not only the existence of duplicates but also, and above all, the extremely fragmentary condition of the lexical tablets. Many of them are large three or four-column tablets broken in twenty or more fragments. Their reconstruction implies an incredibly long and tedious process, complicated by the dispersion of fragments and the scale variations in the copies. Arnaud's efforts make the bulk of lexical material accessible to the reader in a form that must be considered generally correct and extremely useful, but nevertheless provisory. Many joins remain to be made and the parallelism with the available Boghazköy and Ugarit material — compare, for instance, no. 553 with the edition in *MSL* 10 37ff. — has not been fully exploited. It must be stressed that these limitations are in no way due to lack of competence on the part of the editor but to a practical, if not uncontroversial, choice. A complete, state of the art reconstruction would have required such a protracted effort that the publication of the Emar texts would have been delayed for years. As soon as the Emar

copies became available in 1986, and without waiting for the transliteration volumes, the reviewer, with the able assistance of Dr. Gertrud Farber, proceeded to a complete reconstruction of the Emar lexical tablets within the MSL project. A complete presentation of the reconstructed lists is out of the question within the limits of the present article. The following pages only underline some of the differences between the MSL reconstructions and the ones in the Emar volumes and should be considered as some sort of guide for the reader interested in the optimal use of the admirable resources that Arnaud has put at the disposal of Assyriologists. The reader must keep in mind that the proposed tablet reconstructions are the result of "paper and scissors" joins, with no benefit of direct examination of the sources, and should therefore be construed as temporary suggestions. Some texts, HAR-ra V-VII for instance, are presented in a rather detailed –though not exhaustive– way; for others only general hints are given.

Vocabulary S^a [nos. 537-38]. This almost complete text of a typically MB syllabary –very imperfectly known until now from Boghazköy and Assur sources, see MSL 3 49ff. –is possibly the most important contribution of Emar to Mesopotamian lexicography. The only broken signs are 22, 97-105, 116-33, and 142-47 (sign numbers according to the MSL 3 edition). The sign sequence is relatively stable but the contents of the sections can vary considerably not only in relation to the Assur and Boghazköy versions but also within Emar; compare, for instance, the section HAR in sources A and C, or the section IGI in sources A and F. There are interpolations, e.g., 149-51, 435'-37', and 500'-02'. Most lexical tablets from the Northwest teem with scribal mistakes, but source C is unusually full of them; see, for instance, col. ii 2ff.: *ma-[ša]-lum* (for NA or NU = ?), *na-me-lu* (doublet of line 5?), *na-pa- <<ta>> -šu*, *na-mi-lu*, *na-i-lu* (= *a-mi-lu*, *i-lu*, in these two entries the scribe has repeated the sign NA at the beginning of the translation subcolumn), *la-bi-nu-ú*, *la-bi-in-tum* (perhaps two unsuccessful attempts to render the relatively infrequent term *suppinmu*).

There are only three tablets with the complete vocabulary: 1) A + E + G + G' + H + I, 2) C (+) D (the latter the upper right corner), and 3) F; there is in addition one tablet (B) which has only the first half of the vocabulary (signs 1-53). The rest are insignificant fragments which probably join one or another of the main tablets. The joins allow a number of textual improvements, only some of the more interesting ones are mentioned here. In lines 152ff., the joined text of A+ (more compact than the one of C and F) gives:

NUMUN	[ze]-rù
ZU	[/ /]
	(five broken lines with ZA (?), SU, NU)
[NA]	<i>na-pa-šu</i>
[NA]	<i>AN.li</i>
[NA]	<i>la-a</i>
[BA]	<i>šu-ú</i>
[BA]	<i>su-pi-in-nu</i>
[ZI]	<i>na-pu-ul-tu₄</i>
	etc.

A comparison with the homologous sections in C and F illustrates the enormous difficulties in attempting to provide a single text edition. The disagreements between sources are often hard to detect in the editor's reconstruction. There seems to be no other way out than a parallel edition of individual sources. Note, for instance, that the fact that F has no less than seven entries with BA is not indicated. Line 164 should be eliminated. Another example of the usefulness of joining the fragments before editing the text is provided by the section BE and its continuation in A+. This tablet inserts the section IDIM

right after BE, against source C and the canonical version which have IDIM separately after EZEN. The text of A+ at the bottom of col. vi and beginning of vii gives:

	BAD	<i>be-lu</i>	
uš	BAD	<i>mu-ú-tu₄</i>	
MIN	BAD	<i>mu-ta-a-nu</i>	
[BAD]	[]
[BAD]	[]
ti-i[l	BAD]	[]
MIN	[BAD]	[]
šu-um	[BAD]	[]
ba-ad	[BAD]	[]
i-dim	[IDIM]	[]
(five broken lines)			
	TUR	[]
	TUR	[]
	UGU	[]
	UN	[]
	UN	<i>[m]a-a-tu₄</i>	
	GÚ	<i>ki-ša-du</i>	
	GÚ+	<i>ši-mi-it-tu₄</i>	
	[IG ₅]	<i>da-am-qu</i>	
gur	[SIG ₅]	<i>pi-qi-it-tu₄</i>	
[TE]	<i>uš-šu</i>	
[KAR]	<i>[l]a-sa-a-mu</i>	
ka-ak- ⁶ x ⁷	[KAR.KID]	<i>[h]a-ri-im-tu₄</i>	
[BAL]	<i>[p]i-la-aq-qu</i>	
[BAL]	<i>[n]a-bal-ku-tu₄</i>	
[ŠUL]	<i>[e]t-lu₄</i>	
[ŠÁH]	<i>[še]-e-hu-u</i>	
[ŠUBUR]	<i>[^up]ap-sukkal</i>	
[LÚ]	<i>[a]-mi-lu</i>	
[LÚ]	<i>[be]-lu</i>	
[LU(GAL)]	<i>[šar]-ru</i>	
te-em-ma	DIM	<i>[di-im(?)]-tu₄ (C:]⁷x⁷ da-ma-tu₄)</i>	

Note that A+ has only SIG₅ while C has only SIG; no text has both, against the canonical recension. Examples of other improvements after joining fragments: in line 306 A+ reads te NE = *ti-im-[g]i-nu* (metathesis for *tiqmēnu*) and in line 444' the sign is not TAB anymore, but LU[H = *me-s]u-u*.

Miscellaneous remarks. Line 48: Arnaud is right in assuming that *še-ra šel-ru-u* of L belongs here; the reading is followed by the sign name; the sign before *-ru-* is the separation mark followed by: *še-*, rather than ŠE alone. Line 89: the fragment 74199a gives the reading te for RI. Lines 99'ff.: *i-ú* is the sign name of NI. Line 131: F apparently has *il-úr*. Line 132f.: the sign name probably has to be read *i-[ki-i]š-pa-da-ku*

(< *igi-šub-ba-ku*); the same form is attested in Diri Boghazköy. Line 419': note that from independent evidence in S^a 156, as edited in MSL 3, DUGUD has to be corrected to GIG. Line 441': all evidence (see fragments 74123g and 74127p) confirms that the sign is DIB (LU), despite the traces on the tablet. Line 468': *ga-ir-ra* is a misunderstanding of the sign name (*sa*) *giddu* of SA; in 461' one should perhaps read [*lu-k*]*ju-tu*, for (*sa*) *lguddu*, sign name of DI. Line 619': *te = me-nu* is the sign name. Line 710': KBo 13 3 has *še = i-ú*, see remark to Hh II 92ff.

Diri [540, 554 (text D), 562, 599, 600]. Only fragments of this major series have been found in Emar. 1) Signs ZUR-ZUR and KU₇-KU₇: 74152b. 2) KAS₄-KAS₄ and BÚR-BÚR: 74198d. 3) IGI-IGI and IGI-compounds: 74146a, 74199i + 74198z + 74238r. 4) GIŠ-section: 72254c + 74160a, 74128 c, 75165e, 74128k. 5) Proverb: 74107g. The text will be edited, together with all known Diri texts, in MSL XV where further details, including other small possible fragments, will be given.

HAR-ra I [541]. Almost complete Sumerian text with some bilingual sections. Add 74117c = 77ff. There are several possible joins which will not be discussed here.

HAR-ra II [542, 602 (Annexe V)]. The situation is similar to HAR-ra I. Add 74101x = 212'ff., and 74232q whose last line = 121'; in 120' read in-da-[ag-da-ag], syllabic for in-UD-UD. The fragment 74232d, published at the end of no. 602, probably corresponds to lines 75'ff. Lines 92'ff., among others, provide further evidence for the elusive name for 'barley' in Akkadian, not the commonly accepted *še'u* but something like *'ujum* in OB, first discussed by the reviewer in OrAn 21 (1982) 15.

HAR-ra III [543], *IV* [544], and part of *V* [545]. The lexical entries with GIŠ are divided in Emar, as well as in Ugarit, mostly in two tablets. The first has Hh III, most of IV, and the sections *gigir* and *mar-gíd-da* from V. The second, a few items from IV, most of V (with the exception of wagons and chariots), and VI-VII. KBo 26 5 + 6 is also an instance of a combined text of III + IV. The editor has segmented the texts according to canonical HAR-ra, but it makes more sense to examine the texts following the bipartite tablet arrangement. The first GIŠ-section is preserved in a large unilingual tablet (731030) which ends curiously enough with an incantation (published by Arnaud as no. 737, a duplicate of Köcher, BAM 6 574, [pointed out by W. Farber]) filling the remaining space. There is a bilingual fragment with the ^{sis}nimbar section (7480a), and a large fragment combining III and IV (74163b), but 731048 had only IV and vehicles. The tablet 74163b has at times rather cursive signs and the transliteration of III 212'ff. can be improved from parallels:

- 212' ^{sis}i-ri₉-na
- 213' ^{sis}a-i-ri₉-(an)-na
- 214' ^{sis}gú-gilim-an-na
- 215' ^{sis}gú-gilim-ba-ab
- 216' ^{sis}ú-gá-lá (metathesis for ú-luh-ha)
- 217' ^{sis}úr-gibil
- 218' ^{sis}pa-ku₅'

With 218' end the entries from Hh III. I cannot identify the first sign in 219', read *lú* by Arnaud, but the line should somehow correspond to ^{sis}suk-lum (= IV 1) and 220' is probably ^{sis}[i-um].

HAR-ra V-VII [545]. The text of this tablet is preserved in bilingual form in almost its entirety. It restores several entries broken or absent in the canonical version. The 44 fragments (after eliminating A and B which belong to the first GIŠ-tablet) can be reduced to a limited number of sources, even after adding a few pieces not included in the edition. There are two large tablets almost completely restorable and with a practically identical text: Tablet 1 = D + V + AA + AB + AC + 74117d + 74232b, and Tablet 2 =

C + E + F + G + H + J + K + L + N + O + P + Q + T + W + X + Y + Z + AD + AE + AF + AG + AH + AJ + AK + AL + AM + AN + AP + AT + 74234o + 74123h + 74197h + 74238i (see fig. 1). There are fragments of a third one: U + AR + 7498j. Their three colophons are preserved. In addition there is a fragment from a unilingual multi-column tablet (AO) and four one-column exercise tablets (I, R, M + S + 74178e, and AQ). For 7481c, which perhaps could be part of AQ, see remarks to lines 504'ff.

The editor's reconstruction is partly unsuccessful because, following too closely the late canonical recension, it misplaces the ⁶³ig-section. As can be seen from fig. 1 and fig. 2, the tablet starts with the ⁶³ig-section which fills most of col. i and thus lines 202'-52' of the edition are to be placed before line 60' (lines 1-59' of course do not belong to the second GIŠ-tablet). With the door-section in its proper place and with the help of the joins, practically all gaps in the edition can be bridged. The following discussion keeps, for convenience, the editor's line numbering.

Lines 194'ff. (in fact i 4ff.) are completed by the join G + C:

194'	ig-dib-ba	<i>te-eb-bi</i>
195'	ig-dib-dib-ba	<i>ta-am-hi-ši</i>
196'	ig-li-u ₅ -um	<i>le-i</i>

The gap after 201' remains problematical and it is possible that tablets 1 and 2 differed at this point.

222'ff. The leftmost column of D gives the Akkadian of these lines:

222'	[]-ig	[]-at-ti
223'	[nu-kúš-a]n-ta	<i>[e-l]u-um</i>
224'	[nu-kúš-ki-t]a	<i>[šap]-lu-um</i>
225'	[]	<i>me-de-lu] :]-la-ra-ma (1) e-la-ra-mu (2)</i>

Line 225' should be identical to 226', with an unidentified logogram for *mēdelu*; read perhaps ŠU.D[!]. EŠ or ŠU.<DI>.E[Š] (from AC).

Line 252' is followed by 60', after a one-line gap (loom-section):

252'	TAK.TÚG-bar-sig	<i>[š]a ma (so copy)-ar-si-ik-ki (1) ša ma-HAR-ni (2)</i>
253'	[TAK.TÚG-sal-la]	[]
60'	[TAK.TÚG.síg/kin-bar-ra]	[]-x ² -ú
61'	[TAK.TÚG.šu-kam-ma	<i>ša me-ri]-il-ti</i>
92'	[TAK.TÚG-é-pa-na]	<i>da-pa-na</i>

Lines 114'ff. The Akkadian is restored by the right column of H, 117'ff. are identical to 122'ff., and there is no gap:

114'	é-[rín]	<i>ku-uk-ku (2) [] MIN (1)</i>
115'	á-[rín]	<i>i-ta</i>
116'	x-[rín]	<i>GIŠ.DILIM qa-ab-li-ti</i>
122'	[]-x ²	<i>ta-ab-ku (1) ta-ab-bu-uk-ku (2)</i>
123'	[na]-ba-rum	<i>MIN</i>
124'	[x na]-ba-rum	<i>MIN</i>
125'	^{a-bi-[un]} api[n]	<i>e-p-[i-nu]: ši-ir-ha-du (2) []-x (copy UN)-nu (1)</i>
126'	ap[in-šu]	<i>e-p[ī-in q]a-ti</i>
127'	[apin]-šu	<i>ki-in-ši-ib-bu</i>

Lines 189'ff. Line 190' is identical to 258' and there is no gap:

189'	ù-šub [(a)-a]b-ba	<i>na-[al-ba]-ti</i>
190'	bar-d[u-a]b-ba	<i>bar-dù [(x)] ap-ti</i>
259'	kak-sum-[(ba)]-lá	<i>KAK nap-[pé-e]</i>

Lines 280'ff. Line 280' seems identical to 282' or, at the most, there is one line missing to account for the first sila in AS.

Lines 318'ff. AM is to be placed here, as suggested by Arnaud; with it and with the parallels discussed in *RA* 81 (1987) 187 the gap can be restored as follows:

318a'	šu-nir	^c x-x ² -[]
318b'	igi-kal	[šaddu]
318c'	^c igi ² -[kal-bàd]	[šaddu dūri]
319'	giš u ₄ -sa[kar]	[šinu]
320'	kak-u ₄ -sakar	si!-[kat MIN]

Lines 355'ff. 355' is immediately followed by 356'; no gap.

Lines 380'ff. 380'f. are identical to 382'f. ("da" is balag); no gap.

Lines 410'ff. The join M + S + 74178c gives now:

410'	bún- ^c x ² -[(x)]	[(:)]-la-hu (2)
	gú-uh?-dé	^c x ² -[] (M+)
411'	ha-sur	[m]u ² -pa-ri-ku [()]
412'	< ni-gub	ni-ka-ku-up-pu
413'	níg-zaba[r-gub]	GIS za-bar-gub-[(2)]- ^c bar ² -gu-bu (1)
414'	kak-ù-[zu-lá] (M+)	na-as-ru uzu [(1)
415'	uzu-[lá]	na-as-ru
416'	kak-uzu-[lá]	KAK na-as-ri
417'	túg/éš-lá	hal-ma-ad-ru
418'	kak-túg-lá	KAK hal-ma-ad-ri
419'	ši-ši-ig	ši-in-ni-tu ₄ (ši-ši-ig = sig-sig)
420'	sig-sig-é-pa-na	da-pa-na

Lines 448'ff. AT belongs here:

448'	^l éš[hé]-da	hi-it-tu-u
449'	^g š-hé-da-[ká-na]	[MIN š]a ba-bi
449a'	^g šgàr-[ba]	[]
449b'	kak-gàr-[ba]	[]
449c'	gú-gàr-[ba]	[]
449d'	^{tu-ku} [KU]	[ka-ak-ku]
449e'	MIN [šu]	[]
450'	MIN [ùr-ra]	[]

Lines 475'ff. There is no gap, line 477' = 478':

475'	z[é-na]	[kal-ba-na-tu]
476'	z[é-na-mah]	[]
477'	z[é-na]-ak?	ka-[l-ba-na-tu]

Lines 500'ff. There is no gap, line 500' = 502':

500'	ku-ri KUR	ki-iš-ki-bi-ir-ru
------	-----------	-------------------

Perhaps 7481c corresponds to 504'ff., with the unexpected reading bu-ri for URI, cf. wa-ar-im URI Proto-Ea 145; the fragment would read:

504'	^c ge-eš ² -[kal-la...
505'	KAL! <u>naš-[-...</u>

508' bu-ri [URI...

etc.

If this is correct, perhaps 7481c joins AQ.

Lines 545'ff. The pieces 74232b (p. 88 sub Hh X) and 74123h belong here:

545'	di[m-ma	
546'	dīm-ma mar-[šum	
547'	dīm-ma KU [
548'	dīm-ma-n[u-ti-la	
<hr/>		
549'	gá-an-nu	<i>ˁkanˁ-[nu]</i>
549a'	gá-an-nu-ga	<i>ša [ši-iz-bi]</i>
549b'	gá-an-nu-kaš	<i>ša ši-[ka-ri]</i>
549c'	gá-an-nu-i	<i>ša ša-[am-mi]</i>
550'	gá-an-nu-tur	<i>ki-id-[du-ru-u]</i>
<hr/>		
551'	[dub-bu-u]m	<i>tup-[]</i>
552'	[dub-nun-n]a	<i>tup-ˁxˁ-[]</i> (<i>tupninnu</i> expected)
553'	[dub-šen]-na	<i>tup-še-[nu]</i>
<hr/>		
554'	[ŠI]D	<i>GIŠ mi-nu-tu₄</i> (AR probably]-n ₄ -tu ₄)
555'	[ŠID-an]-ti-ib-lá-nigin	<i>mu-ša-bi-[bu](?)</i>

Lines 572'ff. From the join of 74123h + 74197h + 74238i:

572a'	[(giš)-é-4]	<i>É er-bé-et-ta</i>
572b'	[gurun]	<i>[i]n-bu</i>
572c'	[gurun]	<i>[il-]u-ur-ru</i>
572d'	[gurun]	<i>[ha-an-ni-bu]</i>
573'	[za-u ₁₈ -ša]	<i>sa-ba-[bu]</i> (<i>sa-ab-[]</i> expected)
574'	ar-ga-bi-nu	<i>[]-nu</i>

Perhaps the]-nu in 7498f is really the last sign of the Sumerian entry and there is no translation.

Minor remarks and comments. These tablets, like many similar lexical tablets from the Northwest, write the determinative only at the beginning and end of the column, and thus the presence or absence of the determinative is of no significance. For AK read 294'-97' instead of 289'-92' in p. 66. Lines 222'ff.: kúš instead of kùš. 250': there are traces of a sign before *eb*. 66': ˁdaˁ-pa-na. 85': read ga-ZUM-ki/sig-bar (tablet AN)-ra. 99'ff.: gúr, not gūr. 100': gúr ma-an-sim *MIN ni-pí-ti*, for *nappītu* 'sieve'; similar confusion with *nāpatu* in MSL 6 59: 100. 106': there is no need to emend the iš to e; read probably <ki>-iš-ri (the correct standard form is giš-rín). 113': probably [rín-GI]Š-ba-na. 181': zu₅ is NINDÁxNUN, the sign on the tablet is KA_xUD, the logogram for 'tooth' used in Boghazköy, etc. 262'ff.: the join of 74177d to tablet 1 gives the translations: [-p]u, [u]h-pu, [x]-uh-pu; note that this section reappears in 467'ff. with the normal translations. 311': the sign is a clear ellag(BIR) rather than du₁₀.kan. 345': read *gur-di-mu* and *[a- gi]-sí-li-kum!*; the last signs of these two entries are visible on the edge of A in the copy in vol. 2 p. 511, the -tu₄ in AN needs collation (it is probably -kum). 371': read *[š]a mar-ri*. 394': har-har is expected; confusion of *harharru*, a musical instrument, with *huhāru* 'bird trap'. 405': *ki* better than *di*, see *NABU* 1987 no.48. 412'-18': these lines are an interpolation in the musical instruments section. 439': tablet 2 has *kal-*. 453'ff.: the signs before MIN are an overrun from the column at left. 465': tablet 2 has -me, not -meš in the Sumerian. 469': *[di]-lu-tu*; the Sumerian entry is extremely curious; cf. lines 262'ff. 471': the gloss may belong to the preceding line. 491': read bür instead of GAM; the sign U is occasionally written with two Winkelhaken in OB tablets and this is the form that survives here. 498': note the determinative inversion ku-ri-né-eš for ne-eš-ku-ri. 510'f.: []-ˁxˁ-GAR *qi-[lu-tu]*, (giš) ki-NE-[] *qi-[lu-tu]*. 515': *ša mar-ta-'ú*. 519': read nam-gaz-nig-bür-bür-re; *ša GIŠ!PAN* seems to belong to the end of the preceding line, after *i-da-nu*. 532': no need for an exclamation point after rab; RAB and LUGAL are the same sign in the cuneiform script of most periods. Annexe II = 410'ff., III = 448'ff., and IV = 194'-96'.

HAR-ra VIII-IX [546, 580, 585]. Only about 40% of the entries of the entire tablet are preserved in Emar. The sources probably belong to three large tablets at the most (A = A + I + K + 7491o (+) M + 7487c, etc.). There seems to be an unilingual fragment with syllabic writings (J). C and E are probably also unilingual, cf. also D. Add to the sources: 7487c (no. 585), 74171e (no. 580), 7491o, and 74107ad (line 3' probably to be read [(gi) ba-an-d]u₈ pi-it-tu₈, for *pattu*). Perhaps 7484a belongs to this tablet too, cf. Hh IX 316ff.

Line 4. Note *ri-tu-u* for *letû*.

Lines 14ff. EME should have here a reading *guru(š)*, but how?

Lines 17ff. 17 and 18 are the same, there is no gap. Read EME-[tab]-ba in 18.

Lines 28'ff. There is a gap of about three lines between 28' and 29'; MIN k[aš!], 30' MIN ga-[âr, etc.

Lines 50'ff. The section *gur* can now be restored in great part. Lines 57'-59' are to be placed before 51'. After line 50' there is a gap of 3 or 4 lines and then:

	[min] 3-tab-ba!	[šu-ul-lu].šu	(from J and 7487c)
	[min] ka?-lu?-(x)]	[]	
	[min] síg	hé-nu	
	[min] IL	pa-an a-ge-e	(J: a-g[a, syll.)
	[min] šu-ti-a	me-el-qé-ti	
	[min *nindá]	na-ma-an-su	(J: ninda = GAR)
56'	[min *GAM-ma]	[]-ba-[]	(J: gu-ru, syll.)
57'	min igi-še-ra-ah	ša mar?-UD-x	(<i>narpasi</i> expected)
58'	min esir-šub-ba	ša it-ta-a [a-ap-tu]	
59'	gur-sal-la	gur-sal-[lu]	
		(one line may be missing)	
	[min šu-sal-la]	sa-a[s-sa-nu]	(from 7491o)
	[min] 'še-bal'	mu-še-[]	
	[min a]-ab-lá	da-lu-[u]	(for a-bal)
	[min] sahar-ra	gur-ra SAHAR-R[A]	
	[min (nig)]-SAR	gur-ra mar-qi	
	[min ri-ri]-ga	MIN li-iq-te-t[u]	
51'	min ma[r-gíd-d]a	MIN i-ri-qi	
52'	[mi]n [zi-d]a	gur-zi-da-[ku]	
53'	min zí-d[a]	[MIN qé-mi(?)]	
54'	min dil-dil	[]	
55'	gur-pi[san!]	[]	
	(end of gur-section)		

Lines 71'f. Read min k[askal] in 71' which is followed without a gap by 72' [ma]-sá-[ab ninda].

Lines 85'ff. Read ma-sá-ab-'kuš'-[si-ga...]. F does not immediately precede line 86', the section ma-sá-ab cannot have been that long. A gives MIN [four times (the last two look like ZA) and then ma-[, probably to be restored ma-[an-sim (end of section).

Line 100'. Read uri *u-ri-in-nu*.

Line 103'. Read [(gi)]-an-[na].

Gap 103'-04. To this gap belongs 74171e [no. 580]:

[KAxIM]	[n]a-ap-p[a-hu]
[KAxIM-šu]	nap-pa-ah [qa-ti]
[KAxIM-gir]	MIN GİR
ul	ha-mu
GAN	hu-ša-bu

an-bar	qu-li-ip-[tu]
NE	lu-tu-u
NE	ta-aš-šu-u
šu-uš-kin	šu-ru
šu-uš-kin-tur	hi-im-m[a-tu]
ub-zal	tū-fub-qu

There is then a gap of a dozen lines or so until A r. i 1'. The extra signs before the two NE above are overruns from the left column (-rja?-ti KID MĀ and -tji).

Line 116'ff. Restore [šu]-ak-a, [kibir]-ak-a, [a]-ak-a, [na₄]-ak-a in the Sumerian subcolumn.

Line 129'. Note k[a]-zi-ra for kun-zi-da.

HAR-ra X [547]. Very little is preserved of this tablet, even less than it appears in the edition since source B belongs to Hh XVIII, C to Hh V-VII, and E to Hh XI. Source D is unilingual, the right column reading: sikil-e-[dè], má-ru-l[um], má-r[u-zum], á-[dam-šáh]. Two small fragments can be added: 74119c (šab and kír) and 74119b. The latter reads:

1'	kír-[šu-lál]	x ^c -pu-ul-tu ₄
2'	[a-sud]	[ma]-aš-la-ah-tu ₄
3'	[ti-lim-du]	[ti-i]l-i-im-tu ₄
		(blank)
5'	[tal]	tal-lu

In line 1' the broken sign may be ù, but the expected form is luputtu, cf. Hh X 167.

HAR-ra XI-XII [548-49, 547 (source E), 581]. A large unilingual tablet [D + K + Tokyo fragment] preserves most of Hh XI-XII. There was at least another similar tablet (B and C). Numerous bilingual fragments, several of which belong to the same tablet(s), complete the text. Unfortunately, source D+ and the bilingual pieces belong to two different recensions. This explains the editor's large number of Annexes. There are also one-column exercise tablets, e.g., C. Additional fragments are 74101v (given as source E of Hh X in p. 89; [m]ju-ša-ah-hi-nu is one type of the copper kettle šen-dilim), and 7481d (bu-lu-uq-[qu], ma-aq!-qa-[ru]). The mutually duplicating fragments 7484c and 7485l could be part of Hh XI, but they do not agree with lines 110ff. of the edition. If they are part of Hh XI, although from a different recension, maš-né-e could be a gloss to šēnu. One could still consider 74107y. No. 581 is the right side of source D (Annexe IX rev. 15'ff.) and belongs to the zabar-section);

15'	níg-PI MIN	ú-zu-u[n-tu]
16'	níg-PI! MIN	ka-li-t[u]
17'	níg-PI MIN	ta-lim-[tu(?)] or ta-ši-[hu]?
18'	níg-za-na MIN	níg-za-nu-[ú]
19'	šu-uš-gar-ra MIN	šu-u[š-gar-ru-ú]
20'	šu-šè-lá [MIN]	nam-[]
21'	zag-šu-šè-l[á MIN]	[]
22'	ÁBxGÁN ^{li-i} [li-is MIN]	[]
23'	[MIN] ^{si-im} MIN	[]
24'	[MIN] ^{si-im} [MIN]	[]

In line 22'f. source S has the gloss before the sign.

HAR-ra XIII [550]. There are at least two unilingual tablets of the type described for Hh XI-XII, but they are very fragmentary. Two pieces are bilingual (D and E). For the smaller fragments it may be at

times difficult to determine whether or not they are bilingual since they omit the Akkadian translation for large stretches of text, see the obv. of E, for instance. In line 186' read a-tu₅-a, with the components of TU₅ widely spaced.

HAR-ra XIV [551]. A few relatively large fragments. The unilingual pieces B and C seem to be part of the same tablet. The rest are bilingual. In line 47' the gloss is u-du-ti-il, with the u- still visible on the extreme left; an identical gloss has now been found in an unpublished copy of the canonical recension of Hh XIV.

HAR-ra XV [552]. On a single tablet with Hh XIV, at least in the unilingual text. Hh XV is a natural appendix to Hh XIV since it lists cuts of meat and body parts of animals, not parts of the human body. Line 1 is [nig-ki]-gi-a, or the like, and it is the last line of Hh XIV. There are too many ti-ti in lines 12'ff.; one would simply expect uzu-ti, uzu-ti-ti, uzu-kak-ti. Read áb instead of ab in line 80'. In the last two lines, one would expect [uzu]-im!-ma and [uzu-dah]-ma-maš, the latter being the real last line of Hh XV.

HAR-ra XVI [553]. The text is about 50% preserved by comparison with the very similar Ugarit version published in MSL 10 37ff. There are probably no more than two large bilingual tablets (A = A + B + C + D + E + H + I etc.), and a unilingual (?) fragment (M). Pieces not included in the edition are 74200c + 74204 f (which join J and therefore A), 74199s (+ D), 731082, 731089f, and, perhaps, 74148ab (na-za-h[i-li, cf. line 143']). Lines 42'ff. Restore:

42'	[ad-tab]	[a]t-tap-pu
43'	[ad-gú]	[u]-lu!
44'	[har-gú]	[hi-i]-šú
45'	[hal-gú]	[hal-zi-i]q-qu

Lines 117' and 119'. Read *e-ri zi-bu a-di nár-ka-bi-šu* and *e-ri ad-ba-ri a-di nár-ka-bi-šu*, respectively, from 731082 and the overruns from the other side of 74204f.

Lines 120'f. Hyphenation incorrect: read *HAJR ši-mu-ru-u*, *HAJR b[š]-u-uh-ri*.

Line 159'. Composite form of dur-il and dur-il (the form in Ugarit), see Hallo, *RA* 75 (1981) 95.

Lines 179'ff. The fragment 74199s confirms the reviewer's suspicions, arrived at from independent considerations, that the reconstruction of the Ugarit version in MSL 10 47: 279ff. is incorrect. After the section an-za-gul-me (here 173'ff.) the Emar text must be reconstructed as follows:

178'	a[l-li-g]á	al-li-gu!-{(x)}
179'	kišib [min]	
180'	lagab [min]	(blank)
181'	ellag al-li-gá	
182'	šu-u	šu-[ú]
183'	[šu-min]	šu-un-mi-in-nu

Line 177' = 178' and the D[U, from F, is really a[l-; the rest of the line is from A.

Annexe I 1'ff. The min stands for šuba and there is no need to add this word at the end. Lines 19'ff. to be read:

19'	[šu-gur]	[šu-g]u-ur-ru
20'	[hé-gá]!?	hi-iq-lu (ki-gal expected)
21'	[]	[ú-š]u-ur-tu ₄ : aš-tar MUL
22'	[bíbra]	[b]i-ib-ru-u
23'	[u ₄ -hi-in]	[ú]-hé-nu

24'	[nunuz (za-gìn)]	[ir]-ni-tu ₄
Annexe III. Can now be completed by 74200c + 74204f:		
9'	nu-ù-tu	la a-la-di
10'	peš ₅ (ŠĀ)-a	[NA ₄] e-ri-[i]
11'	nu-peš ₅ -a	[NA ₄] la-[a e]-r[i-i]
12'	mu-nu-uš la-ra-[ah	NA ₄ DU.DU : []
23'	du ₁₄ (LÚ)	[NA ₄] ša-al-ti
24'	[sag]-[ki]	[NA ₄] na-ak-kap-[ti]
25'	kak-[šub-ba]	[NA ₄] šli-ik-ka-[ti]
26'	gan-[šub-ba]	[NA ₄] ga-r)a-bi
27'	ur-[šub-ba]	[NA ₄] ha-še]-e
28'	ḏ [DĪM.ME]	[la-m]a-aš-ti
29'	DU.[]	[...] : NA ₄ IGI.HI.A
109'	[gír-tab]	[NA ₄] za-qí]-qí-pi
	etc.	

In line 12' the logogram DU.DU must stand, in some way, for *pušqu*. Note that pap-hal = *pušqu* and also pap-hal = *muttalliku* (DU.DU) so that one has here a logogram substitution.

HAR-ra XVII [554]. Of this tablet only insignificant fragments were found in Emar. Source D belongs to Diri, not to Hh XVII. The traces in 2'ff. favor NUMÚN rather than ninni.

HAR-ra XVIII [555, 547 (source B), 579, 596, 593]. Emar provides important, if not too extensive, bilingual fragments of this tablet, imperfectly preserved, except for a unilingual Ugarit tablet with a text extremely close to that of Emar. The edition of canonical Hh XVIII in MSL 8/2 had been completely revised for MSL prior to the Emar discoveries, but these fragments are most welcome as important sources for the history of Hh XVIII. Most of the pieces seem to belong to the same three-column tablet and there is in addition a complete exercise tablet (K). Four texts not identified but published in the edition ("source B" of Hh X and nos. 579, 596, and 593) can now be added to the list of sources.

Line 12' may be identical to line 14'.

Lines 27'ff. After line 27' immediately follows the first line of 74107 aa (no. 547 B), after this source immediately follows 74122w (no. 593) which in turn is followed by lines 28'ff. of the reconstructed text (determinatives omitted):

1'	[m]u-ur-ra	
2'	[m]-ur-ra-a-a[b!-ba]	
3'	mu-ur-ra-i[d-da]	(Akkadian broken)
4'	mu-ur-ra-a[l-lu-ús-sa]	
5'	mu-ur-ra-d[ùn-na]	
6'	a-da-gur ₄	
7'	gír-a-da-gur ₄	
8'	agargar (NUN- <i>tenû</i>)	
9'	[ag]argar-sil-la	
10'	[agar]gar-a-ab-b[a]	
11'	[agar]gar-íd-d[a]	
12'	[agar]gar-gibil	

13'	[agargar]-bar	
14'	[agargar]- ⁷ bar ⁷ -[huš]	
	(space for 7 lines, blank in no. 593)	
1'	[gir-šú]	[(x)-x-n]u?
2'	[gir-gíd]	[ta-(ab)]-bi-in-nu
3'	[gir-a-ab-ba]	[ta-bi]-in a-ja-ba-ak-ku
4'	[gir-íd-da]	[ta-bi]-in i-da-ak-ku
5'	[gir-šu-luh-ha]	[me]-su-ú
6'	[e-sír]	[še-e-n]u
7'	[]	(traces, not in copy)
8'	= 28' of main text.	

In the gap after line 46', and already in the bird section, must be placed Annexe I (F); lines 2'f. must be read [u-su]-uk-ku and [u-su]-uk-ka-nu. After a gap comes no. 579:

3'	[AN.IM.DUGUD]	[šu-u :] ah!-ga-bu
4'	[erin-na (and gloss)]	MIN
5'	[nunuz-erin-na]	[pi-i]l še-e
6'	[amar-erin-na]	[a-tam] še-e
7'	[sila-erin-na]	hu-ri-in-nu
8'	[šúr-dù]	[šu-u]r-du-u
9'	[šúr-dù]	[ka-s]u-su : ša-a-i-[(x)]
10'	[]	[ka-su]-su : ša-a-i-[(x)]

For lines 4'ff., restored from the Ugarit recension, compare the reviewer's note in *OrAn* 22 (1983) 2ff. The gloss in line 3' is reminiscent of Arabic 'uqāb 'eagle'; note in this connection the translation 'ki⁷-a-bu of a-hurin_x (BALAG) 'eagle' in the Vocabulary of Ebla (MEE 4 269: 620, not available to the writer at the time the *OrAn* article was written). In line 5' the traces are good for -i]l but not for a]n-.

Lines 47'ff. These lines must follow almost immediately line 11' of no. 579, above. The source J (obv.!) is at this point joined by H giving:

	[]	[x-x-x ⁷ -(...)]
	[buru ₅ -x]	šu-ku-lu
47'	[buru ₅ -ki-zi]	uš-šu-ur ki-is-[si]
48'	[buru ₅ -Ú.GÍR]	iš-šu-ur et-te-e-[tu]
49'	[buru ₅ -ugu-dù]	ap-pa-an-nu
50'	[buru ₅ -habrud-da]	uš-šu-ur hu-ur-ri
51'	[šen-šen-bal]	[hu]- ^r ru-um-ba'al-lu-u
52'	[šen-šen-al-ba-úš]	[hu-ru-um-ba]-ka-an-nu : ma-ši-ši-ja-[nu?]

HAR-ra XIX [556]. With the exception of an interesting completely preserved exercise tablet, only insignificant fragments have been recovered. The poorly written exercise tablet (D) is remarkable for having a complete syllabic spelling of each entry between the Sumerian and its translation. Its correctness is open to question. The tablet tends to align the syllabic parts and it would have been a good idea typographically to keep this arrangement to make the text easier for the reader. Perhaps 74190m (sag-gil-mud) duplicates line 20'.

HAR-ra XX-XXII [557-59]. Of Hh XX only some fifty lines of a-ša are preserved, but the other two tablets are attested in a rather complete form and partly in duplicating but diverging versions.

HAR-ra XXIII-XXIV [560-61]. Only small segments of these tablets have been recovered. A couple of additional small fragments are 74107ab = 3'ff. and 74199p = 26'ff. In table XXII lines 55'-63' refer to soups (tu₇) and should have been put somewhere after line 8', e.g. 61' is [tu₇-zi-da = r]a-bi-ku_{1,3}, and 62' [tu₇-zi-zú-lum]-ma = bi-qi-qi, corresponding to line 2' of F i. The fragment 74107ab gives:

	tu ₇ -[sig ₇]	[um-ma-r]u da-am-qu
4'	min-g[ú-gal]	[MIN h]u-ul-lu-ru
5'	min-g[ú-tur]	[MIN k]a-ak-ké-e
6'	min-g[ú-níg-àr-ra]	[MIN g]u?-ni-mur-re-e
7'	(not deciphered)	

The fragment 74199p gives the end of the Sumerian part of 26'ff. The first line has gu₇ instead of nag. It adds several lines after 29'. Tablet XXIII ends with line 91'; lines 92'-96' (source H) belong to tablet XXIV, lines 97'-101' belong to the first column of XXIII, and lines 102'-06' have to be placed before 79'.

Fragment 74143k probably belongs to tablet XXIV and so does 74197d (mun). See also the comment to no. 591. In line 56' read [igi]-esir = pa-an it!-te-e.

Ea(?) [563]. Since no Ea text has been found so far in the Northwest, including Boghazköy, and the format of the texts included here does not agree with that of Ea, it is better to try to find some other solution. For A, cf. Diri Ugarit III 244f. For B, probably with the logogram DU.DU in 17f., a Diri identification seems more likely. Therefore, they are included provisionally in MSL 15, where more details can be found.

Izi and acrographic lists [564-68, 571-72, 573?, 577-78, 586?, 594, 595?]. The material classifiable under this rubric falls into several categories.

a) A tablet with the text of Lu II (see no. 602) has, after the end of Lu, the opening lines of a version of Izi which differs from the one in b), below.

b) Some fragments (no. 567 (+) 74122i + 74122h? + 74248b (+) no. 594) have the beginning of a recension of Izi which starts with an-úr, like the Ugarit recension. There is a minor problem at the beginning: there is an entry ú-pu at the beginning of the Akkadian subcolumn, which otherwise should have started with an-úr = išdi šamê, and there is in the Sumerian an A hanging loose between lines 2 and 3. The tablet seems to be written in a hand unusual in Emar: the sign read díim by the editor in 2f. is really úr, and the uh in 8'f. has to be read sud. Immediately after line 12' comes 74122i, whose line 4' has probably to be read an-úr instead of an-NE. Even if it turns out that NE is what the tablet has, the little fragment 74132q with *anzahhu* does not seem to fit here. Very close to 74122i follows 74248b to be read: ^dia-am-[ma]KAL, ^q[udug, and after dividing line, ^qnin-kilim, mul-[da, etc. A bit later, perhaps already in col. ii, has to be placed no. 594 with the equivalents of UR₄-UR₄ and KIN-KIN; read e-se-[du] in line 1' and [kin = ši]-ip-ru in line 7'. The only other certain portion of this tablet is the rev. of 567. The tablet ended shortly afterwards on the edge, visible in 74248b, and thus the tablet contained only the first half of Proto-Izi I. The only candidate for the second part is 74122ab with the en-nu-un-section, close to the end.

c) A number of fragments duplicate the large Boghazköy tablet KBo I 42, edited in MSL 13 132ff. (add von Weiher, ZA 62 [1972] 109ff. which appeared, too late to be incorporated into MSL 13, and which after line 183 switches to A-compounds instead of si): nos. 564-66, 74198u, 7479b, 74198r, and 74238n (= source J of Vocabulary S^a). Col. i' (= rev. i) of the latter seems to duplicate lines 239ff. of the Boghazköy text and col. ii' should fill the gap between cols. iv and v; note that line 278 could be identical with 74238n ii' 3'. The logogram of this section is probably GAZ — inferred from the Akkadian equivalents — and 74127n (with GAZ) seems to fit neatly on the left of 74238n (subject to verification, like all the "joins" in this review).

d) Izi Boghazköy B (MSL 13 143ff.) is also represented by a few fragments. The most important is no. 568 which shows that the tablet sides as published in KBo I 31, and edited in MSL, are to be interchanged. In the lower part of the central column of the reverse of no. 568 has to be placed no. 578, with the transition from BAD to MUD.

e) There is a third tablet, Izi Boghazköy style, represented by 741991 + 14198w and incompatible with d). It is the lower left corner, and col. i ends in the NIR-section. The last column of the reserve starts with šu-gíd. This is not clear in the transliteration of no. 571; line 12' is the last of col. i and line 13' the first of col. iv. The small fragment 731075j, the other small fragments mentioned by Arnaud on p. 167, and especially the exercise tablet no. 572 can be assigned now to this tablet.

f) Nigga is attested, in a version that differs from the OB one, by no. 573 and 574 (in the latter níg-pad-pad is preferable to níg-sur-sur).

Sag tablet [575]. This piece, as already recognized by Arnaud, joins a large tablet recently edited in MSL SS 1 28ff. and corrects some entries of this edition. In line 7' read probably sag-kud-d[a] = *za!-i-ri-nu* and in 8' certainly sag-bal-la = [n]a-bal-ka-tum (with overrun to the column at right). In 30'ff. the KA in this section is to be read zú; in 39' restore zú-ur₅-ra = *e-[se-qu]*.

Lu = ša [602, 583, 587, 589, 598]. This series was divided at the time in two tablets, the second starting with sipa. Indications of this division are already found in OB (see MSL 12 26f.). Ugarit shows clearly the existence of a break after the ab-sin-section, kept in the canonical recension. The editor's reconstruction incorrectly inserts the preserved part of Lu II in the middle of Lu I (lines 312'-59'), apparently on the basis of a questionable join in source E.

a) Lu I. Most of this tablet is preserved, with some medium-size gaps. Probably there are not more than three large four-column tablets. The determination of the joins is more difficult than in other tablets and an inspection of the originals is essential. There seems to be a block of joining fragments which restores most of the right hand column of a tablet: D + F + G + H + S + 74129d + 74146t. N and U seem to go with A, and I with C (these in turn may join D+). Other joins are likely. Additional fragments are: 73015p (no. 589) = ca. 65, 74132u (no. 598) i' = 254'ff.?, ii' = before 74106e in the gap before line 360', 74106e whose last line is 360' or 361', and 74146t obv. = before 184' (i-du_g), rev. = 272'-77'. The rev. of S belongs in the gap before 230'. Source AC belongs to Hh II. Except for the insertion of 312'-59' (Lu II) and the misplacement of lines 254'-61', which should go after 288', the reconstruction is satisfactory and the text is full of interesting new information.

Line 7. An entry <lugal> is expected after this line.

Line 10. The gloss requires emending the 5 to 7. In the preceding line, u₃ stands syllabically for 10.

Lines 45ff. AB may belong here, with a slightly variant text.

Lines 58ff. Lines 58-59 and 60-61 are single long entries.

Lines 63ff. Restore ra-[gaba] with the Akkadian probably provided by 731075p. Its line 2', read *sar-ru* 'liar', could be a translation of ra-gaba-ki-bad-du 'messenger of far away places' used in the meaning 'liar' in OB Sumerian literary texts. There is a gap of some 10 lines between 65 and 66', with ra-gaba, kin-gi₄-a, etc.

Line 74'. The presence of the determinative na₄ confirms in this case the reading kišib.

Line 123'f. The um-ma-[is a gloss to umún in all probability. In the following line, "GAM" is the separation mark and šu-na is a gloss to DŪN or BŪR.

Line 146'. Read uri instead of ra.

Line 150'. Read ūr instead of úr.

Line 210'ff. The restoration of these lines has to be revised: S (+ 74129d) turns out to be not as different as suggested in note p. 193. The combined text reads:

210'	[ug]ula-šu	MIN 'x ² -an-[]	
211'	[ug]ula-šu-i	MIN ga[l-la-bi]	
212'	[ug]ula-šu-ha!	MIN ba-il-ri	
213'	[ug]ula-šu-kud-da	MIN mi-ik-x	(miksi expected)
214'	[ug]ula-lú-s[a!]-gaz	MIN h[a]-am-ba-ti	
215'	[ug]ula-x-gá	MIN [x] ² -x ² -ku	(hun-gá and agri expected)
216'	[ug]ula-ní-zu	MIN ša]-ra-qi	
217'	[ug]ula-é-tu[p]-pa-a	[MIN E]-tu-pi etc.	
218'	[ug]ula-é-[na]-kam-tum ²	[MIN] na-ak-kám-ti	

D omits line 215' or has it after 216'.

Line 253' is followed almost immediately by 262'ff.; these lines are all Sumerian: pa-mul (twice) and pa-pa-al (twice).

Line 267'. The spacing suggests that *la-a!-ga!-ru* (if thus to be read) is a gloss, not the first translation.

Line 270'. Restore *[ne]-ša-ak-ku*. The history of the text shows that nu-ensí is here an incorrect writing for nu-ěš, not for ensí.

Line 273'. E has the incorrect variant guda₄-ta-bal.

Line 280'. Instead of LIŠ read šita; for this entry, see *Nabu* 1987 no. 9. After line 288' have to be placed lines 254'-61', duplicated by 74132u right col., and afterwards Z col. i'.

Line 311'. The right column of N belongs in this gap: MIN [ú-tu], MIN nu-[ú-tu], etc. For lines 312'-59', see Lu II. In the gap before line 360' has to be placed 74123u ii' (cf. OB Proto-Lu 353ff.) and then 74106e:

1'	šeš [
2'	šeš [
3'	šeš [
4'	nin ₉ -a-[ni
5'	im-ri-'a' [
6'	im-ri-a [
7'	im-ri-a-[dagal-la

The last line is 360' or 361'. The double line in line 7' must be an overrun of the double line ending the tablet. Read 362'ff. [gú-dúb-bu] = *[gu]-du-bu-uk-ku*, ki-[NE-NE-gul-gul] = *[x-x] ki-mu-ni*.

Lines 392'ff. There is room for a sign at the beginning of the lines: [šá]-ki-SAG, for ša-kuš-ù, and [ad]-gi-gi.

Line 406'. There is probably one more line between the bottom of vii and the top of viii in A with GĪR.NITA uru-ša-ga and the Akkadian of this line.

Lines 414'. See discussion of these lines in the reviewer's edition of "Farmer's Instructions".

b) Lu II (Sipa-tablet). With the exception of 74158e (no. 583), probably an exercise tablet, all the other fragments may belong to the same tablet ending with the initial lines of Izi, see above. In sequential order the portions which can be reconstructed are:

1) Source M, with the first 8 lines of the tablet.

2) No. 569 (sides to be interchanged). In 74122c, the sign "ZAR" represents šurim (cf. OB Proto-Lu 486ff.) and read a!-gar-gar instead of min-níg-níg. Then 74178e reads: gizkim, gizkim-[ti], gizkim-[sag₉-ga], gizkim-nu-[ti(l)-la] (end of col. i).

3) No. 587 + 741021 (OB Proto-Lu ca. 566ff.):

1'	a-[il]	[ŠU]
2'	a-[il]	[za-bil] A.MEŠ

3'	ga-[íl]	[ŠU]
4'	ga-[íl]	[za-bil ší]-iz-bi
5'	kaš-[íl]	[ŠU]
6'	kaš-[íl]	[za-bil] KAŠ-MEŠ
7'	im-me-luh- ^r ha ^r -[íl]	[MIN (x)]-mu-uk-ti
8'	[im-íl]	[MIN] tji-i-ti
9'	[sahar-íl]	[MIN] ^r e ^r -pe-ri
10'	[giš-íl]	[MIN] GIŠ.MEŠ
11'	[NE-íl]	[MIN] di-ik-me-ni
12'	[sag-íl]	sà-ki-il-lu
13'	[un(?) -íl]	za-bil ki-na-[ti]
14'	[ár-ár]	ta-i-nu

There are trace of the right and left adjacent columns; for the latter one can suggest: za-[am-za-am], N[E...], g[ú...], ki-[ru-gú], ki-[šú] (OB Proto-Lu ca. 619). Before it comes the following section (4).

4) 74104b obv! (cf. OB Proto-Lu 578ff.). After the section KU.KU. (KU), comes the section of clowns and dancers:

6'	alan-[zu]
7'	u ₁ -da-[tuš]
8'	sùh-[sùh]
9'	á ^r -ú ^r -[a]
10'	KA-[dug ₁ -dug ₁]
11'	gu ₁ -[ud-da]
12'	húb-[bé]

5) X + L + P + 74159a + 74198e:

1'	[bur-gul]	pur-[kul-lu]
2'	[ugula MIN]	a-[kil MIN]
3'	šidim	šá-t[í-im-mu]
4'	[ugula m]in	a-k[il MIN]
5'	[kù]-dím	ku-d[í-im-mu]
6'	[ugula min]	a-k[il MIN]

Immediately follow lines "312-18" and then, probably with no gap, "319" ff. of the edition; ti-bi-lá is gloss to TIBIRA.

6) Next column (rev. ii) of the same sources = lines "335'-59'" of the edition. In 337' read probably [SAL-gešt]in-na, and in 358' [m]u!-un-na-ak-ru is an error for *munnarbu*. The substitution of the traditional nigin by gi₁-gi₁ in lines "353" ff. is a scribal curiosity.

7) 74104b rev.! (cf. OB Proto-Lu 775ff.):

1'	bàn-da	[]
2'	bàn-da	[]
3'	ku-[li]	[]
4'	ku-li-[li]	[]
5'	du ₁₀ -ús-[sa]	[x]-ŠI-[]
6'	gemé-[arad]	ki-na-t[u ₁]	

7'	an-ta	[tap]-pu-u
8'	ta[b]-ba!	[tap]-pu-u
9'	zu-a	/ /
10'	[min]-mu	/ /
11'	[mi-i]q-du	ʿxʿ- / /
12'	[dè]-huʿ	ʿxʿ- / /

In line 5', one would expect *ru'ir*; the apparent SI may be part of *-ir-* or of *-i-*.

8) No. 583. parallels from 795 to 809 of OB Proto-Lu; the text can be restored with confidence, e.g.:

5'	[túg-ba]	[na]-al-ba-šú
6'	[si-il-lá]	[pi-qi]-it-tu
7'	[kuru ₇]	[pa]-qa-du ₄
8'	[šú-sum-ma]	[MIN]
9'	[erín]	[sa]-bu
17'	[kuš ₇]	[ki]-šú-ú
18'	[kiri ₄ -tab]	[kar]-tap!-pu
21'	[gir-a-hum]	um-mu-šum!

9) No. 569, rev. (!). The fragment is very close to the end of the series. The edge has entries from the beginning of Izi and the colophon.

Syllabic Vocabulary A [603]. The Emar version is practically identical to that of Ugarit published many years ago by Nougayrol. It is important to point out that the "translations" of this traditional and peculiar tablet cannot be considered lexical translations.

For the benefit of the reader, the following list gives the unidentified or vaguely labeled lexical numbers in the edition with their proper identification, if known.

- 562 = Hh V-VII 565' ff.
- 563 = Diri?
- 564-66 = Izi c).
- 567 = Izi b).
- 568 = Izi d).
- 569 = Lu II.
- 570 = Diri.
- 571-72 = Izi e).
- 573-74 = Nigga.
- 575 = Sag B (MSL SS 1).
- 576 = unknown series, compare MSL 13 244, Section 1.
- 577 = IGI-compounds, + 74841.
- 578 = Izi d).
- 579 = Hh XVIII.
- 580 = Hh VIII-IX.
- 581 = Hh XI.
- 582 = Hh VIII-IX.
- 583 = Lu II.
- 584 = Hh XI?
- 585 = Hh VIII-IX.

586 = IGI-compounds (IGI+UR).

587 = Lu II.

588 = ?

589 = Lu I.

590 = Izi?

591. This fragment is a curious example of the problems encountered in identifying small pieces. Arnaud's interpretation is perfectly possible and would place the piece in Lu, close to no. 598. However, one could equally well read: *ši-iz-bu*, *li-il-[du]*, *ma-a-ru-[u]* in which case it would be part of Hh XXIV (just before 74891) corresponding to Sum. *ga*, *ga-àr*, and *ga-ŠE*, respectively.

592. In all likelihood this is not a lexical fragment; reading *ma-za-[al-tu]* in line 2' and *a-šar [pa-ši-ši]* in 3' it would be the Akkadian of the opening lines of nos. 771-74.

593 = Hh XVIII.

594 = Izi b).

595 = IGI-compounds.

596 = Hh XVIII.

597 . Probably not lexical, perhaps astronomical omens, *birštu?*

598 = Lu I.

599 = Diri.

600 = Diri.