The Old Babylonian scribal curriculum included several so-called acrographic lexical lists. The defining characteristic of an acrographic list is that the entries are ordered by their first or main sign. Proto-Izi, Proto-Kagal, and Nigga have been edited by M. Civil in MSL 13. A fourth example, Proto-Sag, was edited by the same author in MSL SS 1.

In this paper I will present a late Old Babylonian acrographic list with Akkadian glosses (§1). The evidence from this new source will be used for an analysis of the function of these lists compared to other lexical compositions (§2), and discussion of the uses of glosses and Akkadian translations in the Old Babylonian lexical tradition (§3), followed by a short conclusion (§4).

This paper ends with a discussion of the textual history of Nigga (Appendix).

1. BM 54712: Late Old Babylonian Proto-Kagal and Nigga

BM 54712 (82-5-22, 1039) is the upper right corner of a tablet, measuring ca. 6 by 6 cms. The text is late Old Babylonian and most probably comes either from Sippar or from Babylon (see Reade 1986, xxxii-xxxiii).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Nigga (MSL 13, 91ff.)</th>
<th>Izi Bogh A (MSL 13, 132ff.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>traces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>438-442</td>
<td>1507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[gul]-TAR-{</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[gul]-sr-ab-šd-ki-x-{</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[gul]-ki-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;gul&quot;-sr-ab-šd-šub.&quot;ba&quot;</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. The tablet is published by permission of the Trustees of the British Museum. I wish to thank the curators, Dr. I. Finkel and Mr. C.B.F. Walker for their hospitality and help. Dr. Eleanor Robson was so kind to collate a few questionable passages for me, for which I owe her my sincere thanks. My stay in London, spring 1997, was made possible financially by a fellowship at the Warburg Institute of London University. It is a pleasant duty to acknowledge their support. Prof. E. Leichty (University of Pennsylvania) was so kind to correct my English. Needless to say, none of the persons mentioned above can be held responsible for errors that remain.
| 1'  | a-|  |
| 2'  | a-DU-|  |
| 3'  | a-sig-[ga] | 377 |
| 4'  | a-kar-'ra |  |
| 5'  | a-kar-'ra |  |
| 6'  | a-kar-ra-gál-la |  |
| 7'  | a-gub-ba | 340 |
| 8'  | a-gub-ba m̀ ku-nam |  |
| 9'  | a-dé-a | [455] |
| 10' | a-dé-|  |
| 11' | a-dé | 310 |
| 12' | [a]-nu-dé |  |
| 13' | [a]-dug4-ga |  |
| 14' | [ ]x|  |
| 15' | traces |  |

Proto-Kagal (MSL 13, 63ff.)

Rev.

1'  lost
2'  traces
3'  a-paš'-lê
4'  a-sur-ra-gal
5'  a-sur-ra-sig
6'  a-ba' šù-TU-TU m̀ ku-nam | 505 |

---
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| 7'  | a-sud-râ m̀ ku-nam | 422 |
| 8'  | a-sud-râ m̀ ku-nam |  |
| 9'  | a-bad-râ |  |
| 10' | a-an-zag-nu-za |  |
| 11' | a-šùtu-nu-za |  |

Nigga (MSL 13, 91ff.)

12'  nīg-gur11 |  |
13'  nīg-lugal |  |
14'  nīg-gur11-lugal |  |
15'  nīg-gur11-lugal |  |
16'  nīg-gur11-lugal |  |
17'  nīg-erim2 |  |
18'  nīg-ā-[z]l |  |
19'  nīg-ā-l |  |
20'  nīg-ā-x |  |
21'  nīg-l |  |
22'  nīg-l |  |

(end of column)
2. The Nature of the Acrographic Series

In order to understand the nature and uses of the acrographic series we must locate them in the Old Babylonian curriculum. For Nippur the curricular order of the exercises may be reconstructed by using the evidence from so-called type II exercise tablets. Type II tablets combine two different extracts: a new exercise and a repetition. The new exercise is found on the obverse. It is a short extract from one of the educational series, inscribed by the teacher on the left side of the tablet. This model was copied several times by a pupil on the right-hand side. The pupil then used the reverse to repeat something studied earlier. More than 2,000 type II tablets from Nippur are known by now. This tablet type was used in the elementary phase of the scribal education. All kinds of lexical compositions have been inscribed on type II tablets. Literary texts, which belong to the advanced stage of education, are with few exceptions written on other tablet types. The relation between the obverse and the reverse allows for a reconstruction of the order in which elementary exercises were treated. It appears that this order is far from random. It may be summarised as follows (including the major exercises only):

1. I 5 and I 6
2. I 6 and I 7
3. I 7 and I 8
4. I 8 and I 9
5. I 9 and I 10

is a free rendering of the Sumerian rhetorical question: who can touch (him)? or: who can withstand him? The reading of TU-TU remains uncertain.

I 8' For a-an-zag-nu-zu as a word for deep waters, perhaps the abzu, see Horowitz 1998, 310–313.

I 10' For a-an-zag-nu-zu as a word for deep waters, perhaps the abzu, see Horowitz 1998, 310–313.

II 5' [Nig]-diri-gū-di is glossed ḫīṣequm (need). The Sumerian is apparently related to the administrative term nīg-gū-dī (object called for; need; supplies), which appears in texts from the Ur III and early Old Babylonian periods (see Neumann 1987 43–44 for Ur III and Ferwerda 1985, 6 for early Isin; both with previous literature). As far as I know nīg-qrī-gū-di or nīg-qrī-gū-dī is not attested elsewhere. The gloss is written over the lower part of the line.

II 6' Sumerian ḫīṣu (TUR.DIŠ) has various Akkadian renderings; among them are māqu (to be weakened) and ṣallitu (disabled person; see MSL 14, 438 105–110). The alternative reading genna (child) for TUR.DIŠ is less likely in the present context.
The very first exercise, Syllable Alphabet B, is an exercise in the correct execution of a number of important and frequent signs. Most entries have no meaning. The exercise is usually copied in oversized writing, so that every detail may be given due attention. At the other end of the elementary phase of their education the students copied Model Contracts and Proverbs. Here for the first time pupils studied Sumerian sentences, rather than isolated signs or words. The Proverbs, in literary Sumerian, provided a suitable transition to literary education.

Between Syllable Alphabet B and the Models and Proverbs a variety of lexical texts were copied. Each of these exercises has its own characteristics, corresponding to a specific educational end. TU-TA-TI deals with the syllabic values. The Name Lists for the first time introduce meaningful items. Proto-Ur5-ra is a thematic list of Sumerian words, comprising several thousands of words and aiming at building a Sumerian vocabulary. Proto-Ea deals with polyvalency. For each cuneiform sign the possible Sumerian readings are listed. Proto-Diri provides sign values and Akkadian translations for compound signs. Finally in the Mathematical Tables the pupils learned multiplication and division. By the same token they were made familiar with number writing.

How can we understand the position of the acrographic lists in this sequence? The sign lists Proto-Ea and Proto-Diri both isolate one aspect of cuneiform writing that was hardly wholly new for a pupil who started copying them. In Proto-Ur5-ra the pupils had encountered numerous examples of polyvalent and compound signs. Proto-Ea and Proto-Diri systematize these two important aspects of the writing system. By systematically listing polyvalent and compound signs these two aspects are treated on a more abstract level. While the pupils learned to use polyvalent and compound signs in Proto-Ur5-ra and similar exercises, they were now taught the abstract concepts of polyvalency and compoundness through Proto-Ea and Proto-Diri. The acrographic lists do something similar. They treat the incongruity between Sumerian and Akkadian, or rather, the incongruity between Sumerian writing and Akkadian. Again, incongruity is something that is omnipresent, and must have been familiar to a pupil who reached this stage of his education.

He (or she) knew that the sign A corresponds to the Akkadian word mātu in many circumstances, but that it may as well be part of the word a-ba, to be translated mānu. The incongruity between a sign and its Akkadian translation has many sources. It is partly due to the polyvalency of the Sumerian writing system, but as well to the asymmetrical relation between the Sumerian and the Akkadian lexicons. Without trying to be exhaustive we may distinguish between five types of incongruity. All examples are taken from the text edited above.

a. Polyvalency
a-an-zag-nu-zu Water that knows no horizon (probably: endless water).
a-ųtutu-nu-zu Water that Utu does not know.
The sign AN is used in two different ways.

b. Syllabic vs. Logographic Use
a-ba šu-TU-TIša-pu-tu-tam command
a-sud-rą-a-gā-šam far away (waters)
The sign A corresponds to mātu (not represented in the gloss) in the second line, but is used for its syllabic value in a-ba in the preceding line.

c. Asymmetry between Sumerian and Akkadian Lexicons
a-sud-ša-ga-šam far away (waters)
a-sud-ša-ga-šam far away (waters)
One Sumerian term corresponds to two synonymous but etymologically unrelated Akkadian words.

d. Alternative Parsing of Sumerian Grammar
a-dē-a flooding
a-dē-ą-į-il me-e carry water!
The Sumerian a-dē-a means flooding (Akkadian edā). In the second line dé-a is taken as the imperative of a verb dé.

e. Compound Words: Idiomatic Expressions
The section GU has a number of compound words which do not correspond to equivalent composita in Akkadian. An example is girši-pu-apu-tum. The Akkadian rendering has nothing to do with the common Akkadian renderings for Sumerian ēpu or šir. For words like these the relation between Sumerian and Akkadian is isomorph with the relation between a Sumerian compound sign and its pronunciation. The pronunciation of a Dirī-compositum

---

4. Female pupils and scribes are known for Northern Babylonian sites including Mari, Sippar, and Tell Hadad.
cannot be deduced from the pronunciation of the signs involved. In idiomatic expressions the correct Akkadian rendering may not be deduced from the rendering of the individual words.\textsuperscript{5}

None of the 5 types of incongruity distinguished above may have been absolutely new to the pupils copying the acrographic series. The concept of incongruity was made conscious by isolating it from the complex system of cuneiform and treating it extensively. In this the acrographic series are fully comparable to Proto-Ea and Proto-Diri, in which other aspects of the same system were isolated and exercised. Thus the pupils not only learned how to use the writing system in practice, but also how to understand its mechanics on an abstract level.

### 3. Glosses and Independent Learning

The primary characteristic of acrographic lists is the organization of their entries by the first or main sign.\textsuperscript{6} Another feature, prominently present in our new text, has received less attention. This is the way in which the Akkadian translations of the Sumerian words are represented. In Old Babylonian lexical lists Akkadian renderings appear in different ways. Proto-Ur\textsubscript{5}-ra, the series of thematic lists, is unilingual in its written form. Akkadian translations were added orally by the teacher. That this is the case may be concluded from sequences of two or three times the same Sumerian entry. Such sequences make sense because they correspond to different Akkadian translations of the same word.\textsuperscript{7} Other lexical compositions, such as Proto-Diri, have a separate column for the Akkadian. A few texts, such as Ugu-mu (MSL 9, 51–73), exist in both unilingual and bilingual format. This is also the case for the acrographic series. Bilingual acrographic texts are relatively rare. In the bilingual examples the Akkadian is found in a separate column, as is the case in other bilingual lexical texts. In the unilingual examples, however, we find an alternative way to represent the Akkadian. As demonstrated in the text edited above, the Sumerian entries may be selectively translated in the form of glosses. The use of glosses is exceptional in the Old Babylonian lexical tradition.\textsuperscript{8} A rare example is text G of Proto-Ur\textsubscript{5}-ra 23–24, section 7.2 (MSL 11, 121–122) which provides glosses for various Sumerian readings of the sign SIM (lines 1–5). Both Akkadian glosses and pronunciation aids for rare Sumerian signs are found in SLT 37+.

\textsuperscript{5} This is probably equivalent to what Civil has labelled ‘Izi-compounds’ (where the pronunciation of the compound may be derived from the common sign values), in contrast with ‘Diri compounds’ where this is not the case. See Civil 1995, 2310.

\textsuperscript{6} The organization of Proto-Izi is discussed in some detail in MSL 13, 7–10 by M. Civil. Proto-Kagal and Nigga are strictly acrographic, whereas Proto-Izi allows for an admixture of thematic principles.

\textsuperscript{7} For the bilingual character of Old Babylonian unilingual exercises see M. Civil MSL 14, 85; Veldhuis 1997, 46–47.

\textsuperscript{8} It should be noted that our evidence for the Old Babylonian lexical tradition is almost entirely Nippurian in origin. Our impression, therefore, may be top-sided.
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SLT 46\textsuperscript{9} (Proto-Ur\textsubscript{5}-ra 13–15). This particular tablet is the only example of Akkadian glosses in Nippur Proto-Ur\textsubscript{5}-ra I know of. In the unilingual acrographic series, however, glosses are frequent. These glosses include both pronunciation aids for the Sumerian word and Akkadian translations. Glosses are applied selectively, and the sources do not agree as to which entry is glossed and which is not. The inclusion of these selective Akkadian glosses may be directly related to the function of the acrographic exercises. Since they deal with the incongruity between Sumerian writing and Akkadian translation, the Akkadian translation is an inherent part of what is being exercised. In Proto-Ur\textsubscript{5}-ra, where Akkadian translations were provided orally, the focus is on writing Sumerian correctly. Though translations are necessary in Proto-Ur\textsubscript{5}-ra to make the exercise intelligible, these translations do not belong to the core of the exercise.

In addition to the acrographic series there is one other lexical text which is frequently glossed. This is Old Babylonian Proto-Ld. This agreement in format is matched by the frequent association of Old Babylonian Proto-Ld and Proto-Izi. In Nippur the two series are sometimes treated as if they belong together as one unit. Of the four tablets which preserve the end of Old Babylonian Proto-Ld there is only one which has the subscript ‘nisaba-ra-mi’ (text E’. Nippur). In text M” (of unknown provenance) Old Babylonian Proto-Ld is immediately followed by an abbreviated version of Proto-Izi (MSL 12, 31). Text A (Nippur) ends with the catch-line to Proto-Izi. Text C, finally, also from Nippur, has neither catch-line nor subscript (collated).\textsuperscript{10} The same connection is now attested for Emar (see Civil 1989, 24). Moreover, outside Nippur there is a recurrent relation between Proto-Ld D and Proto-Sag (see MSL SS1, 3). This confirms that in the native classification of the lexical corpus the acrographic type and the Ld type were closely associated. In the Nippur curriculum we may understand this association as a kind of transition between the thematic type (Proto-Ur\textsubscript{5}-ra) and the purely acrographic type (Proto-Kagal and Nigga). Both Old Babylonian Proto-Ld and Proto-Izi may be understood as somewhere in-between, with a stronger representation of the thematic in the former and of the acrographic element in the latter.

The presence of glosses in Old Babylonian Proto-Ld and in the acrographic lists may be related to a gradual increase in independence in the way the pupils did their exercises. There were various ways in which the curriculum differentiated between more and less intervention by a teacher. The more a pupil had mastered, the more the teacher receded to the background. This may be seen, for instance, in the type II tablets. The obverse of these tablets contains a model, which was

\textsuperscript{9} The full description of this tablet is now: CBS 2178 + N 5491 (MSL 81/2 V36) + CBS 2258 (SLT 37) + CBS 1082 (SLT 46) + N 1866 + N 4313 (MSL 9 41 V19) + N 5280. Sumerian glosses (not graphically distinguished from the main entry) only appear in the expression ga-sa-ša-ha (‘milk-suckling’) in the sections sila4, and amar (MSL 8/1, 86 166 and 87 229). A few Akkadian glosses in tiny script appear in the wild animals section. The text and glosses will be treated in the forthcoming edition of Proto-Ur\textsubscript{5}-ra I by the present writer.

\textsuperscript{10} In the literary letter edited by van Dijk 1989 the teacher promises to teach Izi and Ld instead of Akkadian (452 26). Here the order is reversed!
to be copied by a pupil. On the reverse he copied all on his own another exercise. The reverse contained an exercise which he had learned previously by copying teacher’s models. Now he was considered to know this material and to be able to copy it by himself. Advanced exercises, the literary extracts, have no model at all. Whether pupils copied the literary texts from dictation or from a standard text is not known. Anyway, they had to do without the handy and handsomely written teacher’s model. Similar patterns may be found in the two known formats of Proto-Ea and Proto-Diri. Both sign lists are found with and without a separate pronunciation column. The copies without pronunciation column were written by more advanced pupils. This makes sense. The pupil must learn to do without reading aids, because he will have to do without in the practice of copying literary tablets and in his later career as scribe. In the absence of glosses the pupil was no longer taken by the hand to interpret his sign list. In a similar way we may understand the various ways in which Akkadian translations were present in the exercises:

- Proto-Ur5-ra
- Old Bab. Proto-Lú & acrographic lists
- Proto-Diri

For Proto-Ur5-ra the presence of a teacher was indispensable, because the entries make no sense whatsoever as long as the Akkadian translation is unknown. Proto-Diri, however, may be copied and understood independently by a pupil who has a reasonable skill in reading cuneiform. The glossed lexical texts may stand somewhere in-between. In copying a glossed teacher’s model a pupil may have understood most of it. Apart from the glossed entries there were a number of words he already knew. For other words he would still rely on explanation.

4. Conclusion

In our understanding of Old Babylonian lexical texts it is necessary to realize that these are exercises, meant for the instruction of pupils at the scribal school. As exercises they fill a slot in the curriculum, in which each individual lexical composition has a specific function. In the structure of this curriculum we may note two important didactic principles. First the order of the exercises, and the format of the respective exercise tablets, allow for a gradual withdrawal of the teacher. The more advanced a pupil is, the more he is supposed to work on his own. Second, in copying a variety of lexical lists the pupils studied the writing system from a variety of perspectives. The object of their studies was always the same: the writing system. It is, therefore, no surprise that we find quite some overlap between the lexical series. The perspective chosen, however, differs, and this allowed the pupil to gain an understanding of various abstract principles behind the system of cuneiform writing: polyvalency, compounding, incongruity.

Appendix: the Textual History of Nigga

Our picture of the Old Babylonian lexical tradition is necessarily influenced by the disproportionate share of Nippur tablets in our source material. There are reasons to believe that the Nippur corpus is not representative for the Old Babylonian tradition at large. The Nippur lexical tradition may have been a conservative one; some of the developments we tend to associate with the post-Old Babylonian period may be older. A comparison between the Proto-Ur5-ra versions of Nippur and Isin, for instance, shows that the Nippur version is in most cases shorter, and that the Isin text already includes a number of items known from later (Middle Babylonian) sources. The lexical tablets from these two neighbouring cities are contemporaneous. Other evidence shows that S̄ and Ur5-ra 1 and 2, both unknown in Old Babylonian Nippur, were known in other Old Babylonian centres. It should be added, though, that the extant tablets may be considerably later than the Nippur material. The existence of an Old Babylonian bilingual version of Proto-Ur5-ra 11–12 (in a very idiosyncratic fashion) confirms that the Old Babylonian lexical tradition may have been much more variegated than we will ever know. The earliest bilingual versions of Ur5-ra that were known so far are from Ugarit and Emara.

Our new source for Proto-Kagal/Nigga may be used to evaluate what we know about the history of the acrographic lists in the Old Babylonian period. The present text has Nigga integrated into Proto-Kagal. Two of the sections that belong to Nigga in the Nippur tradition are attested here, but they are not even adjacent. Nigga is fully merged with Proto-Kagal and is not recognizable as a separate chapter. On closer scrutiny, however, it may appear that Nippur is the only place where Nigga is an independent composition. An unpublished lexical prism from Isin was described by Wilcke as containing a local version of Proto-Kagal followed by the catch-line to Nigga (IB 813; Wilcke 1987, 93). The number of lexical texts from Isin is too small for a fruitful investigation of the local use of catch-lines. In Nippur, however, catch-lines are used to connect consecutive parts of a single lexical composition. Nippur Proto-Ur5-ra is divided in six chapters (or ‘tablets’). Each of these chapters ends with the doxology "nisaba zá-mí: Nisaba be praised!" The doxology is never followed by a catch-line to connect one chapter to the next. Catch-lines are used occasionally to connect sections of one tablet. SLT 179 has the list of stones. In the Nippur tradition this is the first section of chapter 4 of the series. The chapter continued with plants, fish, birds, and clothing. Accordingly, this tablet does not contain the "nisaba zá-mí formula, but ends with the catch-line to the section plants (zú). Similar evidence exists for Proto-Izi. In the

11. Prof. Dr. C. Wilcke generously allowed me to utilize his copies of the Isin texts, which are to appear in a forthcoming volume of TIB. It is a pleasure to express my gratitude here.
12. For S̄ see Tanret 1982.
13. BM 85983. This text will be edited by the present writer.
14. More examples may be found in Veldhuis 1997, 49-50.
First, Nigga may be an invention of the Nippur scribes, who isolated sections from Proto-Kagal to form an independent lexical composition. Second, Nigga may be an old lexical series which gradually disappeared to merge with (Proto-)Kagal. Bearing in mind the conservatism of the Nippur lexical tradition, I have a slight preference for the latter solution. The history of Nigga may go back as far as the Ebla corpus. The so-called Esbarkin-list (see most recently Picchioni 1997) begins with a long NIG section. So far, however, a historical connection between this list and Nippur Nigga cannot be established.
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BM 54712 (82–5–22, 1039)
In the ninth century B.C., during the successive reigns of Ashurnasirpal II and Shalmaneser III, Assyria extended its western boundary and came to claim suzerainty over the North-Syrian countries situated to the west of the Euphrates river. Shalmaneser III's conquest of Til-barsip on the east bank of the Euphrates, the main residence of Ahuni, the leader of Bit-Adini, was a crucial step in this historical process. He subsequently reorganized the area along both banks of the river into an Assyrian province, and placed its administrative center at Til-barsip, which he converted into an Assyrian city with the new name Kār-Šalmanānu-aššarīdu “Port Shalmaneser.” This province served as the lasting western boundary of Assyria and was a cornerstone of Assyrian imperial policy in the west until the renewal of territorial expansion by Tiglath-pileser III in the second half of the eighth century B.C.1

The recently discovered archaeological and epigraphic (Luwian, Aramaic and Akkadian) evidence from Tell Ahmar (ancient Til-barsip) will undoubtedly stimulate scholarly discussions on the complex cultural heritage and political history of this site.2 The purpose of the present study, however, is not to discuss these new materials originating in Til-barsip, but to re-examine the Assyrian annals in order to scrutinize the historical details of Shalmaneser III’s conquest of the city and discuss the related historiographical problems.

Shalmaneser’s battles with Ahuni are narrated in several versions of his annals, as well as other historical texts.3 The Kurkh Monolith Inscription, composed in the king’s sixth regnal year

---


3. The primary versions of Shalmaneser’s Annals are: the One Year Annals: M. Mahmud and J. Black, Samur 44 (1985/6), pp. 135–155, Text no. 1 = RIMA 3, A.0.102.3; the Two Year Annals: RIMA 3, A.0.102.1; the Kurkh
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