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Chapter 7: The scribes involved

The present chapter deals only with the scribes as far as they directly appear as historical persons. Indirect aspects, such as the individual scribes’ handwriting or the individual formats of the tablet colophons, are dealt with as physical characteristics in chapter 8.

1. [Scribes in the Ḫattuša lexical lists: the scribe Šabuḫaza] The primary evidence for the identity of the scribes who produced lexical tablets are the colophons of these tablets, on which the scribes would leave: their name, filiation, title, sometimes the names and titles of their teachers and supervisors (autobiographical information), as well as the specific circumstances under which they wrote the tablet (editorial information). Secondary evidence is provided by the colophons of those tablets that shared the shelves and the specific archival context of the lexical tablets.

Unfortunately, there are only a mere five colophons preserved on the manuscripts of the Ḫattuša corpus (for a formal description and analysis, cf. chapter 8, sect. 4), and among these, there is only a single instance with a scribe mentioning himself by name. This name, spelled Ša-buḫa-za, is – at least in this spelling – entirely unparalleled. If it is indeed an abbreviation for Šamuḫa-ziti, as proposed by R. Lebrun (1978: 10), the name finds some parallels in other documents; yet it is far from being clear that these attestations denote the same historical person (see discussion in chapter 8, sect. 6.ColA). Apart from his name, Šabuḫaza does not give his filiation nor does he mention a title or a position, so it is impossible to link him into a prosopographical network or to determine his exact function within the archive.

2.1. [Pupils, apprentice scribes, teachers, supervisors in other sources – the material preserved] As demonstrated in chapter 6, sect. 4., lexical lists represent only a small portion of the contents of the archives in which they were found in Ḫattuša. Scribes known from colophons of long-term documents or as named in ephemeral documents; thus, are numerous and cannot be treated here in detail. Since the functional context of the lexical lists is supposed to have been that of scribal education; however, it shall be useful to discuss at least those sources in which scribes mention themselves as somehow involved in scribal training.

There could be verified nine colophons altogether that identify the respective manuscripts as the products of scribal training: The scribes denote themselves either as Akk. GĀB.ZU.ZU / kabzuzu “pupil” or as Akk. DUB.SAR.TUR. “junior scribe”:

1) KBo. 12,41 (Treaty with Talmi-Teššob, HaH, IIIc) [PN] [kabzuz]u of Mera-Muwa
2) KBo. 15, 37 (išuwa-festival, BkA, IIib) Talmi-Teššob (genealogy) kabzuzu of MAH.DINGIR.MEŠ-ma, under supervision of UR.MAH-Ziti GAL.DUB.SAR.MEŠ
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(3) KUB 13,9 (Instruction text, find spot unknown, IIIb) \([\text{Ali}]\) [\text{hĩni}} \) (genealogy) \([\text{kabzu}] \) zu of Zuwa EN É.\(\text{Gis}\) KIN\(\text{-ti}\)

(4) KUB 33, 120+ (Myth of Kumarbi; T.I, IIIb) Aššapala (genealogy), kabzu of Ziti

(5) KUB 44, 61 (Medical text, find spot unknown, IIIa\(^1\)) NU.\(\text{Gis}\) KIRI\(_6\) (genealogy) kabzu of Hulanapi

(6) KUB 57,110 (Festival fragment, find spot unknown, IIIc) GUR-Šarruma kabzu of Ḥalwa-Ziti

(7) VBoT 12+ (Omen fragment, HaH, III) Pala D\([\text{UB}]\) kabzu of [PN]

(8) KBo. 45, 69 (Festival related to Zippalanda, HaH, IIIb) Piḫami [DUB\text{.SA}R.TUR kabzu of Ḥalwa-Ziti

(9) KUB 20, 4 (KI.LAM-festival, find spot unknown, IIIb) PN DUB\text{.SAR.TUR} (no teacher or supervisor mentioned)

2.2. [Pupils, apprentice scribes, teachers, supervisors in other sources – the individual titles and positions] An evaluation of the colophons and of the titles and positions mentioned in them leads to the following results:

(1) If a scribe mentions both his father and his teacher these are never identical. This does not necessarily imply that apprentice scribes were not trained by their fathers; however, there is at least no positive evidence for such a relationship.

(2) In contrast to Akk. DUB.SAR.TUR “junior scribe” (cf. Nos. 8&9), which invariably appears without supplement, Akk. \(\text{kabzu}\) “pupil” (cf. Nos. 1-8) is always followed by the name of a teacher, which suggests that \(\text{kabzu}\), unlike DUB.SAR.TUR, was not a title, but simply marks a specific pupil-teacher relationship (comparable to Akk. DUMU “son”, which marks a genealogical relationship).

(3) The combination of both Akk. DUB.SAR.TUR and Akk. \(\text{kabzu}\) in the same colophon (No. 8, possibly also No. 7) demonstrates that a trainee having achieved the status of a junior scribe could still be the disciple of a teacher.

(4) The differences and the specific relationship between teachers and supervisors are not entirely clear. That tablets are written “in front” (Akk. \(\text{ina pāni}\)) of a supervisor suggests that the actual teacher did not permanently supervise all scribal activities of the apprentice. As far as a respective title is concerned, the teachers and supervisors are introduced as high officials. Thus, the supervisor UR.MAH-Ziti in (2) appears as GAL.DUB\text{.SAR.MEŠ “chief scribe”}, the teacher Zuwa of (3) as EN.É.\(\text{Gis}\) KIN\(\text{-ti}\) “chief of the É.\(\text{Gis}\) KIN\(\text{-ti}\) (the [scribal] workshops)”\(^2\)

---

1 Following Sh. Gordin (pers. comm. 2011).
2 As for the É.\(\text{Gis}\) KIN\(\text{-ti}\), cf. Gordin 2011.
(5) The compositions that have definitely been copied by junior or apprentice scribes belong to various literary genres, and notably, their language is invariably Hittite. There are no compositions among them that belong to the curriculum of classical Babylonian scribal education. With the exception of Nos. (5) and (7), which cannot be dated exactly, all tablets preserved were written down in the 13th century.

3.1. [The scribes of the lexical lists of the parallel corpora – general note] In contrast to Hattuša, the corpora of lexical lists from Ugarit and from Emar provide a comparably rich attestation of scribes mentioning themselves in colophons. As for Emar, this is true both for the lists of the Syrian (Em-Syr) and of the Syro-Hittite (Em-SH) tradition.3 The archival context of the Emar lists – as the private archive of the scribal family owning the archive building and governing the training activities – moreover makes it possible to link in most of the actors known from the colophons into a prosopographical framework (cf. Cohen 2009) and to reconstruct part of their professional activities.

Ugarit scribes of lexical lists do not display such rich prosopographical links as in the cases of Emar, though the character of the archives they worked in is also private. Nonetheless, it is possible to reconstruct part of the broader educational context of some individual scribes, particularly through manuscripts in the local paleographic tradition (Ug-loc) of the archives Ug-Rap and Ug-MT, and to provide some approximate dates by means of synchronisms.

Lexical manuscripts of the smaller corpora are completely devoid of biographical information about the scribes who produced them. Also the archival contexts – as far as they are recoverable from published sources – do not provide any valuable secondary information about the local scribal education of these sites and their organization.

3.2.1. [The scribes of the lexical lists of the parallel corpora – Emar – the Syrian tradition] On paleographic grounds, one can identify four manuscripts with specifically Syrian colophons within the corpus of Emar lexical lists: Urra 1 Em. 541A+, Urra 1 Em. 541D, Urra 3 Em. 543-5A+, and Sag Em 757+. All four colophons show the typical Non-Syro-Hittite structure with editorial information preceding biographical information (see chapter 8, sect. 4.4.2.). The four scribes having signed the manuscripts in these colophons can be respectively identified as Ba‘al-bēlu, Išma‘-Dagan, Rībi-Dagan, and Ba‘al-bārû (Rībi-Dagan also mentions himself in a second colophon, which is discussed in sect. 3.2.3.).

The title by which these scribes mention themselves, i.e., Akk. Ï.ZU(.TUR.TUR) “(junior) diviner”, is notably uniform in all colophons; it corresponds to Akk. LÚḪAL of the Syro-Hittite colophons.

3 Lexical lists in the Syrian tradition are by far less numerous, but comprise notably many well-preserved exemplars.
Only Baʿal-bārû in his copy of the Sag-tablet identifies himself as “(professional) diviner” (Akk. ʾÌ.ZU), in contrast to the “junior diviners” (Akk. ʾÌ.ZU.TUR.TUR) of the other colophons. This status of the scribe after having finished his studies, in combination with the general quality of the manuscript⁴ and the long period of time it survived in the shelves, suggests that Baʿal-bārû had not written this tablet as an exercise, but that he did so in order to conserve the text, possibly as a composition or textual version he was hitherto not familiar with. Baʿal-bārû is also the only one among the four scribes who is attested in additional, ephemeral documents. He accordingly is known to be the father of a certain Mašru-ḥamîṣ, who, equally a diviner and the scribe of a number of ephemeral documents, proves to be a contemporary of King Pilsu-Dagan.⁵ It seems thus that Baʿal-bārû lived and worked during the reigns of Yaṣi-Dagan and Baʿal-kabar I, the predecessors of Pilsu-Dagan (i.e., around 1280-1260 BCE).

Manuscript Urra 3 Em. 543-5A+, written by Rībi-Dagan, bears the impression of an anepigraphic seal, which probably is to be identified as the personal seal of this scribe.⁶ Apart from the fact that seal impressions are extremely rare on lexical tablets, this fact is notable in that it apparently proves that apprentice scribes could have possessed seals. Following Y. Cohen, one may suggest that Rībi-Dagan “was already approaching, if not actually at, adulthood” (2009: 127) when he wrote the tablet.

Unfortunately, the scribes of all four colophons only mention their title, but not their filiation, so it is impossible to determine whether there exist any kinship relations among them.⁷

3.2.2.1. [The scribes of the lexical lists of the parallel corpora – Emar – the Syro-Hittite tradition – the Zū-Baʿla family] With the exception of the external teacher Kidin-Gula, the scholarly scribes of the Syro-Hittite tradition as they appear in the colophons of the Syro-Hittite lexical lists can all be traced to the same family, by the filiation they give in the colophons as well as by their mention in ephemeral documents.⁸ This family, named after the first-generation paterfamilias Zū-Baʿla, is an influential family of diviners, holding and passing down the position of chief diviner of the city (Akk. ʾÌ.ḪAL ša DINGIR.MEŠ ša ʾÌ.Emar). The family is documented in four generations.

---

⁴ Cohen 2009: 124f.
⁷ An additional scribe of the Syrian scholarly tradition, Tuku-ʾÌ.ḪUR.SAG, is attested in the colophon of a traditional literary text (Em. 775), where he identifies himself as ʾÌ.SANGA ʾDagan “priest of the god Dagan”. Unfortunately, he is otherwise undocumented as well (further see Cohen 2009: 135f.). The omen compendia preserved in Syrian paleography also contain a number of colophons, however without any of the scribes being identifiable. (further see Cohen 2009: 136-144).
⁸ See the detailed reconstruction of the history of the Zū-Baʿla family in Cohen 2009: 147-189
The traceable members found in the colophons of the lexical lists all belong to the third and, in one potential instance, to the fourth generation; cf. the following generation sketch:\(^9\)
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They involve the scribe and diviner Šaggar-abu, successor of his father Ba’al-qarrād and of his grandfather Zū-Ba’la positioned in the office of the chief diviner, Šaggar-abu’s brother Ba’al-mālik, taking over the position after Šaggar-abu’s (early) death, and, if Y. Cohens’s interpretation of the colophon in Urra 7 Em. 548H is correct (2009: 178f.), also Ba’al-mālik’s son Zuzu/Zū-Ba’la (as for Bēlu-qarrād, the cousin of Šaggar-abu and Ba’al-mālik, cf. the following section 3.2.3.). The scribes regularly give their filiation, thus mentioning their father Ba’al-qarrād and, in one case (Lu 1 Em. 602A+), also the grandfather Zū-Ba’la.

The titles appearing in the colophons involve (1) Akk. DUB.SAR “scribe”\(^10\), (2) Akk. ḤAL ša DINGIR.MEŠ ša EMAR “diviner of the gods of Emar”, (3) Akk. AZU “diviner” and just once, (4) Akk. MĀŠ.ŠU.GÍ.DÍD, also “diviner”; thereby (1) is always bound to the occurrence of (2), which it then precedes, whereas (2), (3), and (4) never occur in immediate combination. Since the position of these titles within the colophons invariably comes after the filiation of the scribe and never directly after the name, it appears that they belong to the father mentioned in the filiation;\(^11\) the colophon of Lu 1 Em. 602A+ supports this suggestion, since it lists titles after Šaggar-abu’s father as well as after his grandfather. It would otherwise be notable that Šaggar-abu and Ba’al-mālik were already fully educated scribes and chief diviners while they were studying lexical tablets (but see sect. 3.3.2.).

---

\(^9\) The sketch only includes those persons that are mentioned or mention themselves in the colophons of the lists.

\(^10\) Thus contra Fleming 2000: 26; colophons written by members of the Zū-Ba’la family and including the title Akk. DUB.SAR involve Urra 1 Em. 541B+, Urra 4 Em. 545D+, Urra 5 Em. 546A+, and Urra 12 Em. 555A+.

\(^11\) And not, as assumed by Cohen (2009: 165/175), to the scribe himself.
3.2.2.2. [The scribes of the lexical lists of the parallel corpora – Emar – the Syro-Hittite tradition – the teachers and other scribes] Akk. *kabzuzu* “pupil”, as noted in sect. 2.2. with regard to the Hittite colophons, probably is not a title in the strictest sense, rather it merely denotes a pupil-teacher relationship. In the Emar lexical lists of the Syro-Hittite tradition, it only occurs occasionally and if so, like in the parallel traditions invariably with the name of the teacher following.

The manuscript with the first attestation, Urra 4 Em. 545U+, does not have the name of the teacher preserved. The second attestation is in Izi 1 Em. 567A+, and the name of the teacher is Kidin-Gula. This scribe also occurs in the colophons of Urra 3 Em. 546A+ and Urra 12 Em. 555A+, and the (broken-off) term to be restored in front of it must again be Akk. *kabzuzu*. The latter colophon identifies Ba’al-mālik as the scribe who wrote the tablet, and hence as a pupil of Kidin-Gula. Ephemeral documents demonstrate that Kidin-Gula was hired as a teacher only and was not a member of the Zū-Ba’la household; he probably lived and worked as a scribe in his own right in or around House 5 in excavation area A.12

In the aforementioned attestation, Ba’al-mālik identifies himself as a pupil; however, in the third attestation of Akk. *kabzuzu*, Lu 1 Em. 602Ad, he appears as the teacher. Akk. *kabzuzu* is probably also to be restored in Urra 7 Em. 548H, preceding again Ba’al-mālik then, who is also identified in the colophon as the father of the scribe (whose name in turn is broken off). This attestation is the only definitive attestation within the Emar lexical lists in which the father of a scribe simultaneously acted as his teacher. A second, potential case is the colophon of Lu 1 Em 602A+: After naming his father Ba’al-qarrād and his grandfather Zū-Ba’la, Šaggar-abu again mentions himself as the son of Ba’al-qarrād; the repetition is probably a mistake, with Akk. DUMU “son” to be emended to Akk. *kabzuzu* “pupil”.13 Altogether thus, scribes mentioning their father as teacher are notably rare; however, it is possible that colophons that give the filiation but do not explicitly mention a teacher were meant to indicate that the tablet was written under the father’s instructions.14

3.2.3. [The scribes of the lexical lists of the parallel corpora – Emar – evidence for the transition from the Syrian to the Syro-Hittite tradition] The transition from the Syrian to the Syro-Hittite tradition has as of yet not been substantially traced, as noted by Y. Cohen: “In spite of the change,
there is no evidence of a single scribe who made the transition from one tradition to the other. There were mutual influences of the two traditions on each other, but these were minimal." (2009: 29).

Some details within the paleography of two manuscripts as well as the style of their colophons may provide some potential hints at this transition. The scribe mentioning himself in the colophon of SvO Em. 603A has been identified by Cohen (2009: 159f.) as Bēlu-qarrād, the son of Kāpī-Dagan, who was the younger brother of Ba’al-qarrād and thus the uncle of the Šaggar-abu and Ba’al-mālik, the scribes responsible for the great part of colophons of the Syro-Hittite scholarly tradition (cf. the chart in sect. 3.2.2.1.). Bēlu-qarrād, thus, was the cousin of these two scribes; however, the manuscript he wrote principally follows the Syrian tradition: (1) The paleography, though showing some Syro-Hittite sign forms, appears basically Syrian. (2) The title given in the colophon, Akk. İ.ZU. TUR.TUR, otherwise occurs in colophons of the Syrian tradition only. And (3) the formal characteristics of the tablet, with horizontal auxiliary rulings used instead of intersection rulings (cf. chapter 8, sect. 2.4.), are also typical of Syrian-style lexical tablets. On the other hand, the paleography as noted, already shows the intrusion of some Syro-Hittite sign forms and the general structure of the colophon – with biographical information preceding editorial information – differs from the structure of the other Syrian colophons, but resembles that of the Syro-Hittite colophons. If Cohen’s identification is correct, thus, the manuscript may prove that scribes in the third generation of the Zū-Ba’la family still adhered to the Syrian tradition to some degree. 15

The colophon of manuscript SaV Em. 537C+, written by the Syrian scribe Rībi-Dagan (who also wrote Urra 3 Em. 543-5A+; see sect. 3.2.1.), like the other traditional Syrian colophons lacks the filiation. However, it deviates from the standard structure of the Syrian colophons in that biographical information is given before editorial information, as is typical for the Syro-Hittite colophons, and in that it omits the scribal title. Apart from that, the general paleography of the manuscript – which is basically Syrian in style – contains Syro-Hittite sign forms. It seems thus that Rībi-Dagan, clearly working in a Syrian tradition when he wrote the colophon of Urra 3 Em. 543-5A+, must have ‘experienced’ some Syro-Hittite influence when he wrote the colophon of SaV Em. 537C+. It is possible that the notable editorial remark in his colophon in which he mentions that he wrote the tablet Akk. i-na ŠĒR.ŠĒR.ZABAR “(placed) in copper chains”, is not (only) to be interpreted as an indication of bondage due to financial problems, as proposed by Cohen (2009: 129), but also acts as a witness to the foreign impact which the hitherto dominant local scribal tradition and their members were undergoing.

15 Though, since Kāpī-Dagan was the younger brother of Ba’al-qarrād, his son Bēl-qarrād was probably the younger cousin of Šaggar-abu and thus started his scribal training after the latter, on whose tablets, in turn, no Syrian features can be identified.
3.2.4. [The scribes of the lexical lists of the parallel corpora – Emar – some synchronisms] By means of the synchronisms established between the scribes mentioned in the preceding sections and with officials known from other, also Non-Emarite documents, it is possible to specify the dates of production of some manuscripts that have been established on the basis of paleography in chapter 5, sect. 4.2., and add a few approximate absolute dates.

The synchronism between King Pilsu-Dagan and Maḥru-ḫamiš, the son of Baʾal-bārû, who in turn wrote Sag Em. 757+, suggests 1280-1260 BCE as an approximate date of production for this manuscript, i.e., ca. 80-100 years before the destruction and abandonment of the archive. The manuscripts in which Baʾal-mālik identifies himself as scribe may have been produced roughly between 1215 and 1195 BCE; Baʾal-mālik is known to have been active as a diviner at least until 1185, and the period of his scribal education may have been some 10-30 years earlier. The exercises produced by Baʾal-mālik’s elder brother Šaggar-abu may thus date back to some 10 years earlier than the ones produced by Baʾal-mālik, hence at some point in time between 1225 and 1205 BCE. In this respect, having been produced 25-45 years before Emar’s defeat, they form the earliest datable lexical manuscripts of the Syro-Hittite tradition.

3.3.1. [The scribes of the lexical lists of the parallel corpora – Ugarit – scribal families involved in scribal training] In contrast to the lexical lists from Emar, scribes often give a relatively detailed filiation in the colophons of the Ugarit lexical lists, including their own filiation, but also that of the teacher supervising them. Thereby it is possible to reconstruct two scribal families involved in scribal training:

The scribe Nuʾme-Rašap, identifying himself as the scribe of the Atra-ḫasis copy RS 22.421, – if the contrasting spellings of the name really trace back to the same person – appears as the father of a scribe whose name is broken off in Urra 3 Ug. RS 22.217A+19, and as father of a second scribe whose name is almost lost (ฎD ฎX1 ฎX1 ฎZI) in Urra Ug. 10A = RS 22.346+; in the same manuscript he is mentioned as the father of 𝒾D 𝒾X1 𝒾X1  iscI's teacher Gamir-Haddu (spelled 𒈗BE-DrU'). Thus, 𝒾D 𝒾X1  iscI was a trainee of his brother Gamir-Haddu. These scholarly tablets all stem from Ug-MT and its surroundings. Gamir-Haddu possibly acted as a teacher also in Ug-Lam, as evidenced by the colo-

17 As for the following, generally see van Soldt 1995: 181
18 Cf. the discussion in van Soldt 1991: 30f.
20 And not his uncle, as suggested in van Soldt 1995: 181.
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phon of Urra 5 Ug. RS 25.453+21, and Ug-Rap (Urra 4 Ug. RS 20.170B+,22 spelled BE-DIŠKUR there) – if the respective manuscripts were really produced in these archives and not brought there from MT. A fourth son of Nu’mé-Rašáp, Ili-šapšu, mentions his father in the legal document RS 22.223 (also from Ug-MT); he also appears as the scribe of a second legal document found in Ug-Ršp (RS 17.36). Nu’mé-Rašáp himself is the scribe of several legal documents, which were found in the palace archives. The different archival find spots demonstrate that the administrative and the scholarly activities of this scribe, and possibly also those of his sons, were bound to different archives respectively.

A second scribal family involved in scribal training emerges from the colophon of SV o Ug. A = RS 17.41+, (found outside Ršp + MPC5); it identifies the scribe Irīb-Ba’lu as a pupil of his uncle Šub-[  
Yet, there are no further scholarly or ephemeral documents to attest to the scribal activities of these scribes, including their grandfather and father Abi-yātar (who is mentioned in the same colophon).

In contrast to Emar, there is no positive evidence for a father being the scribal teacher of his son. Possibly, as it may still be the case for the Emar lists, colophons in which scribes give their filiation but which do not mention their teacher were meant to indicate implicitly that the scribe worked under the instructions of his father. Apart from that, there is no positive evidence as yet indicating that the owners of these houses (known for Ug-Rap and Ug-Urt) were actively involved in the scribal activities connected with the lexical lists.

3.3.2. [The scribes of the lexical lists of the parallel corpora – Ugarit – titles and careers] There are only two titles scribes assign themselves in the colophons of the Ugarit lexical lists, Akk. LÚDUB. SAR and LÚ.A.BA, both “scribe”. The title Akk. LÚ/DUB.SAR.TUR “junior scribe”, i.e., the title actually expected, is notably absent. The students identify themselves as professional scribes, although they also state in many instances that they are the pupils (Akk. kabzuzu) of a teacher. A possible explanation is that at least some scribes appearing in the syllabic-cuneiform lexical lists had accomplished some prior scribal education in alphabetic cuneiform. That this was the fact is apparently demonstrated by manuscript Tu Ug. C = RS 22.225, with the basic syllabic-cuneiform exercise Tu on the one side and an advanced literary composition in alphabetic cuneiform on the other.23

A kind of promotion within an individual scribal career is possibly traceable to the scribe Yanḥāna, who is known from at least five colophons.24 Yanḥāna identifies himself as LÚ/DUB.SAR

---

21 Colophon exceptionally published in van Soldt 1988: 316, No. m.
24 Involving the following published manuscripts:
RSGT Ug. A = RS 20.230 as LÚ/DUB.SAR and without a teacher mentioned,
Urra Ug. 12C1 = RS 20.201A+ as LÚ.A.BA and with a teacher Nūr-mālik,
and as LÚA.BA each in two colophons (with the title not preserved in the fifth one). Notably, the occurrences of LÚA.BA (which is otherwise not attested in the Ugarit colophons) are bound to the mentioning of the teacher Nūr-mālik. The teacher’s name in the colophons in which Yanḥāna calls himself LÚDUB.SAR, is not mentioned in the first instance and is partly broken, but does definitely not read Nūr-mālik, in the second one. It is conceivable thus that the alternation of the titles corresponds to a change of the teacher and, quite possibly, testifies to a kind of promotion Yanḥāna had undergone (further see chapter 13, sect. 3.2.2.).

Two colophons also attest to the titles of the teachers. Thus, the above-mentioned Gamir-Haddu (with the name of the scribe mostly broken) appears as LÚGAL.SUKKAL “chief vezir” in Urra 5 Ug. RS 25.453+26. In Urra 5 Ug. RS 22.437B, the teacher [...] X3-DI (with name of the scribe equally lost) appears as LÚSUKKAL MUNUS.LUGAL “vezir of the queen”. Thus, the teachers – at least those named by title – appear to have held very high positions in the state administration and, hence, to have accumulated a wealth of social capital.27

3.3.3. [The scribes of the lexical lists of the parallel corpora – Ugarit – some synchronisms] Only a few scribes known to have produced lexical tablets or to have supervised their production also appear as scribes of ephemeral documents. Though not numerous, cases of this sort provide some valuable synchronisms with otherwise historically attested and datable persons.28 Thus, according to the synchronism between the juridical document RS 18.280 by Nu’me-Rašap with King Ibirānu, the lexical manuscripts written or supervised by Nu’me-Rašap’s sons, Urra 3 Ug. RS 22.217A+, Urra Ug. 10A = RS 22.346+, and Urra 5 Ug. RS 25.453+, must date roughly to the period 1230-1190 BCE. Further synchronisms exist, via a number of juridical documents, between the scribe Iltaḥmu, as attested in manuscript Diri Ug. 3A = RS 22.227B+, and King ḤAmiṭtamru II, as well as between Šapšu-malku, (as mentioned by the scribe Ba’lasku as his teacher in the colophon of Urra Ug. 11A = RS 20.32), and the Kings Niqmaddu II and Arḫalba. These two manuscripts, thus, were likely pro-

---

25 See previous note.
26 Colophon exceptionally published in van Soldt 1988: 316, No. m.
27 As for an analysis of the social status of the scribal class, as judged from the OB Eduba, cf. Veldhuis 1997: 142ff.
28 The synchronisms given in the following have already been listed in van Soldt 1992.
duced within the periods 1260-1220 and 1340-1300 BCE respectively. Thus, one of the manuscripts was very likely produced at least 120 years before the defeat and abandonment of the site.

Iltah.mu is the only scribe attested that identifies himself as a disciple in a colophon of a lexical tablet and additionally appears as the scribe of an ephemeral document – provided the two attestations of the name really trace back to the same historical person. Whether Iltahmu wrote this juridical document before, during, or after his studies of lexical lists cannot be said; in the colophon of the lexical list, he does – unlike other students of lexical lists (see above, sect. 3.3.2.) – not assign himself the title of a professional scribe, i.e., Akk. DUB.SAR.

4. [Some conclusions] A comparison of the data found for the scribes of the Ḫattuša lexical lists with those found for their ‘colleagues’ from Ugarit and Emar, leads to the following conclusions:

1) There are no hints that the scribal activities and abilities connected with the lexical lists were passed down within the immediate circle of scribal families in Ḫattuša, in contrast to what is verifiable for Emar and – at least in parts – for Ugarit.

2) In all three corpora, the teachers and supervisors explicitly mentioned by title belong to the elite of the administration (Ḫattuša and Ugarit) or of the local cult (Emar).

3) Unlike the lexical lists from Ugarit and Emar, there moreover are no attestations of scribes calling themselves disciples in the colophons of the Ḫattuša lists. Instead, the designation Akk. kabuzu ša “pupil of” frequently occurs in the colophons of regular Hittite long-term documents. This can be compared with the fact that the Emar apprentice scribe Rībi-Dagan already possessed a personal seal, or regarding the situation found in the colophons of some Ugarit lexical lists, that scribes of lexical tablets identify themselves as Akk. DUB.SAR “(professional, thus fully-educated) scribes”. Assuming that these scribes had mastered alphabetic cuneiform before approaching the syllabic-cuneiform curriculum, one may suggest that Hittite scribal apprentices first studied conventional Hittite long-term documents before changing over to compositions of the traditional Mesopotamian scribal curriculum, such as to lexical lists.

4) The dates of production established for a number of manuscripts via synchronisms among the scribes that mention themselves in the colophons, suggests that individual scribe’s manuscripts may have been stored for periods longer than 100 years both in Emar and Ugarit. The date of production of the earliest lexical manuscripts of the Ḫattuša corpus as identified by means of paleography (cf. chapter 5, sect. 2.3.) antedates the the abandonment of the respective archives by at least 150 years (yet, in this respect note the problems concerning the archaeological context that are discussed in chapter 6, sect. 1.).