

**Click here to view
current issues**
on the Chicago Journals website.

Prince Ashurbânîpal's Reading Book and Some Related Tablets

Author(s): C. H. W. Johns

Source: *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (Oct., 1917), pp. 60-66

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/528514>

Accessed: 14-11-2021 14:08 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*

Critical Notes

PRINCE ASHURBÂNIPAL'S READING BOOK AND SOME RELATED TABLETS

When the contents of Ashurbânipal's library at Nineveh, transferred to the British Museum in London, came to be catalogued, there proved to be some fifty to sixty fragments of closely related texts for which the description "lists of wood or wooden objects" was devised. It was sufficient to indicate their nature roughly. The texts all belonged to a single series which the Assyrian scribes named $\dot{G}AR-RA = \textit{hubullum}$. There had been at least six tablets in the series, but not one was completely preserved.

Naturally, the first duty was to publish the texts, at any rate those of the larger and better-preserved fragments. Accordingly in the second volume of Sir H. C. Rawlinson's *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* two or three fragments were published as "relating to wooden objects." But it was reserved for Friedrich Delitzsch in the third edition of his *Assyrische Lesestücke* (*AL*³), 1885, pages 86–90, to combine all that was then known of the principal tablet and publish it under the above title. How far the work was due to Delitzsch's own copies and how much he was indebted to the copies sent him by George Smith are not easy to decide, but it was a masterly effort to reconstruct and restore the full text from all the available sources. These were about eight fragments of at least four different tablets, each of which once contained a separate copy of the text of the fourth tablet of the series.

This edition did not indicate in every case what was the "class-mark" or registration number of the fragment from which variants of the text were quoted. G. Smith apparently sent copies from fragments then still unnumbered. But these publications enabled Dr. C. Bezold in his great *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collections of the British Museum* to recognize a number of the fragments; and in his fifth volume, page 2093, he was able to assign eighteen fragments to the $\dot{G}AR-RA = \textit{hubullum}$ series. Many of these, of course, were from other tablets of the series. He displayed some hesitation about a number more which he described as "explanatory lists of names of various kinds of wood and wooden objects" (V, 2096–97).

In April, 1898, I was led to copy all these fragments, to point out a number of "joins," and to make many additions to my copy of the *Assyrische Lesestücke*. I did not carry this study farther then, because I expected that the appearance of the fifth and index volume of the *Catalogue* would largely

augment the lists I had been able to draw up for myself by perusing the earlier volumes. Also I became aware that Dr. Br. Meissner was working at similar texts and I did not like to "queer his pitch" or forestall his results. He soon published some of his copies in a valuable *Supplement zu den assyrischen Wörterbüchern* and made use of the results of further study in his *Seltene assyrische Ideogramme*, 1906.

More recently, in his *Assyriologische Studien*, published from time to time in the *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, and last in his *Assyriologische Forschungen*, I (1916), Dr. Br. Meissner has been able, with the help of duplicates not in the British Museum, to reconstruct and restore the larger part of the third and fifth tablets of the series and to identify a fragment of the sixth.

There are several other closely related series about which much may be said. But not a little can be added to the results already obtained for the tablet named above, by Smith, Delitzsch, and Meissner. In this article I propose solely to point out what additions I have noted.

In constructing a standard text for a critical edition of a work existing in several copies, it is a great advantage when, as in our case, the copies do not deviate except in such small matters as various spellings or different arrangement of lines. The order was the same throughout for all copies. Further, they all began and ended alike. This was absolutely necessary, because each tablet was quoted by its first line and carried as its last line the "catch-line" which was also the first line of the next tablet of the series. But the duplicates might arrange the intervening lines differently as to their columns.

Thus, if we call the tablet K4338*a*, given by Delitzsch, duplicate A; and the tablet K2016*a*, referred to by him, duplicate B, we may note that while A had 70 lines in its first column and 72 distinct entries (for there are double entries in lines 24, 66), B had at least 80 entries and to all appearance 80 lines. This divergence naturally increases as the columns succeed in order, till the sixth column of B begins with the line 32 on the sixth column of A. Further, while A has crowded 92 entries into its last column, B leaves 16 or more lines to be occupied by the full colophon which Delitzsch quotes, *AL*³, page 90. This lack of agreement as to number of lines *per* column is a hindrance to the recognition of the place to which a fragment is to be assigned.

It will be observed that *AL*³, page 86, makes up the first column practically complete. The duplicates, in fact, add little. Meissner, *SAI*, 4268, rightly concludes that I.18*a* has lost nothing, but one duplicate adds *u* at the end of *ut-tu- . . .* It must be clear that fragments which might complete Ib or the Semitic part of the first column would not be entered in the *Catalogue* as "lists of wood or wooden objects," because they would lack the "determinative of wood"—*GIŠ*. They could not be so entered because there was then no reason to suppose that the Semitic words preserved had any relation to the ideograms in Ia.

In I.46a, Delitzsch pointed out that the scribe evidently had before him in his original *GIŠ-BA-KIN* where we might expect *GIŠ-BA-ŠÍK*. He apparently wrote *KIN* without scruple, but altered it to *ŠÍK*, or perhaps wrote *ŠÍK* as being in use in his day, but altered to *KIN* in deference to his original. He clearly copied his original faithfully in lines 64, 65. The duplicates all give *ŠÍK* for *KIN*. That *KIN* (or *SI-KI*) was used where we usually find *ŠÍK* is now certain from the "Yale Syllabary," No. 174, page 88, in A. T. Clay's *Yale Oriental Series*, Vol. I. But otherwise the six duplicates add nothing beyond orthographical variants to the first column.

The second column evidently devoted its first 60 lines, according to Delitzsch's numeration, to the theme *GIŠ-GU-ZA*, begun in the last 4 lines of the first column. There is not much difficulty in conjecturing the Semitic entries in IIb which answer to the lines IIa, 1-11, as preserved on A. B put the corresponding lines at the end of its first column and must have started its second column with what was once preserved on A, II.14. Unfortunately that is lost and no duplicate restores it. The inadequacy of what A, as Delitzsch left it, yields may be judged from the fact that it furnished only three entries to Brünnow's *Sign List*—Nos. 11157, 11158, 11160. Of these only the last is correct. The first should be *a-rat-ti-tum*, the next *ka-bit-tum*. Meissner, *SAI*, 8528, would give II.6b as *tar*, but it is really *kud-di-ni-tum*. Line 2 should be *GIŠ GU-ZA ZAG-BI-UŠ* = (*kussi*) *ni-me-di*. The Semitic of line 1 is not found yet. In Column II, lines 7-11 read thus:

- | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|------------|------------|-------------------------------------|
| 7. | <i>GIŠ GU-ZA</i> | <i>GĪD</i> | = | <i>ša ħar-ra-ni</i> |
| 8. | " | " | " | <i>NIM-MA-KI</i> = <i>pal-ti-gu</i> |
| 9. | " | " | <i>UŠ</i> | = <i>ša zi-ka-ri</i> |
| 10. | " | " | <i>SAL</i> | = <i>ša sin-niš-ti</i> |
| 11. | " | " | <i>TER</i> | = <i>ša kiš-ti</i> |

The duplicate A gives only slight traces of the last entry, but, once known from other fragments, they are easily made out.

After this we have many claimants to the places left vacant on A in Delitzsch's edition. He was surely right in placing the fragment published II.R.46, No. 7 somewhere in this column, but wrong in putting in lines 20-26. Hence it is an error to quote its entries as those of K4378a, II.20-26, as has frequently been done. Bezold in his *Catalogue*, page 2237, does not record its identification. K12060 is a duplicate which enables us to restore somewhat as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| <i>GIŠ GU-ZA -BA</i> | = | <i>kussu ħu-</i> |
| " " <i>ANŠU</i> | = | " <i>i-me-ri</i> |
| " " <i>ŠAG-ZAG-MA</i> | = | <i>na-ad</i> |
| " " <i>GIŠ-KIN-TI</i> | = | <i>ku-us-su</i> |
| " " <i>GIŠ-MĀ-KAN-NA</i> | = | <i>ma-ak-kan-nu-u</i> |
| " " <i>GIŠ-ME-LUGĜĀ</i> | = | <i>me-lub-ħu-u</i> |

GIŠ GU-ZA MÀ-LĀĠ^c = *ša ma-lab-hi*
 “ “ -*NA* = *ku-us-si bu-*
 “ “ *SÁ-KUD* = “ *da-a-ia-ni*

It will at once occur to my readers to conclude that K12060 cannot be the source of II.R.46, No. 7, for the editor would surely have given more of its text, but the restorations are certainly worth having. They must fall after line 12 and before line 34.

It is remarkable that the traces on A, as given by Delitzsch, show that his lines 34 and 35 began with *GIŠ GU-ZA*, but that lines 36–42 began with *GIŠ* followed by a ditto sign. More than one duplicate begins its entries in the same way, but it is not absolutely certain whether the ditto sign stands for *GU-ZA* or for a longer phrase. But, with this reserved for the present, we can restore lines 36–62 as follows:

36.	<i>GIŠ</i>	ditto	<i>KÙ BABBAR GAR-RA</i>	=
37.	“	“	<i>URUDU</i>	=
38.	“	“	<i>ZABAR</i>	=
39.	“	“	<i>GIŠ KÍN</i>	=
40.	“	“	<i>ZU-SI-MES</i>	=
41.	“	“	<i>KAR</i>	=
42.	“		<i>GU-ZA KAR-AN-</i>	=
43.	“	“	<i>GIŠ A-TU-GAB-LIŠ</i>	= <i>ša ša-ar-bat-tú</i>
44.	“	“	“ <i>KU</i>	= <i>ša ur-ka-ri-in-ni</i>
45.	“	“	“ <i>KAL</i>	= <i>ša ú-ši-i</i>
46.	“	“	“ <i>ĠA-LU-ÚB</i>	= <i>ša ha-lu-up-pi</i>
47.	“	“	“ <i>ŠĀ-KAL</i>	= <i>ša šak-kul-ti</i>
48.	“	“	“ <i>MES-MĀ-KAN-NA</i>	= <i>ša mu-suk-ka-nu</i>
49.	“	“	“ <i>KA-AM-SI</i>	= <i>ša sin-ni pi-i-ri</i>
50.	“	“	“ <i>ŠÚ-KA-Ê-RÚ-A</i>	=
51.	“	“	“ <i>KARATIN-Ê-RÚ-A</i>	= ditto
52.	“	“	“ <i>KA-RÚ-Ê-RÚ-A</i>	= <i>e-rim-ti</i> ditto

The duplicates are not exact; one seems to have left out line 43 altogether, and my copy gives a different entry in another line. But, such as they are, they may be useful. Possibly someone may have come across other duplicates. The remainder of Col. II as on A is not affected by the duplicates which I have seen.

Column III.1 began with *GIŠ ŠU-A* as did lines 64–72 of Col. II. But, so far, I know of no suggestions for lines 2–16, which are absent from all the duplicates. But someone may know of a list beginning *GIŠ ŠU-A*. Col. III. 17–42 can now be restored as follows:

17.	<i>GIŠ NA AM-ZI-GA</i>	= <i>iršu ri ša ša-ša-ri</i>
18.	“ “ <i>ZI-GA</i>	= <i>um-mul-tum</i>
19.	“ “ <i>KU-A</i>	= ditto

20.	<i>GIŠ NA Ú</i>	ditto	<i>KARATIN</i>	=	<i>ir-šu ur-ba-ti</i>
21.	" "	<i>SAG</i>	<i>KARATIN</i>	=	" <i>aš-li</i>
22.	" "	<i>DUBBIN</i>		=	" <i>šu-up-ri</i>
23.	" "	"	<i>GUD</i>	=	" <i>šu-pur al-pi</i>
24.	" "	"	<i>NIN</i>	=	" <i>šu-pur-šu mim-ma</i>
25.	" "	<i>ŠĪG-GA</i>	<i>ŠU-AG-A</i>	=	" <i>ša bu-sik-ki</i>
26.	" "	<i>ŠĀ-TAG</i>		=	" <i>še'-at</i>
27.	" "	<i>ŠĀ-TAG</i>	<i>KIN-GA ŠU-AG-A</i>	=	" <i>ša bu-sik-ki</i> "
28.	" "	" "	<i>ŠĪG-GA</i> " " "	=	" <i>ša šar-ti en-zi</i> "
29.	" "	<i>SIS-UNU-KI</i>	<i>GA-DAM-TA</i>	=	" <i>mu-tak-ma-tum</i>
30.	" "	" "	" " " "	=	<i>muḥ-ḥu-uš-tum</i>
31.	" "	" "	" "	=	<i>U-ri-tum</i>
32.	" "	<i>ARI-KI</i>		=	<i>Ak-ka-di-tum</i>
33.	" "	<i>KA-MUŠ</i>		=	<i>ir-šu ka-muš-ša-ku</i>
34.	"	<i>SAG-AN-DUL-NA</i>		=	<i>ki-ti ir-ši</i>
35.	"	"	"	=	" "
36.	"	"	"	=	" "
37.	"	<i>ZAL-DA-</i>	"	=	<i>par-ri-kat</i> "
38.	"	<i>SAG-</i>	"	=	<i>pu-u-tu</i> "
39.	"	<i>SAG-</i>	"	=	<i>kil-tu</i> "
40.	"	<i>EN-</i>	"	=	<i>bel-tum</i> "
41.	"	<i>MES-</i>	"	=	<i>a-mar-tu</i>
42.	"	<i>DUBBIN-</i>	"	=	<i>šu-up-ru</i>

These results are due to comparison of four duplicates. They are not entirely consistent, but put their entries in different orders. The fragment which Delitzsch put in this column and which Meissner, *SAI*, *passim*, quotes as K4338a, III. 14–26, would really be III. 25–39 if it lay on A, but it is really K8217 and part of B. Such variants as *ša-rat* for *šarti* or *mu-ḥu-uš-tum* for *muḥ-ḥu-uš-tum* do not amount to much. But it may be worth noting that for *SIS-UNU-KI* in lines 29, 30, one duplicate gives *ARI-KI* (or *BUR-BUR-KI*) as in line 31 and for *GA* puts *MAL* or *GĀ*. From line 43 to line 72 the third column as given in Delitzsch's edition has little need of restoration. Meissner, *SAI*, 5731–38, has booked what Brünnow was not able to register.

From Delitzsch's edition of A it might be concluded from line 3 in Col. IV that the ideogram with which the column began, but which was lost from the first 2 lines and replaced in lines 4 and 5 by a ditto sign, really commenced with *GIŠ-KA . . .* but neither Brünnow nor Meissner was able to exploit the first 5 lines. We may restore them thus:

1.	<i>GIŠ KA-ŠŪ-KAT</i>		=	
2.	" "	" "	<i>GIŠ-KAL</i>	=	<i>ša ú-ši-i</i>
3.	" "	" "	<i>GIŠ-MES</i>	=	<i>ša mi-e-si</i>
4.	" "	" "	<i>KA-AM-SI-DUN-DUN</i>	=	<i>ša šin-ni pi-ri</i>
5.	" "	" "	" " " <i>SI-GA</i>	=	" <i>uḥ-ḥu-zi</i>

One duplicate makes two lines out of line 4 and two more out of line 5, as they were too long to write in one line. A avoids this by writing a ditto sign after *GIŠ* in lines 4 and 5 to replace *KA-ŠŪ-KAT*. Which of the values already registered for this ideogram was here placed in IV.1*b* no duplicate shows, but it is unwise to speculate. A admits of no addition to this column from line 6 to line 20, but the next 8 lines are very uncertain. In line 27 we have *GIŠ SI-SI I-DIB* = *hu-ú-ku*; the ideogram in line 28 also ended in *I-DIB* and was explained as *la-ku-ú*. In the following lines the duplicates are at variance. The signs read *BUGIN* and *BUNIN* in Brünnow's *Sign List* are easily mistaken, and, rightly or not, the duplicates confuse them. But, subject to some reserve as to these signs, we may restore lines 29–46 as follows:

29.	<i>GIŠ</i>	<i>BUGIN</i>	= <i>bu-nin-nu</i>
30.	<i>GIŠ</i>	<i>BUGIN</i>	= <i>bu-gin-nu</i>
31.	<i>GIŠ</i>	<i>BUGIN</i>	= <i>su-us-sul-lu</i>
32.	<i>GIŠ</i>	<i>BUGIN-GAL</i>	= <i>ra-bu-ú</i>
33.	"	" <i>TUR</i>	= <i>ša-aḥ-ru</i>
34.	"	" <i>MES-BAR-RA</i>	= <i>mub-ḫu-ṣu</i>
35.	"	" <i>KUD-DA</i>	= <i>kud-du</i>
36.	"	" <i>ŠŪ-ĜA</i>	= <i>ša ba-i-ri</i>
37.	"	" <i>KIT-NI-UŠ</i>	= <i>ta-pa-lu</i>
38.	"	<i>KU-GAZ</i>	= <i>e-šit-tum</i>
39.	"	" " <i>ŠE</i>	= " <i>še-im</i>
40.	"	" " <i>ŠE GIŠ-NI</i>	= " <i>ša-maš-šam-me</i>
41.	"	" " <i>ZŪ-LUM-MA</i>	= " <i>su-lup-pi</i>
42.	"	" " "	= <i>ma-dak-ku</i>
43.	"	" " "	= <i>ka-ak ma-dak-ki</i>
44.	"	<i>KAN-NA</i>	= <i>bu-kan-nu</i>
45.	"	= <i>su-up-pi-in-nu</i>
46.	"	= " <i>i-tin-ni</i>

Meissner copied K8239 for his *Supplement zu den assyrischen Wörterbüchern* and exploited its entries for *SAI*, 2378–2400. Other duplicates show that this fragment gave Col. IV. 51–71. The ends of the two lines given by Delitzsch, page 89, are the remains of the last two entries on A Col. IV. 72–73, but are actually on B.

In the fifth column, Delitzsch was able to give a complete text for lines 1–43. The duplicates merely add a few variants. One can fill up lines 44–65 so far as the ideograms are concerned, but the Semitic equivalents are lost for the most part. The last five lines of this column and the first line of the next may be restored thus:

68.	<i>GIŠ</i>	<i>MÁ NISAG</i>	= <i>ni-sa-an-ni</i>
69.	"	" <i>KI-ÁG EN-LIL-KI</i>	= <i>ta-ram Ni-ip-pu-ri</i>

70. *GIŠ MÁ KI-ÁG SIS-UNU-KI* = “ “ *Ú-ri*
 71. “ “ “ “ *DŪG-GAR-KI* = “ “
 72. “ “ “ “ *KĒŠ-KI* = “ “ *Ki-e-ši*
 VI.1. “ “ “ “ *KIŠ-KI* = “ “ *Ki-ši*

Meissner, *SAI*, 6168, 8350, has exploited some of these results as he did one variant of Col. VI.2 in *SAI*, 4035.

With respect to the sixth column it must be noted that A crowds 92 entries into this column, while B has only 60 lines. No two copies arranged their entries alike in columns. But they maintained the same order of entries. The nearest conclusion is that the whole text registered in all 72+72+72+72+72+92 entries, or 452. Many duplicates show the beginnings or ends of lines alongside those portions sufficiently preserved to be useful. Had the lengths of columns always been the same, these traces might have helped to fix the place of more fragments. But, to take one example only, Col. II.5 is on the same level as Col. I.5 on A, while Col. II.49 is on the same level as Col. I.45 on B.

Delitzsch gave a complete column down to line 38 (entry 44) and then from line 50 (entry 55) to line 75 (entry 92). We can complete from duplicates all the ideograms, but can give no Semitic equivalents.

For the whole text the duplicates give 83 new entries and complete 28 of those already partly known, thus adding about one-fifth. Some day I may have the opportunity to publish the fragments in full. It does not seem worth while here to record mere variants nor set down unexplained ideograms.

C. H. W. JOHNS

ST. CATHERINE'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

STUDIES IN HEBREW ROOTS AND THEIR ETYMOLOGY

I

בִּישַׁק, שִׁקַּק, שׁוּק

The three roots בִּישַׁק, שִׁקַּק, and שׁוּק were hardly distinguished in post-biblical and talmudic times when confusion of roots was the outstanding feature in biblical exegesis.¹ Menahem ben Saruk, the champion of the biliteral (and also uniliteral) theory of Hebrew roots, throws them all together under שִׁקַּק²; and even Ḥayyuj, the iconoclast of the biliteral fad, still confuses words whose origin is שׁוּק with those whose origin is שִׁקַּק.³ Ibn

¹ On violations in the Septuagint cf. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 200. Confusion of roots is also rampant in the minor Greek translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, as pointed out in my "Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila," *JQR* (New Series), IV, 578 ff. As to Talmud and Midrash cf. Bacher, *Die Anfänge der hebräischen Grammatik*, p. 6; see also Gesenius, *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift*, pp. 69 ff.

² *מחברת מנחם*, ed. Filipowski, p. 179.

³ *The Weak and Geminate Verbs in Hebrew*, ed. Jastrow, p. 268 of the Arabic text. Even בִּישַׁק Job 31:27 is included in this group!