§1. Introduction

§1.1. Any understanding of extispicy as a literature transmitted from the 3rd into the 2nd millennium depends on the premise of forerunners to the three forms of technical literature arising in the Old Babylonian period: liver-omen models, compendia, and reports. Aside from the size, extent, and comprehensiveness of the OB compendia, several other features have lent plausibility to the existence of a 3rd millennium written tradition for liver-divination texts. These include: later references to extispicy’s antiquity; the appearance of 3rd millennium kings in OB historical omens; the appearance of diviners in 3rd millennium professional lists; 3rd millennium references to sheep omens and liver divination in literary contexts (without reference to textual material); and a few purported examples of 3rd millennium extispiical texts (which can be shown to be spurious). Yet nothing has been so influential in this premise than the only piece of 3rd millennium evidence that seems to specifically mention extispiical technical literature, two oft-quoted lines from Šulgi’s Hymn B, ll. 132-3, usually translated:

1 a ritually pure interpreter of omens.
2 I am the very Sintu (creator deity) of the collections of omens only.

ma₂₃ ū gido₃-gido₃ zalag-zalag-ga-me-en
gir₃-gen-na imim UZU-ga-ka ₂tin-tu-bi ge₃₃-me-en

§1.2. The translation “collections” (or “library,” or “series”) is derived from the Standard Babylonian word girginakkû (CAD G 86-7). The reasons for understanding gir₃-gen-na-ka as girginakkû seem fairly straightforward: aside from the obvious homophony, gir₃-gen-na logically suggests the serialization of a library series or collection in the periphrastic sense of a “proceeding-by-foot”: as one puts one foot after another, so one reads (or writes) one tablet after another. The meaning seems to fit well in this passage (§2), if more problematically where it appears in other Šulgi Hymns (§3). The etymology seems further reinforced by an Ur III literary catalog (§4) which employs the term gir₃-

---

1 By “forerunners,” I mean here any text that employs an observational principle to record an observed signifier in connection with its signed meaning; for a good example of a text which discusses extiscipy but falls outside this definition, see the Ebû “omen” published by Coser (2000).

2 I will treat these other aspects in a later, separate article.

3 Translation Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature (ETCSL, <http://www-etcsl.orient.ox.ac.uk>), text 2.4.2.02; similarly: Castellino (1972), and Klein (1981), who gives: “I am a ritually pure bârê-diviner. In the “series” of the oracles I am the Nintu of their word(ing),” preferring gir₃-gen-na-ka UZU-ga … (against ETCSL’s gir₃-gen-na imim UZU-ga …); cf. Šulgi B l. 318, gir₃-gen-na imim en₃-du-ga-ka, “the collected words of all the hymns …”. Below, I will cite ETCSL for Šulgi B (except where otherwise indicated) given the continued want of an up-to-date edition of the text, esp. for comparison of variants as would be critical to, e.g., the discussion of l. 318. The manuscript of Geerd Haayer cited by ETCSL was not available to me.

4 Most recently George (2005) 133; the author nowhere suggests, however, that extispiical texts were among these “library” texts. Extispiical knowledge does not appear among the humorous scribal dialogues describing the e₂-dub-ba-a curricular subjects, and the Kassite extispiical scribal exercise UM 29-13-542 (Veldhuis 2000) is “by far the oldest example.”

5 Or perhaps not so obvious: Klein’s (1981) reading of the possessive particle -ka in this one attestation would be the only known reading which would support a non-back-formed phonetic etymology for Akkadian girginakkû; the three other attestations in which gir₃-gen-na supposedly means girginakkû are all in TMH NF 3, 55, discussed in §4; none employs the particle -ka.
gen-na, apparently referring to “series” of incantations. Thus, though most other 3rd millennium attestations of gir₃-gen-na indicate a semantic field of conveyance or movement, it would appear that Šulgi was indeed referring to a serialized Ur III omen literature much like the Old Babylonian compendia. 6

§1.3. Yet the supposed “Sumerian loanword” girginakku is in all other known logographic writings (all post-dating the Old Babylonian period) expressed by the altogether different term im-la₂ (or im-gu₂-la₂, or im-gu₂-la₂-geš-tuku). 7 No known source expresses the lexical equation \{gir₃-gen-na = girginakku\}. The other post-OB reading for gir₃-gen-na in Akkadian is tallaktu (AHw 1310-1311): “methods,” “procedures,” “pathways.” 

Akkadian tallaktu is syllabically attested as early as the Old Babylonian period, while syllabic girginakku is not known until later Standard Babylonian (CAD G 86-87). 8 One might question whether Šulgi did not use a more current term like ka-kes₂-da if “series” was indeed what was meant? 10 In reading Šulgi B ll. 132-3, should we necessarily look ahead to SB girginakku (always otherwise written im-\{gu₂\}_la₂), and understand a “series” of omen tablets, when we might read OB tallaktu, a “procedure” of divination? The essay below argues that neither the context of these lines in Šulgi B – nor other uses of gir₃-gen-na in his hymns – nor, finally, the use of the term in an Ur III “literary catalogue” – should lead us to believe that “series” should be the translation of Ur III gir₃-gen-na, but rather “procedure,” with implications for the editorial history of extispical literature.

§2. The local context of gir₃-gen-na in Šulgi B ll. 132-3

§2.1. The lines in which Šulgi boasts of his skill as a diviner are set in the middle of a long passage about his innate physical and mental abilities, and far from the point at which he begins to discuss his learned abilities. After a brief introduction (ll. 1-12) to the 385-line poem, Šulgi does indeed brag immediately of his ability to write (ll. 13-20), a skill which he tells us includes “subtraction, addition, reckoning and accounting,” but he does not return to this theme until l. 270 and following. The major subjects of Šulgi B may be profiled thusly:

- military prowess
- hunting ability
- physical strength (e.g., racing and dancing)
- skill at extispicy
- musical ability (tuning, finger technique, natural ability)
- kingly nature (innate sense of justice and destiny)
- skill at conversing in foreign languages
- innate sense of justice
- observance of cultic duties
- the pacific internationalist
- learned skill in reading ancient hymns and writing new ones
- establishment of scribal academies, compositors.

6 Other attestations of gir₃-gen-na are discussed by Civil (1989) 55, in which the translation “list (gir₃-gen-na) of fields” belies the underlying allusion to the fixed “sequence of turns” of the prebend-holders in the use of those fields (see Civil’s discussion, p. 59); for the Early Dynastic administrative text from Adab, see fn. 18, below.

7 Even this equation im-gu₂-la₂ = girginakku is known from only one source, Hb 10, 460-461. It is, of course, precisely because no Old Babylonian usage of girginakku is attested that Lieberman (1977) did not include it in his study of Sumerian loanwords in Old Babylonian Akkadian.

8 gir₃-gen-na as “pathways” would be in harmony with the semantics of extispicy, a practice full of “paths.”

9 It is true, however, that a lexical equation of tallaktu with gir₃-gen is not confirmed until the Middle Babylonian period, AHw 1310: “bab., m/nN, LL. gir₃ = tal-laktu” (V R 16, 24ab. Wz. GIN.GIN”); the OB exemplar for tallaktu comes from AFO 13, 46 (MCT 137, 46).

10 van Dijk and Geller (2003), 61: ka-ke₂₃, ka-ke₂₂, similar to the later es₂₂-gar. The “Temple Hymns,” for example, are credited to the “compiler” Enheduanna, lu₂₂-dub-KA-ke₂₃-da en-he₂₂-du₂₂-an-na (Sjoberg and Bergmann [1969]), l. 543; in the “Instructions of Suruppak” (Alster [1974] 50-51 and pls. V-VI), the text concludes by praising the instructions, l. 281: nin dū gal-gal-la šu dú₂₂-a, “which befit the queen of all great tablets [=Nisaba]”; cf. ETCSL, text 5.6.1, l. 279: “the lady who completed the great tablets.”

11 Šulgi insists that he has created (rather than learned) rules for tuning instruments, he is able to instantly play instruments he has never touched before, he can perform laments off-the-cuff better than any professionals, etc.

12 ll. 181-183: “I am one who is powerful enough to trust in his own power. He who trusts in his own exalted name may carry out great things.”

13 In this passage, the emphasis is on Šulgi’s wisdom, which, by example, serves as the template for justice throughout his land.
§2.2. The subject of extispicy comes right after Šulgi talks about fighting, hunting, running and dancing—right before music, justice and kingship—and 121 lines before he discusses his knowledge of texts and writing, about how he can read hymns written in cuneiform, and how he instituted a “house of wisdom” (e₂₄-gēš₃₄₃₃₂), “academies” (e₂₃-dub-ba), and “places of learning” (ki-umun₃₂) for education in writing. Extispicy is squarely set within the largest part of the hymn which concerns itself with Šulgi’s innate and natural abilities (ll. 21-269), rather than those learned skills that relate to written knowledge and the propagation of his immortal legacy (ll. 270-385).

§2.3. A closer look at ll. 131-149 in full is in order:

*I am a ritually pure interpreter of omens. I am the very Nintu (creator deity) of the GIR₃-GIN₃-NA of omens. These words of the gods are of pre-eminent value for the exact performance of hand-washing and purification rites, for eulogy of the en priestess or for her enthronement in the gipar, for the choosing of the lumab and nindinig priest by sacred extispicy, for attacking the south or for defeating the uplands, for the opening of the emblem house, for the washing of lances in the “water of battle” (blood), for the taking of subtle decisions about the rebel lands. After I have determined a sound omen through extispicy from a white lamb and a sheep, water and flour are libated at the place of invocation. Then, as I prepare the sheep with words of prayer, my diviner watches in amazement like an idiot. The prepared sheep is placed at my disposal, and I never confuse a favourable sign with an unfavourable one. I myself have a clear intuition, and I judge by my own eyes. In the insides of just one sheep I, the king, can find the indications for everything and everywhere.*

§2.4. No elaborate exegesis is required to show that Šulgi is a liver-divination expert not because he learned how to do it, but because he is a “natural.” It is in fact the “expert” here who is the “idiot” (na-ga₂₃), while Šulgi relies on his “clear intuition” (š₃₃₂₃ zalg₂₃) and the judgment of his “own eyes” (igi-gu₁₀)₁₅; the king is not some mere trained apprentice who has been taught a technical skill, he is (quite the opposite) the very “creator deity” (₄nin-tu)¹⁵ of such omens. Compare next this passage with Hymn C, the most similar in Šulgi’s hymnic literature, in which he discusses his extispical powers in ll. 97-111:

*By heart (ETCSL: “Since from birth”)*¹⁶ I am also a Nintu (creator deity), wise in all matters, I can recognise the omens of that extispicy in a pure place. I keep a look-out that ... I am a lord ..., as I range about in my anger. I also have a solidly based knowledge of .... My vision enables me to be the dream-interpreter of the Land; my heart enables me to be the Ëbbara (god of justice) of the foreign lands. I am Šulgi, good shepherd of Sumer. Like my brother and friend Gilgameš, I can recognise the virtuous and I can recognise the wicked. The virtuous gets justice in my presence, and the wicked and evil person will be carried off by .... Who like me is able to interpret what is spoken in the heart or is articulated on the tongue?*

§2.5. Šulgi’s extispical skill is innate, not learned: his recognition of extispical signs comes to him “by heart” (š₃₃₂₃-ta). His knowledges and interpretive abilities are derived from his “vision” (igi-gu₁₀) and his “heart” (š₃₃₂₃-gu₁₀), he “recognizes” (mu-zu) “what is spoken in the heart” and “articulated on the tongue.”¹⁷ In this context, a reading of gir₃-gen-na in Šulgi B ll. 132-133 as “procedure(s)” is much preferable to “library”:

*I am a ritually pure interpreter of omens.
I am the very Nintu (creator deity) of omen-procedure(s).*

§3. (ki-)gir₃-gen(-na) elsewhere in Šulgi Hymns

§3.1. Six other uses of gir₃-gen occur in the Šulgi Hymns. Four of these are formulated as the compound ki gir₃-gen, and these all refer to walking or going,¹⁸ not to seriation, collection, compilation, or the like:

---

¹⁴ ll. 374-385 include the king’s epithets and a concluding hymn to Nisaba.

¹⁵ Šulgi also compares his creative powers to Nintu’s in Hymns C and E; not only is Nintu well known as a creator-/birth-/mother-goddess (ETCSL: Nintud A, Enki and Ninhursag, Enki and the World Order, Ibbi-Sin C, others), she is elsewhere credited with creation of en-ship and kingship (Nintud A, Išme-Dagan A).

¹⁶ One anonymous reader has pointed to the word-play in juxtaposing š₃₃₂₃ (as “womb”) with ₄Nintu.

¹⁷ ETCSL. As in Šulgi B, these lines appear in a passage clearly segregated from that in which Šulgi discusses his ability to read and write: ll. 46-49 describe his writing ability as focused on accounting techniques, adding (at his most literary) the ability to write inscriptions on pedestals.

¹⁸ The semantic range is supported by the appearance of the term gir₃-gen-na in four lines of OIP 14, 193;
§3.2. Elsewhere, gir₃-gen occurs twice by itself without ki, in ll. 308-336 of Šulgi B, in a passage which is explicitly concerned with written sources. The meanings of gir₃-gen here are not contingent on the context of writing: Šulgi may here refer to “method of writing” (though even this is disputable), but that does not mean that all methods (most importantly, the gir₃-gen of ll. 131-2) are written ones. The first use of gir₃-gen here may be found in ll. 316-8 of Šulgi B:

§3.3. This translation implicitly further the idea of a “collection” by translating “all” (from ki-šar₃-ra) twice, both in “all other formulations” and “of all the hymns.”⁵⁴ Lines 317-318 are, without doubt, quite difficult to understand, especially with regard to syntax, but several points are in order. The first is that gir₃-gen modifies speech (du₃₁ / inim, or perhaps en₃₃-du), not writing. The terms are tangled precisely because the passage discusses the writing down of unwritten forms (spoken and sung compositions), but either A) what are collected are spoken words (inim), not tablets, signs or writing; or B) the meaning is “its procedures” or “the manner of words” (i.e., by reading git₃-gen-na-ka). A translation of “procedures” or “manner” fits well here, neither consequent nor contingent on the passage’s overall concern with writing.

§3.4. In this understanding, gir₃-gen-na is a reference to the “procedure” or “method” of composition, to style—not to an editorial technique of collection or redaction of manuscripts—a translation which nevertheless does no damage to the idea that (indeed) Šulgi’s hymns are being written down.

§3.5. Our second case (ll. 328-329²⁶ of Šulgi B) makes

---

²³ The “knowledge” referred to here are the songs of Šulgi which had been established in the scribal “academies” of Nippur and Ur; see esp. George (2005).  
²⁴ Castellino (1972) 227 acknowledges the possibility of understanding ki-šar₃-ra as the subject either of what precedes it or follows it, but translates it only in the former sense. The ETCSL translation also adds “that are in my honor,” which is not present in the text.  
²⁵ inim (za₃₃watt₃u) in the sense of “wording (of a tablet)” is well-established (CAD A₂ am₃₃tu A, mng. 3, 34-35, though mostly in legal, not literary, contexts); cf. Šulgi Hymn E, l. 51 (Ludwig [1990] 55): mu ni₃ en₃-du-ga₂ l. 51, “Zeilen des Inhalts meiner Lieder” (ETCSL text 2.4.2.05): the “lines of the songs”).  
²⁶ ETCSL ll. 328-329: lugal-me-en₃₂₅₃₃ lama₃₃ma-bi kalag-ga-na šir₃-bi-im / ki gir₃-gen-na-gu₃₀ nar-e mu-ši-
this point even more clearly:

328. lugal-en a₂-ga₂₃lama-bi(-im) kalag-ga-ga₂ si₃-bi-im
329. ki-gir₃-gen-na-gu₁₀ nar-e mu-si-gar

Castellino (1972) 61-64:

328. I, the king, (lugal-me-en), my arm is the protecting genius (a₂-ga₂₃lamma-bi-im) (and) this is the song of my valour (kalag-ga-ga₂ si₃-bi-im)
329. Which I placed (mu-ši-in-gal₂) in my “library” (ki-gir₃-gen-na-mu) for (the use of) the singer (nar-e).

ETCSL:

328. For me, the king (lugal-me-en)
329. the singer (nar-e) has recorded (mu-ši-in-gar) my exploits (ki-gir₃-gen-na-gu₁₀)
329. in songs (si₃-bi-im) about the strength of the protective deity of my power (a₂-ga₂₃lamma-bi kalag-ga-na).

§3.6. In this instance, only Castellino proposed to translate “library”—yet he was already aware that it was less probable to understand Šulgi as the subject of the clause in l. 329 and the singer as modified by a terminative particle. He chose instead to see Šulgi as the “true subject” (as the speaker), and thus the song is “placed in my library” (ki-gir₃-gen-na has never otherwise been proposed as “library,” but only gir₃-gen-na). ETCSL’s translation properly restores ki-gir₃-gen-na as the object of the verb: the musician has recorded Šulgi’s exploits (or expeditions, or ways, as in the four examples at the outset of this section) in songs. Once again, even though the passage is explicitly about writing and composition, (ki-)gir₃-gen-na is not a term referring to a “series” of tablets or “collection” of songs, but to the “exploits” or “ways” of the king.

§4. gir₃-gen-na in the Ur III “literary catalog” HS 1360

§4.1. Outside of Šulgi’s Hymns, the only other known use of gir₃-gen-na supporting the later Akkadian girginakku is its use (four times) in the Ur III “literary catalog” HS 1360. This text has received much attention, but has thus far defied a secure translation, and continued reference to the text as a “catalog” of other texts must remain provisional. The structure of the text may be presented in the following “collapsed” form:

1 dub-sag-ta
2-7 [six incipits, the first of which is 4-en-ki unu₂-gal im-e₁₁, followed by double-ruling]
8 gir₃-gen-na 4-en-ki unu₂-gal im-e₁₁-kam
9 ša₃ LAGABxU-dili-kam
10 dub-sag-ta
11-15 [five incipits, the second of which is 4-li-šu-šu₃, followed by double-ruling]
16 gir₃-gen-na 4-li-šu₃-kam
17 ša₃ LAGABxU-dili-kam
18 GIR₁-SAHAR lu₃ inim zi dag PUZUR₂-ba
19 gir₃-gen-na-bi lu₃ nu-da-pa₃
[empty space]
20 gir₃-gen-na
21 ird-bala-a-a₃-di-da-kam

§4.2. Kramer’s original interpretation of HS 1360 was that it catalogued four separate compositions by listing the incipits of at least 15 other serialized tablets, each group of incipits (to tablets) summarized as “gir₃-gen-na [name of composition].” Already a quarter-century ago, Civil questioned the idea that the text was an in-
ventory of other tablets on the grounds that the discovery of a duplicate made that function unlikely; Civil speculated about a possible “didactic arrangement” of the tablet’s information.33 That “catalogue” is a problematic understanding of the text is further suggested by the absence of the term gir3-gen-na (as well as the great structural differences) in all other known Ur III34 and Old Babylonian35 literary catalogs — HS 1360 simply has no known analogues. Wilcke, in almost the same moment as Civil, issued a brief (1976) note about the text (“Rituale? Katalog?”), gravitating towards the interpretation that gir3-gen-na here meant “ritual.” Though still holding that the text as a whole was an inventory, the term gir3-gen-na did not itself indicate “library” or “series (of tablets),” but was, rather, a liturgical directive indicating the ritual’s procedure of the individual incantations (i.e., “the performance of the ritual ṅen-ki unu₂·gal im-e₃₄₁₁, etc.”).36 Only a few years later, Krecher similarly offered that the text’s use of gir3-gen-na-bi could be read “its sequence” [of doing] as much as “its series.”37 These three positions have recently been adopted in two important amendments proposed by van Dijk and Geller (2003):

1. first, that the term dub-sag-ta—which Kramer apparently took to mean “first tablet” of the first two “compositions”–ought to be understood as “incipit” (specifically, however, an incipit only at (lit.) “the head of the tablet”);
2. accordingly, the gir3-gen-na’s that conclude the first two sequences refer to ritual procedures as a whole—both recitanda and operanda—rather than (by title) to a ritual text on another tablet.

§4.3. Kramer’s multi-tablet “library-series” (i.e., a collected works entitled “Enki-is-the-unugal-rising”), on these terms, becomes instead a “(ritual/rubric of) procedure.”38 The subscripts indicating the proper performative sequence of listed incantations (i.e., for the enactment of a ritual called “Speaking-to-the-rebel-city”) thus likely referred as much to unwritten ritual acts as their accompanying utterances.39

33 Civil (1976) 145 n. 36: “…when one can find duplicates of a catalogue, even though it has all the appearances of an inventory (e.g., TMH NF 3, 55, now duplicated by Ni 1905), some other interpretation seems to be in order.”

34 Hallo (1963) 168-169 notes that the Yale catalogue better resembles the Old Babylonian catalogues in content (many of the titles were known as OB copies of hymns) and structure (especially the accounted total of tablets as šu-nīgin,) than its Ur III “counterpart,” HS 1360, which lacks these features. Though at that time Hallo knew of no titles or incipits from HS 1360 which could be identified with known Ur III or OB hymns, van Dijk and Geller (2003, 4-5 and notes to nos. 16, 14, and 21) have proposed contemporary Ur III parallels between (from greatest to least degree of convincingness): HS 1360’s l. 15 and HS 1556; l. 18 and HS 1368a; l. 3 and HS 1497. Note that although the first and third (both incantations) of these parallels are to the first lines of the respective tablets, the second parallel (not an incantation, but a ritual direction) is not the first line of a tablet — it appears on HS 1368a’s line 13, not an incipit.

35 Among those eleven OB catalogues transliterated by the ETCSL (0.2.01.-08, .11.-13), a thumbnail sketch finds both catalogues with lists of incipits only (.01, .03, .05, .06, .11, .12?, .13) and catalogues with subtotals (.02, .04, .07, .08?) — and in most cases (excepting .05 and .07-.08), a good portion of the compositions they catalog are otherwise known — but in no case can I see rubrics present in these documents, and certainly not using the term gir3-gen-na.
§4.4. The following interpretive points follow logically: first, dub-sag-ta as “incipit [at the head of the tablet]” indicates that the incantations following on HS 1360 are all contained on one tablet, not that each following incipit marks the head of a new tablet. Consequently, gir₃-gen-na (a rubric meaning “procedure”⁴⁰) summarizes the ritual, performed by incanting these incantations in sequence. “Procedure” also makes better sense of the gir₃-gen-na in ll. 19-20, the first of which refers to an incantation which has not been found, and the second of which refers to HS 1360 itself, which (single tablet that it is), cannot be a “series”—but certainly a “procedure”. Thus, where Kramer saw the text as an inventory of four compositions on 15+ tablets, the observations made by Civil, Wilcke, Krecher, and van Dijk and Geller lead us to see HS 1360 as a liturgical text outlining a ritual procedure composed of three subrituals, whose materials would be found on only three other tablets:

- ll. 1-9, a tablet, found in the LAGABxU, which contains six incantations, the performance of which is a procedure called “Enki-is-the-unugal-rising”;
- ll. 10-17, a tablet, found in the LAGABxU, which contains five incantations, the performance of which is a procedure called “The God Lilîa(k)”; ⁴¹
- ll. 18-19 is a procedure whose name is known, but whose tablet has not been found (and thus the individual incantations are not able to be listed);
- and ll. 20-1 is a subscript summarizing the three procedures above as (together) a ritual procedure called a “Speaking-to-the-rebel-city.” ⁴²

§5. Ur III gir₃-gen-na ≠ girginakku = tallaktu

§5.1. The difference between understanding HS 1360 as a list of procedures, rather than a list of tablets, is perhaps fine enough to account for a later Middle Babylonian scribal misunderstanding that gir₃-gen-na meant the same thing as im-gu₂-la₂. ⁴³ The implications for the editorial process and observationalism of liver omens are somewhat larger:

I am a ritually pure interpreter of omens.
I am the very Nintu (creator deity) of the omen procedures.

§5.2. The difference between a “run” or “series” of procedures (tallaktu) and a “run” or “series” of tablets (girginakku) marks the difference between a traditional craft knowledge and a manuscript tradition, and this has further implications for how we understand the development of the later OB serials and their pretensions towards observationalism (though these pretensions may, in the end, be our own). A 3rd millennium “library” would lead us to understand the OB liver-omen compendia as the first-known recensions of an as-yet undiscovered (but older and transmitted) scientific literature. 3rd millennium “procedures,” however, is a translation of gir₃-gen-na which leads us to see a traditional art (whether intuitive and inspired, orally-transmitted, or both) only later transformed into a written and technical science, sometime between the reigns of Šulgi and the post-Isbi-Erra OB liver models found at Mari.

§5.3. Šulgi’s claim to proprietary knowledge of the divinatory arts was, nevertheless, an early rhetorical assertion of a privileged, royal epistemology, one that later sparked the scholastic, technical literature deployed as an instrument of power by OB kings and courts. Epiphenomenal literature emphasizing “secret” knowledge (in this latter case, belonging to diviners in royal service) was—and is—a hallmark of changes in discourses of power which can no longer rely solely on traditional forms of legitimation to secure rule.

---

⁴⁰ Krecher (1980) translates HS 1360’s gir₃-gen-na as “Abfolge(?).”

⁴¹ Understanding the text as an inventory of tablets would also require the (awkward, though not impossible) condition that the scribe would have to have otherwise known that the GIR₃-SAHAR … etc. was a “series” of tablets despite its absence.

⁴² This summary would answer the questions raised by Civil (1976) and Krecher (1980).

⁴³ girginakku should probably number among those Sumerian loanwords which came into Akkadian on “an Akkadian speaker’s defective knowledge of scholastic Sumerian” (Lieberman [1977] 19).
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