

ILI-MALKU THE 𐎗𐎙

Donna F. Freilich

In *Ugarit-Forschungen* 20 (1988), pp. 313-21, W.H. Van Soldt concluded in his article, "The Title 𐎗𐎙" «that this personage was the same as the SUKKAL of the Akkadian texts found at Ras Shamra». He examined the examples of Ugaritic 𐎗𐎙 found in the three colophons to the literary texts copied by Ili-malku (KTU 1.6 VI 54ff; KTU 1.16 VI left edge; KTU 1.4 VIII left edge) in the light of colophons to Akkadian texts. The one title that stood out in the Akkadian colophons, other than «scribe», was SUKKAL. Correspondingly, in Ili-malku's long colophon (see below), the one title that stood out, besides *prln*, *rb khnm*, and *rb nqdm*, all of which most likely pertained to cultic duties and temple hierarchy, was 𐎗𐎙.

The Ugaritic texts in question are:

1) *spr. ʾilmlk šbny / lmd. ʾatn prln.rb / khnm rb.nqdm / 𐎗𐎙.nqmd.mlk ʾugrt / ʾadn.yrgb.bʿl trmn* (KTU 1.6 VI 54ff).

Ili-malku the Shubbanite wrote (it)¹, the student of Attenu the diviner², chief of the priests, chief of the *nāqidūma*, 𐎗𐎙 of Niqmaddu, king of Ugarit, lord of *yrgb* and master of *trmn*.

2) [*spr. ʾilmlk.𐎗𐎙*.nqmd.mlk ʾugrt* (KTU 1.4 VIII left edge).
[Ili-malku, the 𐎗𐎙 of Niqmaddu, king of Ugarit, [wrote (it)].

3) *spr. ʾilmlk.𐎗𐎙* (KTU 1.16 VI left edge).
Ili-malku the 𐎗𐎙 wrote (it).

Van Soldt divided the Akkadian colophons into two types, and it is his Type A that provided him with a useful comparison to the Ugaritic colophons, because colophons of that category name the scribe's teacher, and, like the first Ugaritic example, describe him as that person's student. The following texts are quoted directly from his article.

¹ Or «Ili-malku is the scribe». See the remarks of Van Soldt in the article under discussion, p. 313 n. 4.

² See for this translation W.H. Van Soldt, 'Atn prln, 'Attā/ĉnu the Diviner: UF, 21 (1989), pp. 365-68.

e. (RS) 20.32

šu *Pba-la-as-ki* lú^udub.sar/lú^uka-ab-zu-zu ša P^uutu-lugal dumu
KAM.MU èr^u dAG/ ù^u dnisaba mu.bi al.til,
«Hand of Ba^ulasku the scribe, pupil of Šapšu-malku, son of
Iršeyā?, servant of Nabû and Nisaba, its lines have been
completed» (p. 315).

m. (RS) 25.453+

[š^u P...] x-la-na lú-lum^udub.sar-rù kab-zu-zu!(BA) PBE-U
lúgal.sukkal[...]/[...], (empty) i-na i^ui-ši-GI il-ta-ṭa[r-šu....],
«Hand of ...lānu the scribe, pupil of Gamir-Haddu the chief-
SUKKAL... He wrote it in the month IŠši-Gi» (p. 316).

o. (RS) 17.41+

šu *Pir-ib*-dU dumu dU-x[...]/dumu dumu-šú ša Pad-diri [...]/kab-
zu-zu šá P^ušu-ub-x[...]/dumu Pad-diri-ma šeš a-[bi-šú(??)]/èr^u dAG
u ddam.ki.[na],
«Hand of Irib-Ba^ulu son of Ba^ulu-..., grandson of Abi-yatar,
pupil of PN, also son of Abi-yatar, *his uncle*, servant of Nabû
and Damkina» (pp. 316-17)³.

Altogether sixteen Type A colophons are listed, some quite broken, of the pattern
qāti PN₁ - **tupšarru* - *filiation - *doxology - pupil of PN₂ - *title - *filiation -
*doxology - *editorial remarks⁴.

In seven Akkadian legal texts from Ras Shamra the scribes are also SUKKALs,
and in one of these the scribe is a high priest as well⁵. Additionally, a certain Karrānu
is identified as the SUKKAL of the king of Ugarit in RS 17.137 = PRU 4, p. 105. This
Karrānu is a scribe well known from other texts⁶.

Van Soldt drew the following conclusions from these observations:

- 1) The title SUKKAL occurs only with scribes⁷;
- 2) Ili-malku's long colophon (KTU 1.6) is a Type A and adheres to that pattern
thus: *spr* 'ilmk - *qāti* PN₁, *šbny* - filiation, *lmd* 'atn - *kabzuzu* PN₂, *prln rb khnm rb*
nqdm ṭ'y *nqmd mlk* 'ugrt - title of PN₂⁸;

³ As Van Soldt explained (UF 20, p. 317 n. 43), the 'also' is misleading, since the student Irib-Ba^ulu
is really the grandson of Abi-yatar, not his son.

⁴ The asterisks indicate optional entries. Van Soldt: UF 20, p. 314.

⁵ RS 16.186 = PRU 3, p. 168: [...]^ulú^usukkal lú^uugula.sanga, «[PN (was) scribe], the SUKKAL, the
high priest». The seven colophons are listed in Van Soldt: UF 20, p. 318.

⁶ Van Soldt: UF 20, p. 319.

⁷ With the exception of three texts. Van Soldt: UF 20, p. 319.

⁸ Van Soldt: UF 20, p. 320.

3) The series *prln rb khnm rb nqdm* refers to religious duties and can be compared to the title «high priest» that the scribe of RS 16.186 bore (see note 5), while Ugaritic ʔy parallels that scribe's other title of SUKKAL, as well as the title of SUKKAL held by the scribes of the longer Akkadian colophons⁹;

The author bolstered these results with a new reading of the broken sign at the end of line 39 of KTU 3.1 (Šuppiluliuma's treaty with Niqmaddu) as ʔ*¹⁰, yielding the following text:

37. [ks.ksp.ktn.mʔit.pḥm]

38. [mʔit.ʔiqn]ʔi lskn.[

39. [ktn.]m*ʔit pḥm.ʔ*[ʔy]

ʔ*[ʔy] in line 39 is parallel to SUKKAL in line 34 of the Akkadian version of the treaty RS 17.227 = PRU 4, p. 40¹¹.

In the process of reviewing the Ugaritic and Akkadian colophons Van Soldt concluded that all the titles other than words for «scribe» pertained to the teachers named, and not to the scribe/students. Otherwise, how explain that the scribe wrote his filiation and doxology after his own name, but his title after the name of his teacher¹²? Thus, in the case of Ili-malku's long colophon, it is Attenu who is Niqmaddu's ʔy, as well as his *prln, rb khnm*, and *rb nqdm*, since these titles follow Attenu's name.

I begin my refutation of the equation ʔy = SUKKAL with the last assertion. If indeed the Akkadian colophons are organized so that all the titles after the teacher's name refer to the teacher, then Ili-malku's long colophon clearly does not adhere to the Akkadian Type A pattern, for ʔy, though it follows Attenu's name in KTU 1.6 VI 57, must refer to Ili-malku and not to his teacher. There is no other way to make sense of the two shorter Ugaritic colophons *spr.ʔilmlk.ʔy* (KTU 1.16 VII left edge) and [*spr.ʔilmlk.ʔy*.nqmd.mlk ʔugrt*] (KTU 1.4 VIII left edge), where the identification of Ili-malku as the ʔy is unquestionable. One could guess that when Ili-malku recorded KTU 1.6 Attenu was Niqmaddu's ʔy, while at the time he recorded KTU 1.4 and 1.16 he himself had attained that post. But there is simply no basis for separating in time the writing of tablets 1.4 and 1.6, both of which are part of the story of Ba'lu (1.16 is the final tablet of Kirtu). Thus, the conclusion must be that Ili-malku was Niqmaddu's ʔy when he wrote KTU 1.6, even though he listed that title after the name of his teacher.

ʔy, the last in the series of titles listed in Ili-malku's long colophon (before Niqmaddu's titles), is preceded by three others: *prln, rb khnm*, and *rb nqdm*. Which of these attach to Ili-malku and which to his teacher Attenu? Is Attenu the *prln* while Ili-malku is the *rb khnm, rb nqdm*, and ʔy? Or, since Ili-malku condensed his title only to ʔy in the abbreviated colophons, should one infer that the three others belonged to Attenu? My guess is that all the titles in the long Ugaritic colophon belonged to Ili-

⁹ Van Soldt: UF 20, p. 320.

¹⁰ Read in KTU as ʔ* and in CTA as ʔ.

¹¹ Van Soldt: UF 20, pp. 320-21; id., *Fabrics and Dyes at Ugarit*: UF, 22 (1990), p. 357.

¹² Van Soldt: UF 20, p. 318.

malku, and that *lmd ʾatn*, «student of Attenu», was just one of the list, perhaps equivalent to the modern title PN, PhD, University of Chicago. I believe that this is true also of the Akkadian colophons called Type A. The titles that appear after the names of the teachers pertain to the scribe/students. To answer Van Soldt's question of how to explain such a word order in this case, one need only accept that conventional scribal practice permitted some flexibility in the listing of personal information. The person who disputes this must explain why, in sixteen examples of the Type A Akkadian colophon, personal identifications never appear twice, once for the student and once for the teacher, apart from two exceptional cases. In the first the scribe and his teacher are noted to be «(both) sons of Nuʿme-Rašap»¹³; in the second the teacher is identified as the son of the scribe's grandfather, that is, his uncle¹⁴. In every other example, where scribe and teacher are not related, only one filiation ever appears, sometimes before, sometimes after the teacher's name. Why identify sometimes the scribe's father and other times the teacher's father? The same is true of the so-called doxology. In no colophon listed does the statement «servant of DN» appear twice, once after each name. In two examples it appears after the scribe's name¹⁵, while in the others it appears after the teacher's name. The case of Gamir-Haddu is relevant here also. He is the named teacher in three of the Akkadian colophons. In one, the tablet is broken after his name¹⁶; in the two others the colophon is intact at that point¹⁷, yet only the last one has the title «chief-SUKKAL» following Gamir-Haddu's name. Why was he not identified by that title in the second colophon if he indeed filled that office?

The colophons to the Akkadian legal texts which Van Soldt listed¹⁸ actually support the interpretation just outlined, since the scribes who wrote them unambiguously claimed for themselves the title of SUKKAL, and in one case the title «high priest» as well. The scribes who did the work of recording the texts honored themselves by appending their titles of high office to their names. These legal texts show that the scribes did not humbly ignore their own exalted positions when identifying themselves, as we would have to assume the scribes of the Type A colophons did, since no title of high office appears immediately after their own names, only after the names of their teachers.

The Akkadian colophons and their Ugaritic counterparts do not, in fact, elucidate one another to any great degree. The office of SUKKAL at Ugarit does indeed seem to have been held exclusively by scribes, as brought out mainly by the shorter colophons of the legal texts. The longer colophons mention that title only three times out of twenty three examples. Why assume that this title be mirrored in Ili-malku's list

13 Van Soldt: UF 20, p. 315 (h).

14 Van Soldt: UF 20, pp. 316-17 (o).

15 Van Soldt: UF 20, p. 315 (h) and pp. 315-16 (k).

16 Van Soldt: UF 20, p. 314 (c).

17 Van Soldt: UF 20, p. 315 (h) and p. 316 (m).

18 Van Soldt: UF 20, pp. 318-19.

of offices? After all, the Ugaritic titles *prln* and *rb nqdm* have no parallel in the Akkadian colophons, and *rb khnm* is paralleled just once¹⁹. Nor did any scribe working in the Ugaritic language refer to himself as «servant of DN», a form of piety very popular with the scribes of Akkadian. We are left with the fact that both SUKKAL and ʿy were offices attached to the king or queen, and that scribes filled both these offices. This is hardly evidence of their synonymy²⁰.

To maintain the identification of the scribe-ʿy with the scribe-SUKKAL, and to define that official as a state bureaucrat, Van Soldt was forced to remain silent about the other Ugaritic examples of ʿy. Yet in these examples we see a religious official of high degree who appeared alongside the king during the latter's performance of his cultic obligations. In KTU 1.119, the king, mentioned in line 5, is directed to offer a series of sacrifices at the «house of the ʿy » (lines 6-8). In KTU 1.90, after a series of broken lines, we read that the king «should give to the ʿy (the aforementioned sacrifices)» (lines 21-22)²¹. The association of the king and the ʿy recalls Ili-malku's position as Niqmaddu's ʿy.

If one dissociates Ili-malku's title of ʿy from these other examples, one is forced to conclude that there were two different offices connected to the king, one secular, one religious, both held by someone called the ʿy, a title having two completely different meanings.

Against this, I consider the ʿy to have been a religious official who answered directly to the king, and was associated with him in the performance of certain rites. The ʿy was a man of high degree who could hold other religious offices as well, such as *prln*, *rb khnm*, and *rb nqdm*. In the case of Ili-malku he was also an accomplished scribe. Ili-malku ended his copy of KTU 1.6 with a postscript advertising his high offices, emblems of great achievement and honored status. His association with the teacher Attenu was a testament to his excellence as a scribe.

At this point the treaty between Šuppiliuma and Niqmaddu in which ʿy and SUKKAL are presumably parallel, must be reconsidered. Van Soldt's reading of the last sign in KTU 3.1:39 as ʿ* is not supported by the photograph in CTA (Plate XLVIII) nor by the hand copy there (Figure 119). The remains of the left-hand wedge match that of a š much more closely than the small, tight, superimposed angle wedge

¹⁹ See note 5.

²⁰ Perhaps the SUKKAL at Ugarit was required, by virtue of the responsibilities attached to his office, to be fluent in Akkadian. For this reason, only scribes of Akkadian could have held the position.

²¹ The verb I translate as «he should give», *ynšl*, has been variously translated by others as «to cease» (G. del Olmo Lete, *Ug. ʿ. ʿy, ʿt : Nombre Divino y Acción Cultural* : UF, 20 [1988], p. 31 & n. 17); «to separate oneself» (P. Xella, TRU I, p. 112); and «to get gifts from someone» (Gordon, UT #1688). None of these is particularly convincing. My translation is based on the Arabic root *wašala*, which, among other things, means «to give, bestow». A w/n interchange between cognate roots is uncommon, but not unknown. It is almost unanimously supported in the case of Ugaritic *wpt*, Arabic *nafaṭa*, «to spit».

of the other ḡs in the text (lines 16, 19, 20, 30, 36)²². It was read as ḡ by Herdner in CTA and by Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartin in KTU. Without seeing the tablet itself I cannot accept the reconstruction $\text{ḡ}^*[\text{y}]$.

²² My thanks to D. Pardee for lending his expertise to deciphering this damaged sign.