THE CHICAGO MAQLÛ FRAGMENT (A 7876)

By TZVI ABUSCH and DANIEL SCHWEMER

1. A dubgallu manuscript of Maqlû

While any inscribed clay tablet could be referred to as ŭppu and any written text could be called šatāru, Babylonian and Assyrian scribes had a number of more specific terms at their disposal not only for various inscribed media such as tablet, writing board and parchment, but also for different and formats and types of tablets. A systematic nomenclature of tablet types, however, was never established despite the central role of the clay tablet in Mesopotamian scribal culture. Most of the relevant terms, such as Ṽlûtu, eşûtu, ḫudûdadû and liginnû, refer to tablet formats which were typically associated with certain genres or types of text; but the same terms could then be used for different types of text that shared the same format, and a given term could refer to a certain type of text even if the format of the tablet in question was different from usual. A few colophons of tablets inscribed with omen compendia, god-lists or literary compositions claim that they were excerpted or copied from a dubgallu, a “large tablet.” No tablet explicitly designated as dubgallu has survived, but from the fact that the famous Middle Assyrian six-column An: Anum manuscript K 4349+ (CT 24, 20–46) was copied ana pi ḫudûlī labirir (rev. XII 9’) we may infer that a dubgallu would typically comprise five or six columns on each side, each column containing 150 or more lines of text, often in a minute script. The sister-tablet of K 4349+, the Middle Assyrian An: Anum tablet YBC 2401, would also have been regarded as a dubgallu; it contains six columns of about 185 lines on each side, inscribed in a very small script with a line height of about 2.1 mm. This type of “large tablet”, containing the complete text or major parts of a lexical series, is already well known in the Old Babylonian period; although such tablets often have colophons, the amount and nature of the scribal mistakes to be found on them suggests that they were written by advanced students as a kind of “journeyman’s piece” in the process of memorizing the traditional lore. The fact that Nissaba and Ḫaya, the gods of the scribal art, are praised for writing such “great tablets” in Sumerian literature shows, however, that the ability to produce a dubgallu was regarded as a major achievement.

As is shown by the first-millenium colophons, not only lexical texts, god-lists and omen compendia were inscribed on dubgallu-tablets, but also literary compositions could be committed to such tablets. Only a few specimens of dubgallu’s inscribed with literary texts have survived or been identified as fragments of a “large tablet”. One example from the Neo-Assyrian period is GM 1 found at Tariṣu (Sherkhan) within the complex of the local Nergal temple (see Sagg 1986). The six-column tablet originally contained the full text of the Erra epic and the Anû myth. As with the Middle Assyrian An: Anum tablets, the script is excessively small with a line height of about 2.5 mm. The editor of the tablet concluded that “the very small and meticulously written script, and the occurrence at one point of a gloss in minuscule writing, indicate that the tablet was the work of an expert, and not a mere exercise . . .” (Sagg 1986: 2). The colophon states that the tablet was “hastily copied [for] his [. . .] [. . .]-šu zî-mar nashat(zi)y”. Possibly using an original from Ḥanigalbat (rev. XII 1’–2’). The drawing of an (apparently uninscribed) “magic

1 Hunger 1968: 7–8 gives an overview of the terms used in the colophons of literary and scholastic texts; Radner 1997: 52–67 discusses the various terms used in the Neo-Assyrian period. The im-section of Ḫb. X (MSL 7, 101–4) contains a number of words for different types of tablets, but is not intended as a comprehensive presentation of the relevant terms.

2 See Hunger 1968: 161 and CAD T 126 for the relevant attestations. The word dubgallu is so far not attested before the Middle Assyrian period, but is evidently a loan from Sumerian. Nissaba is praised as the lady who completed the “large tablets” (dub-gal-gal-la) in the doxology of the Instructions of Šûrûppak (see Alster 2005: 100 l. 289) and her husband Ḫaya holds great tablets (dub-gal-gal) according to UET 6/1, 101 obv. 2 (cf. Volk 1995: 147).

3 For a description of the tablet, see Litke 1998: 16–18.

4 Together with the prisms, the large tablets form “type I” in M. Civil’s classification of lexical manuscripts from the OB period (see MSL 12, 27–8 and, for their status as school texts MSL 14, ?); for a more detailed discussion of the role of ‘type I’ tablets in OB scribal education, see Veldhuis 1997: 28–32.
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diagram" at the end of the reverse could indicate that the tablet was used as an amulet, but in view of the colophon this is far from certain.

The object of the present article is the fragment of yet another dubgallu from the Neo-Assyrian period. The fragment A 7876 in the collection of the Oriental Institute, Chicago, represents the upper right corner of a six-column tablet that originally contained the complete text of the series Maqlû with its nine canonical tablets. The tablet is inscribed in the Neo-Assyrian ductus of the eighth and seventh centuries; the size of the script with a line height of about 2.5 mm is similar to that of other dubgallu manuscripts. On the convex side of the fragment, which must represent the obverse, only the last two columns are partly preserved, while on what must be the reverse substantial parts of the first two columns and a few line endings of a third column are preserved. The beginning of the upper edge of the tablet is clearly visible on the reverse so that the original shape of the tablet can be roughly reconstructed; it would have been about 31 cm high and 24 cm wide and would have contained six columns on each side. Because the manuscript often sets two canonical lines on one line or diverges from the canonical line division, only an approximate reconstruction of the original distribution of the text over the tablet is possible. The following sections of Maqlû are preserved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Revise</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1‘–33’</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1‘–36’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1‘–41’</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1‘–43’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>1‘–12’</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>63–111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>32–79a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>80–177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>29‘–115’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>116“–39”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>105‘–79’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the preserved sections the original distribution of the text over the tablet would have been approximately as follows (cf. Fig. 1): 7

I   ca. I 1–143 with rubric
II  ca. II 1–144
III  ca. II 145–225 with rubric, III 1–60
IV  ca. III 61–187 with rubric, IV 1–16
V   ca. IV 17–151 with rubric, V 1–18
VI  ca. V 19–154
VII  ca. V 155–75 with rubric, VI 1–111
VIII ca. VI 112‘–57” with rubric, VII 1–79a
IX  ca. VII 80–177 with rubric, VIII 1–28’
X   ca. VIII 29‘–115’
XI  ca. VIII 116”–39” with rubric, R 1–104’
XII ca. R 105‘–79’ with rubric and colophon

2. History of research

According to the records at the Oriental Institute, A 7876 was purchased in Baghdad by H. A. Frankfort in January 1930. Nothing is known about the provenance of the fragment. Apparently, the fragment was identified as a Maqlû manuscript soon after its accession to the collection of the Oriental Institute. G. Meier was able to use the fragment in his 1937 edition of Maqlû. Especially his reconstruction of Maqlû VI relied on "ein grosser, nicht in Europa befindlicher Maqlû-Text" (1937: 5). In the posthumous publication of Meier’s notes on Maqlû, E. Weidner identified this text as A 7876 (1966: 77 fn. 22). While it remains uncertain who made A 7876 available to Meier

---

5 See the schematic drawing of the reverse in Saggs 1986: 6. For the "magic diagram" (two diagonally crossing pairs of lines) on tablets serving as amulets see Maul 1994: 176–81. Tablets inscribed with the Erra myth were used as amulets, as shown not only by the final lines of the text itself, but also by the amulet-shaped Erra manuscript KAR 169.
6 The line count of Maqlû used here is that of Abusch and Schwemer 2008 (for a concordance with Meier’s edition see there and Schwemer 2007b: 283–5).
8 The extant text on the fragment does not contain any rubric, but comparison with other dubgallu’s, such as the An : Anum tablets K 4349 + and YBC 2401 and the Anzu/Erra tablet GI 1, suggests that the text of each canonical tablet was concluded by a short rubric giving the tablet number and series title, possibly also the number of lines.
Fig. 1 An approximate reconstruction of the original shape of A 7876, obv. (left) and rev. (right).
and in what form, it seems likely that it was F. W. Geers. Geers supplied “Abschriften”, probably copies and transliterations, of many of the new British Museum fragments incorporated in Meier’s edition (see the preface to Meier 1937 as well as p. 1 fn. 4); he probably provided Meier with a transliteration of the Chicago fragment as well. The fact that Meier used the Chicago fragment only in certain places indicates that the transliteration at his disposal was of a provisional nature and did not cover the many fragmentary passages.

The fragment remained unpublished, but was studied by Abusch in the preparation of his new edition of Maqlû. He first examined the fragment in 1973, and at his request it was cleaned and a cast made by R. Tindel with the help of R. Whiting. Tindel sent Abusch photographs of the uncleaned fragment as well as the cast. Using the cast and photographs, Abusch then prepared a preliminary transliteration. Subsequently, in the 1990s, the tablet was also studied by R. Borger, who graciously made the results of his reading available to Abusch. In 2006–7, the present authors prepared a new German translation of Maqlû for TUAT NF Vol. 4 on the basis of Abusch’s synoptic transliteration of all Maqlû sources and of their own translations. To assist them in this project, Schwemer prepared a provisional copy of A 7876 using the cast and the photographs of the fragment. At that time, they decided that the importance of A 7876 called for a separate publication of this Maqlû manuscript. Accordingly, during a stay at the Oriental Institute in April 2007, Schwemer finalized his copy (here Figs. 2–3) and subsequently prepared a first draft of the present article; this draft was then revised by both authors. While any mistakes in the copies of cuneiform texts are Schwemer’s alone, the responsibility for the content of the article as a whole lies with both authors.9

3. Palaeographic, orthographic and linguistic characteristics of A 7876

A 7876 is written in the Neo-Assyrian ductus of the eighth–seventh centuries BC. The scribe writes sar with only two horizontal wedges at the beginning of the sign (“kēš”) and lū sometimes in the reduced form typically found in Neo-Assyrian letters and documents, clear indications that the manuscript was not written by one of Ashurbanipal’s scholars at Nineveh, but belonged (at least originally) either to the tablet collection of a temple or to the private library of an Assyrian scholar, quite possibly of the Sargonid period. The assumption that the tablet was produced in a non-Nineveh Neo-Assyrian context is confirmed by a number of typical orthographic and linguistic features that A 7876 shares with Neo-Assyrian manuscripts of Standard Babylonian texts found in places like Aššur, Sultantepe and Nimrud.

1) Orthographic features

Frequent defective writing of geminated consonants: e.g. kur-ši-ni (kursinni, VI 19’), a-na-ša-kim-ma (anāšakkimmna, VI 25’), ter-ri-na-tu (terimmatu, VI 28’), li-na-ša-pu (linnaspu, VI 31’), li-qāl-pu, li-ša-lu-ti (liqgalpu, lišaltu, VI 32’), i-qa-ri (iqarri, VII 2’), ib-na-ša-ma (ibunnima, VII 8’), tā-na-si-su (tunnassu, VII 27’), [i]-a-hi-šše (uššakka, VIII 2’), ga-ta-kī (gattaki, VIII 30’).

Use of CVCV values:11 [q]aq-qar (qaqqari, VII 27’), lim-ḫur-ın-ni (limḫurinni, VIII 43’), šar-pu-u (šurppu, VIII 6’).

“Alphabetic” use of syllabic signs: a-ta-ma (probably for ātaper, VII 37’).

Logograms characteristic of the Neo-Assyrian period and typically found in non-Nineveh manuscripts of Standard Babylonian texts: 20 for šarru (VIII 9’), 6guš.tuk for Gilgamesh (V 22’),12 4bad for Enlil (VII 8’, VIII 15’), 4niš for Ea (VIII 1’, 5’, 28’),13 6mem.e for Gula (VIII 10’).

8 We would like to thank W. Farber, keeper of the collection of the Oriental Institute, for his kind permission to publish the fragment. BM 34077, BM 36618, 80-7-19, 146 + K 10559 + K 11993 + Sm 133, K 2956, K 10341 and K 13349 are published by permission of the Trustees of the British Museum. Schwemer’s stay in Chicago and Boston in 2007 was funded by a Small Grant from the British Academy.

9 Note that the representation of final syllables of nouns by means of CVm signs has been retained in the transliteration because signs of this type are sometimes clearly not used phonetically (e.g. kišm for expected nominative erēta) and may therefore represent conventional spellings.

10 To avoid confusion we give only the CVC value in the transliteration.

11 For this logogram, see George 2003: 81, 349. In Maqlû sources it is otherwise only attested in A 43 = Ass. 1223 obv. 28 (= Maqlû I 38), a Neo-Assyrian manuscript from Aššur that displays numerous Assyrianisms.

12 For the usage of 4niš in Neo-Assyrian sources, see Galter 1981: 10–11.
2) Linguistic features (Assyrianisms, Assyrianizing spellings)

Spellings probably reflecting a voicing resp. devoicing of etymological b and p in certain positions.¹⁴ ‘taq-pi-ra (taqbirā, V 3’), ‘iš-kaš-si-na-niš-si-ma’ (ukaššimššimmu, VII 15’), a-tab-ni (probably ataper, VII 37’), [a]b-pi-[ra] (abhiru, VIII 26’).

Interchange of a and u: amatūtu (inim)menš-sū for expected amatūtu(im)menš-sū in VI 30’, ³e2-pu-sū-ni³ for expected īpušāni in VII 22’, naḫa(k)ur[b]⁵ for expected naḫpu in VII 15’.

Assyrianizing inflection of nouns and verbs: likkalmēši (VI 19’), tarabūmīti (VII 9’), ēpušānimššimmu (VII 14’), ēpušāni (VII 22’), ēmaru (VII 24’), ¹⁶šadē(k)ur’ (VII 5’), pišerte (bu[t])’[⁲] (VII 32’), minaʾēška (VIII 8’), rabē(gal)’ (VIII 10’).

Assyrianizing variant forms of other words: ib-re-tu for ibratu (VI 15’), aklim for ēklim (VII 9’), ēpisēti’a for ēpisēti’a (VII 21’), ana mala for mala (VII 10’); cf. the commentary on the individual lines.

However, not all peculiarities are Assyrianisms. Our text also preserves evidence regarding the level of skill of the scribe. Thus while the use of -a to mark the accusative singular and the use of -i for the nominative plural (as well as the occasional use of -i for the genitive-plural, cf. VI 21’, 30’) are a common feature of all Neo-Assyrian sources of Standard Babylonian texts, a spelling like kūma qit-ma (VI 12’) would be unexpected in a tablet written by a master of the scribal art. Moreover, the preserved text contains a few true corruptions (VI 26’, VII 32’, cf. also VIII 10’) as well as a number of minor mistakes (V 16’, 27’, 29’, VI 8’, 13’, 24’, VII 9’, 29’, 30’, VIII 3’, 18’, 20’, 22’) and idiosyncrasies (VII 10’). Often two (by Nineveh standards) canonical lines are taken together on one line, sometimes in contradiction to the syntax of the text (VI 24’–5’, VII 26’–7’, 36’–40’); once a whole line is omitted, probably due to an oversight or a lapse of memory (V 26’). The most reasonable conclusion from this evidence is that the fragmentarily preserved durbagallu A 7876, despite its impressive size and small script, was not the work of a mature scholar, but rather the masterpiece of an advanced student. Since the colophon is not preserved, it is impossible to tell where exactly the tablet was written. It was certainly not produced by one of the scholars of the royal court for Nineveh’s royal libraries; rather, it was the product of a non-royal scribal “school” of eighth–seventh century Assyria. Of course, this does not mean that the tablet could not have eventually ended up in Ashurbanipal’s library; but only a join to a fragment from controlled excavations can shed further light on the fragment’s actual provenance.

A 7876, copy Figs. 2–3¹⁷


obv. V

| 1’ | 24 | [salmiya ana mti tap-q]-¹-da | te² |
| 2’ | 25–6 | [salmiya ana mti talj-rn salmiya itti mti tušnil]-¹-l¹ | t[e]² |
| 3’ | 27–8 | [salmiya ana sùn mti tušnila salmiya ina kùma mìti]i(add)â] ‘taq-pi-ra’ | t[e]² |
| 4’ | 29–30 | [salmiya ana gúllgaltu taptiðl salmiya ina igàrt]i ‘ap]-¹-ha]-³-a | te² |
| 5’ | 31–2 | [salmiya ana askuppati tušnila salmiya ina bi-i ša du]-¹-ri[bá]-¹-da tap-ha-a | t[e]² |
| 6’ | 33 | [salmiya ana titirri taqbir-close sàmmà-nà] ‘iš-kab-[bí]-¹-[su] | t[e]² |
| 7’ | 34 | [salmiya ana burè ša ašlakî šà bāra tapå] t[â]-¹-[a]q[-b]-¹-ira | t[e]² |
| 8’ | 35 | [salmiya ana ràtî šà mukaribbi šà bāra tapå t]aq[-b]-¹-ira | te² |
| 9’ | 36 | [salmiya lù šà bûni lù šà erêni lù šà lîpi] ‘lu šà-i šîkûrî(DU₈₉,LÀL) | |
| 10’ | 37–8 | [lù šà kûpsi lù šà itễ šà tîdi lù š] ‘lu-laš(išig.sila₃₁,gà) | |

¹⁴For the alternation of p- and b-spellings in Neo-Assyrian texts, see most recently Luukko 2004: 72–3.
¹⁵The confusion of -sù and -sū occurs frequently in Late Babylonian manuscripts of Standard Babylonian texts and is part of a general tendency to replace a with u that is already in evidence in the Neo-Assyrian period (see George 2003: 799). For -sù instead of expected -śù in non-Nineveh Neo-Assyrian sources of Maqlû, cf. ki-ir-ra-sù, ep-se-ti-sù (A 43 = Ass. 1223 obv. 26 = Maqlû I 34), mu-ma-ri-sù (A 43 obv. 27 = I 35), li-b-mi-sù (STT 83 obv. 29 [coll. = Ritual tablet 49’).
¹⁶Forms with the 3rd sg. prefix e- on 1’ verbs may reflect Assyrianizing orthography rather than true language interference, see Worthington 2006: 62, with fn. 18–20.
¹⁷The canonical Maqlû line numbers are indicated in italics; the line count used here is that of Abusch and Schwemer 2008 (for a concordance with Meier’s edition see there, and Schwemer 2007b: 283–5).
Fig. 2 A 7876 obv.
Fig. 3  A 7876 rev.
11' 39 [salmi mu'shalati ša paniya] ʅu la-ni-l-ia
12' 39-40 [tepša-ma kalba tus]-i-ki-10 la-šah(šaḥ) tušaklā(jimin)
13' 41 [ışšar] tušaklā(jimina na nār)i(t(i)|)[ta-]-ad-da-a
14' 42 [salmiya ana ʃ]-a-maš-ti màrat(dumu,nunus) 14-d[a-nim] tap-qi-j-da
15' 43 [salmiya a-n]a ści-tha tap-qi-1-da
16' 44 [mēya itti] mitti(adda) tuš-ni-l-la
17' 45 [mēya ma ş]ān(ü)i)mitti(adda) tuš-ni-il-la
18' 46 [mēya ina ŋ]maḥ(ki),maḥ mitti(adda) taq-bi-ra
19' 47 [ina x-x-(x)] erṣeti(ki)jimm mu'ya(a-mu)-mu taq-bi-ra
20' 48 [ina x-x-(x)] erṣeti(ki)jimm mu'ya(a-mu)-mu taq-bi-ra
21' 49 _LOOKUP新闻记者A? ma[h]ar(i)gi)? ill? mu?š]-S]? mēya(a-mu)-mu tath-ba-a
22' 50 ʃārat(ʃīk)? ʃ[u]f-[anji]-r]-jul? a-na da-gilgamesh(giš.tuk) tap-qi-da
23' 51 'a-na a-j-(ra-a)-1-le-e ta-hi-ra-in-ni
24' 52 zikurudā(zi.kuₜ,ru.da) a-na pāni(igi) ści(tr 30)
25' 53-4 ʃ[z]ikurudā(kki)min ana pāni(igi) dišul-pa-ès zikurudā(jimina pāni(igi)
26' 55-57 ʃ[z]ikurudā(kki)min ana pāni(ji)gul-la zikurudā(jimina pāni(igi)
27' 58-9 zikurudā(jimina) an aupāni(igi) ʃ[maš]-uqaqip[gi](gar,taba) zikurudā(jimina) ana
28' 60 [zikurudā(kki)min ana pāni(igi)muḥābasirāni(en,te,na,1-bar,ču)]
29' 61 [zikurudā(kki)min] sā šerr(ši) ʃ[d]-šikk(ši)nu.kilim) arrabi(ʃeš.ûr.ra)
30' 62 ʃ[z]ikurudā(kki)min jā 'pa?/-ag?-ri ʃ x x (x) x x x-he-e
31' 63 [mi]-ma šum-siš ʃ[u]-ša-ki-la]-in-ni
32' 64 me(ʃ'a)mʃ[zi] bat(ga)? šikara(kas) karāna(geštin) taq-q(a)-a-in-j-ni
33' 65 [me u ušša]:turammiški-l]-in-ni
do 9

Ca. 2–3 lines missing to upper edge.

ovy VI
1' 21 [alki na-bal-kā ]t-tum šumrī nabakhattu
2' 22 [ina nasāḥ]t(zi)i šēp(ši)(gi)jim1 ŋšāš[š]i pisya(šuₜ,ža-mu) u kaššāpiya šēpikī šikni
3' 23 [li-lu l]-i-bi-il-ma m[maš]-ašāt[a ana dayyānša]
4' 24 [d]ayānin(ši.kaₜ)-sā kūma(gim) nešti(uru.mah) [lissā elša]
5' 25 [li]-ma šuš leš(te)-sa li-r[er] amāsa ana piša
6' 26-7 [e-pš]-tu muš-te-pš-tu kūma(gim) [ninī lināši kūšša]
7' 28 [k]i-ma ʃazupiri(šar,sag) [šizzapirāši kūšša]
8' 29 'ki-ma sahl(ša)li.ši]-li i-[šu]-šaši-lušši kūšša
9' 30 'ki-ma ʃamidi(kur,zu) li-[šu]-šaši-lušši kūšša
10' 31 'ki-ma kasi(šazi)at šik-s[u]-ši kūšša
11' 32 'ki-ma ʃaššē(šar,šar) li-[šu]-šaši-lušši kūšša
12' 33 'ki-ma qit-[ma] li-tu-[u]-ši kūšša
13' 34 'ki-ma nūhr(iti)-mu.nu.šu(ša)) li-tal-hi-r(šapšaša)
14' 36-7 e-pš-tu muš-te-pš-tu libalkit(šal)-ši sāgu u sulā
15' 38 libalkit(šal)-ši ib-re-tu u nē-[medaša]
16' 39 šal-bal-ki-tu-si-ma išši(dingir)meš ʃšāši u šēši
17' 40 [maš]-aššāt[ušₜ,ža] kūma(gim) kabī(šuš,gi) ana ši-ghraṭti(ši)nu.ki(kūma(gim))
18' 41 'ki-ma kib-si immeri(šuš,ni)na ʃi-[šam]-ši-kašši-1-ma šišaši
19' 42 'ki-ma kur-si-[ni] ineri(šuš,ni)ana šišu(gis) (ši)ši-ki(kūma(gim))
20' 43-4 'e-pš-tu muš-te-pš-tu ši-bi-r(šal)š[ušₜ,ža] ʃi-la-šu-ru ku-šu-la-saša
21' 45 ina bi-riš ku-šu-la-saš 'ši-la-šu-la kal-bi
121 78 85 én kibrítu(pis₁₀, 4id) elдету(kù)⁴m ранат(dumu.munus) 4id kibrítu(kimin) kal-lat 4id
122 79 80 sā sebe(7) u sebe(7) ⁴m kaššāpāti(uš₁₁, 2'u)⁴m sā ṣā' sebe(7) u sebe(7)
123 81 85 sā a-ba-ti-ša
124 80 81 e-pu'-ša'-niš-šim'-ma ul in-nē-pu'-uš₃
125 82 83 4'ša'-ša'-niš-ši-ša' ul ik'-ka'-šip
126 82 83 man·nu sā a-nā' kibrítu(pis₁₀, 4id) iippuša(dù)ša kiš-pi
127 83 84 kibrítu(pis₁₀, 4id) sā sebe(7) u sebe(7) ⁴m iippuša(dù)⁴m-ni lipšur('bûr')
128 84 85 kimin'? [x] x lipsur(bûr)-ma ana-ku lu-šub-[lu]-ṭen
129 85 85 én kibrítu(pis₁₀, 4id) elдету(kù)⁴m ⁴atā'išu(kur.kur) ⁴šam²-mu qad-du-[šu anāku]
130 86 87 e-pi'-šu'-nun ul i'-le'-a'-in-n[r]
131 87 88 e-pi'-šu'-nun ul i'-le'-a'-in-n[r]
132 88 89 e-pi'-šu'-nun ul i'-le'-a'-in-n[r]
133 89 90 e-pi'-šu'-nun ul i'-le'-a'-in-n[r]
all in all approx. 50–2 ll.) and

rev. VIII

1 32 [šaman šipti] ša ša
2 32 [šaman šipti] ša ša
3 32 [šaman šipti] ša ša
4 32 [šaman šipti] ša ša
5 32 [šaman šipti] ša ša
6 32 [šaman šipti] ša ša
7 32 [šaman šipti] ša ša
8 32 [šaman šipti] ša ša
9 32 [šaman šipti] ša ša
10 32 [šaman šipti] ša ša
11 32 [šaman šipti] ša ša
12 32 [šaman šipti] ša ša
13 32 [šaman šipti] ša ša
14 32 [šaman šipti] ša ša

End of rev. VII; the rest of Maqâlî (112–57); small gaps remain between ll. 111, 112 and 113 as well as after l. 157", all in all approx. 50–2 ll.) and Maqâlî VII 1–31 in the break at the beginning of rev. VIII.
21' 53-4 ip-ša bar-tú amāt(imim) lemuttti(hul)’[m]’ la’ iteḫḫā(te)-ni la iqaṟriḇī(ku.nu)-ni ỉa-ši ēn

22' 55 i’ēn at-ti-1-man(eš)-nu (munus) kaššāptu(ušš1, zuš) ša ipuša(dū)’ā ṣal-mi
23' 56 it-[u]-lu la-a-1[ni il]’i-mu’[u] .Impassimi(lamma)
24' 57 e1-[mu-ru bar-ti] 1’u-šar-2-ri-[hu] gat-ti
25' 58-9 [iššābu nabaašt] um-μaš-3-ši-šu bu-an’1-na-ni-ia
26' 60-1 [u]’b-3-p1-’r[u mināt]-ia u-1’kās-3-su-u meš-re-ti-ia
27' 61 1’u-kan’1[ni-ru] ma-na-ni1’u1
28' 62 ia-a-ši 1’śe-[v[išši] [3]maš(aš)1’il(di)’ešgim miša-[u-ra-ni-ma]
29' 63-4 ina maḫaṣ̱(i)g 1’šaṃaṣ(utu) sa-lam1’ki e1’sir la-an1’ki1 at-tu1’lamma1(1)m1’ki 1’u1 ab-ni1
30' 65 bal-ta-ki a-2-mur ga-ta-ki1 1’u-šar-ri-[1]ṭu ṣi
31' 65-6 na-b1-ni-it-ki u1’-la-[ba-h]1’mišašba1’ elletu(kū)1’u1’bu-n-μa-ni-ki1’u1’maš1’šil
32' 67 [mišātik]i ubbir meš[r]-e-ti1’k11’u1’kās1’ši
33' 68-9 [mu’aštiki ukannin išša]1’t(e-pu-šin1’ni1’épaša(dū)-ki
34' 70 [miš̱hur tuṣanhamir1’n]i 1’u-šam-ḥir1’ki
35' 71 [gimil tagmišu]n1’u1’ter1’1’g(m)n1’il1’ki1
36' 72 [kispiški rīdeki ru-še]1’k13 ep-še1-ke-1’ti1’lemeš1(nu)-ti
37' 73-4 [uššašeški ayyābāti na-aš-pa-ra-ti-ki ša lemuttti(hul)1’im]
38' 75 [ṟam̠ki zirki dīl]1’alā(di.β)a1’(a)-1’k13 zikurudā1(zii.ku1, ru1.da)-1’k13
39' 76 [kadaḥbedašši dimmaḫur]1’s(dimma.kūr.t)a1’k1-li-ki1’lu ṣeš1-sag1’k13
40' 77 [iti mē ša zumriya u maṣāti ša qāṭiya(šu1)1’mn-mu]
41' 78 [liššaḫtima ana muẖīki u lānki]1’1’lil-šiša
42' 79 [maبالغ luḥut ēnuṯu]1’li1’na-1’ni1’ni
43' 79-a [maẖirtu]1’lim-ḥar-1’an1’ni a1’m-lat mu1’iṣ-hu1’lu1’lim1-ḥur1-in1’ni 1’ēn

End of rev. VIII; Maqlū VII 80–177 and the first 15–20 ll. of Maqlū VIII in break.

The line endings preserved in rev. IX belong roughly in the gap of approx. nine lines between Maqlū VIII 16 and 17', probably overlapping with the fragmentary ll. 17–21' whose endings cannot be reconstructed yet, or, less likely, with the fragmentary ll. 14–16.

rev. IX

1' [ le|mnu1’ēti(hul)1’mēi
2' [ ] x-ti
3' [ ] 1’hū?
4’–8’ completely broken
9' [ ] x
10' [ ] 1’ni1’?
11' [ ] x-sšu
12' [ ] -s? d?

Rev. IX breaks; rev. X–XII lost.

obv. V

1' 24 ‘[You have han]ded over [figurines of me to a dead person],
you (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!]
2' 25–6 [You have chosen figurines of me for a dead person, you have lajād [figurines of me with a dead person],
you[!] (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!]
3' 27–8 [You have laid figurines of me in the lap of a dead person], you have buried [figurines of me in dead person’s grave],
you[!] (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
4’ 29–30 [You have handed over figurines of me to a skull], you [have] immured [figurines of me in a wall],
   yo[u] (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
5’ 31–2 [You have laid figurines of me under a threshold], you have immured [figurines of me in the sewage opening of the (city) wall],
   yo[u] (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
6’ 33 [You have buried figurines of me on a bridge so that the crowds trample (over them),
7’ 34 [you have opened a hole in a fuller’s mat (and) buried figurines of me (therein)],
   [y]ou (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
8’ 35 [You have opened a hole in a gardener’s channel (and) buried [figurines of me (therein)],
   [y]ou (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
9’ 36 [Figurines of me — whether of tamarisk wood or of cedar wood or of tallow] or of wax
10’ 37–8 [or of sesame pomace or of bitumen or of clay, or of dough —],
11’ 39 [figurines, likenesses of my face] and of my body,
12’ 39–40 [you have made f] (fed them) [to a dog], fed (them) to a pig,
13’ 41 [fed (them) to birds, thr] own (them) [into a river],
14’ 42 You have handed over [figurines of me to L]amaštu, the daughter of [Anu],
   you (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
15’ 43 You have handed over [figurines of me to] Gira,
   you (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
16’ 44 You have laid [my water with] a dead person (into a grave),
   you (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
17’ 45 You have laid [my water in the lap of a dead person,
   you (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
18’ 46 You have buried [my water in a dead person’s grave],
   you (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
19’ 47 You have buried my water [in . . .] of the earth,
   you (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
20’ 48 You have buried my water [in . . .] of the earth,
   you (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
21’ 49 Before the gods of the night] you have drawn my water,
   you (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
22’ 50 You have handed over hair from [my] body to Gilgamesš,
   you (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
23’ 51 You have chosen me for the [ne[ther] world,
   you (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
24’ 52 ‘Cutting-of-the-throat’-magic before (the moon-god) Šin,
   you (have performed against me, you have had performed against me: may Gira release!)
25' 53–4 ['Cu]tting-of-the-throat'-magic before Jupiter, 'cutting-of-the-throat'-magic before Cygnus,
26' 55, 57 ['cu]tting-of-the-throat'-magic before (the star of ) Gula, 'cutting-of-the-throat'-magic before Ursa Maior
you (have performed against me, you have had performed against me: may Gira release!)
27' 58–9 'Cutting-of-the-throat'-magic before Scorpius, ‘cutting-of-the-throat’-magic before Orion,
28' 60 ['cu]tting-of-the-throat'-magic before Centaurus
you (have performed against me, you have had performed against me: may Gira release!)
29' 61 ['Cu]tting-of-the-throat'-magic making use of a snake, a mongoose, an arrabu-mouse
(or) a piruru-tu-rodent
you (have performed against me, you have had performed against me: may Gira release!)
30' 62 ['Cutting-of-the-throat'-magic making use of a corpse, [ ... ] ...
〈you (have performed against me, you have had performed against me: may Gira release!)〉
31' 63 You have [given] me [a]ll kinds (of bewitched food) [to eat],
you (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
32' 64 [You have] given me (bewitched) water to drink, m[ilk, beer (or) wine],
you (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)
33' 65 [You have bathed] m[e with (bewitched) water and potash],
you (have performed (sorcery) against me, you have had (sorcery) performed against me: may Gira release!)’’

Obv. V breaks off.

obv. VI

1' 21 “[Come, rebell]i[on, rage, rebellion]!
2' 22 [Place your feet where you have remov]ed the feet of my warlo[ck and witch]!
3' 23 [Let an idiot] take the w[itch to her judge]
4' 24 so that her [j]udge [may roar against her] like a lion,
5' 25 [m]ay he strike her cheek, may he tu[rn back her word to her mouth]!
6' 26–7 [So]r[ceress (and) enchantress: Like [ammi may her witchcraft be dislodged,]
7' 28 [I]ike saffron may [her witchcraft squash her],
8' 29 like sahl]-plant may [her witchcraft pierce her],
9' 30 like sami]-plant may [her witchcraft cover her],
10' 31 like kas]-plant may [her witchcraft bind her],
11' 32 like thyme may [her witchcraft chop [her up],
12' 33 like black alum may [her witchcraft] chop [her],
13' 35 like nuh]-asafoetida may [her lips] be made to shrivel!
14' 36–7 Sorceress (and) enchantress: May [street and alley] turn against h[er],
15' 38 may the open-air shrine and [its] cu[lt socles] turn against her,
16' 39 may the gods of [the open country and the city] turn against her
17' 40 so that the witch — like a dog with a stick, like a liza[rd with a clod of earth],
18' 41 like sheep-dung — may be cl[ea]red away and [passed by],
19' 42 so that the passerby may fro[wn upon her] as upon a donkey’s fetlock in the street!
20' 43–4 Sorceress (and) enchantress: May her headscarves whirl (in the dirt) betw[een the
do]gs,
21' 45 may dogs whirl between her headscarves,
22' 46 may axes whirl over her!
23' 47 Like (when burning) gazelle dung may her smoke dissipate!” Incantation (formula).
Incantation: “Whoever you are, witch, who is performing (sorcery) for three months, ten days (and) half a day: I lift up against you kukru-plant, the nourishment of the mountain(s), thyme, the nourishment of the land. ‘String, string of the gadištu-votaries, cone, cone that is full of seed, break this of my warlock (and) witch, (namely) their bond, turn her witchcraft into a storm-wind, her words into wind!’ May her witchcraft be blown away like chaff, may it be peeled off like garlic(-skin), may it be stripped off like dates, may it be untwined like a string – by the command of Istar, Dumuzi, [Nanaya, lady of love], and Kanisur[ra, mistress of witches.” Incantation (formula).”

Incantation: “The hate-magic you have performed against me, have had performed against me, is (directed) against you,”

Obv. VI breaks off.

rev. VII

Incantation: “(so) may her witchcraft, her sorceries, [her] magic (and) her evil machinations not come near me, not approach me!” Incantation (formula).

Incantation: “Hey, you who have performed all (kinds of witchcraft)! Whatever you have performed against me (and) [my] fate – may the kukru-plant of the mountain(s) break your bond, may the south wind carry off what is on your right and on your left!”

Incantation: “Pure sulphur, daughter of the great heavens, am I! Anu created me, then Enlil (and) Ninlil brought me down to the land. Sorceress, where could you (possibly) have bewitched me, raḫitu-witch, where could you (possibly) have impregnated me (with witchcraft)? As much as my head heaven is holy, as much as my feet earth is holy. On my inner hem is cast the incantation of the sage of the gods.” Incantation (formula).

Incantation: “Sulphur, sulphur, sulphur, daughter of the River, sulphur, daughter-in-law of the River, whose witches are seven and seven, whose enemies are seven and seven! They performed (sorcery) against her, but she was not affected (by their sorcery), they bewitched her, but she was not bewitched. Who is it who would perform witchcraft against sulphur? May sulphur release (the sorcery) the seven and seven have performed against me, may sulphur release . . ., so that I may live!” Incantation (formula).

Incantation: “Pure sulphur, atâ’išu-plant, the holy herb, [am I]! My sorcerers are the Sages of the underground ocean, my sorceresses are the heavenly Daughters of Anu. When they performed (sorcery) against me, they were never able to overpower me, when I performed (rituals) against them, I was able to overpower them. I rise up like fish in my water, like a pig from [my] mud, like soapwort in the flood plain, like grass on the bank of a canal, like the seed of the ebony-tree on the seashore. You of the Balīḫ, you of the Balīḫ! Hide yourselves in the ground, you who shook your hair out [at me]!”
Incantation: “The [Ri]ver is my head, sulphur is [my] bodily form,
my feet are the river who[se] inner being nobody knows,
the annulla-plant is my mouth, Ayabba, the ⟨wide⟩ sea, are [my] hands.
Like the River my head, like pure sulphur [my]
my feet are the river who[se] inner being nobody knows,
the annulla-plant(!) (and) ‘heals-a-thousand’-plant, the plants of release,
my limbs are pure. . . . sul[phur].
By the . . . of Ea, [. . .''
Incantation: “River, I have eaten, I have drunk, I have been anointed, [I have
clothed myself],
I have provided you lavishly [with soothing oil]
that Ea has granted for soothing.
I have anointed you [with the oil of life],
I have expelled the asakku-demon, the ‘seizer’-demon (and) the chills of your body,
I have removed the stupor, apathy (and) misery of your body,
I have soothed the sinews of your sick limbs –
by the command of Ea, king of the underground ocean, by the spell of Ea,
by the incantation of Asalluh ˘i, with the great bandage of Gula,
with the soothing hands of Nintinugga
and Ningirima, lady of incantation(s).
Ea cast on N.N., son of N.N., the incantation
so that the seven sages of Eridu may soothe his body!” Incantation (formula).
Incantation: “Enlil is my head, Sirius is my body, my forehead is the rising sun,
my arms are Auriga at Marduk’s gate, my ears are the capable one,
your, oh great gods, shine like (the sun-god) Šamaš in the sky.
As — like tin (and) iron — sorcery, revolt (and) evil talk
do not come near you, do not approach you,
so let sorcery, revolt (and) evil talk not come near me, not approach me!” Incantation
(formula).
Incantation: “Whoever you are, witch, who made a figurine of me,
who [saw my good looks], gave rich detail to my physical build,
who studied (my) figure, reproduced my features,
I have drawn your image before Šamaš, I have observed your body, I have created
a representation of you.
I have seen your good looks, I have given rich detail to your physical build,
I have [studied] your figure, with pure flour I have reproduced your features,
I have bound your limbs], I have tied your [body p]arts,
33’ 68–9 [I have twisted your sinews! The sorceries you performed against me I have performed against you,
34’ 70 [the mishap you had me encounter] I have had you encounter,
35’ 71 [the revenge you took against me] I have taken against you in return,
36’ 72 May [your witchcraft, your sorceries], your [magic], your evil manipulations,
37’ 73–4 [your hostile machinations], your [passages of evil,
38’ 75 [your love-magic, your hate-magic] your ‘[per]version-of-justice’-magic, your ‘cutting-of-the-throat’-magic,
39’ 76 [your ‘seizing-of-the-mouth’-magic], your dementia-magic take hold of your (own)
person!
40’ 77 [With the (washing) water of my body and the washwater of] my hands
41’ 78 [let it be rinsed off and] let it come [upon your head and body]
42’ 79 [so that I may live. May someone] take (it) over from me,
43’ 79–a may [someone] receive (it) from me. I have[encountered] mishap: may they receive it from me!’’

End of rev. VIII.

rev. IX
1’–12’ too fragmentary for translation
Rev. IX breaks; rev. X–XII lost.

Commentary

Obs. V 1’–33’ (Maqlû IV 24–65): Only the middle part of Bīšī bīšī: the first incantation of Maqlû IV with its long list of acts of witchcraft which Girû is asked to undo, is preserved on the Chicago fragment. Substantial parts of this passage were unknown when Meier prepared his edition, and a few fragmentary lines are still known from the present manuscript only. The following duplicates are relevant for the passage: K 2454 + 2984 + 3178 + 7616 (+) 2976 (ll. 24–55; Kuyunjik, Assyrian script), K 2956 (ll. 52–65; Kuyunjik, Assyrian script, copy Tallqvist 1895: II 71–2, here Fig. 4), Rm 548 (+) (ll. 30–9; Kuyunjik, Assyrian script), BM 34077 (ll. 48–65; Babylonia, Late Babylonian script, copy Fig. 5; we thank M. J. Geller who made his own unpublished copy of the fragment available to us), BM 36618 (ll. 64–5; Babylonia, Late Babylonian school excerpt, copy Gesche 2000: 267–8, here Fig. 6), BM 40726 (ll. 29–37; Babylonia, Late Babylonian script). Apart from the line division the text of the passage as preserved on the Chicago fragment shows no significant variants from the other manuscripts.

1’–5’ (24–32): The preserved line endings seem to suggest that ll. 25, 27 (or 26), 29 and 31 were missing in the present manuscript (all lines preserved in K 2454+, 29–31 in BM 40726, 30–1 in Rm 548). But the spacing between the preserved signs at the end of ll. 1’–5’ suggests the possibility that these lines contained considerably more text than the comparable ll. 15’–18’ further down in the same column. It is therefore likely that two canonical lines were included on one line in this passage; the opening word saluniya was probably represented by kimin, and te-, the incipit of the refrain, was repeated only at the end of each line rather than after each entry. This is supported by the fact that the zikurudå-section of the litany shows exactly the same structure: the opening line of the section is on a line of its own (l. 24’ = 52), but in the following lines two canonical lines are combined on one (ll. 25’ = 53–4; 26’ = 55, 57; 27’ = 58–9), zikurudå is represented by kimin, and te- is repeated only at the end of a line (or not at all). In favour of assuming that these lines were originally on this tablet (rather than assuming that they were omitted accidentally or were not part of the original text) is the fact that they are not randomly distributed, but occur together in alternate lines.

3’ (27–8): For the spelling taq-pi-ru instead of taq-bi-ru (so in ll. 18’–20’), see our remarks on the language and orthography of the Chicago manuscript (supra, introduction).

6’ (33): There is not enough space for the restoration of the expected te-; note that the scribe omitted te- also in l. 25’.

7’–8’ (34–5): hūru is a pit or a hole in the ground and, more specifically, a hole filled with liquids (bitumen, water), therefore “pool”, “well” etc. A small hole dug into a fuller’s mat fills up with the dirty washwater that the fuller presses out of the clothes when rubbing them on the mat. The image of burying figurines in such a hole suggests at the same time drowning in a small well, or the like, and being soiled (cf. Schwemer 2007a: 46 ad 13 rev. IV 12’–3’). A hole in the ground or on the edge of a gardener’s channel fills up with muddy water; the basic meaning of the image is therefore again that of dirtying and drowning the figurine. Generally, the deposition of figurines in the ground symbolises their transfer to the nether world, and the use of geḇērû in both lines indicates that this meaning is intended here too.

11’ (39): For the restoration of this line, see Schwemer 2007b: 92 fn. 123.

14’ (42): How substitute figurines could be handed over to Lamaštu is nicely illustrated by the ritual K 888 (with the parallel text KAL 2, 26 and 27 // RIAA 312 // CBS 1498), where Lamaštu guides substitute figurines of the patient to the nether world (see Schwemer 2006; for RIAA 312, cf. also Abusch and Schwemer 2009).
Fig. 4 K 2956 (Maqlû IV) obv. (top) and rev. (bottom).
16’–20’ (44–8): For an interpretation of “my water” as the water of the patient symbolically poured as his funerary offering see Schwemer 2007b: 101–4; for a possible restoration of the beginnings of ll. 19’ and 20’, see ibid. 102 with fn. 176.

21’ (49): The reading offered here for the first half of the line remains tentative. The slight traces preserved at the beginning of l. 21’ look very much like ina i[gi, and the broken sign before môya could be š]i. The latter reading is supported by the equally broken, corresponding sign in K 2976 obv. II 4 where clear traces of a Winkelhaken are preserved before the vertical and horizontal ([...]š]i ašš-ta [...]}. The symbolic drawing and pouring of water for the patient’s funerary offering is closely associated with zikuruduš-magic, and some texts indicate that, like zikuruduš-magic, this ritual use of water was performed before the stars (see Schwemer 2007b: 102–4); it therefore seems plausible to restore ina ma[išar iš mašši] “before the gods of the night” or, possibly, ina ma[išar kakkabu maššu] “before the stars of the night” (for mâšu, rather than more common mušitu, preceded by ilu or kakkabu, see CAD M II 295a; for the slight semantic difference between mâšu and mušitu, see Wasserman 2002: 71–3).
22° (50): The beginning of the line is only preserved in the present manuscript; for the tentative restoration offered here, cf. Schwemer 2007b: 102 fn. 178 (but note that the tentative restoration of BAM 231 obv. I 16 has been ruled out by collation in the meantime).

24’–30’ (52–62): The zikurudu-SECTION of the litany was largely unknown to Meier, and its last line is still very fragmentary. It is well known from other texts that zikurudu-witchcraft was believed to have been performed before astral deities (ll. 52–60) and that this form of witchcraft made use of rodents and snakes (see Thomsen 1987: 40–7, Abusch 2008, Schwemer 2007b: 63–4, 101–5, 155–7, 222–6). Though a certain hierarchy in the order of the astral bodies can be observed and some of the stars named are attested within the context of zikurudu-witchcraft elsewhere, the list seems neither to follow an overall logic in its arrangement nor to be exhaustive — zikurudu performed before Sirius (Sûkûdû, mulâg.âs.sah, see Thomsen 1987: 44, Mayer 1990: 169–74) is missing.

24’ (52): The performance of zikurudu-witchcraft before the moon-god is not attested otherwise, but one anti-witchcraft ritual against zikurudu is performed before Sin (see Schwemer 2007b: 222–6, and note that the “three” rituals of this type adduced by Thomsen 1987: 44 all belong to the same text); also the dangerous women at 7th cent. Guzana who are able to bring down the moon from the sky should be mentioned in this context (SAA 16, 63 rev. 26–7, cf. Schwemer 2007b: 104 and 126 with further references). The transcription of igi as pa-ni: (and not mahûr) here and in the following lines is based on syllabic pa-ni in K 2976 obv. II 7–8.


26° (55, 57): L. 56 is preserved in BM 34077 obv. II 9°: [zi.ku.s.ru] da° ana igi mulû.uk.la te--; its omission here is due to a mistake on the part of the scribe (haplography). The fact that l. 26° has l. 55 without te- and then, after the omission of l. 56, l. 57 with te- suggests that it was the writer of the present tablet who decided on the line division and on the omission of te- in the first half of the line and its inclusion, when possible, at the end of the line. For zikurudû performed before Eregû (Ursa Major, l. 57), cf. PBS 1/2, 121 and AMT 44/4 + KMI 76a obv. 2 (joined by Abusch in 1976 and discussed by Thomsen 1987: 44, Schwemer 2007b: 229–30). L. 55 is preserved here as well as in K 2976 obv. II 10 (traces of gu only) and BM 34077 obv. II 8°. Instead of ana igi “gu-la “before (the goddess) Gula” BM 34077 has ana igi mulû.GUL.SA. The determinatives for deities and stars are interchangeable, “sometimes even in one and the same text” (Reiner 1995: 5). In the...
present case, however, problems of interpretation arise. “Cutting-of-the-throat” magic before the goddess Gula is attested also in *BAM* 449 (+) rev. III 24–7 // *STT* 89 obv. I 23–7 (ana ği[gu]-la), and Thomsen’s assumption that “vielleicht der Stern Gula gemeint [ist]” (1987: 44) finds welcome support in the fact that Gula is named within a list of astral bodies here. According to *MUL.APIN* I i 24 (Hunger and Pingree 1989: 25), Gula’s star is Lyra, the She-goat (*Enzu, mul-üz*), cf. also the description of [mul] *gu*-lu in the *Aššur* star catalogue VAT 9428 rev. 14–16, see Weidner 1927: 75, 77, 84–5, cf. also Gössmann 1950: 28, 60–2). This information is borne out by the interchangeable role that Gula and the Goat star play in many healing rituals (see Reiner 1995: 54–6); note especially the anti-witchcraft ritual *SPTU* 2, 22 + 3, 85 obv. II 24 ff. that is performed before the Goat star and addresses Gula in the pertinent prayer (cf. Reiner 1995: 128–9, Schwemer 2007b: 149 fn. 4) and the fact that the Goat star is designated as *kakkab* (mul) *kišpi* ([ušši, zu] “star of witchcraft” in a late explanatory text (BM 55466 + *STC* 2, 67–72 rev. IV 7, cf. Landsberger 1923: 43–8). However, there is also the constellation *mul-gu-la* “The Great One” (Akkadian reading unknown, but possibly the Sumerian name was simply taken over in Akkadian) that has to be identified with Aquarius (see Weidner 1927: 84 n. 5, Kugler and Schaumberger 1935: 334–6, Ungnad 1941–4: 258 fn. 50). The “Babylonian Lunarium” known from two early Seleucid tablets associates the performance of anti-witchcraft rituals (*ušarrudâ*) with the moment when the moon stands in the region of Aquarius (and alternatively in Pisces): ušši₃ bür.ru.da *k*₃ *mul-gu-la* *sa-ni*₃ k*₃ *mu₃*₃ *kun*₃*[me]*₃ (*BRM* 4, 20 obv. 23, cf. 19 obv. 12’, for the texts see Ungnad 1941–4, Neugebauer and Sachs 1952–3, Stol 1993: 115–17, Reiner 1995: 106–10, Schwemer 2007b: 160–1, also Scurlock 2005–6 with a different overall interpretation). The conclusion must be that both constellations, Lyra (*mul-Enzu, kakkab* (mul) *gu-la*, also simply *gu-la*) and Aquarius (*mul-gu-la*), were associated with witchcraft, though an explicit link with *zikurâdu* magic can be established only for Lyra. Whether our passage refers to Lyra or Aquarius is difficult to decide (it is possible, but not likely, that the usage of different determinatives in the two extant manuscripts indicates that the Neo-Assyrian scribe intended Lyra *gu-la* while his Late Babylonian colleague thought of Aquarius (*mul-gu-la*). Which interpretation represents the tradition more generally accepted among Babylonian scholars must remain uncertain in the absence of more manuscripts or a commentary. As such, the variant writing seems to indicate that the strict distinction made in astronomical texts between “Star of Gula” and “Gula-star” might not be observed by less specially trained scribes (and the debate about the astral significance of the *kuddurrus* symbols and their assignment to specific constellations shows that modern scholarship is also susceptible to this kind of confusion, cf. Koch et al. 1990: 99, Iwaniszewski 2003: 81–2).

27 (58–9); For *zikurâdu* performed before Scorpion, cf. *KAR* 121 = *BAM* 203 = *KAL* 2, 35: 5–6’ (Middle Assyrian) and *STT* 89 obv. I 55.

28 (60); For *zikurâdu* performed before Centaurus, cf. *STT* 89 obv. I 50–1.

29 (61); Pests that easily enter houses like snakes and rodents were regarded as potential indicators (ominous messengers) of *zikurâdu*-magic, see Thomsen 1987: 40–7, Abusch 2008, Schwemer 2007b: 63–4, Stol 1993: 115–17, Reiner 1995: 54–6; note especially the anti-witchcraft ritual *zikurudu*₃*˘*₃ with the moment when the moon stands in the region of Aquarius (and alternatively in Pisces): ušši₃ bür.ru.da *k*₃ *mul-gu-la* *sa-ni*₃ k*₃ *mu₃*₃ *kun*₃*[me]*₃ (*BRM* 4, 20 obv. 23, cf. 19 obv. 12’, for the texts see Ungnad 1941–4, Neugebauer and Sachs 1952–3, Stol 1993: 115–17, Reiner 1995: 106–10, Schwemer 2007b: 160–1, also Scurlock 2005–6 with a different overall interpretation). The conclusion must be that both constellations, Lyra (*mul-Enzu, kakkab* (mul) *gu-la*, also simply *gu-la*) and Aquarius (*mul-gu-la*), were associated with witchcraft, though an explicit link with *zikurâdu* magic can be established only for Lyra. Whether our passage refers to Lyra or Aquarius is difficult to decide (it is possible, but not likely, that the usage of different determinatives in the two extant manuscripts indicates that the Neo-Assyrian scribe intended Lyra *gu-la* while his Late Babylonian colleague thought of Aquarius (*mul-gu-la*). Which interpretation represents the tradition more generally accepted among Babylonian scholars must remain uncertain in the absence of more manuscripts or a commentary. As such, the variant writing seems to indicate that the strict distinction made in astronomical texts between “Star of Gula” and “Gula-star” might not be observed by less specially trained scribes (and the debate about the astral significance of the *kuddurrus* symbols and their assignment to specific constellations shows that modern scholarship is also susceptible to this kind of confusion, cf. Koch et al. 1990: 99, Iwaniszewski 2003: 81–2).

30 (62); Both duplicates (K 2956 obv. II 11, BM 34077 obv. II 15’) are fragmentary. The traces preserved here suggest *ša pagri* near the beginning of the line, but we cannot cite any parallels to support this reading. The last two signs of the line (-he-e) seems more likely than -ge-e) can hardly be anything but the ending of a genitive, which most likely would belong to a series of genitives following *zikurâdu*₃*˘*₃ (cf. l. 29’). Since this is the last line of the *zikurâdu*-section, an emissionion of *te* at the end of the line seems inevitable. The traces preserved before -he-e could suggest a reading *k*[imin]₃ *ša*₃ *łe*-he-e, but the fact that BM 34077 has only one corresponding line (with a large uninscribed space after *zikurâdu*) militates against the reconstruction of a line with two *zikurâdu* phrases. One could also read *u*₃ *ša*₃ *łe*-he-e, so that the whole phrase would be: “*zikurâdu* of a corpse, of a y and of a z” (but note that u is not used in the structurally parallel line 29’). Another alternative would be:  '&#1055;[e][e][e][e]₃ łe*-he-e, which would give us “*zikurâdu* of a corpse, of an x of a y of a z”, i.e. four items as in l. 29’. Even the reading of the last word itself remains uncertain. While ‘łe*-he-e’ “of ruhu-magic” fits the traces perfectly, *ša*-he-e “of a pig” cannot be excluded.

31 (63); The duplicate line BM 34077 obv. II 16 reads: *ina aš*[ka]-lu uš-kal-tum inbi (gurum) [...]. The traces preserved in K 2956 obv. II 12’ indicate that this manuscript had the same text: [... u-ku]-tu₃ *gu*[run ...]. The Chicago fragment gives us the expected verbal form *tušâšâlîm[ıni]*, but the first half of the line differs from the duplicates. The list of foodstuffs is replaced with a simple *minnu šunu*a (for *minnu šunu*a in a comparable context, cf. Lassoe 1955: 38: 13–5 //). The space available suggests that *minnu šunu*a was not preceded by *ina* (for the restoration of *ina* in the duplicates, cf. the commentary on the following line). The transfer of witchcraft to its victim by means of food, drink, bathwater, oil and presents is a well-known motif in anti-witchcraft rituals (see Abusch 2002 [= 1989]: 12 with fn. 26, 83–7, Schwemer 2007b: 87–9).

32 (64); All extant manuscripts are fragmentary, but together they allow an almost complete reconstruction of the line:

---

A 7678 obv. V 32: — *[a*₃*me]*₃ *go*[a]₃ *x* x *taš-q[a][a]-i*-i*[ni]*₃ *[e]*

K 2956 obv. II 13: *ina a*₃*me*₃ *[g]*₃ *ka*₃ *g*₃ *ge*₃ *tu*₃ *k*₃ *q*₃ *inni*...

BM 34077 obv. II 17*: [i]-na *a*₃*me*₃ [...

BM 36618 obv. 1: *ina a*₃*me*₃ *g*[a]₃ *ka*-tu*[a]-i*[i]*₃ *taš-q[a][a]-i*-i*[ni]*₃

---
The name of the second beverage is fragmentary in all manuscripts. Next to water, beer and wine, milk is the most common beverage, and the traces in K 2956 fit a reading šičiše, while the few traces preserved in our manuscript and BM 36618 at least do not contradict it. At the beginning of the line, the traces in BM 36618 and the space available in K 2956 and BM 34077 strongly suggest ina; this is confirmed by the fact that we have parallel constructions with ina in ll. 65–7: ina mē u ṣiḥištu urammiḫi‘inni, ina šaanna tapšišša‘inni, ina ša banūštu tšišša‘inni (preserved in BM 36618 and partially in K 2956). Consequently, ina has to be restored also in the preceding l. 63 (here 31) of these manuscripts. As in l. 31, however, there seems not to be enough space before the broken a for the restoration of ina in our manuscript; apparently it had a simple double accusative construction instead of the elliptic phrases (i.e., phrases without the explicit mention of witchcraft) in the duplicates. Close parallels can be adduced for both constructions. Elliptic construction: ša . . . ina akālu ušičilanni ina šićari šišqanni ina mē urammiškanni ina šaanni šašqanni ina ukullu ušičilanni “who . . . has given me (witchcraft) to eat with food” (Læssøe 1955: 38: 11–13 // STT 76–7). Simple double accusative construction: mē kaššiqpištu ina šićarti šiiqarti ina šaanni škišipatti (BRM 4, 18 obv. 1–3 //, see Abusch 2002: 84 — note that in the duplicate AMT 92/1 obv. II 12 ‘ina before raḫša is not present on the tablet [coll.]). It seems that usually the elliptic construction does not mention witchcraft explicitly, while in the double accusative construction the second accusative object is either simply kšišti etc. or a substance qualified as bewitched by a following genitive (mē kaššiqpišti etc.). For the interchange of prepositional and double accusative construction with certain verbs see GAG² §145g, but note that as far as šikalu, šaqi and paššu are concerned, the prepositional phrase is usually found in elliptic expressions, especially when referring to administering drugs (not explicitly mentioned) to the patient in or with edibles or oil.

33’ (65): For the restoration of mē instead of ina mē of the duplicates, see the commentary on the preceding line.

Obv. VI 1–23’ (Maqlû V 21–47): All but the first two lines of Dununnu dununnu, the third incantation of Maqlû V, are preserved. The incantation is clearly structured in four parts: The opening section (ll. 19–25) describes the reversal of the witch’s and the patient’s fates in images of social upheaval and revolutionary change (for this motif, see Schwemer 2007b: 206–9). This is followed by three further sections, each of which is introduced by ēpišti muššēpsti, a phrase that all manuscripts but the present and BM 48928 place on a separate line. Lines 26–35 contain a series of short analogical pleas which play with the names of the dried herbs used in the ritual (cf. the ritual tablet ll. 73–4). The following section (ll. 36–42) expresses the wish for the witch’s rejection by gods and men; the witch is imagined as a person living in the streets who is pushed aside and scorned by passersby. The last part of the incantation (ll. 43–7) finally evokes the image of a woman lying in the gutter at the mercy of passing men, her scarves whirled around by dogs. The text of K 7242+ is lost in Kuyunjik, Sm 741 and Sm 12500, and in a number of manuscripts, e.g., K 3230 + 8444 + 8467 + 8495 + 10356 + 11754 + 12917 + 13328 + 15958 (+) 18127 (ll. 21–47; Kuyunjik, Assyrian script), K 7242 + 8498 + 8965 + 9833 + 9868 (+) (ll. 23–40; Kuyunjik, Assyrian script), Sm 741 + 2069 (+) … (+) K 18618 (ll. 21–5, 36–46; Kuyunjik, Babylonian script), BM 36643 + 37527 (ll. 39–46, Late Babylonian school excerpt, Gesche 2000: 269–72), BM 48926 (Late Babylonian, probably Babylon).

2’ (22): Or “[Place your feet where] my warlock and witch have removed the[ir] feet!”

6’ (26): All other sources have ēpišti muššēpsti instead of the simple nominative in our manuscript. The same is true for ll. 36 and 43; with the exception of K 7242+ which has the suffixed form here, but the simple nominative in l. 36 (l. 43 not preserved), and BM 48926 which has the simple nominative in both these lines (the present line is not preserved).

6’–13’ (27–33, 35): Only our manuscript omits l. 34 (kīma erre šiririši kšišaša); the omission is probably a scribal mistake. The “wordplays” in these lines are purely formal, and an adequate translation of the passage is therefore impossible. The verbal roots chosen all signify hostile actions against the witch and have as many radicals as possible in common with the consonants of the corresponding plant-names. To modern linguistic standards — which, however, do not apply to Babylonian linguistics and exegesis (see Lambert 1999: 222–31) — there are no etymological or semantic connections between the verbal forms and the plant-names, nor do the verbs denote typical actions or properties of the individual plants (for a similar “wordplay”) (or better: Babylonian exegetical etymology), cf. the anti-witchcraft incantation TCL 6, 49 obv. 20 //, see Schwemer 2007b: 198 with fn. 23). Due to the natural limits of the language, the match between plant-name and verb is not always perfect: Akkadian has no verbal root *m- or *n-, so nīma is paired up with nāšu; similarly flawed is the match between samudā and sumūtu — apparently samudā “grind” was excluded for semantic reasons. Other pairs are formally perfect, but semantically forced: ḫuṣṣu “mutillate, chop” is never used in connection with witchcraft elsewhere, nor is sumūtu “hammer, harass”; the “wordplay” between nāḫuru and nāḫuru “be shrivelled, invalid” occurs also at Maqlû VI 133’, but the usage of nāḫuru in anti-witchcraft literature is restricted to this Babylonian etymology (for the corrupt writing *nu₃₁₁₃₃, cf. already Borger, MZL p. 270). The exact meaning of suppuru is notoriously difficult to define; in view of the general character of our passage, the present attestation contributes little to the understanding of the verb (pace CAD S 133a: “may her spells ‘trim’ her as (one trims the vegetable) azupiru’nā”; AHw 93a, 1082a: “azupiru (von scharfen
Blättern’"). The basic meaning of šapārū/seperū seems to be “squeeze”, “pinch”, “press in, press together”, then also “squin”, “trim”, “taper” (see CAD § 96–7, 132–3, AHw loc. cit.). There is no clear evidence for a separate denominative verb suppurū “scratch” (< suprū). A certain part of the azupiru-plant is called suprū “claw” (CAD § 253b, AHw 93b); the designation probably refers to the style and stigma of the saffron-plant which are shaped like a bird’s claw (or nail pairings), but it is difficult to see how this would be relevant to the present context. Most of the plant-names in this list are unidentified (for a recent discussion of kasū and sabsū, see Stol 1983–4, Stol 1994 and Geller 1995).

15 (38): AHw 363b explains the form ibretu (or ibritu) as the Neo-Assyrian dialect form of ibratu. At the time, the form was attested only in the genitive (Šarpu III 83, preserved in Neo-Assyrian manuscripts from Aššur, see Borger 2000: 45; also in the commentary KAR 94 rev. 55, see Reiner 1958: 50), and consequently the e/i in the second syllable was attributed to vowel-harmony by CDA 124 (“NA gen. ibriti”). But the form in our manuscript (ib-re-tu) must be nominative, and accordingly the explanation as vowel harmony is excluded here and unlikely for the Šarpu attestation; all other sources relevant for our line have the expected a-vowel (K 33, 2530 +, 2544 +, 7242 +, all Nineveh Assyrian, K 18618, Nineveh Babylonian, BM 48926, Late Babylonian). Thus ibretu must be interpreted as a Neo-Assyrian variant of ibratu. This also confirms von Soden’s proposal to emend the unique form ni-ib-re-ta in KAR 178 rev. V 54 (another Standard Babylonian, non-Nineveh Neo-Assyrian manuscript) to ib-re-ta; the context and the fact that the following word begins with a ni-sign also support this emendation (AHw 363b, CAD N II 203b with separate entry, but characterised as “variant of ibratu”).

16 (39): The spelling CVČ-CV for VC+ V at the morpheme boundary, as in lib-bal-kit-tu-ši-ma is an occasional feature of Neo-Assyrian manuscripts of Standard Babylonian texts (cf. George 2003: 351, 438).

18 (41): As rightly pointed out by Walters (1970: 49–51, Frankena 1978: 40–1, pace AHw 1017, CDA 314), the lexical evidence suggests a basic meaning “turn” for samāku. The verb is associated with Sumerian ni-igi in Old Babylonian Dirī (MSL 15, 14; 71, 41: 67). Antakal Vll 185 renders [sašar]-ni-igi as samāku ša epi-šir which Walters took as “turn (soil)”, “heap up” (said of earth); this translation is confirmed by the entry that follows in l. 186 and is in the same group: [sašar]-gár-ra — katummu “cover (with earth)”. The preceding entry (184) has simple samāku, but the Sumerian is fragmentary ([x]-dub) and no further conclusions can be drawn. Whether there is any semantic link to the preceding group of words concerned with various expressions for anger remains uncertain. Old Babylonian contexts show, as already argued by Walters and followed by CAD, that the meaning “heap up” led to a more specific usage of samāku as “dam up” or, in the stative and N-stem, “to be clogged” (said of waterways, see CAD s 109–10, 338b for the attestations, cf. also Stol, AšB 9, p. 155 ad 252a; note that the only attestation for *samkātum “damming work” (CAD s 118a, CDA 315) has been eliminated by collation, see Durand 1997: 352 with fn. 39). Following Walters (and CAD), samāku in Middle Assyrian Laws §55 is best explained as “turn away, reject someone”. Our passage requires a similar meaning for the D-stem: summuku is done to a dog with a stick, to a lizard with a clod of earth and to sheep dung without any particular instrument apparently on the road, with the aim of safely passing by these obstacles, hence: “clear away”, “get out of the way” (CAD’s “chase away” and Walters’ “frighten away” go well with dog and lizard, but do not fit sheep dung). An unpublished Neo-Assyrian letter quoted by CAD (110a) seems to confirm a meaning “reject”, “rebuff” for the D-stem, but other contexts show that summuku could also mean “demolish”: It is used with reference to fortresses in parallel with hešši “destroy” and ṣaṣṣāt in Borger 1971: 12 rev. III 24, and it refers to the consequences that a chariot accident had on parts of cultic utensils in SAA 13, 44 rev. 4 (there tentatively translated as “damage”). This specific meaning of the D-stem is probably related to the usage of the G-stem in the sense of “to heap up (earth)”, as one can easily explain it as being derived from a basic meaning “to turn into heaps”. The verbal adjective samku, attested in Neo-Assyrian texts, is best rendered as “deceitful” or “spiteful” (see CAD s 118a with references, pace AHw 1018b, CDA 315a) and may have a basic meaning “turned”, “twisted”. As CAD notes, it is unclear whether the equation of samku with mitu “dead” in Malku IV 80 refers to the Akkadian adjective (then possibly “heaped up” > “buried”) or to a foreign word samku.

19 (42): We treat both II. 40–1 and l. 42 as logically dependent on -ma in libbal-kitšīma (1.39) and therefore begin ll. 40 and 42 with “so that”. Why a passerby would frown upon a donkey’s fetlock is unclear to us. Is it a look of angry suspicion that the donkey might kick — but then why the fetlock and not the hoof? There is no evidence from omen texts that seeing a donkey’s fetlock was regarded as impure or bringing bad luck. The sheep’s fetlock was a cut of meat that would be offered and eaten.

23 (47): This line is not part of the image evoked by ll. 43–6, but a final wish at the close of the incantation. Gazelle dung was used as fuel in ancient Babylonia as in other areas where wood is scarce. The corresponding passage of the ritual text is fragmentary. As far as preserved, it prescribes only the strewing of dried herbs: en du-un-zi-ni dammi(k)inni, ta-hi-lu dih<sup>be</sup> [x x x] (73’–4’; VAT 4103 obv. 20 / K 8879 ÷ Sm 229 + 499 + 929 + 1194(+)-) obv. II 6’–7’); burning could be mentioned at the end of the entry, but possibly only a phonetic complement is to be restored. It is therefore uncertain whether the present line refers to a ritual action accompanying the incantation, though the preceding and all the following ritual units consist of burning various substances. It also remains uncertain whether “her smoke” refers to the smoke of the witch’s figurnes burned within the ritual or to the smoke caused by the witch’s rituals against the patient. In the first case the line would imply the complete annihilation of the witch, in the second it would refer to putting an end to the witch’s evil burning rituals. In most passages of Maqlū that mention the witch’s smoke the
first meaning is intended (cf. Maqlû I 141, III 166, V 74, 110, 146, 161), but in VI 42 the smoke at the witch’s house certainly alludes to her burning rituals (cf. also the “messenger” of the witch’s fire in VI 128 and 136”). If “gazelle dung” here referred to the actual fuel used within the present series of burning rites, an interpretation as “Like (the smoke caused by burning this) gazelle dung (here) may her smoke (there [i.e., in the burning rites that she performs]) dissipate” would be possible. But it seems more likely that our line refers to the smoke caused by burning gazelle dung generally. “Like (the smoke typically caused by burning) gazelle dung may her smoke (here within the present burning rites) dissipate”.

Obv. VI 24–35 (Maqlû V 48–56): The incantation is clearly structured in four parts: the attimanni-opening with the description of the ritual actions (ll. 48–9), the invocation of string and cone (ll. 50–2), analogical pleas for the removal of the witch’s sorceries (ll. 53–4) and the closing formula (ll. 55–6). The incantation has an artificial feeling and gives the impression that several standard formulas were pieced together and attached to the opening lines. Apart from the Chicago fragment, the text is fully preserved in K 2544 +; K 33 breaks after l. 48, K 2530 + after l. 49.

24’–5 (48): Instead of du’(d.u)46, K 2544 + and K 33 have itenepupa(du.du)46. The Gtu-form is confirmed by the quotation of the incipit in the ritual tablet where the Neo-Babylonian manuscript VAT 4103 has te-te-ne-ep-pu-ul[i] (obv. 21 = ritual tablet l. 75; for the missing feminine morpheme -i, cf. ibid. rev. 15 = ritual tablet l. 103; d.u4]) for expected rēpāši, cf. also ibid. obv. 13 = ritual tablet l. 65’). While the phonetic complement in the Kuyunjik manuscripts indicates a 3rd sg., the 2nd sg. of our manuscript is also found in the ritual tablet (VAT 4103 obv. 21). The long span of time the witch has spent on performing sorceries against the patient (one hundred and a half days) is expressed in a tripartite numerical saying in which the units of time become smaller (months — days — fraction of a day), while the fractions of the next bigger unit of time become larger (three months = a quarter of a year, ten days = a third of a month, half a day).

25’–6 (49): The epithet of the kukriu-plant is te’tū šādi according to our manuscript, though the last sign of te’tū looks more like nu than ut — a corruption that may indicate that the scribe was not entirely confident of what he was doing when writing the passage. The epithet is parallel to te’tū māti, the epithet of ḫāšū. But in addition to the poetical awkwardness created by the simple repetition of the first member, the phrase “nourishment of the mountain(s)” seems to be slightly out of place within our context. The kukriu-plant comes from the mountains (cf. Maqlû VI 22, 25, 35, 67, VIII 47”), but it is used by a speaker to whom its role in the distant mountain regions is of little concern. We rather expect an epithet like “product of the mountain(s)” (for comparable expressions see the references given by CAD S 1 53–4). It comes as no surprise that the Kuyunjik duplicate K 2544 + offers a different epithet for the kukriu-plant: ta-kūr šādi (obv. II 2). This was interpreted by Meier 1937: 36 as ta-nat šādi “Stole(?) of the Gebirges”. The doubts indicated in the translation show that Meier was aware of the fact that a bound form of tanattu “glory” should be tanattu, and his interpretation was not adopted by the dictionaries, which are silent on our word (quoted in CAD K 501a without reading or translation). Taking into account that the scribe of the Chicago fragment seemingly had difficulties with the phrase and that a word meaning “product” or the like is expected, one should consider the hypothesis that a very rare word was used here. A rare word for “offspring”, “creation” in Akkadian seems to be ta-kūr-ru, which is equated with Sumerian a-ri-a in Lānu A 25 = CT 18, 39 obv. I 19 (preceded by the equation a-ri-a = rīhišu in l. 24, see CAD T 91, AHW 1309b, both with only this reference and without any comment on the meaning). The word takuru was unknown to the scribe of our manuscript, and he simply replaced it by the much more common te’tūtu occurring in the second half of the line. The correct text of our line, then, reads: amaṣišakimmu kukru takuru šaši te’tūtu maši “I lift up against you kukru-plant, the offspring of the mountain(s), thyme, the nourishment of the land”.

27’–8 (50): Contra CAD P 436b we understand l. 50 as syntactically independent of l. 49. The string and cone are invoked as agents of undoing the sorceries that bind the patient. Anti-witchcraft incantations refer to the qadištû-votaries both as dangerous agents of witchcraft and as experts who have powerful instruments for undoing spells at their command (the same is true for the nadištû and other female cultic personnel: for a discussion of the relevant attestations see Schwemer 2007b: 76–7, and cf. Abusch 2002 [= 1992]: 188–91 for a comparable role for the practicioners referred to in Maqlû VII 88–95; note also the reference to the sekretu in BRM 4, 12: 75 [see CAD S 215b, pace Schwemer 2007b: 163]). Here and elsewhere, conifer cones are praised for the great quantity of seeds they carry (cf. esp. Maqlû I 24 with the commentary KAR 94 obv. 16–18’) and are assigned to the qadištû also in Maqlû VI 27, 37 and KAL 2, 26 rev. IV 8 // RIAA 312 rev. III 9’. Since incantations name them together with small teriu-vessels (Maqlû VI 26–7, 36–7’) and protective spirits depicted on Neo-Assyrian reliefs hold them up in one hand while often carrying a small bucket (filled with water?) in the other (Reade 1998: 38), it seems plausible that the cones were used as a sort of potenti aspergillum for purification. An interesting interpretation similar in part to ours is given by Parpola 1983: 182–3 ad LĀS 187: 13’, who is of the opinion that “the hierodule, impersonating the witch, provided a tangible object for exorcistic activity, whereas her accessories, the palm fibre mat and fir cone, probably symbolized the ‘bonds’ of the sorcerers and were to be broken or unraveled in the course of the ceremonies…”. Untwining a string that symbolises the bound state of the patient is a ritual action well known especially from nimbardi rituals (Maul 1994: 82) and, as noted by Maul (fn. 112), this ritual procedure is mentioned in the following section of our incantation (l. 54); possibly this function of the string is also implied in the present line. The ritual tablet (ll. 75–6) prescribes the burning of kukru, ḫāšû and chaff during the recitation of our incantation. These actions are referred to in ll. 49 and (indirectly) 53 of our incantation. We have no
reason to assume that the invocation of string and cone necessarily corresponds to an accompanying ritual action.

The Akkadian word for cone requires comment: All dictionaries, with the notable exception of Borger, MZL p. 375 (cf. also the short remark by Steinkeller 1987: 349), give terinna (with various phonetic variants) as the singular form of the word and analyse syllabic spellings with the feminine morpheme as plural: terinnatu. While there can be no doubt that many of the syllabic attestations of terinnatu are plural forms, the evidence for the corresponding singular form without the feminine morpheme is slim. The only attestation so far for a singular terinnu is a plant-name in Uruanna I 179–80(a) = KADP 11 obv. I 73–4 // CT 14, 41 K 8829: 9’ where ‘te-ri-na-u, sˇe.u `.suh’ (and ‘na-ri-nu’) are explained as ‘iˇsisi (gisˇ) piˇs-ri’. To our knowledge, the alleged Old Assyrian terinnum referred to by CDA 404 s.v. terinnu is attested in the feminine form ta-ri-na-tum only (Hecker 1993: 289 VI 11 and 290: 1, word lists used by students), which form can be compared to Neo-Assyrian tar-na-tu˘ (Radner 2002: 214 no. 198 obv. 6, excerpt of a lexical list). In both these cases, there is no reason to assume that the feminine forms, simple entries in lists, are plural rather than singular. The Uruanna entry as such suggests that terinnu and terinnatu are not identical, but rather that there were two separate items: a terinna-plant that was used as a drug and a cone that was used mainly as a magical instrument. Of course, the plant-name terinnu may be related to the word for cone — just as ‘wood of release’ (liti) pisˇi, GISBURA) is a designation for both a pharmaceutical plant and a magical instrument. The latter is invoked side by side with the cone in KAL 2, 26 rev. IV 8 // RIAA 312 rev. III 9: giˇsi(,)bur ˇsa nadad˘i ašˇe.šu têm, ˇsa qaˇsdaˇt˘i. The fact that the ‘wood of release’ and the cone as magical instruments are treated as a pair is parallel — and could indeed be related — to the explanation of the drug terinnu as ‘wood of release’ in Uruanna, but is of little consequence for the formation of the singular form corresponding to terinnatu ‘cones’. As already seen by Meier 1936–7, the evidence from Maql˘ı does not square well with the assumption of a masculine singular form. All sources of Maql˘ı I 24 write the word logographically: ašˇe.šu têm, liˇp-sur-an-ni ˇsa se(ˇa)šem (gan-em) ma-la-a-ta ‘may the cone that is full of seeds release me’. The commentary KAR 94 quotes this line as te-ri-na-at a-te-ši liˇp-sur-an-ni ˇsa ‘se-im ma-la-a-ta[R], replacing simple ašˇe.šu têm, with the (explanatory) genitive compound ‘cone of a pine-tree’ (obv. 16’). As indicated by the verbal form mal˘at(˚a), terinnat itself can only be singular, and this agrees with the writing ašˇe.šu têm, in all manuscripts of Maql˘ı I 24 without a plural determinative, for the plural forms in VI 27, 37 are clearly indicated by the plural determinative in the one preserved manuscript ašˇe.šu têm, in K 2595 + (+) obv. I 13’ = Maql˘ı VI 37. The fact that our sources clearly differentiate singular and plural when writing logographically leaves no doubt that the form te-ri-na-tu˘ in the present manuscript also stands for the singular, since the duplicate K 2544 + has simple ašˇe.šu têm, for terinnatu (obv. II 4). In the commentary section, KAR 94 quotes the lexeme as te-ri-na-tum (glossed by iˇs-pur-na-˚um) in obv. 17’, and this tallies with H˘H III 83–5 where ašˇe.šu têm, and ašˇe.šumum.šu têm, are equated with te-ri-na-˚u (with variants ti-ri-in-na-tum and ti-ri-na-tum, see MSL 5, 100, MSL 9, 160; cf. also the Neo-Assyrian lexical excerpt quoted supra). Finally, it is worth noting that lexical lists from Ebla equate še.šu têm, with da-ri-na-tum (var. da-ri-tum), clearly a feminine form (see CAD T 356a for the attestations as well as for related še.šu têm, za-gin // da-ri-mi-du at Ebla). In short: the evidence suggests that we separate terinnatu (plural terinnitus) ‘(pine) cone’ from terinnu, a pharmaceutical plant. Both words are very likely related, but we know too little about the plant terinnu to determine the exact nature of this relationship.

29’ (51): For the word order in this line, cf. Maql˘ı VI 28 // 38 with the same emphasis on riksu in final position: al-ka-nim-ma ˇsa kuˇsˇapipaˇy-a(uš)3˚ 1,xu-mu) u ašˇe.šu têm, da-ri-na-tum (gazˇ) rikis (kešda)-aš “Come and break my warlock’s and my witch’s strong bond!” (addressing the kukru-plant as well as the small ter˘hu-vessels of the entu-priestesses and the cones of the qaˇsdaˇtu-votaries). The transposition of noun and adjective at the end of the line in VI 28 // 38 and the intrusion of the verb there between the noun and its adjectival form (da-nna h˘piˇr rikisˇa) are well-known features of Standard Babylonian literary style; the genitive with ˇsa before the governing noun with suffixed pronoun is another characteristic of poetic style, typically used by anti-witchcraft incantations for placing warlock and witch in sentence-initial position (e.g. e.g. Maql˘ı II 12, 224, III 17–8, 70–1, VII 12). The position of annu at the beginning of the present line (rather than immediately preceding h˘piˇr), which is peculiar even by the standards of poetry, indicates a substantivised use of annu with dependent genitive and therefore a syntax slightly different from Maql˘ı VI 28 // 38: “this here of my warlock and witch: break (it, namely) their bond”.

30’ (52): For ‘iˇs instead of ‘iˇša, see the introductory remarks on the orthographic and linguistic features of A 7876.


Rev. VII 3‘–6’ (Maql˘ı VI 63–8): The following duplicates are known for this passage (all Nineveh, Assyrian script): K 2420 + 2446 (+) (ll. 65–8), K 13322 (+) (l. 65), Ki 1904-10-9, 112 (BM 99083) (ll. 65–8).

3‘ (65): K 2420 + (+) and Ki 1904-10-9, 112 have atti ˇsa tep˘ušt without the interjection e (see infra commentary on rev. VII 26–7), but at least one manuscript of the ritual tablet gives the incipit as here: at-ta-e ˇsa ... . (Neo-Babylonian VAT 4103 rev. 15 = Ritual tablet l. 103’: K 8879 + ˇSm 229 + 499 + 929 + 1194(+)) rev. III 5’ possibly to be restored accordingly.

4‘ (66): K 2420 (+) and Ki 1904-10-9, 112 put u between y˘aˇši and sˇiˇntuˇya. It is worth noting that the indirect object is represented by the dative pronoun followed by a simple genitive without ana at the beginning of the phrase. For the interpretation of this line, see Schwemer 2007b: 154–7, 226–8.
5' (67): K 2420 + (+) obv. II 23 has gazmeš instead of gazš here. Exactly the same line recurs in the second incantation of Maqlû VI in l. 22: [gazmeš] kuku šum
tu a-a a-a usta-
i (K 2391 obv. I
22 // K 12925(+ obv. I 7' // BM 36643 + 37527 obv. 16', gazmeš preserved on K 2391, BM 36643 + only [−]-iš-[]). The expected reading of gazmeš // gazš would be the plural imperative ēpipa, as in Maqlû V 51 (ē-pu-a, K 2544–A, 7876), VI 28 (gazmeš, K 2595 + [−], K 15032[+] and VI 38 (gazš, K 2595 + [+]), were not expected for the fact that both here and in VI 22 the kuku-plant alone is addressed so that a singular form is expected. The writing gazmeš, then, must indicate an iterative form and the phonetic complement in our manuscript would have to be explained as a ventive form. The [−]-iš-[ preserved in BM 36643 + shows that we have to read a G-stem (or possibly D-stem) form of ēpipa (but not the imperative), and the preface in l. 68 would seem to support the reconstruction of a precative form also in l. 67, i.e. īhteppā (possibly īhteppī in K 2420 + [+]).

Rev. VII 7'–11' (Maqlû VI 69–77): The incantation begins with the speaker’s (i.e. the patient’s) identification with personified sulphur and a short account of sulphur’s creation and delivery to men (ll. 69–71). Two rhetorical questions emphasise that overall the patient is immune from witchcraft: nowhere on his body can witchcraft a rhetorical questions emphasise that overall the patient is immune from witchcraft: nowhere on his body can

- sa-šum u-sin-ni (written ki and ki

- kasˇ-da-in-ni

- maa-šam-ma ša-a šum-ma er-settu kišu

- lih-teppā (possibly lih-teppī in K 2420 + [+]).

9' (72–3): One should note the Assyrian vocalism in tur[u]hiš[n] instead of the expected ture[u]hiš[n] in K 6797 (+) obv. II 3. More importantly, our manuscript has a-ki-šar-am and a-ki-šar-am instead of e-ki-šar-am in K 6797 (+) obv. II 2 and 3. This form of Standard Babylonian ekišam (< ayyikšam) is not attested otherwise. It has no phonetical justification and is certainly influenced by ayakā (yoki), the corresponding form in the scribe’s Neo-Assyrian vernacular (note also that underlying ayu can be glottalised a’u in Neo-Assyrian).

10' (74–5): The corresponding lines in the duplicate K 6797 + (+) read: [ ... ] an4 GA-āš- [x], [ ... ] kiim
gA-aš-da-[x] (obv. 4’–5’). The endings of the two verbal forms are only partly preserved in our manuscript. Kaš-du in l. 74 is beyond any doubt, while at the end of l. 75 kaš-da-[a] means more likely than kaš-da-a, though only traces of the lower tips of the lower two horizontal wedges are preserved. A reading kaš-da-at is also more plausible from a purely orthographic point of view, since the stative feminine plural in -a would hardly be marked by a plene-writing. One could admit such an irregular spelling for the Chicago fragment, but taking into account that also the duplicate definitely had another sign after gaš-da-du- the readings kaš-da-a[t] resp. gaš-da-[a] are virtually certain. This reading is further confirmed by comparison with a similar anti-witchcraft incantation preserved on K 10341 obv. 1–9 (= A, Nineveh, Assyrian script, copy Fig. 7) // 80–7, 194 + K 10559 + K 11993 + Sm 1330 obv. I 56–61’ (= B, Nineveh, Assyrian script, copy Fig. 8). The text of the incantation, whose similarity to Maqlû VI 69–77 was noted by Lambert 1974: 84 and Abusch 2003: 9 fn. 23, reads:

1 A obv. 1

2 A obv. 2

3 A obv. 3

4 A obv. 4

5 A obv. 5

6 A obv. 6

7 A obv. 7

8 A obv. 8

9 A obv. 9

Clearly the subjects of the two stative forms in ll. 4–5 here and in Maqlû VI 74–5 must be šamu (written an and anš) and er-settu (written ki and kišarmes), and there is no need to explain the ending of kašša as a subjunctive form. It seems, then, that also anšula functions as a preposition (not as a subordinate conjugation). And the two lines each form an independent sentence; this assumption is confirmed by the
fact that in K 10341 the same phrases occur in a slightly different context. The writings ga-âš-... and kaš-... are not easily reconciled. Ga is used regularly for ga and fairly often for qâ in manuscripts of Standard Babylonian texts, while its use as kâ is restricted to texts or phrases that imitate 3rd mill. orthography. The sign u on the other hand is regularly used for kaš and qâš, but a value qâš is so far unattested to our knowledge. To put it simply: while the spellings in K 6979 (+) and K 10341 strongly suggest a reading qašdû, qašdati (qadašu “to (be)come pure, holy”), the fact that the scribe of A 7876 used kaš indicates that at least he may have thought of kašdû “to reach” rather than qašdû (“the heaven reaches as far as my head, the earth reaches as far as my feet”). Given that the context deals with the overall immunity of the patient’s body against witchcraft and the state of being bewitched was associated with impurity, it seems wiser to follow the Kuyunjik fragments’ lead and to admit that the scribe of our tablet either misunderstood the passage or created an ad hoc value qâš, therefore: “as much as my head heaven is holy, as much as my feet earth is holy”. We recognize the conceptual difficulty implied by this literal translation of the Akkadian, since we expect the holiness of heaven and earth to be the point of comparison and the goal of the statement to be the transference of holiness from heaven and earth to head and feet, as, e.g., in the well-known formula kîma šamē lûlîl kîma ers eti lûbih.

The use of the prepositional phrase ana mala instead of simple mala is typical of Assyrian. That its occurrence here may represent yet another intrusion of the scribe’s vernacular into the traditional text is supported by the fact that the parallel text K 10341 // has simple mala.

Rev. VII 12–8' (Maqlû VI 78–84): Lines 78–81 are preserved here and partially in K 6979 (+). The last three lines are also duplicated by K 13264 (+) (Nineveh, Babylonian script), though this fragment preserves only traces of the very first sign of each line. A close parallel to ll. 78–81 is found on the Middle Assyrian fragment KAR 269 (VAT 11119) obv. II 4–8 (cf. Abusch 1987: 77). The right-hand fragment copied by Ebeling as part of VAT 11119 had been lost during the second world war and therefore the photograph sent to Abusch in 1976 could not be used for collation (see Abusch 1987: xv–xvi); but the, as it turned out, four missing fragments have now been identified by Schwemer in 2007 and 2008 among the unnumbered fragments at the Vorderasiatisiche Museum. Therefore, all quotations from the text are based on Schwemer’s collation (and new copy, to be published in KAL 4) and not on Abusch’s transliteration of Ebeling’s copy (1987: 17–8, 80–2).
Fig. 8  80-7-19, 146 + K 10559 + K 11993 + Sm 1330 (only obv. preserved).
12” (78): KAR 269 obv. II 4–5 is fragmentary, but apparently had a very similar incipit: èni kib-rí::it kib-rí::it kib-rí::it kib-rí::it màrat [id], e[l]-[t]-[a][t]-[i]d [for another possible case of masculine agreement with kibritu cf. unpubl. VAT 10786 rev. 15: èni kib-rí::it e[l]-[t]-ka·ru [kúru šam-mu u[du]bishu anakdu]).

13” (79): Collation shows that KAR 269 obv. II 6 has a similar text, though distorted by corruptions: s[a se]-e-be kaša-kul-pa-tu-sa ù se-[h]-lu ayyûbatùsù, possibly to be emended to s[a se-he] ù se-be kaša-kul-pa-ta-sa ù se-hlu ayyûbatùsù. Only the end of the line is preserved in K 6979 (+) obv. II 9’1 . . . 7 7a-a-ta-sù.[14–15 (80–1):] The first halves of these two lines are only preserved here, but collation of KAR 269 gratifyingly suggests the reading suggested by the traces visible in A 7876: i-p[i]-s[a]-šù·ma el in-né-pu-usù·u̯-kaš-ši-pu-ši-ma, ul ‘i·-[kaš]-š[i]p anu-ku ki-ma ‘id ila kur-i·[a lù elékù] (obv. II 7–8). 16” (82): K 6979 (+) obv. II 12” has syllabic ip-pu-sà. 18” (84): The traces at the beginning of the line suggest kimin rather than pi[sˇe]-id, though only two verticals are clearly visible at the end of kimin. In K 13264 (at first sight like ba-tu-sˇau se-b[se-be lu se-be kašša-kul-pa-tu-sa ù se-hlu ayyûbatùsù]) the plural determinative was often, though not always, omitted. Here this was transferred by analogy to dumu.munus for gods before an (e.g. abgal cf. unpubl. VAT 10786 rev. 15). 19–20” (86–7): The plural épisûtā’a — for the regular form épisûtā’ta see e.g. Maqlû 1136, V 112 — is also attested in the Sultantepe manuscript of the ritual tablet (STT 83 rev. 4: e-pi-ši-šu-ša-ša; the duplicate K 2385 + obv. II 8” has [e-pi]-ši-ša-a-a-a- and in 80–7–19, 146 + K 10559 + K 11993 + Sm 1330 obv. I 60” (see supra). Within all contexts the forms refer to feminine agents excluding a masculine adjectival plural. A phonetic explanation seems more likely. By adding the suffix -‘a the stress moves from the penultimate syllable (episûtā’ta) to the last syllable (e-pisûtā’ta). This may have caused a slight shortening of the feminine plural morpheme which would then have been susceptible to vowel harmony — assuming the underlying was Assyrian: episûtā’ta > episûtā’ta ‘a. The plurality of apkallû and mārût is not indicated by the logographic writings abgal and dumu.munus here and in K 6979 (+). In the parallel passage Maqlû 1136 ll. 31 and 32), whereas apkallû is represented by simple abgal there too. Simple abgal for plural apkallû is attested elsewhere in Maqlû (V 104, VII 46) and outside Maqlû (e.g. KAR 298 obv. 2, 14), but abgelmél is used as well (Maqlû II 125, VIII 40, KAR 298 obv. 11). There is no significant distribution of the two spellings over different groups of manuscripts. The conclusion must be that we are dealing with a simple graphic phenomenon that is comparable to the omission of the determinative for gods before an (Anu) in order to avoid a sign sequence AN AN. The sign sequence abgal(uN.ME)resp. abgal(uN.ME) resp. (uN.ME) resp. (uN.ME) was apparently regarded as slightly awkward and the plural determinative was often, though not always, omitted. Here this was transferred by analogy to dumu.munus as well. The fact that both the Chicago fragment and the Kuyunjik duplicate here omit the plural determinative not only with abgal, but also with dumu.munus could indicate that the spelling had become part of the textual tradition at this time. But the fact that in the parallel passage Maqlû 1136 all manuscripts consistently write dumu.munusmél (two Kuyunjik manuscripts, Assyrian script; two Late Babylonian manuscripts) rather suggests that the omission of the plural determinative in both manuscripts is due to a coincidence. 22” (88): The (Assyrianizing) form épisùtimi certainly stands for i(episûtimi) (cf. the introductory remarks on the linguistic features of A 7876), and the fragmentary duplicate K 2959(+) may have had the expected form: [x 1]-pu-sà-a-ti. The ‘present tense’ of ‘dú’ādinni denotes the durative in the past (“never”). There is only room for one sign in the break before episûtimi in K 2959(+) . Though not excluded, a spelling of kí with simple kí is unexpected in a typical Ashurbanipal library tablet. A restoration gim seems more likely therefore and the logogram was probably read kímá rather than kí. Note that kí-i occasionally is attested as a variant of ki-ma in manuscripts of Standard Babylonian texts: e.g. Gilgameš XI 75 (George 2003: 706), Istar’s Descent 29 (Borger 1979: 197) and Dialogue of Pessimism 67 (Lambert 1960: 148); cf. also the use of kí- instead of expected gim = kínma in SAA 4, 276 obv. 12 and kí- as variant of ki-ma in a Nabopolassar inscription (VAB 4, 64 iii 27). 23” (89): For the use of the perfect in the main sentence after a kí clause see GAG3 k172e. 26”–7” (95–7): The combination of two canonical lines on one works well in ll. 24–5 and in l. 27’, but grouping together ll. 94–5 obscures the structure of the incantation, which is clearly subdivided into the opening line (85), the motif of the sages and the Daughters of Anu (86–9), the deliverance of the patient in comparisons (90–4) and a final absence to “those of the Balû” (95–7). These last three lines of the
incantation are rather cryptic. For l. 95 the duplicate K 2595+(+) has: *es aša ḫalīḥ(e)kasḵal-kur(e) e ša ḫalīḥ(e)kasḵal-kur(e)*. The omission of *e* in our manuscript leaves little doubt that the sign represents the interjection *ē* and not the logogram for *ēku* “ditch”. The dictionaries treat the interjection *ē* as identical with or related to the vettive particle *aī* and translate “no!” (AHw 180a, CAD A 9a) and “no, no!” (CAD E 1a).

The interjection is used in Maqlū right at the beginning of a series of incantations addressing the witch: *ē kasḵāra* in Maqlū VI 112 (restored), 126*, 134*, 142*, 151* with the corresponding entries in the ritual tablet; cf. also *CTN 4*, 92–rev. III 35*, 48* (Schwemer 2007b: 50). The same interjection is also used after *attī* in addressing the witch, and the spellings *at-ti-ī-e-e* (besides *at-ti-e-e*) show that the interjection was closely attached to the pronoun: *attī(e)* (Maqlū III 102–11 with corresponding entry in ritual tablet l. 50*; *at-ti-e-e* with variant *at-ti-e-e-e* in Assyrian manuscripts from Kuyunjik and elsewhere, as well as in VAT 4103, a Late Babylonian manuscript of the ritual tablet, and variants *ata-t’a-e-e*e* and *ata-t’a-e* in Late Babylonian sources of Maqlū III; for VI 65, cf. supra, commentary on rev. VII 3*). A meaning “no!” does not fit any of these contexts well, for in none of them is *ē* followed by a negated statement. As already seen by Meier (1937: 25, 44–6 translating “he” resp. “du da”, cf. also *GAQ* §124b), in these contexts *ē* functions as an attention-demanding (and slightly reprimanding) interjection, much like English “hey!” as in “Hey you, stop that!” The same meaning is probably intended in the present line, and ša Balīḥ(e) represents the vocative that typically follows or precedes *ē*; our scribe simply omitted the “hey” preceding the two vocatives. But who is addressed by the vocative ša Balīḥ(e)? Clearly a masculine plural, as the plural forms *narāqā* and *tunassāsā* *gismatkišu* in the following lines show. Balīḥ(e) resp. *kasḵal-kur(e)* is the deified river Balīḥ in western Upper Mesopotamia. The river Balīḥ seems to have played a certain role in Babylonian mythology, since the son and successor of Etana is called Balīḥ(a) according to the Sumerian King List (II 68–70, ETCSL 2.1.1). Etana himself, like Gilgamesh, becomes a god in the nether world under unknown circumstances (Lambert 2002: 208–9), but nothing is known yet about the role of Balīḥ in the myths associated with Etana. It should be noted that the reading *kīl̥-i-kī ba₃-ha₃[ī]ḥ* proposed by Kinnier Wilson 2007: 63 for K 13859: 2*, possibly an Etana fragment, does not stand up against scrutiny; the fragmentary line actually reads *aš₃ ba₃ lu₃ḥ* or possibly *aš₃ ba₃ kād* (coll.). If the name Balīḥ is really what the scribe intended, it would be written without a determinative; while this is not excluded, it should further caution us against readily accepting Kinnier Wilson's far-reaching, but for the most part reconstructed account of the latter parts of the myth's role in the story.

The river(-god) Balīḥ is written with the logogram kaskal-kur which, as convincingly demonstrated by Gordon 1967: 70–80 (cf. also Hawkins 1995: 44–5), has to be understood quite literally as “underground road” — an epithet that is very fitting for the river Balīḥ, which already in antiquity was connected to an underground river in the vicinity of Urfa (Gordon 1967: 77–9); this underground river served as an important water source, a characteristic of the Balīḥ that is not lost on Babylonian literature: in *Surpu* VIII 54 Balīḥ(e) is followed by *kappu* “pond (of a spring or well)”, *nāḥu* “(water-carrying) wadi” and *mīḫāṣu* “pond”. It is also worth noting that divine Balīḥ is invoked after Belet-sēr, a goddess of the western steppe and the nether world, in a Standard Babylonian incantation (K 9875 obv. II 20–1, see Meier 1937–9: 141–4, Vanstiphout 1977: 52–6). Already in third-millennium Ebla the deified river Balīḥ was conceived as a dyad and referred to in the dual (Pomponio and Xella 1997: 78–9), and this is the background of the form Balīḥ(e) still found in Maqlū and other first-millennium sources. It is tempting to assume that the dual nature of the river, which flows underground and on the surface, forms the background of this concept; the Balīḥ, however, is not the only river that is conceptualized as a divine dyad (see Woods 2005: 13–14). Here, the speaker orders “those of Etana’s” *es ū₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₁₀₁₁₁₂₁₃₁₄₁₅₁₆₁₇₁₈₁₉₂₀* and “his children” *ši₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₁₀₁₁₁₂₁₃₁₄₁₅₁₆₁₇₁₈₁₉₂₀* to shake out their hair and shake their heads to the rhythm of the song; a gesture of shaking one’s hair out at someone would then probably have a threatening connotation here.

*Rev. VII 28–35* (Maqlū VI 98–105): The incantation is still only partially known. K 2595+(+) rev. III 5–12 duplicates the whole text, but is very fragmentary after l. 100. The small fragment K 13349, which probably belonged to the same tablet as K 6979+(+), picks up in l. 105, but only traces at the beginning of the line are extant. The first part of the incantation (II 98–100) consists of a series of identifications of the patient’s body parts with a set of pure substances that are immune to witchcraft: river-water (*Id* and *nārut*), sea-water, sulphur and the *anālhu*-plant (for the latter, cf. Schwemer 2007b: 198, and, for its use in *BMS* 12, cf. Abusch 1987: 62–4 and 74). Lines 101–3 explain the relationship between the substances and the body parts more explicitly by rephrasing II 98–100 in the format “like . . . my . . . is pure”. While II 98–100 and II. 101–3 clearly correspond to each other, there are marked differences not only in structure, but also with regard to the individual components of each series. The end of the incantation is largely broken or undeciphered.

30 (100): The expected phrase is *Ayahha tāmtu rapaštu*. That our scribe omitted *rapaštu* by mistake is confirmed by the duplicate K 2595+(+) which reads: *anālhu-an.[ūl₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₁₀₁₁₁₂₁₃₁₄₁₅₁₆₁₇₁₈₁₉₂₀]u₃₄₅₆₇₈₉₁₀₁₁₁₂₁₃₁₄₁₅₁₆₁₇₁₈₁₉₂₀ (rev. III 7). 31–3 (101–3): The syntactic interpretation of these lines depends on the reading of *ebbu* in l. 33, which seems, however, reasonably certain. It is assumed that *ebbu* refers to all preceding syntagms: “Like Id my head (is pure), . . .”
The ritual tablet prescribes the usage of sulphur, "anhullu" and "imhur-lish" plant for this incantation. "anhullu" is already identified with the patient’s mouth in l. 100 and is expected to be named here besides "imhur-lish" followed by the fitting epithet “plants of release”. The traces on the tablet suggest "ha.lu.ub" rather than "an.łu.łu.la"; given the vague phonetic similarity between the two words and the outer similarity of the two sign sequences we can safely assume that our manuscript is corrupt and that the correct reading is "anhullu".

The traces preserved are too ambiguous for any confident reading. Once a duplicate is identified the copy may well be in need of revision.

Rev. VII 36'-41' (Maqlâ VI 106–11): Only the first few lines of this incantation are fragmentarily preserved here, on the small fragment K 13349(+) (copy Fig. 9) and in K 3665(+) rev. III 1–4 (Nineveh, Babylonian script; only the beginnings of the lines are preserved). The reconstruction of the text as given above depends very much on its coordination with K 13349(+); it seems therefore advisable to provide a synoptic transliteration of the available sources (note that the recently identified fragment K 13349[+] and its coordination with K 3665[+] now show that what was counted as l. 108 following A 7876 ought to be split into two lines, hence 108A and 108B):

K 13349(+) (A) // A 7876 (a) // K 3665(+) (a)

Fig. 9 K 13349(+) (Maqlâ VI) rev. III and IV (only rev. preserved on this fragment).
A similar text is known, but again fragmentarily, from the Middle Assyrian Maqlû “forerunner” KAR 269. There, the passage forms the second part of the incantation Kibritu kibritu (cf. here the commentary on rev. VII 12–18). Not a single line of the fragmentary text is without problems of reading and interpretation, but the basic motifs are clearly the same as in Maqlû VI 106 ff.: KAR 269 obv. II (coll.)

9 4id a-[k[u] al-ti al-ba-bit a-[t] [si?] 9 River, I have [eaten], I have drunk, I have put on a garment, I have p[ut on a headress]!

10 4id a-[ka]-ti a[u]-bar-[ti-ia] 10 River, my bread (and) my water, [my] garmen[t]

11 4isig k-a-ia k-[me]-e-[i]a 11 and my headress, my doors [ ]

12 4id qit-ul-[m[a]] 14[d] r[u]-?

13 River, take heed, River, [ ]

The situation described in these incantations seems to be that of a patient who has refreshed himself with food and drink, been anointed, put on clean clothes and protected the entrances to his house, probably after having undergone a purifying washing rite. Washing with river water is, however, not explicitly mentioned in either of the two texts, though the river-god is the main addressee of the incantations.

36 (106): For the tentative restoration of abḫalip cf. preserved abḫ-[u]- in the duplicate.

37 (106–7): a-ta-ni-ri is interpreted as a Gt preterite form of apâru with reflexive meaning (cf. the reference to paršigû in KAR 269 obv. II 11). This usage of the Gt stem of apâru is otherwise not yet securely attested (but cf. Streck 2003: 41 on Gilgâmeš VI 5). However, the pair apîru “cover oneself with regard to the head” and nûpûru “be covered with regard to the head” can be compared with piššatu “anoint oneself” and napisšatu “be anointed”, litūšu “put on (a garment)” and nallūtu “be clothed” and other verbs of the same semantic fields (cf. Streck 2003: 40–4). In view of KAR 269 obv. II 9 it seems likely that ku.k[i] in K 13349(+) rev. III 3’ should be read alaḫisî(mu₄, mu₄) rather than alaḫaḫiš through the dictionaries (CAD L 21a, AHw 524a) note only one attestation of mu₄, mu₄ standing for an N-stem form.

38–9 (106–9): The reading of du₄ and keša remains uncertain. Because of the occurrence of explicit first-person forms in ll. 36–7, it is tentatively assumed that both logograms stand for 1st sg. preterite verbal forms, though instead they might represent second-person forms addressed to the divine river. Since the patient seems to be envisaged as having already finished his meal we tentatively translate “clear away” though paṭâru in this sense usually refers to whole arrangements (riku, paśšaru, niqanaka) and not to single items. Note that the reading zaq.du₄ is not entirely certain, though doors are mentioned in KAR 269 and, if restored correctly in K 13349(+), also in our text. The construction of the doorframe and the joining of the doorjams are often referred to as raḵašu or ra[kkusu] within the context of building works.

40 (110): The tentative emendation is inspired by comparison with KAR 269 obv. II 11 (cf. supra).

41 (111): Read perhaps a₂[me₄] (k₄[me₄]-se), or possibly ‘al₃ me₄ x τ₄ me₄. If a₄ me₄ is correct, the following might be a corrupt rendering of subašṭa (cf. KAR 269 obv. II 10).

Rev. VIII 1–14 (Maqlû VII 32–46): The incantation Šammu ella Šammu eḫu is attested in no fewer than seven Maqlû manuscripts; but it is also known from other contexts as a standard incantation to be spoken over the oil that was used for anointing the patient (cf. KAL 2, 7, CT 51, 98: 3, TRHUW 16 Vs. 1 ff. as well as K 11725 and Rm 2, 480). For a transcription, translation and discussion of this incantation, see Abusch 2003: 4–6.

10 (42): ina rikis rabē(gal)’ is a corrupt variant of ina rikis rabāti resp. ina rikis rabābi “with the soothing banga”, but not an isolated mistake of a single scribe. Thus while we find ina ri-kis ra-ba-bî in K 2950 + obv. I 42 (Nineveh, Assyrian), ina rikis ra-ba-ba in N 1423 + obv. I 11’ (Nippur, Late Babylonian; so also non-Maqlû K 11725 obv. 11’), ina rikî-si ra-ba-li in K 3247(+1) obv. I 12’ (Nineveh, Assyrian script, cf. fragmentary K 5350 + obv. I 24’, Nineveh, Babylonian) and ina si₃ rab-ba-ṣiṭî in Ni 2927 + obv. I 21’ (Nippur, Neo-Babylonian), we have the mistaken ina rikis rabē(gal)’ in the Chicago ms. and ina rikî-si gal’ in KAR 268 obv. 21’ (Babylonian script); note that the latter variant is also found in KAL 2, 7 obv. II 6’, a non-Maqlû version of this incantation.

13 (45): K 2950 + places idiššumma between annanna and Ea, but all other sources have the word order attested here. The interpretation of ēn kā sā ti.îa is not entirely certain. The expected appositional phrase šiptu amānu ša balâši is ruled out by syllabic š-paṭ k[i] in K 3247(+1) obv. I 15’. Nevertheless a reading šiptaka ša balâši is difficult to reconcile with the 3rd sg. idiššumma whose subject must be Ea. However, the syllabic spelling ṻ-di is fully preserved only in our manuscript; all other sources either write logographically or are fragmentary (in K 11725 obv. 14’), which has k-i-di-š-a-an-ma, the first sign could be ṣd or ṣ, coll.). It is possible therefore, as already suggested by Abusch 2003: 5 fn. 13, that the preterite form is a corruption of an imperative: idiššumma anu annanna mū annanna Ea šiptaka ša balâši “Oh Ea, cast your incantation of healing on N.N., son of N.N.!”

14 (46): Note that šapšāṭu instead of lipaššū (all other Maqlû sources) is also found in the non-Maqlû version KAL 2, 7 obv. II 10’. Cf. l. 39, where our manuscript and K 2950 + read upaššī, while KAR 268 (Assûr, Babylonian) and K 3247 (+) have ušapšāṭu; our manuscript is broken in l. 31’, but there again K 3247(+) has mu₄[apaššu] against the mu₄apaššu of all other sources.

Rev. VIII 15–21’ (Maqlû VII 47–54): Lines 47–50 are also preserved in K 2950+, K 3247(+) and N 1423+, whereas ll. 51–4 are only known from the present manuscript and N 1423+. In this incantation the patient
identifies various of his body parts with several gods, constellations and other divine beings and then invokes the astral manifestations of the great gods with the aim of making himself as immune to witchcraft as are the stars.

15 (47–8): The patient’s head is identified with Enlil, the traditional head of the Babylonian pantheon (cf. Maqlī VI 1). Possibly the god’s name stands for Enlil’s astral manifestation, Bōtēs, but the text does not state this explicitly nor is a commentary preserved that would provide evidence for such an association; also note that, like Anu and Ea, Enlil is usually not identified with a specific constellation. The Arrow (Sukūtu, Sirius) is the star of Ninurta, Enlil’s foremost son (see Annus 2002: 133–7). The arrow is one of warlike Ninurta’s weapons, and Ninurta himself is invoked as the arrow “that [kills] all enemies” (Annus 2002: 207, Mayer 2005: 52 l. 8). Ninurta’s power is here transferred to the patient’s body so that it may overcome his evil witches and enemies. The identification of the patient’s forehead with the rising sun evokes the image of the appearance of the upper part of the sun-disc at sunrise. The duplicates have more explicit sag.du instead of simple sag.du for sag.ki, a legitimate Late Babylonian spelling of pātu.

16 (49–50): For the identification of the patient’s arms with the gamlu, a curved staff, cf. also Maqlī VI 4. The constellation Gamlu (Auriga; K 2950 + obv. I 40 writes ḫašubi, but K 3247 (+) obv. I 18’ has ḫašubi) is designated as the weapon in Marduk’s hand in V R 46, 1 obv. 3 (cf. Gössmann 1950: 19) and identified with Marduk himself in VAT 9818: 12’ (Reiner 2005: 80, Jupiter omens). Within the present context one would expect the phrase sa bāb Marduk to refer to an astral constellation as well. While Marduk can only represent Jupiter, it is difficult to see what “Jupiter’s gate” could refer to in the night sky. Possibly the text only implies that the gamlu-stick, the apotropaic weapon of the exorcist, protected the entrance to the temple of Marduk, the exorcist of the gods. The following canonical line identifies the patient’s ears with le-ṭu-ṭa (K 2950 + obv. I 50: le-ṭu-ṭa, N 1423 + obv. 14’:] le-ṭu-ṭa). While le-ṭu-ṭa in N 1423 + suggests “writing board” and the overall context might lead to speculation that somehow is lē, the Bull’s jaw (Hyades), might be intended, the spellings in the present manuscript and its Kuyunjik duplicate can hardly represent anything but lē “capable”. This sounds impossibly bland at first sight, but it should be noted that Aa II:4 11–13 groups zešu “ear, wisdom”, lē “capable, wise” and bāšu “ear, wisdom” together. Furthermore, lē as a divine epithet, while in principle not restricted to one deity, is associated in literary texts foremost with Marduk and his son Nabū, both gods of wisdom (cf. Tallqvist 1938: 115, CAD L 160). It seems therefore likely that an identification with Marduk or Nabū is intended; given the prominence of the former in the preceding sentence he probably would have been associated by most Babylonian scholars with the epithet here.

17 (50): Though one would expect a reference to yet another astral body here, laḫnu is unattested so far in the heavens. laḫnu, the ‘hairy one’, is a creature of Ea’s realm (see Wiggermann 1981–2 and 1992: 164–6 with further references), and the identification of the patient’s feet with laḫnu-heroes roots him deep in the subterranean ocean. At the same time the laḫnu is an important protective spirit whose apotropaic power is transferred to the patient. The motif of the two laḫnu-heroes (note the dual form mukabbisā in the duplicate K 2950 + obv. I 50) stepping on the “flesh”, i.e. the body, of other laḫnu-heroes is so far only attested here in Akkadian literature. The phrase probably alludes to a victorious gesture of stepping on one’s defeated enemies. The laḫnu has been convincingly identified by Wiggermann with the naked hero (“sechslockige Held”) attested in Babylonian iconography from the Jemdet Nasr period onwards. Akkade-period cylinder seals show naked heroes wrestling in pairs, the victorious partner stepping with one foot upon the defeated hero (see Boehmer 1965: 47–8, especially his no. 279, pl. xxiv). It seems likely that the very same motif underlies our passage in Maqlī.

18 (51): The line is only preserved here and, partially, in N 1423 + obv. 15’ where we read: [ . . . ] (off)tu ʾan-na-nup-iš-ti-[mu]. The emendation of N 1423 + is based on A 7876. However, the line as presented by the Chicago fragment must be corrupted too, and we propose to insert kīma before ḫašamiš. The great gods invoked during the night are the stars that shine in the sky like the sun in day-time. The term išu ṛabātu in l. 51 certainly comprises the gods invoked in the first part of the incantation — Enlil, Ninurta-Sirius, Aurigā(-Marduk), Marduk(-Jupiter) (?) — but other divine beings mentioned there, such as the sun-god himself in l. 51 and the subterranean laḫnu-heroes in l. 50, are not referred to here. It seems that the line contains a rather general invocation of the great gods in their astral manifestations and was only secondarily combined with the first part of our incantation.

19–21 (52–4): Note that N 1423 + has a longer list of witchcraft activities, adding kašpu ṛuḫa ṛusu ʾupṣāšu lemmūtu after ṣaṣi bātu amāt lemmūtu. Unfortunately the first half of l. 52 is not preserved in N 1423 +, as it presents the only problem in what is otherwise a straightforward analogic spell. We expect “as sorcery, revolt... do not approach you... let sorcery, revolt... do not approach me...”, but the symmetry of analogy and plea is disrupted by additional words between kīma and ṣaṣi that, given the available space in the break, must also have been present in the only duplicate. The signs in question are reasonably well preserved and suggest a reading an-na-ʾku? an-br[ar]?: A trace between kū and AN might represent an u, but if so it would have been additionally squeezed in by the scribe after having written the full line; we therefore prefer to interpret it as a scratch. While the reading of the actual signs does not present us with too many difficulties, their interpretation within the present context is far from obvious. Addressed are the great gods in their astral manifestations. The words annaku “tin” and parzillus “iron”, if our reading is correct, seem to form part of the sequence that is continued by ṣaṣi bātu amāt lemmūtu; they are missing, however, from the parallel
sequence in the following request. Furthermore, the sequence in itself does not make much sense; what could possibly be the point of saying that tin and iron do not come near the stars? In contrast to copper and tin for the production of bronze, iron and tin were not alloyed in ancient Mesopotamia. Could this possibly be the background of the comparison made here? Just as iron and tin do not mix, do not come near each other, so witchcraft is something that cannot approach the gods. Grammatically one would have to assume that the spelling *an-nu-ki stands for *annaki (*kina annaki parzilli “like tin (and) iron”) and that a second *kina was omitted elliptically in order to avoid an impossible *kina *kina annaki parzilli. This assumption, advanced here with much hesitation, underlies our provisional and tentative translation. Further discussion must await a duplicate that confirms or modifies (our reading of) the text as preserved on the Chicago fragment.

Rev. VIII 22’–43’ (Maqlû VII 55–79): Numerous manuscripts preserve the text of this incantation. Apart from a few typical Neo-Assyrian spellings (ub-ir-ru for abhiru, lam-šur-î-nî for limḫuri’înû) the text as preserved in the present fragment agrees with the other available sources. Note that the final annur niḫru limḫuri’înû (l. 79a) is otherwise only found in Babylonian manuscripts (KAR 268, N 1423 +, Ni 2927 +, BM 64203), but is missing in the two extant Kuyunjik sources (K 2950, K 8058).

Rev. IX 1’–12’ (Maqlû VIII): The beginning of Maqlû VIII is still only partly known. The present passage has to be inserted somewhere after l. 16. The text picks up after a break of approximately nine lines, but the endings of ll. 17’–21’ are missing and cannot be restored with any confidence. The exact placement of the line endings preserved here therefore remains uncertain.
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Abstract
The fragment A 7876 (Oriental Institute, Chicago) occupies a special position among the cuneiform sources of the ritual Maqlû. The six-column tablet, inscribed in the Neo-Assyrian script of the 8th and 7th centuries BC, originally contained the complete text of the series with its nine canonical tablets. Taking into account the relevant duplicate manuscripts the article offers an annotated edition of this fragment and compares its style and format to other “large tablets” (dubgallû) of Babylonian literary texts.
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